J11
.R

103
88134
10V

Appendix

Address by Hon. Hubert H. Humphrey, of Minnesota, Before Minnesota Association of Student Councils

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, February 20, 1958

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, it was my privilege to address the Minnesota State Association of Student Councils at their annual meeting in Thief River Falls, November 8, 1957.

This student council association represents the elected study leaders of our Minnesota high schools. Here we find bright, alert, inquiring young minds seeking answers to the many perplexing issues which confront our society. It is always a real privilege and a challenge to speak to this group.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the text of my address prepared for the annual meeting of the Minnesota State Association of Student Councils.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS BEFORE MINNESOTA ASSOCIATION OF STUDENT COUNCILS BY SENATOR HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, NOVEMBER 8, 1957

Every time I think about those Russian satellites sailing over our heads every 90 minutes, the thought is brought home hard to me that some 150,000 topnotch young Americans, this year, and last year, and the year before that, did not go on to college—just because of financial difficulties. One hundred and fifty thousand students out of the top echelon of their classes in high school did not go on to study in college—just because of a lack of means to pay for college.

How many of those who did not go to college 10 years ago, for that same reason, would now be available to help our country in its desperate shortage of scientists and engineers—had they had the chance?

Every time I get a briefing from the State Department specialists on the Middle East, or India, or any other part of the Asian-African world where the United States vital interests are increasingly concerned, I am appalled once again by the fact that only a handful of Americans can talk the language of the peoples of Asia and Africa—let alone of Europe. The lack of a common language is an almost unsurmountable barrier at times to the transmission and exchange of ideas. Yet too few American students today are preparing through language and area studies for the challenge of America's growing role in these vast, underdeveloped areas of the world.

The last 10 years have seen almost incredible changes in our world.

Atomic energy—with all its shattering dangers and unlimited opportunities—is intruding into our lives more each month. We have a bear by the tail, a locomotive that threatens to run away down hill with us. We have to tame this great power before it enslaves us, or destroys us.

The beep-beep-beep of the first Russian satellite told us that we have crossed another threshold—into the age of space flight.

No longer is it idle speculation that man may some day reach the moon and the planets. The new speeds of today—of a revolutionary nature—are destroying all our old ideas of space and distance, revolutionizing military strategy, revealing new concepts of communication and travel.

These profoundly important technological breakthroughs have made almost desperate the problem of providing enough scientists and technicians of sufficient quality to regain, and hold, world leadership in the technological race.

But the vast political changes in the world, in the relationship between nations, the breakup of the old colonial empires, the creation of a new Soviet empire headed by ruthless and tenacious leaders, the birth of new nations, and the rising tide of nationalism in Asia and Africa—these political-social changes in the world pose an equal challenge to American leadership.

They dramatize the imperative need to find among our young people, not only brilliant research and technical workers, but also leaders for the next generation in every area of our social and economic life.

If we needed more scientists and technicians 10 years ago, we need them doubly now. If we needed then more young people trained to work with the peoples of other nations, and to lead our own, we need them doubly now.

If we needed in 1947 to seek out and encourage creative, industrious, intelligent men and women for every field of American effort, that need is more imperative, more despearte than ever before.

For the truth of the matter is that the backward peasant nation that was the Soviet Union even 30 years ago has raised itself—at what cost in human suffering and the loss of human dignity we can only estimate—to a high level of technological accomplishment. This remarkable feat cannot help but attract the young nations of the world who are themselves now taking their first faltering steps out of their age-old poverty and domination by colonialism. The sputnik merely dramatizes the whole broad field of Soviet accomplishments.

It is not only Soviet missiles and rockets that face us. There is, indeed, a formidable Soviet military challenge, in the form of intercontinental ballistics missiles, in a vast fleet of missile-equipped submarines, and in its huge standing army. We do face a shrewd and ruthless Soviet leader—not at all adverse to the use of threats and of force, if need be. And it is literally true that we have, through the most incredible kind of complacency, permitted the Soviet Union to leave us some months, and perhaps years, behind in rockets and missiles.

But make no mistake about it. It is not only Soviet missiles and rockets we face. Nikita Khrushchev has thrown down the gauntlet across the board. He boasts that the Soviets will be supreme in nuclear power, in consumer-goods production, in cultural activities, in agricultural production, in education.

Yes, the new nations of Asia and Africa, representing the great uncommitted weight of the world's manpower and resources, are watching intensely the onrushing Soviet drive in science and technology.

It is time we realized that the Soviet is waging allout war on us, and that we are locked in a struggle which will demand every resource of our intelligence and our spirit if we are to survive. We are in a one-game world series and we cannot afford to lose any more innings.

The two sputniks are signs in the sky that the race between the Soviet world and the West has entered a new, a deeper, a more profound dimension. We have been shocked into a realization that we must engage the Soviet in every area in which human intelligence can be brought to bear but our own leaders have not yet charted the way for our Nation to pull itself out of the spiritual and psychological doldrums of the past weeks.

We should not fear this competition. We should welcome it.

First of all, we must decide to compete.

That is a decision which must be taken by the President, specifically, but ultimately it must be taken by us all, as a people, as a Nation. I am not sure that either the President or our people have yet actually made up their minds that we must compete. We have not yet faced up to the implications of this competition. We have not really assayed the costs in energy, in money, in worry, in sacrifice, to compete effectively with the Soviet Union, across the board.

A second great decision we must make, if we are to compete effectively, is that there must be a fundamental change in America toward the intellectuals—the scholars in our midst.

What America needs is more eggheads and fewer fatheads.

I agree.

Anti-intellectualism—the fear and distrust of thinking people—is a disease we simply must stamp out. We cannot afford any more the luxury of laughing at eggheads as too often some have done, or of suggesting there is something treasonable about being an intellectual.

It was Soviet eggheads who got the sputniks off the ground, and it will be American eggheads who get our nation off the ground—if we but give them the support they need!

Frankly, I am on an egghead search. I am looking for more scientists and engineers, more gifted young people in every field of American effort.

And I predict that since the launching of the two sputniks, the whole country will be out looking for eggheads before long. We have them. They are here. You have quite a collection right here in your auditorium. But one needs to find them all, to encourage them, to help them.

Not all eggheads are geniuses. Not all eggheads are potential scientists and engineers. An egghead is simply a thinking, reflecting person, who may well have a strong streak of creativity in him—or her. The basic hallmarks of the egghead are concern primarily with ideas, a restless, inquiring mind; a dedication to something higher and outside himself.

Some are hard boiled and some are soft boiled—but we need them all, and it is high time that the American people and our United States Government decided to make it possible for a far higher percentage of young potential scholars to move up into positions of leadership!

I have indicated my distress over the fact that 150,000 brght young Amercans every

year do not even go on to college after high-school graduation because of financial difficulties of one kind or another. But how many thousands more promising young people have to drop out of college after a year or two, for the same reason? We know it is the leading cause of dropouts after the freshman year. How many truly brilliant scholars find it necessary to forgo postgraduate work because they have to get out and make a living for their families?

I just don't think we can any longer afford to look on these losses among our budding intellectual leadership as something that isn't our business and our Nation's business.

We can no longer view these drop-outs and failures to proceed educationally as simply personal tragedies. They are—each and every one—a loss to us all, a loss to our society, a loss to the free world.

Every time a gifted young man or woman fails to go on to college, or has to drop out of college because of a lack of financial support, we lose a battle in the cold war. In this total struggle between ways of life, we must engage the enemy in depth. We must have reserves. We must look far into the future.

There are many, many things we can do to cut our losses of this nature, and to make sure that we are using effectively all the vast creative forces that lie within the ranks of our young people today. I shall outline for you in a moment some of the things I believe our Federal Government can and should do, through new legislation, to prevent this tremendous waste of good brainpower.

But I want to emphasize that not everything can be done through the Federal Government. The task of providing genuine educational opportunity for our young people must inevitably fall largely to our local communities and school disrticts, our school boards, and the local taxpayers who provide the salaries for teachers, and the classrooms and the books.

It is also a very real challenge to student councils.

We must have more teachers, and we must have better teachers. That means higher teachers' salaries, so that a teacher can afford to work at only one job, so that he or she can afford to take further training during the summer months. An average salary of $4,420 is unthinkably low.

Industry's higher salaries are bidding away our teachers—particularly our science and mathematics teachers. Just to cite one figure—only about half of the chemistry and biology teacher graduates in 1956 actually went on into the teaching profession.

Last week at Chicago, at a conference of more than a thousand educators and laymen interested in education, the point was made over and over again that high-school students are capable of handling much more solid intellectual fare than many are now receiving.

I think that you will agree with that. The quality and the intensity of our higher education can be rather sharply increased, by changes in the curricula. This would have two important effects: to give those who are going on to college a running start, and to interest and motivate many young people who perhaps would not otherwise seriously consider going to college.

For several years I have been striving to bring to the attention of our executive department the growing and now desperate shortage of scientists and engineers as compared with the Soviet Union. Just to show you the caliber of the opposition, and the degree to which a Russian high school graduate is being force fed with scientific education—a recent estimate indicates that such a graduate will have had 10 years of mathematics, 4 of chemistry, 5 of biology, 5 of physics, and 1 of astronomy. Shades of the sputnik. This is all before they go on to college.

Here again, student bodies themselves, through their student councils could make a real contribution, in terms of expressing student sentiment for a more challenging curriculum.

Again I want to emphasize that we should not put all our eggs in one basket by concentrating on the education of scientists and engineers to the exclusion of all other professions. But the Russian data surely demonstrates that many American high school students could take a considerably richer diet of education, with a strong seasoning of the physical sciences.

Now, what can the Federal Government do to help in this gigantic national effort which our people must make to provide the yeast of opportunity for the gifted young people among us?

Many things can be done.

Let me touch on some of the high points embodied in legislative proposals I made and introduced in the United States Senate in January of this year—supplemented later in the session, and to which I plan to add this coming January.

I call it my youth-opportunity program, and if it was vitally important before the sputnik began sailing over our heads, it is doubly important now.

DIRECT SUPPORT OF STUDENTS

First of all, we need a really intensive program of Federal scholarships, administered on the basis of merit and need. We need to make available at least three times as many scholarships as are now available through private and industrial sources. In my Student-Aid Act of 1957, I have proposed 40,000 such scholarships each year—carrying up to $1,000 grant per academic year. My best estimates of current average annual expenses of college students are nearly $1,200 for students in publicly owned institutions and about $1,700 for those in privately supported institutions.

With such a program alone, we ought to be getting into college 3 out of 4 of the top 25 percent of the high-school graduates—instead of 2 out of 4, which we are now getting.

In the same bill I have proposed a long-term, low-interest loan program for college students—loans to be made by the colleges themselves and insured by the Federal Government, much as we insure housing loans through the Federal Housing Administration. Such loans could be made up to a maximum of $1,000 to any one student in any academic year, and would postpone the first repayment until 4 years after completion of full-time education. The total program would involve a Federal loan insurance of up to $25 million in any one year.

You may be interested in a special feature of this loan provision. The bill provides that a college graduate who enters the teaching profession upon graduation may write off his loan, a certain percentage of the loan being forgiven for each year he or she remains in the teaching profession. This is an incentive that would keep many young people from taking the jump out of teaching in those first years of typically low teaching salaries.

Last March I introduced another bill with special applications for the teacher shortage, and for the upgrading of teaching quality. It would permit teachers to deduct up to $600 per year in their Federal tax reports for expenses incurred in improving their qualifications through college courses. Incredibly enough, a lawyer can deduct the cost of attending a tax or real estate institute, an insurance man may deduct for a short course in new methods of writing insurance, a doctor can write off a refresher course on the use of antibiotics, and an actor can deduct a course in physical culture for the purposes of losing weight and thereby keeping in good condition. But a teacher who goes to summer school or takes courses during the winter toward an advanced degree or simply to broaden her professional competence cannot deduct the cost. My bill would permit a deduction of up to $600 each year for such extra expenses.

Getting back to direct support of students, I am a strong advocate of the GI education bill. This fine program gave hundreds of thousands of World War II and Korean veterans a lasting reward for their service to the country, but it was also a program of almost infinite value to our country. Since January 31, 1955, men and women who enter the armed services no longer have the opportunity to attend college under the GI bill. I think they deserve the opportunity. The demands of military service are as rigorous today as they were in January 1955. As long as we are requiring young men to serve in the armed services through selective service, we ought to have the GI bill for them.

During the last session, my bill, S. 667, had extensive hearings before the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare. Practically every Minnesota college and university president publicly supported the bill. Unfortunately, there has not been until now a sufficient sense of urgency among our people as a whole to persuade Congress to pass this bill. The administration has opposed the bill. Perhaps now the climate is changing for the better, and we may have favorable committee action and passage by Congress of this legislation at the next session.

GRASSROOTS AMBASSADORS

I am also preparing a different kind of scholarship program—a specialized program to produce what I call grassroots ambassadors. In my observation as a member of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, I am more and more impressed with the shortage of trained, qualified, dedicated Foreign Service personnel. And we need technicians as well as diplomats; we need young people who can speak other languages, who have a zeal to serve the cause of freedom by a willingness to work among other peoples anywhere in the world.

We need to encourage young men and women to dedicate their lives as grassroot ambassadors, both in international public service and international private service for churches, foundations, and private enterprise.

We need more young people trained in diplomacy, with a broad liberal-arts background, to invigorate our posts abroad. But we also need young people who go abroad armed with technical knowledge, trained to get across practical ideas on sanitation, nursing, on farming, engineering, and construction methods, to people at the neighborhood and village level. We need young people who can speak the language of the region and understand the customs and mores of the people with whom they are working.

I am convinced that we need a Foreign Service Academy to provide us with most of our professional diplomats, and I intend to introduce legislation to this effect. But we can also proceed right now, without constructing one building, to get an incentive program underway in our colleges and universities to provide a corps of young men and women to carry out a technical-assistance program and a foreign-economic policy which could also accomplish wonders in winning the understanding of the peoples of Asia and Africa.

These young people should be carefully selected for their personable qualities as well as for their intelligence, for their ability to get along under unusual conditions as well as for their technical skills.

They should be drawn from all levels of our population, from all parts of the country, especially from farm families and the families of workingmen, from our people who have themselves known difficulties, who have had to work hard with their minds and their hands. These are the kind of young people who could make contact with the peoples of Asia, Africa, and South America, who can talk their language—both literally and philosophically—who have the common touch. These are the kind of people we ought to have in India and Pakistan and Indonesia—good, solid American young men and women, tough-minded and practical and knowledgeable.

From these grassroots ambassadors could come future Foreign Service career diplomats, as well as future commercial representatives overseas. And from those who eventually return to careers in the United States will come leaders in American public life who will bring to the Government and education the invaluable experience of detailed knowledge of peoples and places which are for the most part today unknown to most Americans.

COLLEGE WORK-STUDY PROGRAM

Another student-aid proposal which I believe will merit careful congressional study and for which I am preparing legislation is the establishment of a college work-study program based on the highly successful National Youth Administration program which expired in 1943.

Between 1935 and 1943, more than 2 million different students were helped to continue their college educations in useful work at American colleges and universities, under the NYA. I have found a very considerable interest among educators today in reviving some similar work-study program which would not only provide income for students in jobs which are closely allied to their studies, but would also help to relieve the crushing workload now being imposed on our college staffs and faculties.

All of these proposals can help the superior student who has made up his mind to go on to college.

But the problem of finding, identifying, and encouraging these superior young people while they are still in high school is as important a program as making it financially possible for them to go on to college.

Here I think is a real role to play for student organizations, student councils. Few persons are more qualified to judge the capacity and intelligence of a student than his fellow students, many of whom have known him for many years, know his family background, his integrity, his capacity for work far better than it may be possible for teachers.

There is a real challenge to student organization here. There is the challenge to develop systematic procedures to steer promising students into college. And there is the equal challenge to encourage promising students even at the freshman and sophomore levels to take courses which will help prepare them to go on to higher education.

Social pressure, as we all know, is a powerful and pervasive influence on the actions of an individual. It can be a force for good, or for bad. Too often, I am afraid, there has been a climate of disapproval in high-school student bodies for those individuals who are serious about their studies. Just as our Nation as a whole must reconsider its tendency to regard intellectuals as people who are somewhat odd and even suspect, I think that leaders in our high schools have a duty to mold student-body opinion into a more favorable climate for the eggheads in their midst. I said that I am on an egghead hunt. Let me invite you to join me. Let me urge you to make it your personal business as student leaders to look for the other eggheads in your high school. Most of you are the fortunate kind of egghead—the kind who has drive and initiative, and rises quickly to leadership. Not all eggheads, you know, have that ability. Many are shy, retiring. Many are slow starters. They need a helping hand—and no one is better equipped to give it to them than you are.

Do your part to help find our potential leaders in science and industry, the profession, in Government. And I shall try to do mine—to provide these young people with the opportunity they deserve, and which our Nation's own vital self-interest demands, the opportunity to develop their talents and faculties through higher education.

In the generations of struggle which face us and our friends of the non-Communist world, it will not be me, but you and your children, who will decide the issue. It will be your faith and your dedication and your intelligence that will determine whether the world will be free or slave.

Let us hope and pray that my generation will have the foresight and the courage to decide now, before it is too late, to provide you with the opportunity and the training to carry on the battle on at least equal terms.

Senior Citizens of America and Rogue Valley Manor

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD L. NEUBERGER
OF OREGON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, February 20, 1958

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, some of the former outstanding officials of that fine organization, the National Education Association, have founded another excellent organization known as the Senior Citizens of America. Its purpose is to widen the horizons and knowledge of citizens of mature interests. Its activities include scientific research, personal counsel, and correspondence. Its officials include Dr. Joy Elmer Morgan, president, and Dr. Willard E. Givens, chairman of the board of trustees. Both were formerly leading personages in the National Education Association.

The March 1958 issue of the Senior Citizen, monthly periodical of the Senior Citizens of America, published an article by Staff Writer Gertrude Leach entitled "Rogue Valley Manor, Medford, Oreg." This article describes a vast $5½ million apartment-house project in a beautiful city of southern Oregon, which is designed to cater to retired men and women of modest means.

Because all of us are interested in improved housing for the aged, I believe this article from the Senior Citizen magazine should appear in the Appendix of the RECORD, and I ask unanimous consent that it be printed, Mr. President.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ROGUE VALLEY MANOR, MEDFORD, OREG.

(By Gertrude Leach)

In a residential section of Medford, a city of 30,000 people in the lush "fruit basket" valley of southwestern Oregon, construction will begin this year on Rogue Valley Manor, a $5.5 million apartment house project designed not only as a place but a way of retirement for men and women of modest means.

Business, civic, and professional leaders of the community and the ministers and bishops of the Methodist, Presbyterian, and Protestant Episcopal churches of the area jointly sponsored the development which will be operated as a nonprofit corporation under the direction of the sponsors' 36-member board of trustees.

Before building plans were decided upon, a thorough study had been made of several retirement manors already in operation elsewhere; the best features of the earlier types have been combined with the most up-to-date design, facilities, management and financing for the Medford project. When completed the establishment may well become a model for similar housing for people of retirement age.

In addition to the somewhat unique joint sponsorship, the method of financing the project also embodies some departures from the usual, the principal one of which is the distribution of costs over about three "generations" of occupants. This makes possible a considerable reduction in charges to the original purchasers of space in the building.

Construction costs and the expenses of management, maintenance and operation have been carefully estimated and form the basis for the charges paid by residents. These include: (1) Cost of "membership," which varies according to size of the apartment chosen by the occupant and ranges from $6,800 to $23,000. An equitable means has been devised for refund to the purchaser, or to his estate, of a proportional share of this sum in the event of withdrawal under certain conditions within five years; (2) Life-Care, a monthly fee, initially estimated at $110 per month, to cover cost of meals, medical care and all other services; (3) A cash investment in the Life-Care Assurance Fund of a sum calculated at a fixed rate based on latest actuarial life expectancy tables. The fund draws interest at 4 percent annually and the entire principal is returned to the member during his lifetime in monthly payments, or to his estate if death occurs before the entire amount is repaid.

Although financial responsibility is necessary for admission to Rogue Valley Manor, the trustees consider character and personality of the applicant to be the most important requisite. At least two written references must be submitted. These are carefully checked in an earnest effort to admit only people "who have learned the invaluable art of happy, productive living."

A medical report is required as evidence of satisfactory health; only applicants who are ambulatory, generally well for their age and able to care for themselves can be accepted. Those who meet the financial, personality, and health requirements acquire the privilege of life membership in the manor. A deferred member plan is available to those who desire to make the usual deposit and enter at retirement or other later time.

The manor, a 284-apartment building, occupies a 15-acre tract on the crest of a gently rising hill. From the picture windows of every apartment the residents will have views of widespread orchards and of the distant Siskiyou and other mountains. Architect John W. Maloney, Seattle, Wash., who designed the building, also planned the various details to provide greatest possible comfort, beauty, convenience, and safety.

On the first floor are the main lounge (others with TV and radio are on each floor); offices, a large auditorium for group activities and worship; a chapel; the dining room. Ground-level facilities at disposal of members include a launderette; club room with completely equipped kitchen; women's activities room for sewing, weaving, ceramics, painting; hobby shop with tools and equipment for wood and metal working and re-

lated activities; smoking room (a men's retreat); a game room.

The spacious apartments are of 5 types, each with full bath, ample closets and storage; all but 40 have pullman kitchenettes. Rooms are completely furnished, including wall-to-wall carpeting and window blinds, but residents may bring their own treasured pieces of furniture. House telephone, emergency call bell, connections for TV and radio, thermostat for personal control of heat and air-conditioning, are standard equipment. Apartments with kitchenette range in size from 387 square feet to a few 2-bedroom units of 838 square feet. Guest rooms are included for visitors or family when space is not available in the member's own apartment.

One of the most important facilities provided for the members of this remarkable home is the 40-bed infirmary on third floor with its single, double, and other types of rooms. A staff doctor and nurses will be on duty day and night; bedside care in a member's apartment will be provided for minor ailments.

The moderate climate of the region—average temperature 54°—will contribute to outdoor enjoyment of the landscaped site where formal gardens, putting greens, croquet, horse-shoe and shuffleboard courts, picnic grove, parking lot, plots for vegetable and flower gardening by residents, will be developed.

Busy downtown Medford, only 2½ miles away by free Manor bus, offers opportunity for participation in church, civic, and cultural affairs. Within easy driving distances are Crater Lake and Mount Lassen National Parks, Mount Shasta, California Redwoods, and the Oregon coast.

Rogue Valley Manor aspires to be interdenominational and welcomes members of all faiths with the assurance of dignity, comfort, and security in the golden years of life, in a home of their own.

Occupancy is scheduled for early 1959. Further details are available from Walter M. Higgins, executive director, Rogue Valley Manor, Inc., Medford, Oreg.

Right of the Blind to Self-Expression and Organization

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM E. PROXMIRE
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, February 20, 1958

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, S. 2411, introduced by the junior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY], is, I believe, a most worthy and desirable piece of proposed legislation. The bill aims to protect the rights of our blind citizens to self-expression through organizations of their choice.

In my State of Wisconsin there is one of the most active components of the National Federation of the Blind, and also one of the most outstanding leaders of the movement, Mr. George Card, of Madison. Mr. Card and his organization have obtained in Wisconsin one of the most enlightened programs of rehabilitation and assistance for the blind that exists anywhere in the country.

I am, therefore, happy to support the proposed legislation, which will guarantee the rights of blind citizens elsewhere to achieve the same results through organization.

Similar bills have been introduced in the House of Representatives. My good friend, the Honorable CLEMENT ZABLOCKI, of Wisconsin, is the author of such a bill. I hope that these bills will receive the rapid and favorable consideration they deserve.

Mr. President, I have prepared a statement in support of this legislation, and I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR PROXMIRE

America is the Nation which above all others is dedicated to the protection, development, and dignity of the individual. The architects of our Constitution were zealous to erect the strongest possible protection for the rights of the individual. The individual is guaranteed the right to speak as he likes, write as he likes, worship or not worship as he likes. He is fully protected from unreasonable searches and seizures, from cruel or unusual punishment, from the abrogation of his contracts and so forth. In the judicial processes his rights are treated with the utmost deference, even at the risk of delay, obstruction or frustration of justice. In a myriad of ways the law demonstrates its solicitude for the individual, no matter how far he seems to have removed himself from the pale of society.

And this solicitude pervades all phases of our thought and all our institutions. In education, we strive to give the child every opportunity and every encouragement to develop his own special talents and interests, with the minimum of compulsion. In medicine, the last flickering spark of human life must be preserved to the last possible moment. In religion, every shade of doctrine and ritual has its adherents and its expression. In business, we still cling to the ideal of affording everyone the opportunity to stake his judgment and skill in the area and manner of his choice. In the field of social work, everything possible is done to redeem the criminal, to salvage the delinquent, to heal the mentally deranged, to develop the retarded and occasionally even to facilitate the blossoming of genius and to educate, train, and assist the physically disabled. We revel in the ability of an individual to triumph over adversity and nullify the decrees of birth and circumstance.

It has long been recognized that the individual cannot attain the fullest measure of expression and achievement unless he is free to associate and combine with other individuals in similar conditions or with similar aims and aspirations. Thus, included among the rights which were enshrined in the Constitution is that of freedom of assembly. Even in the frontier community where rugged individualism probably reached its most luxuriant fruition, each man was dependent upon the cooperation and support of his fellows. The society of Davy Crockett and Johnny Appleseed was also the society of the quilting bee, the husking bee, and the vigilante committee.

As the Nation grew in size and in complexity, it became ever more difficult for the lone individual to combat the forces of nature and of society without the help of his fellows. Since the power of big business, big government, and big labor burgeoned, the isolated individual became ever more helpless. But by joining his efforts and his influence to those of his fellows with similar goals, his strength was multiplied manifold. He could improve his living conditions, exchange valuable information and experience, wrest concessions from government, or remove inequities and discriminations.

A large group of our blind citizens have found that they must unite to advance their own interests. Excluded from normal participation in most other groups, they feel the necessity for uniting their strength with that of their fellow blind. Being confronted with deeprooted prejudices and misconceptions about the blind, they feel impelled to join in a concerted assault to remove them by a well-designed and well-directed campaign of education. Being confronted by problems of adaptation and improvisation in which the experience of other blind people can be of immeasurable assistance, they have found it necessary to come together to exchange ideas.

The blind, therefore, have formed organizations in various communities throughout the country. These have affiliated into State organizations in 44 States, which in turn are federated into 1 national organization, The National Federation of the Blind, which aggregates a membership of 40,000. I am proud that my own State of Wisconsin has contributed not only one of the most active components of this organization, the Wisconsin Council of the Blind, but that it is the home of one of the most outstanding leaders of the movement, Mr. George Card, of Madison, who has given most lavishly of his time, his energy, his deep understanding, and his varied and considerable abilities. He holds the office of first vice president of the federation, fund-raising chairman, unofficial organizer, editor of its official organ the Braille Monitor, representative on the World Council for the Blind, and a unique place in the esteem and affections both of his fellow blind and of his fellow citizens in general.

The work of the Wisconsin council reflects the wisdom and persistence of Mr. Card and many other able blind citizens of my native State. The organization has fought for and obtained in Wisconsin one of the most enlightened programs of rehabilitation, of vending-stand administration, and of financial assistance for the blind that exists anywhere in the country.

The organization contains as one of its components a group of vending-machine operators who meet regularly to exchange experiences and ideas for improving their businesses, and everyone of whom was enabld to become established in business because of a loan from the organization.

Another branch of the council is an organization of vending-stand operators who have combined to make the Wisconsin vending-stand program one of the most outstandingly successful in the country.

Another project which this organization of blind people conducts is the Badger Home, where living accommodations and board are provided to blind people at cost.

Still another is the sponsorship of a visual-aids clinic, where glasses can be procured which enable persons to read who have only a very slight amount of residual vision. Largely through the efforts of this organization, Wisconsin has an outstanding record in the placement of blind people in competitive industry, commerce, and the professions.

These successes were achieved through organization by Wisconsin's blind citizens by their own concerted and effective efforts, and against some resistance. Wisconsin now recognizes the value of its organized blind movement, but unfortunately, blind citizens have not found this to be the situation everywhere. In some instances, they find the blind are still regarded as wards who must be kept under constant surveillance and supervision, rather than stimulated and helped to attain self-reliance and self-support as they desire. Many of the blind need the services of agencies which are still particularly vulnerable to these misconceptions of the needs of the blind. For this reason, the federation has asked Congress to protect the constitu-

tional rights of blind citizens to freedom of expression and assembly.

S. 2411, introduced by the Senator from Massachusetts [Senator KENNEDY], would afford this protection by requiring the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to institute procedures assuring that Federal administrators will not interfere with the rights of the blind to organize. The bill would also make grants to the States dependent on State administrators and employees desisting from such interference. And finally, the bill requires the Secretary to consult with organizations of the blind in the formulation of policies affecting the blind.

I believe this legislation is both necessary and desirable. Surely this Nation, which values so highly the rights of the individual, will not withhold its protection from this small but worthy group of individuals. Surely it will encourage them to realize their fullest potentialities by uniting for mutual assistance and protection.

Surely the experience, the understanding, and the vital interest which they have in the solution of the problems of the blind should be tapped by the formulators of governmental policy through consultation with them. There are many who will give the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare the approach which regards the blind person as a statistic, a problem in social engineering, a Mr. X in a social casebook, or a subject for medical experimentation. But where else except from these organizations of the blind can it learn the impact of blindness upon the life of human beings, the insight that is gained by human experience, and the inspiration that is generated by the undaunted human spirit?

Our governmental experts ought not to be permitted to disdain this human experience, insight, and inspiration. The bill introduced by Senator KENNEDY will facilitate its fullest development and expression. I shall give it my unqualified support, and I urge my colleagues to do likewise.

Conservation and the Nation's Farm Programs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALBERT GORE

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, February 20, 1958

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an able address delivered by Representative HAROLD D. COOLEY, the distinguished chairman of the House Committee on Agriculture, at the annual meeting of the National Agricultural Limestone Institute, in the Hotel Statler, in this city, on January 22, 1958.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CONSERVATION AND THE NATION'S FARM PROGRAMS

(Address by Representative HAROLD D. COOLEY at the annual meeting of the National Agricultural Limestone Institute, Inc., Hotel Statler, Washington, D. C., January 22, 1958)

Mr. Chairman, I am very grateful to you and to the members of your organization for this opportunity to speak to this fine audience, which includes many of my colleagues in Congress, on a subject which is very close to my heart.

The subject is Conservation and the Nation's Farm Programs.

The subject is calculated to cause me to feel the urge, the dedication and the drive of an evangelist. Although I have never pretended to be a preacher, I like the gospel of conservation.

Nature does not promise to build civilizations nor to establish dignity and peace on earth and among men.

There is no penalty in nature more certain nor more severe nor more precise than that meted out to man and to nations that abuse and destroy the resources of the good earth.

Look back, if you will, through the ages and think for a moment how man has exploited his stewardship of the land. See the sad and sorry consequences—the harsh testimonials of land exploited. Turn back to biblical times.

Babylon, once a rich and beautiful city, now is desolate.

Nebuchadnezzar's famous stables are now buried deep in deposits of sand and loam.

In north Syria among Alleppo, Antioch, and Hama, there lie the skeletons of the flowering villages of biblical times, embraced in bare and desolate countryside. The old city of Timgad, north Africa, is today an abandoned ruin.

Indeed, at the traditionl site of the Garden of Eden, in old Mesopotamia, the land is barren; it is ruined and forsaken.

Turn in your Bible to Jeremiah 12: 10–11, American translations, where the prophet spoke:

"Many shepherds have destroyed my vineyard, they have trampled down my portion; they have made my pleasant lot a desolate waste. They have made it a desolation, in its desolation it mourns to me, the whole land is made desolate, because no man layeth it to his heart."

Mr. Chairman, ladies and gentleman, these citadels of civilization fell victims of soil suicide.

History's pages are filled with the accounts of kings, their wealth, their slaves, their laws, their might, their victories and their defeats. These old civilizations have vanished. Their decline and ultimate downfall was not usually by the turn of events on a battlefield, but from the ruin of their farm lands in the milleniums of use and neglect.

Is it not surprising then that only in recent years has the soil become a matter of concern and of national policy in America? Is it not more surprising, is it not astonishing—is it not a travesty upon the intelligence of our times—that our program, so hard won, to save America from soil suicide, now is lambasted and assailed in many places?

Our forefathers found here a land with deep and fertile soil, fortified with countless minerals. These virgin lands seemed inexhaustible. And for 150 years after this Nation was founded, our soil washed and ran down to the sea. We followed the old route of soil suicide.

It is now only 30 years since the United States took its first step toward the inauguration of a national program of soil and water conservation. Our national effort in the new field of applied soil conservation dates back, actually, to 1928, when Representative James P. Buchanan, of Texas, offered an amendment on the floor of the House to an agricultural appropriations bill, making money available for research in soil erosion on farmlands—and the amendment was adopted without dissent.

We have come a long way in so short a time.

Naturally enough, at the outset our emphasis was on halting soil erosion. Then we began paying more attention to sustaining and building soil fertility. Still more recently, special emphasis has been placed on water management.

It was by the enactment of the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act in 1936 that we began our great national conservation effort with the average farmer.

At that time the Congress, in effect, declared that it was in the national interest to have a partnership between those who produce food and all those who consume food, to stop the great wastage of our natural resources. No one is more aware than members of the National Agricultural Limestone Institute, our host tonight, of the effect of this program which we now know as the agricultural conservation program.

Within a very short time after passage of the 1936 act, millions of American farmers joined with their Government in carrying out conservation practices on the Nation's farms.

Mr. Chairman, your own industry, which had been supplying the Nation's agriculture with 1 to 3 million tons of agricultural limestone a year, expanded production so that by 1947 it furnished over 30 million tons. This, of course, meant more and better crops of clover, alfalfa, and other legumes, more conservation of the soil, and more minerals, principally calcium, in the food for use by the Nation's consumers. Other conservation practices had equally significant increases.

But, in spite of the tremendous increase in all practices we are still a long way from the goals which the soils specialists at our agricultural colleges say we should attain. For example, in the case of agricultural limestone—the colleges tell us that the farmers of the Nation should be using 80 million tons a year. This is far in excess of the peak 30 million tons used in 1947 and the 20 million tons currently being used. Examples of important practices carried out by farmers under the 1956 program are:

1. Initial establishment of permanent vegetative cover, 4.7 million acres.

2. Applying liming materials to conserving crops, 6.5 million acres.

3. Improvement of vegetative cover, 2.4 million acres.

4. Livestock watering facilities to permit better grassland management, 93,724 structures.

5. Establishing permanent sod waterways, 2 billion square feet.

I believe that every dollar invested in ACP programs has been a dollar well invested in the future security and welfare of our country.

ACP cost-sharing assistance may be used to carry out farm and ranch conservation work planned by other agencies and groups. For example, ACP often enables farmers to accomplish conservation work recommended by Soil Conservation Service technicians to soil conservation district cooperators. Also it is used to help farmers pay for practices needed and recommended on farms in watershed projects and in planting trees on reforestation projects. It is used to carry out needed conservation work on farms developed as a project of the Extension Service and other organizations.

Ladies and gentlemen, the ACP program with our other sound conservation activities, constitutes an investment to insure the future strength of this Nation. Our soil, with the brains and enterprising nature of the people who tend it, is the foundation of our strength.

Yet, this ACP program has been assailed from one end of our land to the other as a subsidy, as a Government handout, to farmers. I wonder that any person of intelligence could fall for such rot. If the detractors must pin a blame of subsidy upon someone, then let them consider that for generation upon generation our farmers have been subsidizing the consumers of the Nation, by mining their soil, using up their capital investment, because the prices paid by consumers were not sufficient for our farm families to preserve the soil or to restore it when it was ruined.

Mr. Ezra Taft Benson, upon becoming Secretary of Agriculture, began an all-out effort to destroy ACP.

Here is the story:

1. The 1953 ACP program already had been announced and commitments made to farmers before Mr. Benson took office, so there was nothing his administration could do to curtail that year's operations except to hamper the program's administration by putting the group responsible for planning the program in a service different from the service which is responsible for administering it. This organizational monstrosity persists until this day.

2. For 1954, in presenting his budget, the President made no provision whatsoever for the agricultural conservation program. I vividly recall the reaction of the farmers of my district when they were made aware of this fact. I also recall the survey of farmer opinion made by your organization, Mr. Chairman. Not only were the results of this survey sent to me by people in my district but these figures were used in our deliberations on the floor of the House.

I have checked back on these figures and want to refresh the memory of this audience by pointing up that nearly 84 percent of the farmers wanted the ACP continued and only 16 percent of the farmers supported the administration in their efforts to reduce the program. In fact about 72 percent of the farmers reported that the program in their opinion ought to be increased more in line with the $500 million authorized in basic law, rather than reduced. Year after year, we have had telegrams read from Farm Bureau leaders in which they have advocated elimination or drastic reduction in this program. In the national survey you made of thousands of farmers 80 percent of those who said they were Farm Bureau members voted to continue ACP without a cut and 68 percent voted to increase it.

Several years ago your President was berated during our deliberations as misrepresenting farmer opinion by using biased surveys. I am sure that the surveys could not have been biased or he could not have made the statement that he would use any mailing list furnished to him and make a similar survey for comparison. In fact, my records indicate that a few years ago the Farm Bureau township directors in the State of Iowa were surveyed on the continuation of ACP, and over 85 percent voted for its continuation, while 58 percent advocated an increase. This compared wtih a vote of 95 percent favoring the program and 76 percent advocating an increase on the part of the rank-and-file farmers in that State.

Also, in the State of New York over 78 percent of the Farm Bureau members supported this program and nearly two-thirds of the Farm Bureau members wanted the appropriation increased.

It was not until the middle of March 1954 that the President submitted a revised budget for the Department and requested that we authorize a program amounting to $140 million. This was done in face of the fact that the Congress had stabilized the authorization for this program at $250 million during the recent past and despite enabling legislation which authorized Congress to appropriate $500 million for this purpose.

For its part, the Department cooperated by hamstringing the program with every conceivable gadget and restriction which the new regime could muster. All of this was calculated to make the program unpopular and unattractive to farmers. The measure of their success is attested by the fact we had to compromise in the Congress and reduce the 1954 authorization to $195 million, which was $55 million more than the President requested and $55 million less than the customary $250 million. Then, of the $195 million authorized for 1954, farmers earned only a little over $162 million. Their disgust and dismay at the program changes wrought by Mr. Benson forced many farmers to give up their conservation efforts.

3. For 1955 and 1956 the grassroots reaction against the 1954 changes was so great that the administration was forced to modify or eliminate many of the restrictions imposed in 1954. Even so, the changes were made slowly and reluctantly and only as they were forced by popular opinion. In 1956 the President requested that the authorization be decreased to $175 million. Congress paid him no heed and authorized the customary $250 million.

4. By 1957 the administration decided to adopt the ACP as its own. They made it fairly attractive, and it regained most of its popularity with farmers. They even requested the customary $250 million to finance it. Farmer participation increased.

5. As it turned out, this was only a breathing spell. The Department undertook to announce a 1958 ACP with cost shares greatly reduced and many of the most popular and needed practices eliminated. But, through the alert action of Bob Koch, in informing the Appropriations Committees what the Department was planning, the Congress took effective action to block the obstructive and dismantling changes.

6. For 1959, the story is apparently going to be the same. The President is asking us to cut the authorization for this great program exactly in half—from $250 million to $125 million. It is reasonable to expect that the Department will do its part by reducing rates and cutting out practices so as to make the program as unattractive as possible to farmers.

7. From 1954 through 1957 the opposing conservation tactics of the Department have cost the farmers of this country over $110 million and reduced our conservation efforts by twice that amount. This is shown by the fact that farmers earned during 1954–57 inclusive $113 million less than the Congress authorized.

Some of you may think these statements are too partisan. I am not attempting to become partisan in any way but I am proconservation. For more than 20 years I have served on the Agriculture Committee, and during that entire time, until last year, I served with a very distinguished and beloved statesman, Clifford Hope, of Kansas. He and I sat side by side and for more than 20 years we saw eye to eye on every major problem that came before that committee. And I know that during that entire time we were successful in our efforts to keep partisan politics out of our deliberations. And I know that during all of that time I was a good Democrat and I know that Cliff Hope was a good Republican.

While the ACP and similar programs were inaugurated by the Democratic Party I would be remiss and unfair if I did not point out to you that these conservation efforts have received the stanch support of many Republicans—including some on this platform and in this audience.

I particularly want to refer to my good friend and colleague, EARL WILSON of Indiana, who is a Republican member of the Appropriations Committee and who was the first to call to the attention of the House the crippling effect of the memorandum by Assistant Secretary of Agriculture Peterson last summer. Many of you will recall EARL'S statement at that time.

Mr. Chairman, regardless of whether a man or woman is a Republican or a Democrat, we are all aware that this assault upon the agriculture conservation program has coincided with an onslaught against the general farm program during the last 5 years.

The net result is that agriculture generally has failed to share in the prosperity of this Nation, and many of our farm families are in desperate straits.

Our farm program came into being to rescue agriculture from bankruptcy during the great depression. Its objective was parity, which the Nation had come to regard as fair and just. It was erected upon an awareness that agriculture is the only major element of our total economy that has no device, outside of the aid of Government, to pattern its production to market requirements; that farmers have virtually no bargaining power in the commerce they conduct; that agriculture, comprised of several millions of free-enterprising families, is the only major industry that does not set its prices but goes into the market place and asks: "What will you give me?"

Let us check back and make a few notes on this program.

How did farmers fair under it? For 11 consecutive years prior to 1953 the average prices paid to farmers were at or above 100 percent of parity. Farm prices now average 81 percent of parity.

Now consider the Nation's consumers. While this program has operated, American families have had available to them more and better food, for an expenditure of a smaller percentage of their total income, than in any other period of history. The average hourly wage of industrial workers will buy about twice as much food as in 1929.

What about the cost to taxpayers? The Commodity Credit Corporation supported the prices of major storable crops for 20 years prior to 1953 and, at that time, this program actually showed a 20-year profit of $13 million. For these two decades, the CCC program for all crops, including a number of perishable commodities, showed a loss of only $1,064 million and CCC investments on January 1, 1953 (inventory and loans) amounted to only $2,452 million.

During the last 5 years, CCC deficits have amounted to 4 times as much as was lost in the preceding 20 years—slightly more than $1 billion in 20 years, compared to $4 billion in the last 5 years. Meanwhile, the CCC investments in surpluses have increased threefold, from $2,452 million in 1953 to more than $7 billion as we go into 1958.

This is the story, and we cannot review it without this question:

What is the mind, what is the motive, what is the purpose of the people who are destroying the parity principle which our farmers were so long in winning and which all Americans had come to consider as fair and just?

Now, Mr. Chairman, let us turn back specifically to the agricultural conservation program.

And let me suggest here to the people in the administration who are determining policy in connection with the ACP program that they check with our Chief Executive.

In an exclusive article in the Des Moines Register by Charles Bailey last Thursday, the following practices are listed as those carried out by President Eisenhower on the three farms in Adams County, Pa., which he owns. He received payments in 1957 for carrying out ACP practices in the amount of $1,120.40. Part of those payments were for 128 tons of agricultural limestone and the rest was for fertilizer and seed. Many of the practices carried out under the supervision of Brig. Gen. Arthur Nevins (retired), the President's farm manager, are the ones which Assistant Secretary of Agriculture Peterson attempted to eliminate in his memorandum last summer.

The headlines of the article stated, "Ike Benefits in Farm Aid He Opposed," and, as Mr. Bailey said in the article, "The payments were made under the agricultural conservation program for practices which the administration has sought to eliminate from its cost-sharing program." He states further that "the administration has re-

peatedly tried to have Congress cut back the size of the ACP. Last year it tried to restrict the scope of the program to rule out payments for lime and fertilizer top dressing as a separate practice. In his budget message to Congress Monday (that was last week), the President again called for elimination of some practices in the ACP and asked Congress to cut the program for 1959 from $250 million to $125 million."

In other words President Eisenhower has been using the ACP just like a million other farmers throughout the Nation and he has been using the practices which Assistant Secretary of Agriculture Peterson, in his attacks upon the ACP, has been saying are the practices that should be eliminated.

I should think, Mr. Chairman, that a practice good for the land owned by the President would be good also on the lands worked by our many thousands of farmers.

In my opinion, one of the reasons why the present administrators are trying to eliminate this program is that they have not been listening to the views of the farmers. State after State has indicated it would like to have this program, not scuttled, but expanded.

I do not know a single State in the United States which has recommended through its democratically elected committee system that these restrictions and reductions be made. In my opinion one of the reasons for the great strength of the agricultural conservation program is the fact that it is administered at the local level by farmers elected by their neighbors.

We all expected much of the soil bank and yet, according to the last records which I have available, only 80,000 farmers participated in the conservation reserve program compared to over a million farmers in the ACP. It seems to me that if these 2 programs, the conservation reserve program and the ACP, were administered as 1 just as we administered the same joint effort back in the late thirties, there would be not only less confusion but also much wider farmer participation. It doesn't do us any good to write fancy programs here in Washington if they are not practical enough for farmers to utilize them.

Practically every State in the Nation had to curtail its ACP activities last year because of insufficient funds. Likewise, practically every State had more conservation reserve funds allocated to it than farmers would use.

Unless the administration can come forward with some new practicable proposals it seems to me that we should expand tried and proven programs like the agricultural conservation program instead of appropriating large sums of money in the name of conservation under procedures farmers have already proven they will not adopt. Expanding ACP to $500 million which is currently authorized by statute would accomplish a great deal more under the proper administration than all these new soil-bank plans.

While everyone is for conservation, if we cannot develop plans which the farmers of the Nation are willing to put into practice, we are no further toward our goal than if we had no plans. If the Department of Agriculture will listen to the democratically elected county committees and the State committees who, incidentally, Secretary Benson has appointed, I am confident we can formulate a program which will not only get our conservation job done but which will meet also with the approval of the consumers and taxpayers of the Nation.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I have presented these propositions honestly as I see them.

But, before concluding, I want especially to commend the National Agricultural Limestone Institute. By this meeting tonight, and on similar occasions in years past, you have thrown in your lot with the farmers of America. I pray that in some not too far distant day other great industries of this Nation will come to realize that their own interests are tied inextricably to the well-being of our farmers, and that they then will join us in our labors to frame national, bipartisan policies, free of politics, that will aid in the conservation of our soil and in the restoration of prosperity to those millions of families that live upon and work upon the land.

The Impact of Weather Control on the Cold War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANCIS CASE
OF SOUTH DAKOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, February 20, 1958

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, Capt. Howard T. Orville, Chairman of the President's Advisory Committee on Weather Control, gave a significant address before the University Club of New York on February 8, 1958. Captain Orville spoke on the subject The Impact of Weather Control on the Cold War. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the text of Captain Orville's speech.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE IMPACT OF WEATHER CONTROL ON THE COLD WAR

(By Capt. Howard T. Orville, U. S. Navy (retired))

As much as we dislike it, today we are engaged in a cold war with a nation and its satellites whose leaders are stark realists and who will stop at nothing to achieve their objective—the absolute domination of communism throughout the world. President Eisenhower, in his recent state of the Union message, stated "the threat to our safety and to the hope of a peaceful world * * * is Communist imperialism."

One way of achieving this goal is by means of a worldwide propaganda campaign to lower the stature of the United States in the eyes of the Western Powers. It may well be assumed that they are constantly searching for new sources of material in waging this campaign.

Only last week when the Army successfully fired the Explorer were we able to partially recover some prestige from the terrific loss sustained when the Russians fired two satellites into space. One is still orbiting around the earth. This experience should have taught us that we must be constantly on the alert for seeking the propaganda advantage over the Soviets.

If you will think back to September 1957 or earlier, you will recall that perhaps not one person in a million would have predicted the successful launching of a satellite that would orbit the globe for months. Fantastic, unheard of, impossible, would have been some of the remarks received.

This, then, is an experience very fresh in our minds and should make us aware of the fact that the impossible may become a reality long before the best scientific or military brains can even envisage such an eventuality. In the past we have been slow in assessing the propaganda value of scientific achievements. Let's hope that the future will see us more clairvoyant.

This brings me to the subject of the discussion today—the impact of weather control on the cold war. Few areas of science have implications so profound to all mankind as the study of the atmosphere and the phenomena which occur in it.

Perhaps it would be appropriate to define the terms "weather control." Weather control means that our knowledge of atmospheric processes has reached the level where we are able to apply manmade techniques to large scale weather patterns to start a chain reaction that will produce known results over a specific portion of the globe for a known period of time. For example, if an unfriendly nation were able to bring about the recurring destructive cold spells that have plagued Florida for the past 2 months, this would be absolute weather control.

Prior to the sputnik era the best scientific opinion was that the day of weather control was perhaps 30 to 60 years away, maybe even longer. When, in 1954, I suggested that with the expenditure of $11 billion over a period of 30 to 40 years we might achieve complete weather control, I was severely criticized by my contemporaries.

Since October 1957 there have been many statements (some far too optimistic) by scientists of world renown. Probably one of the most significant statements was made by Dr. Edward Teller before the Senate Military Preparedness Committee. He stated that he was more confident of getting to the moon than changing the weather, but the latter is a possibility. I would not be surprised if the Russians accomplished it in 5 years or failed to do it in the next 50.

What are some of the methods of achieving weather control? A number of methods have been suggested for bringing about major influences on weather or climate. To date, none of them can be called effective methods of weather control because, if applied by any nation, no one knows what would be the resulting action of such drastic intervention on our own country or that of other nations. Until we are able to predict with certainty what will happen when manmade methods are applied, weather control should not be attempted.

USE OF COLORED PIGMENTS (LAMP BLACK)

One method of controlling the weather that has often been mentioned is the large scale use of colored pigments over the polar ice surfaces. It is well known that the persistance of large icefields is due in part to the fact that ice both reflects sunlight energy and radiates away terrestial energy at even higher rate than land surfaces. If microscopic layers of colored matter were spread on the ice or in the air above it, it would alter the reflection-radiation balance, melt the ice, and change the local climate. Measures that would bring about such a change are technically and economically feasible.

WARMING CAUSED BY INCREASED CARBON DIOXIDE CONTENT

The carbon dioxide that is released to the atmosphere by industry in the burning of coal and oil and their derivatives (most of it during the last generation) may have changed the composition of the atmosphere sufficiently to bring about a general warming of the world's temperature by about 1° F. This warning represents a 2-percent increase in the carbon dioxide content of the air. Studies show that when the amount has increased up to 10 percent the icecaps will begin to melt with the resulting rise in the sea level. Coastal cities and areas such as New York and Holland would be inundated.

COOLING CAUSED BY RADIOACTIVE DUST

When the volcano Krakatao erupted in 1883 it released an amount of energy by no means exorbitant. If the dust of the eruption had continued to circle the globe at high altitude for 15 years instead of only 3 years, it would have lowered the world's temperature by 6°. Five such eruptions

would have brought another Ice Age. This temperature is only about 15° below the present world's temperature.

Dr. Teller has testified in congressional hearings that if 2,000 H-bombs were to be exploded over a period of 20 years, the dust floating around in the stratosphere would be sufficient to cause a cooling to bring on a new Ice Age. This, of course, discounts the possibility that the dust might serve as freezing nuclei.

ARTIFICIAL SATELLITES AS PLATFORMS FOR WEATHER CONTROL

Weather satellites equipped with powerful telescopes and television attachments could chart cloud movements, detect the birth of hurricanes or other severe storms, and vastly improve our surveillance of weather patterns.

Dr. Hermann Oberth, of Germany, foresees a gigantic mirror hung in space. It would focus the sun's rays as giant magnifying glass at any desired intensity and beam. The sun's rays could light entire cities or other areas safely at night. The heat of the rays might be used to prevent killing frosts over orchards, or melt Atlantic icebergs, open frozen harbors and probably bring about artificial control of the weather.

Senator LYNDON JOHNSON, of Texas, stated recently: "From space, the masters of infinity could have the power to control the earth's weather, to cause drought and flood, to change the tides and raise the level of the sea, to divert the Gulf Stream, and change temperate climates to frigid."

I have read that at least twice in the past 12 months Moscow has boasted of large public works projects that would upset the entire wind circulation pattern of the Northern Hemisphere; conducted numerous nonpublicized but still detectable experiments apparently aimed at finding ways to speed the melting of polar ice caps; and has even offered to join the United States in a project to turn the Arctic Ocean into a sort of warm water lake by melting the polar icecap.

Russia's apparent preoccupation with plans to change the climate of the Northern Hemisphere is easy to understand. The Soviets and their satellites stand to profit more, from an economic standpoint, than any other combination of nations.

The proposal to turn the now frozen Arctic Ocean into a warm-water lake came over Moscow radio just 3 days after last Christmas.

A Russian engineer, Arkady Borisovich Markin, proposed that a team of international scientists cooperate in designing a dam to redirect the waters of the Pacific Ocean to relieve the severe cold of the Northern Hemisphere. Such a dam built across the Bering Straits would be fitted with thousands of nuclear-energy-powered pumps that would pump the warmer waters from the Pacific into the colder Arctic Ocean. At other times the pumps on the Bering Straits would pump the water from the Arctic Ocean to the Pacific, canceling out the Greenland, Labrador, and other cold oceanic streams.

Just how such a plan would work is not clear to me; but if, as Markin states, the dam would raise the temperatures of such cities of New York, London, Berlin, Stockholm, and Vladivostock 11° to 14½°, then the melting of the icecaps and the release of landlocked waters would cause seacoast towns and cities to be flooded by the expected rise in the sea levels. This means that Russia might then enjoy warm-water ports and mild temperatures similar to our South Atlantic States, but at the expense of great flooding of the western nations' coastal areas.

Other great schemes for Russian public-works programs to divert the course of several of its rivers from the Arctic Ocean to the Caspian Sea are less dramatic, but might eventually upset the present weather patterns over Siberia, which, in time, would affect the weather around the Northern Hemisphere.

There are many other methods by which effective weather control may be practiced by an unfriendly nation, but they are too numerous to even mention by name.

A moments consideration of any of the methods mentioned here today should serve to convince any skeptic that weather control can have frightening and disastrous consequences if any unfriendly nation succeeds in gaining a breakthrough before we do.

This is, I think, what Dr. Teller meant when he recently stated: "The Russians can conquer us without fighting through a growing scientific and technological preponderance. The Russians may advance so fast in science and leave us so far behind that their way of doing things will be the way, and there will be nothing we can do about it. Imagine, for instance, a world in which the Russians can control weather on a big scale, where they can change the rainfall over Russia. This might very well influence the rainfall in our country in an adverse manner. What kind of world will it be where they have this new kind of control and we do not?"

Now, what courses of action can we take to get out of our present extremely vulnerable position for future Soviet propaganda attacks in the field of weather control? There are two important steps that must be taken.

First, see that Senate bill 86 is passed. Fortunately, through the vision and courage of several Members of Congress, notably Senator FRANCIS CASE, of South Dakota; Senator CLINTON ANDERSON, of New Mexico; Senator ARTHUR WATKINS, of Utah, and Senator WARREN MAGNUSON, of Washington, there is now pending in Congress a bill, S. 86, to set up a permanent research program under the National Science Foundaiton for an accelerated study in all aspects of atmospheric physics. When this bill, which was originated by Senator FRANCIS CASE, is passed and is aggressively implemented it will provide for the urgently needed program in basic and applied research.

Second, there must be an awareness and an appreciation of the valuable service that the United States Weather Bureau is performing today under most stringent circumstances. It is understaffed; much of its equipment is obsolete; research facilities are practically nonexistent; its research program is far below that which it should be during these critical times; and the prospects for getting the funds needed to correct these deficiencies are very poor. Other weather services of the Defense Department dealing primarily with military applications of weather control should be given strongest possible support.

Since weather control is an ideal tool for waging the relentless cold war against the western powers, we must not become complacent and we must not be caught as we were when Sputnik I was launched last October.

We must take seriously the truth of Vice President NIXON's statement "the Kremlin has reaffirmed its goal of world domination by nonmilitary means if possible, and by war if necessary."

Weather control has many important nonmilitary applications and just as many military uses.

America's Great Resource—Its Senior Citizens

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, February 20, 1958

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, on many occasions I have pointed out that one of the great untapped resources of this country consists of its senior citizens. The men and women in the golden years, the elderly citizens endowed with a lifetime of experiences, of talents, abilities, and learning—these are a resource which we can ill afford to squander.

Fortunately, in all parts of our land, more and more communities are beginning to realize that they have a responsibility to the senior citizens. And what is more important, elderly folks increasingly realize that they owe a responsibility to themselves. It is a responsibility not to go on the shelf, so to speak, not to go on the sidelines, but rather to be active, creative, constructive; to acquire new interests; build a bright new chapter in their lives.

"Accentuating the positive, eliminating the negative," has become more and more of a theme for folks grappling with this problem of the 10 percent of our population in the senior citizens bracket.

Indeed, right now, there are no less than 34 million Americans aged 45 and over.

But age is not a matter of chronology. It is, as I have pointed out on the Senate floor, the composite of one's interests, one's skills, one's outlook.

Each month, there come across my desk many publications evidencing the wide-awake activity of senior citizens and their spokesmen.

I commend, in particular, the fine publication Senior Citizens, issued by the Senior Citizens of America, a nonprofit organization right here in our Nation's Capital.

So far as the grassroots interest in elderly Americans is concerned, I should like to cite now, as an illustration, a splendid 2-day conference which was held in southern Wisconsin at the start of this week.

I am more than pleased that this conference symbolizes the deep interest of the State of Wisconsin, ever forward-looking, in its elderly citizens.

In Janesville, there gathered a cross-section of some of the most outstanding experts. I congratulate them, and all those responsible for this conference.

The followthrough on this sort of program is, I am sure, going to spell tremendous increases in hope for our people.

I send to the desk now two articles published in the Monday and Tuesday issues of the Janesville Gazette, describing the

program and giving a list of some of the outstanding speakers. I ask unanimous consent that both articles be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CONFERENCE OF THE AGING TO BENEFIT FROM FREE SERVICES OF 48 SPEAKERS

The Conference of the Aging to be held in Janesville next Tuesday and Wednesday will be a $10,000 program but speakers who would ordinarily receive $150 or more for an address will speak here free of charge, Pat Dawson, general chairman, said today.

If weather is favorable, more than 400 are expected at the 2-day conference at which 48 speakers will be heard discussing many aspects of work with the aging. General sessions will be in the senior high school beginning at 9 a. m., Tuesday, the program covering the entire field, economic, housing, and living, education, recreation, and health and medical.

Dr. Carl Winters, pastor of the First Baptist Church, of Oak Park, Ill., will be the speaker at the banquet in Arrow Park at 6:30 p. m., Tuesday, an event for which preparations are being made for a crowd of 150 to 175 persons.

Dr. Winters has achieved a national reputation as one of America's foremost inspirational speakers and as a humorist. To his American audience of more than a quarter of a million people a year, he has just added a world audience by his recent study and lecture trip, during which he spoke to business and educational groups in Manila, Tokyo, Yokohama, Bangkok, Rangoon, Calcutta, New Delhi, Hong Kong, Cairo, Rome, Paris, and London.

Dr. Winters speaks from a broad background of human experience as former crime commissioner of Michigan, 5 years as chairman of the Skid Row Commission of Chicago, adviser on the juvenile board of Sheriff Lohman of Cook County, and as a personal counsellor.

Each year Dr. Winters delivers 30 to 36 commencement addresses to high-school and college audiences totaling more than 100,000 persons and general audiences totaling more than a quarter million persons.

At present he is in his 18th year as minister of the First Baptist Church of Oak Park. This is one of the great Baptist churches of the Northern Baptist Convention, having raised an average of $150,000 a year for all purposes each year for the past 30 years. The church plant of more than 100 rooms is one of the most modern and adequate in the Middle West. The program of the church has become increasingly strong through the years under the wise leadership of very excellent lay people working with the staff of the church.

Dr. Winters is a graduate of Franklin College with an A. B. degree in 1929. He received honorary doctor of divinity degrees from Lincoln Memorial University in 1941 and Franklin College in 1954.

The speaker is reputed to have the rare faculty of combining humor and philosophy and makes his audience laugh while making it think.

Glen Campbell, Janesville attorney, will be master of ceremonies for the banquet which will feature dinner music by Al Schoenrock, organist. Ted Eickemeyer is in charge of banquet arrangements.

The banquet is expected to be concluded before 9 p. m., as many who will attend will return to their homes over this section of the State and return to Janesville for the Wednesday sessions.

Senior citizens groups in this city, who have already contributed much to the success of the conference through sending out invitations and working in other capacities, will serve as guides, registrars and the like.

Dawson said that the panel discussions will be outstanding. Persons who will appear on them have already met at least 2 to 3 times to prepare for their parts in the conference.

Prominent speakers who will appear during the various sessions of the two-day conference are: Al Ludvigsen, Madison, special consultant to Governor Thomson; Dr. Eugene Friedman, Madison, professor of sociology at the University of Wisconsin; Tom Schuler, executive secretary of the Beloit Association of Commerce; Art Laage, Beloit, vice president of the Beloit Iron Works; Dr. Arthur Miles Madison, director of the School of Social Work at the University of Wisconsin; Dr. E. E. La Masters, Beloit, department of sociology, Beloit College; Howard Rich, Sheboygan, director of the Sheboygan department of public recreation; Louis Novick, Milwaukee, executive director of the Jewish Home for Aged, Milwaukee; G. E. Watson, Madison, superintendent of the State department of public instruction; and Charles Odegaard, Waukesha, recreation agent of Waukesha County. A total of 48 speakers will address various portions of the conference.

Committee members who have done considerable work on the conference are: Dawson, Eickemeyer, Mrs. Pearl Dawson, and Perry O'Brien, Janesville; R. Marcele Pett, Edgerton; Dr. Lucius Porter, and Robert Junig, Beloit.

STUDY OF AGING OPENS TUESDAY—TWO-DAY SESSION—AUTHORITIES IN MANY PHASES OF PROBLEM TO CONDUCT PANELS

A panel of 45 experts, among them a number of internationally known authorities, will begin arriving in Janesville tonight for a 2-day conference on problems of aging. Sessions open at 9 a. m. Tuesday in Senior High School.

Churchmen, educators, sociologists, economists, recreation, health, and employment and pension experts will be among the panelists lined up over many months by Pat Dawson, city recreation director, for appearance here. Dawson is general chairman of the conference, which is sponsored by the Rock County Board of Supervisors.

Several hundred southern Wisconsin citizens, many of them persons engaged in working with aging persons, will be in attendance at sessions which are open to the general public.

OUTSTANDING AUTHORITIES COMING

Among the internationally known persons who will lend their assistance to the conference by presenting talks or leading panels here are Dr. Eugene Friedman, professor of sociology at the University of Wisconsin; Dr. William Bolton, Chicago, director of the American Medical Association; Dr. E. E. LeMasters, Beloit College, department of sociology; Louis Novick, Milwaukee, executive director of the Jewish Homes for the Aged; J. E. TePoorten, Madison, coordinator of State schools of vocational and adult education.

Other highlight speakers will be Theda Waterman, Milwaukee, director of the central agency for the chronically ill; George Watson, superintendent of the State department of public instruction; and Al Ludvigsen, Madison, legislative consultant.

An internationally famous lecturer and social counselor will be the banquet speaker at 6:30 Tuesday evening in Arrow Park. He is Dr. Carl S. Winters, minister of the First Baptist Church of Oak Park, Ill. Banquet arrangements are under the direction of T. E. H. Eickemeyer, Janesville, representing the board of supervisors.

GENERAL SESSION IN MORNING

Dr. Friedman will set the stage or the discussion of problems of aging and caring for the aging and Ludvigsen, special consultant to Gov. Vernon Thomson, will summarize the areas of study as the conference opens in general session at 9 o'clock Tuesday morning. Those participating will be welcomed to Janesville by City Manager Joseph Lustig and Walter Lindemann, county clerk.

Five separate panels have been arranged covering economics, housing and living, education, recreation, health and medical aspects of the questions. As problems are developed by the discussions of experts Tuesday they will be recorded for further study in general discussions Wednesday.

Pensions and part-time employment are the general subjects of the economic panel, moderated by Tom Schuler, executive secretary of the Beloit Association of Commerce. Panel experts on pensions include Dr. Arthur Miles, director of the School of Social Work at the University of Wisconsin. Eugene H. Seibert, personnel director of the Parker Pen Co., Janesville; Sydney Miller, Wisconsin director of social security, Madison; Einar Hanson, Wisconsin social security director, Janesville; and Prof. David Johnson of the University of Wisconsin department of economics.

PART-TIME EMPLOMENT

Part-time employment possibilities will be discussed by William Mills, director of the State employment service, Janesville; William Angus, Madison, representing the United Steel Workers, and A. R. Haug, director of the State employment service, Beloit.

"This panel will study pensions and part-time employment as the programs are now being handled and how they might be improved for the aging," said Schuler.

A. G. Steinborn, superintendent of Rock County institutions, is chairman of the housing and living panel, which will be concerned chiefly with problems for nursing home, institutional and private home care for the aging. Participating in the discussions will be Miss Theda Waterman, Milwaukee, director of the Central Agency for Chronically Ill; C. Raymond Bowers, Madison, State Department of Public Welfare; and Mrs. Gladys Heise, Madison, State Board of Health, on nursing home and institutional care. Private home care will be discussed by Dr. E. E. LeMasters, Beloit College department of sociology; Mrs. Mary Bernikowicz, operator of Bern Haven, Kenosha, and Ruth Te Linde, Madison, director of the Visiting Nurse Service. C. Raymond Bowers, Madison, will talk on activities for adjusting to home environment.

EDUCATION AND RECREATION

The education panel will be directed by N. E. Loofboro, president of the board of vocational and adult education, Janesville. The discussion of retraining methods in this panel will be handled by Ruth Coe, coordinator of the Madison Vocational and Adult School; Vernon Swenson, State supervisor of vocational and adult education, and L. R. Morris, University of Wisconsin School of Mechanical Arts. Adult education will be discussed by Richard Oster, Beloit Vocational School; Richard Bardwell and J. E. Te Poorten, both Madison vocational and adult education experts.

Charles Odegaard, Waukesha County recreation director, is the moderator for the recreation panel. Direction of hobbies and furnishing of equipment and instruction will be explored by Mrs. Marshall Brown, Kert Bliss and Dave Nolte, Madison recreation and community center directors. Social problems in the recreation program will be studied by Howard Rich, Sheboygan, director of public recreation; Lillian Nitcher, Madison, Wisconsin Community Welfare Council, and Dave Barry, Watertown recreation director.

Research on health and medical problems will be reported in the panel directed by Dr. W. T. Clark, Janesville. With him in the discussion will be the Reverend Herbert Kimmel of the Janesville First Congregational

Church; Dr. William Bolton, Chicago, American Medical Association director; Dr. Robert Parkin, University of Wisconsin Medical School; Sally Gane, director of social service in University of Wisconsin hospitals; Louis Novick, Milwaukee, director of the Jewish Home for the Aged; and Mrs. C. E. Quinn, Beloit Community Council director.

The H-Bomb Plant

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. HERMAN E. TALMADGE

OF GEORGIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, February 20, 1958

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, the citizens of Georgia and South Carolina are proud of the contribution to our national defense being made by the H-Bomb plant located on the Savannah River near Aiken, S. C.

In its issue of February 2, 1958, the Anderson, S. C., Independent featured an excellent article about this mammoth facility entitled, "Inside the H-Bomb Plant," and written by the noted author, reporter, and commentator, Henry J. Taylor, who presently is serving this Nation as its Ambassador to Switzerland.

I am advised by the Public Printer that to print this article in the RECORD would require 2½ pages and cost $202.50. Notwithstanding that fact, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

INSIDE THE H-BOMB PLANT

(This article is taken from An American Speaks His Mind, by Henry J. Taylor, just published by Doubleday & Co. Journalist and Author Taylor is known to millions of Americans for his radio broadcasts during the past 11 years. This article details his visit to America's supersecret H-bomb plant in South Carolina.)

The hydrogen-bomb plant in South Carolina is the largest construction achievement ever undertaken in the history of the world.

Thus it is the largest single achievement by free enterprise in all history. The great secret plant uses as much electricity as the entire State of Delaware, and enough water to serve the city of Philadelphia. It cost $1,400,000,000. This is nearly four times the cost of the Panama Canal. And, of course, the whole project is dedicated to the safety of the world.

Every ounce of thought, every ton of steel or brick or mortar was put there to preserve the peace—peace for mankind everywhere—by making the United States so strong that there can be no war.

How was this incredible place built? What is happening there now? What does it take to make the hydrogen bomb? How is it made? What were the incredible challenges American engineering and free enterprise had to meet?

That is my story—a story I have long hoped to be able to tell. To tell it, I was the first reporter to be shown the mysterious activities which take place in this vast, supersecret plant. It is the first such account authorized by the United States Government. And nothing will be revealed, of course, that would aid an enemy of America.

To reach the secret area I flew from New York to Augusta, Ga., and then entered the closed reservation with the Atomic Energy Commission escorts. Come inside with me now and see this incredible place.

This peace preserving project actually covers an area of 315 square miles. It stretches through 3 counties on the quiet Savannah River in South Carolina.

You are first conscious of the secrets hereabouts when you discover that every man who enters this place is photographed. Then there are the armed sentries and the squads of radio-equipped patrol cars hovering near each series of barriers, where even the plant's general manager and security chiefs, who directed me throughout, must stop for full identification at every alarm post and check point. That they had passed through the barrier a few minutes before, and been identified, made no difference.

Each building is surrounded by its own immense circuit of barbed wire and secret protection system. The wrong man might get in there; but I don't quite see how he would get out.

What brought all this on in the first place?

Our A-bomb had been a success. Nuclear fission, or the splitting of the atom, had been achieved.

As early as 1905 Einstein suggested mass and energy are two forms of same thing, reasoning that just as energy is convertible to various forms (heat, electricity) and just as mass is convertible to various forms (solids, liquids, gases), so can mass and energy be converted to each other. Energy equals mass. With fission of uranium atom in January, 1939, came proof of this, plus the possibility of setting up controlled chain reactions and harnessing the released energy for useful work. Then followed the first controlled chain reaction in 1942.

We had learned the secret of the transmutation of the elements, changing one element to another.

In a test in Bikini, 10 million tons of water were lifted to a height of 2 miles. This was equivalent to the entire tonnage of the United States wartime fleet—lifted by one A-bomb.

But as a result of the knowledge that the U. S. S. R. had exploded an A-bomb in August 1949, the demand for creation of the even more powerful H-bomb became inevitable; so inevitable, in fact, that President Eisenhower is quoted as saying to a White House visitor in 1954 that, "If the Soviets had beaten us to the hydrogen bomb, Soviet power would today be on the march in every quarter of the globe."

For the Russians were developing their hydrogen bomb, too. Make no mistake about that. In fact, at first Russia was actually ahead of us in the field. It was not until August 1954 that our country overcame certain important technical leads which the U. S. S. R. had over us in the H-bomb.

This was revealed when the top experts were surprised by the force of the first Russian H-bomb explosion.

By our own secret means, of the most miraculous kind, we actually analyzed at a great distance the Red explosion. We actually discovered that the Russians had created their first H-bomb along quite a different line than we had. We found that the Communists did not entirely follow the methods which had been given them by convicted Red atom spy Dr. Klaus Fuchs. In short, the Russians deviated—and temporarily for the better—from the American method that Fuchs stole and taught them.

Their biggest improvement over us, apparently, was in the way they triggered the H-bomb to set it off. Our secret detections showed that the Reds employed what you might call a chemical trigger instead of relying on the explosion of an atom bomb to create the incredible heat and pressure necessary to then explode an H-bomb.

Specifically, the heat and pressure necessary to obtain the fusion of two forms of heavy hydrogen, deuterium, and tritium, whose composition is the basis of one basic type of hydrogen explosion.

In our case, however, the lead to the hydrogen bomb was found when our A-bomb did generate temperatures up to 50,000,000° C. within one and one-tenth millionths of a second. Nuclear physicists then transferred their thinking to the heavens. They began to calculate how to duplicate the reactions of the stars.

For example, the nearest star, our sun, burns at some 20,000,000° C. It is 93 million miles away. It gives off energy in changing hydrogen to helium at the incredible rate of 564 million tons per second.

This is about 7 million billion times the rate at which we generate all the electric power in our Nation.

The sun is a small star, and a young star. It has not yet lived long enough to burn up much of its hydrogen. It is nearly 3,000 times hotter inside than on its surface.

Its heat is 6,000° C. on its surface and 15,000,000° in the center.

In fact, were the sun's surface as hot as its center, the heat on us would vaporize our earth in a few minutes and scorch us into oblivion.

Yet, the top temperature in the explosion on the material made in the H-bomb plant (150,000,000° C.) is 10 times as hot as the center of the sun.

Fortunately, however, this greatest heat lasts only about a ten-millionth of a second. And it is this short temperature-time factor, not the total energy released, or the size of the explosion, that scientists say determines whether the atmosphere above us or the hydrogen in the oceans will be ignited in a complete chain reaction.

Savannah River H-bomb plant experts always were convinced that the greatest heat of the bomb lasts too short a time to create an out-of-hand reaction that would race around the earth in the sky or through the oceans. The correctness of this was apparently confirmed by the atom trials under water at Bikini.

Some scientists had calculated that in other stars bigger than the sun the fusion of hydrogen isotopes generated temperatures even 10 times greater, and in much shorter time. They reasoned that an A-bomb explosion could produce a fusion reaction, if the proper materials were at hand, so that the atomic bomb could be used as a trigger for a fusion bomb.

That bomb, in turn, would consist of igniting and fusing or bringing together, under certain conditions, two of the heavier isotopes of hydrogen.

This was the timetable of events:

The decision to attempt the H-bomb was made at the White House on January 31, 1950.

But the manufacturing challenge was appalling.

The hydrogen bomb must contain materials similar to the contents of the stars, and produce temperatures 200,000,000° to 400,000,000° C.—over 10 times hotter than the sun.

Savannah River scientists told me first estimates were that such material would cost a million dollars a pound. It would have to be carried to the target under refrigeration, at the incredible temperature of 400° F. below zero. The bomb itself would weigh at least 10,000 pounds. It would not be transported aloft. Ultimately, today's feasible material was conceived in the brilliant realm of pure science. But it took what you are looking at, a plant running for 27 miles along the South Carolina side of the Savannah River, to make that product.

The first output was tested near Eniwetok Atoll in the Marshall Islands of the Pacific on November 1, 1952. That bomb was called Mike. It could not be dropped from an air-

plane. It had to be stationed in a tower on the island. But it wiped out the island (Elugelab) on which it was shot, leaving in its place a crater 175 feet deep and a mile wide, big enough to hold 14 Pentagon buildings.

Even this first H-bomb had more force than the combined weight of all bombs dropped on Germany and Japan throughout the 6 years of World War II.

In a populated region, 300 square miles would have been blanketed by this hydrogen explosion. But that is not all. In 1954 another H-bomb, by now so developed that it could be airborne, was exploded in the Pacific. It had 700 times more power than the first H-bomb.

No wonder Secretary of Defense Charles E. Wilson said at that time: "The results and the realities are actually unbelievable."

But technical production difficulties and the sheer immensity of the factory construction problem were so great no assurance could be given that such a nuclear product could be made.

However, in spite of the enormous uncertainties, E. I. du Pont de Nemours & Co.—who had built and operated the Hanford plutonium unit at Hanford, Wash.—accepted an Atomic Energy Commission letter of contract on August 1, 1950. The Du Pont Co. expressed its willingness to take on the project, including responsibility for thousands of suppliers and subcontractors, at a fixed fee of $1. And the Du Pont Co. did the whole job from beginning to end for $1.

When the Du Pont Co. engineers started looking for sites, they started looking for rivers because many millions of gallons of water a day would be needed to cool off its great atomic furnaces. But the investigation also dealt, as well, with all elements and forces of nature.

Some 114 sites were investigated. In November 1950, 3 months after the contract was let, a review committee chose an area southeast of Augusta, Ga., and south of Aiken on the quiet Savannah River. The plant site is larger than the city of Chicago and is four times the size of the entire District of Columbia.

Six villages were made into ghost towns—like Ellenton. The name still appears on the post office, yes, but not a soul remains. The red brick building among some trees is the school. Look closer and you will see that its bell in the yard is a mass of cobwebs.

Dusty houses cluster the short main street. A fresh wind bangs their doors open and shut on creaking hinges. A village pump is broken in half. There's a gray cat in the window of the town's general store, but it is the only living thing you can see. For these stand today in the heart of the secret area. In fact, in a vast building just over the hill, robots—and only robots—are at work, so deadly is the process inside it.

Quietly, 1,500 families had to be moved and resettled; 125 cemeteries, containing 5,300 graves, were evacuated and reburials made elsewhere with approval of the next of kin.

The Land Acquisition Division, United States Army Corps of Engineers, acquired the property for the Atomic Energy Commission, which owns all facilities as agent for the Government.

The Army's Corps of Engineers is the Nation's largest single buyer of many things; for example, lumber. In peacetime the corps buys between 400 and 500 million board feet. The next biggest buyer is a leading maker of prefabricated houses.

Meanwhile, du Pont's engineering work had started. It ended as a series of 2 million blueprints. In a roll of paper 24 inches wide they would stretch from Atlanta to Seattle, Wash., a top-secret engineering blueprint highway 2,000 miles long.

The dirt excavated would cover the same distance, in the form of a wall 10 feet high and 6 feet wide.

Construction activity started in February 1951—less than 3 months after selection of the site. It increased steadily to a peak which nearly equaled the number of workers who worked on the Panama Canal, 38,500 in September 1952. And a full 5,000 were technically trained.

The average age of the engineering and supervisory group that built the H-plant was only 40 years old.

Construction consumed 126,000 carloads of materials, enough for a train reaching from Atlanta to the Pennsylvania Station in New York City. The reinforced steel alone would have filled a train 30 miles long, and the variety of special alloys needed on account of corrosion problems mounted steadily as the work progressed.

Corrosion and leakage are the twin devils always to be slain in the H-plant. For in some stages uranium has the same effect on many metals as dropping a hot iron in water and letting it stay there. Corrosion simply devours it.

Lumber required could build 15,385 houses, enough to house a town of more than 46,000 people (3 to a house).

All personnel live off the secret site in communities removed from the H-plant, a total operating force, at this moment, of around 8,500 people.

Two new world safety records were established meanwhile by the du Pont Co., including work for more than 6 million exposure hours without a single lost-time injury. This is a record unparalled in the construction industry.

Many of the buildings are as heavily constructed as the battleship *Missouri*, and nearly all are windowless.

Certain of the colossal buildings are built as far down as the bedrock and it is there that you begin to get into the innards of the vast complex known as the H-bomb plant.

Some are enormous, stern, gray monsters, as high as the tallest ships, billowing skyward in tier after tier of concrete and steel, shaped unlike anything previously designed by man; and some are actually not populated by a single man above or below the ground because the process inside is so deadly.

Some have a definite, sober majesty. Others are low and rambling, with annexes and entrances that you enter as if you were coming into the yawning mouth of a giant snake.

Still other tremendous buildings, tall as the Grand Central Terminal, consist of row after row of aluminum-colored tubes, trellises, retorts, and tanks, thrown up bare, without walls, for the fumes from their strange processes would be poisonous if confined by walls and the ventilation problem impossible.

In fact, some fumes at this stage are so lethal they are carried to a tower 400 feet tall, and burned that high in the sky—an eerie, and ever-frightening sight at night, for the wild flames flick upward in a whirlpool of blazing imagery.

In this building (and at Dana, Ind.) is made the heavy water (D20)—the product which AEC Chairman Lewis L. Strauss announced at the Geneva, Switzerland, Atoms for Peace Conference will be offered to the free world for sale.

Pumping stations and power stations are everywhere around you. Most of the plant's total power needed is to move water—that incredible quantity of many millions of gallons a day, used chiefly to cool the atomic reactors, because they release such tremendous amounts of energy in the form of heat.

In its chores, this water is pushed through 85 miles of underground mains. Little is consumed. It is simply circulated and returned to the Savannah River. Overhead powerlines, in turn, weave among the buildings for about 128 miles and carry to them enough electricity to serve Dayton or Denver, morning, noon, and night.

In fact, the Atomic Energy Commission is the largest consumer of electricity, and the largest buyer of coal in the United States, long since surpassing any railroad, industrial firm, or utility.

The factory railroad within this project is 79 miles long, switching yards included. Work roads among the buildings cover 159 miles. What, then, is going on? What's being made, and how?

The process for making an H-bomb consists of four main operations: (1) Assembly of the nuclear fuel and the target materials, (2) Five enormous atomic furnaces, or reactors. (3) The so-called separations operations. (4) The manufacture of heavy water (D20), needed in the process but not used in the H-bomb.

Polished slugs of natural uranium are received from a distant processing unit. And 1 pound of this material, the size of a golf ball, has the same potential energy as enough TNT to fill the Yankee Stadium.

In fact, just 1 single pound of uranium can be converted into the staggering power of 2½ million pounds of coal.

The uranium ore itself comes from Alaska, Australia, Belgian Congo (chiefly the great Shinkolobwe Mine), Canada, South Africa, the Colorado Plateau, and several secret sources.

Perhaps it is hardly realized that although difficult to extract, uranium is relatively plentiful in the world; actually more plentiful than zinc or lead. Thorium in the earth's crust—another potential material—is, in turn, about three times as plentiful as uranium.

It comes in chunks, like lava. The uranium appears as a black streak in the lumps. In refining it out this black substance becomes orange, then brown, then green, and finally metallic colored, something like a gun barrel.

Even then, it sometimes appears to change color, depending on the light. But no, it does not glow in the dark, for none of the rays hurled out by uranium are light rays.

Its chief characteristic is its small bulk, for uranium is the heaviest element known to man.

Most of this final refining is done in the Atomic Energy Commission plant at Fernald, Ohio, 19 miles outside Cincinnati. There, in a complicated chemical process, the ore is digested in a nitric-acid solution. It is changed into a liquid. Chemical change after chemical change follows in the course of a process involving great turbulence.

It is boiled down into powdery orange oxide. What comes from Fernald's furnaces, called green salt, is chemically named uranium tetrafluoride or UF–4.

Finally, as molten uranium, it spills into molds and solidifies into ingot form. These ingots are rolled and ground and cut into the slugs you see arrive here at the H-bomb plant at Savannah River.

There a first step toward the H-bomb is to assemble the slugs scientifically inside long tubes, called fuel rods because they contain this atomic fuel. The target material they are to bombard is also assembled inside similar rods in such a way as to provide a self-sustaining chain reaction.

The methods call for applied nuclear science of the highest level and involve, of course, several of the most basic secrets of production.

Roughly speaking, materials that are to react on one another in the nuclear furnace, the reactor, to make our H-bomb, are now ready.

Let me speak first of the terrific challenge to free enterprise when it came to trying to build the reactors, the atomic furnaces. Private enterprise had to rise to the challenge. And it did so, for every day in America is a new challenge.

Previous reactors in other plants like Oak Ridge were atomic piles using graphite in the nuclear process. H-bomb materials required designing a tank-like reactor on a completely different theory.

The Du Pont Co. realized that radiation creates major problems in engineering design because the structural materials may gradually change or disintegrate.

The tank could be made of aluminum. It would be surronded by graphite and then by a concrete shield.

But, in addition, this reactor-tank would have to be filled with heavy water; the 1932 discovery of Dr. Harold G. Urey and coworkers, which won for him the Nobel prize.

This fluid is a phenomeon. It was the pathway to victory at Savannah River. It looks like plain water, but weighs more. Of the total hydrogen atoms in plain water, one atom in very 6,250 weighs twice as much as the rest of the hydrogen atoms.

Every time you use 52 gallons of water in normal, everyday living, an ounce of heavy water is present. This amounts to 1 pound in every 3 tons of plain water—if you can get it out. That is something like saying that one door knob in the Empire State building is heavier than the rest, if you can find it. This plant, unique in all the world, finds it by the hundreds of tons.

In the H-bomb process when neutrons fly out from the uranium, they have very high speeds. They are the spark for the powerful nuclear reaction. But it is necessary to slow them down before they are efficient. Savannah River scientists say they travel about 30 million miles per hour. A bridle must be put on them. If not, they bypass the atomic targets in the other rods that they are supposed to convert. For an atom is built like our solar system. It is almost all empty space. The nucleous is the only solid piece. In fact, Savannah River scientists say if you eliminated all the space in every atom in the body of a 200-pound man he would be no bigger than a particle of dust. Further, the earth without the space in its atoms would be a ball only one-half mile through.

Speaking in London, Sir Oliver Lodge expresses this another way: "Within the atom, electrons revolve around their nucleus several thousand million times a second. Each electron has as much room to move within the atom as a bee has to move in St. Paul's Cathedral."

The heavy water is used to slow down the neutrons by keeping them submerged in the strange fluid. It is called the moderator. But the quantity needed was so relatively great that another industrial supermarvel arises in the fact that thousands of tons are produced in the H-plant whereas only a small quantity existed previously throughout the world.

This was a built-in handicap. Overcoming this made possible the success of the radically new reactors. It was a bad morning for the cynics.

This brings us to the reactor buildings themselves:

These are the great, tiered, bombproof buildings built like the Missouri. There are five. They are the heart and core of the plant, buildings R, L, P, K, and C. All are alike. To the working force, they are buildings Roger, Lilly, Polly, Kitty, and Charley; such is the American penchant for nicknames even in the H-plant.

There are 5 reactors instead of 1, not to enhance the H-bomb processes but merely to multiply the output. Here, then, is a perhaps hitherto undisclosed fact: For it is incorrect to assume that once our country has made up a suitable stockpile of atomic weapons we have on hand any true and standing supply. Atomic bombs deteriorate in storage. They must be freshened, replenished, recharged, which is why there is continuous atomic-materials production, and why the output is on a permanent basis.

Thus we arrive at the next challenge to free enterprise: the instrumentation.

An atomic bomb is an uncontrolled reaction. A reactor operation is a controlled reaction. So, when loaded rods are put in the reactor, the tremendous potential energy locked up in their atoms must be released gradually.

Rods, containing a bluish-white metallic element called cadmium, are stuck in as a safety precaution, and the reactor can be completely shut down by merely pushing the control rods farther in the reactor. That's the way you stop production. But the nuclear operation itself requires controls so fantastically sensitive that human operation is impossible.

The pulse of the reaction must be recorded continuously; for just as growth in nature is silent but continuous, so the reactor is a huge, silent force that goes on continuously. Speed in electronic calculators and signal systems is imperative to monitor it, and also to set in motion the nuclear corrective measures required to compensate for the slightest changes. The Du Pont Co. process engineers had to make a kind of pragmatic judgment about much of the instrumentation: "What works?"

As one result the plant's instrumentation consists of more than 100,000 dials. Some scales weigh invisible specks 1 billion times smaller than a gram, although a gram is as light as a few blades of grass.

Other instruments clock speeds of atomic particles to one-thousandth of a millionth of a second. Miraculous pumps were built to whirl faster than the speed of sound. I looked into a microscope that measures a thickness 10,000 times smaller than an eyelash. I saw vacuum tubes so tiny that a dozen would fit in a thimble. You can see immense doors open and close themselves in perfect unison. Some of the machines weigh 250,000 pounds, yet they must operate with micrometerlike precision and, in fact, are built by watchmakers.

About 120 different skills and technologies were combined to achieve the plant's design. The Du Pont Co. placed more than 87,000 orders with 5,745 firms employing less than 500 people. Thus, as is true throughout our free-enterprise system, it required a combination of the talents and facilities of large and small business to build all this and meet the schedules of our Nation's defense program. It reflects interdependent responsibilities of big and small business in serving our free-enterprise economy, and the people of our country. Teamwork did the trick.

The reactors' products are made in batches, and the fillings of the reactors are staggered. Roger is filled and allowed to percolate. Then Polly, then Kitty, and so forth. Thus when opened they create a steady flow of the products to the next stage in the process.

This is the separations operations.

Uranium from the fuel rods has become partly converted to plutonium, and partly contaminated. Isotopes are bouncing around. Their presence is detected to an astounding degree. For example, 1 molecule of 1 of the isotopes can be discovered in a quantity of materials 10 million times its size. Were there only a teasponful of it in 5,000 tons of any carbonate, Savannah River scientists could still trace it. The teaspoonful divided among 50 million rats could be detected in any 1 rat.

The fission products, or ashes from the atomic fuel, coming out in the batches, are intensely deadly, radioactive. Now they are taken to the separation center.

Like the six ghost towns, these buildings constitute a world where nobody can live—but there is much going on nevertheless.

Robots take over. To avoid radioactive fatality, the incredibly difficult operations had to be designed to operate indefinitely without stopping day or night for maintenance and completely without human contact.

Here you see robot hands, remotely directed, so delicate in their touch that they could pluck a human hair from your head, or flick the cork out of a tiny chemical bottle (the simplest set of hands costs $8,800); or huge robot derricks; levers and electric trollies so heavily built that they move the biggest machines, inching their way through tunnels and down tracks under electronic control, as if guided by brains from another world.

Equipment maintenance and other intricate changes are made on signal by means of these weird workmen among the forest of machines. They connect or break electrical circuits, as man might do, repair leaking pipes, transfer faulty machinery, install replacements, and even flash a battery of lights, like a pinball machine, if they fumble something or smash it.

Technicians scan the operations from outside the vast building through a telescope in the wall. When I asked why the robots needed watching if they were perfect, one scientist replied: "Well, it's lonesome in there. We keep our eye on them to see that they don't go over in a corner and sulk."

Then, at intervals, any discarded machines or tools, if radioactive, are transported to a burial ground down by the river, where even the trucks that haul them are buried forever.

The atomic end products emerge separated. The uranium fuel, repurified, is returned to reprocessing into slugs, to be used again. Some plutonium has been created, useful in the A-bomb. Cobalt has been made radioactive. It will be packaged in the form of wafers, each only slightly larger than a dime, and shipped for use in the medical arts, and therapy machines, like radium.

Isotopes emerge and find their way to outside laboratories for experiments toward better agriculture, better forestry, better industry, better health—including attempts at a cure for cancer.

The poisoned material for which no use is yet known is stored underground in whole batteries of giant sunken tanks, the size of a 10-story building, awaiting a day when science will discover some utilization.

Finally, from the separations processes comes the material for the H-bomb, now purified, lethal, and ready. It is not assembled into the bomb at Savannah River. That is done elsewhere at assembly points in weapons centers, to guard the peace of the world.

Breadlines Are Growing

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALBERT GORE
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, February 20, 1958

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Breadline Grows Bigger Here This Year; Block Long, Four Abreast at Pacific Garden Mission," written by Miller Davis, and published in the Chicago Daily News of February 17, 1958.

I ask unanimous consent also to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, following the article just mentioned, a letter to the editor of the Chattanooga Times.

I point out that the Chattanooga Daily Times of Saturday, February 15, reports the following:

The total picture of the unemployment situation in the Chattanooga area was a depressing one as reviewed by approximately 50 representatives of welfare and relief agencies.

The article reports, further:

There are an estimated 9,100 persons totally employed in the labor market embracing Hamilton County and Walker County, Ga.

This, Mr. President, is the Chattanooga area. I call attention to these facts and urge the Senate and the administration to take cognizance of the distress conditions which are daily growing worse.

I think it is time the Government undertook measures to safeguard our economy from what threatens to be a severe jolt.

There being no objection, the article and the letter to the editor were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Chicago Daily News of February 17, 1958]

BREADLINE GROWS BIGGER HERE THIS YEAR—BLOCK LONG, FOUR ABREAST AT PACIFIC GARDEN MISSION

(By Miller Davis)

"Yes; I ate yesterday morning," explained the 44-year-old mechanic from Pennsylvania. "I had soup, bread, and some stewed apricots."

It was 28 hours later, and the scene was a block-long breadline, the men four abreast, in front of the Pacific Garden Mission at 650 South State.

The mechanic, clean shaven and wearing a faded but freshly starched jacket, stepped back into the line of cold, shivering men.

"Don't want to lose my place," he apologized gently. "But I gotta eat. I can't hunt work unless I eat."

He said he had had a job mopping floors in a cafeteria which paid $5 for 10 hours' work. But the job faded and he spent the money for a bed in a flophouse. That was a week ago.

"My name is Harry McGruder," the mechanic added. "I'm a good mechanic—but so what?"

Richard Sullivan, 40, stood behind McGruder in the line. He stomped his feet to pound the blood back.

"I used to make $120 a week just a couple of months ago with a cartage outfit" Sullivan said. "Then things got bad in St. Paul and I came down here where you could always make a dollar."

But Sullivan said he hadn't been able to make a dollar here.

Four big cartage outfits told him, "We don't need you now; come back in a couple of weeks."

Sullivan said he had "some oatmeal and coffee yesterday morning, and they tell me we get beef stew today at the mission."

Squeezed in his hand was a small yellow ticket reading on one side: "Pacific Garden Mission. * * * Ho, everyone that thirsteth, come ye to the waters, and he that hath no money, come ye, without money and without price."—Isaiah 55: 1.

"Somebody handed me this ticket," Sullivan explained. "This is the first time in my life that I ever had to * * *."

He wiped a hand across his eyes and got back into line.

Condit Kunz, 48, a former warehouse foreman, muttered, "I'm just hungry."

"I'm not too proud to admit it," he gritted. "I have 2 cents in my pocket, after paying 70 cents for a flop last night."

Kunz carries soap and a razor in his pocket.

"I don't look like a bum when I look for work," he said.

Inside the mission, warm but desolate, Supt. Harry Saulnier was guiding the men to seats in front of a rostrum.

He led some hymns and a few prayers before they went downstairs for soup, stew, bread and butter.

"We've had a 20 percent increase in the number of men eating and sleeping here the past 2 or 3 months," the gray-haired Saulnier said.

"We have beds only for 90 men—so the rest, about 170 each night, must sleep on the floor.

"A lot of these are fine-type men, not bums, and they just can't find jobs, even menial jobs.

"You can't throw them out in the snow, somebody has to help them until the job situation gets better."

The mission is supported by voluntary funds from people whom Saulnier terms "Christians and non-Christians who can't think of people going hungry."

At the Salvation Army's Harbor Light Center, 654 West Madison, Maj. Roland Quinn, commander, said the center is feeding 400 men a night now, about 10 percent above a year ago.

"Worst since 1955," commented Quinn's assistant, Bill Red. "Usually work picks up in the middle of January—but this year it didn't."

The center is getting a lot of young men, generally the first to be dropped in a labor pinch, he added.

About 40 percent of the men coming to the center are from the Chicago area, Quinn said.

[From the Chattanooga Daily Times of February 15, 1958]

To the EDITOR OF THE CHATTANOOGA TIMES:

I wonder if anybody else is disturbed by the complacence of most people toward the poor of Chattanooga? This long drawn out cold spell has caused incredible suffering and the recession (by any other name) has added to this misery. Yet over and over I hear people dismiss any spoken sympathy with the words, "Well, they can always go to one of the local agencies, can't they?"

The harrassed and sometimes desperate local agencies are carrying a burden that is far heavier than most people realize. They are handicapped by insufficient funds, insufficient help and insufficient material. If any one has read the list of foods handed out by the agencies here, one must pause to wonder what the ultimate effect of such a diet must be. White flour or meal, white beans, skimmed milk, rice and cheese. No meat, no fruit or vegetables, no butter fat, no energy giving sweets.

This is not a criticism of the agencies. They give what they have. But it is a criticism of this rich Government with its surplus of peanuts and its frequent surpluses of eggs, butter, and of its waste and indifference. Undernourishment can cause tuberculosis—which can spread to even the most well-to-do people; it can cause death from lack of resistance and it can certainly cause crime—for who could resist stealing for his hungry children when the stores all around one display such a lavish stock of food? Starvation and frustration can cause deep psychological scars which may lead to dangerous abnormalities later.

This is not a problem which can be easily solved, but certainly its worst aspects could be alleviated. People who are even fairly comfortable are too prone to dismiss the misery of others.

It disturbs them to think of children in this town dying from hunger and exposure and lack of medical care. Yet it happens. I have been in a house right in town where there was no heat and a little 5-year-old child died of the cold and malnutrition. I know of a family of 12 children, a mother and an old grandmother who live on one floor of a frame house. The children not only haven't enough clothes to go to school but not even enough to cover them. I have been told by neighbors that even the older children wear diapers because they have nothing else. Shoes in a family like that are beyond price and food is something that one hopes for. I know a family where the mother and four children lived on the agencies' food until the little boys, 2 and 4, after having white beans with no seasoning for five consecutive meals, simply sat and looked at them and cried. There are many more. How can you use flour without lard, salt or baking powder? How can you cook beans without white meat or fat?

How can you use meal, even in mush, without something to put on it? And how can you grow into anything like a useful citizen with none of the foods that everybody knows are necessary simply to maintain the rudiments of health?

I confess that I don't know the answer. Unless the churches open soup kitchens before it is too late. The community centers do a wonderful job, but like the agencies, are financially handicapped. It seems to me that the time has returned when individual help is needed, the help of groups and of individual people who are not not subsidized by the Government.

Next Wednesday is Ash Wednesday, the beginning of a season in which most of us turn our minds more firmly toward the precepts and ways of Christ. It might be well to remember the epistle which says, "Though I speak with the tongues of men and of angels, and have not charity, I am become as a sounding brass or a tinkling cymbal * * * and though I have all faith, so that I could remove mountains, and have not charity, I am nothing * * *the greatest of these is charity."

And let those who are so content to leave their charity to the overburdened and often pitying agencies figure how they would provide coal, shoes, clothes, food, light and medicine for a family on what the agencies are able to hand out.

A TROUBLED CITIZEN.

Pay TV

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STROM THURMOND
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, February 20, 1958

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, the Asheville Citizen-Times, of Asheville, N. C., included in its edition of Sunday, February 9, 1958, a most informative discussion of pay TV, written by its able editor, the Honorable Charles K. Robinson.

I ask unanimous consent that this editorial article, entitled "Pay TV and Public Policy," be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PAY TV AND PUBLIC POLICY

(By Charles K. Robinson)

A lengthy debate on pay television versus free television has narrowed down to a few basic issues. Condensing the long story, the basic questions may then be considered in

the light of accepted ideas of sound public policy.

The first and most immediate question is whether Congress will permit the Federal Communications Commission to conduct tests of toll television.

FCC and the advocates of pay television insist that such tests would provide a democratic answer to the question, "Do the people want pay television?"

The opponents, including the three major networks now providing free television, correctly point out that such tests would show only that a minority, ready for new gadgets and able to pay for them, probably would go in for pay television.

The minority would also apparently go in for the good programs for which pay television could outbid free television. The consequent plight of the majority of 50 million families would just be too bad.

Hearings on the controversy have been conducted by the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. The main issues there presented with attendant facts and logical deductions may be thus presented:

The air waves are public property. They belong to the American people, all the people.

Congress writes the rules to assure the people that all broadcasting shall be conducted with due regard for the public interest, convenience, or necessity.

Of the almost 50 million families in the United States, approximately 42 million have invested around $16 billion in television sets.

These investments were made in reasonable belief that the owners would never have to pay additional bills for television programs.

That bill—1 billion and almost 210 million dollars—is now paid by advertisers seeking and apparently finding the larger mass markets upon which the American system of industry and trade is based.

Therefore free television (commercials and all) is a part of our private enterprise system.

Whatever the system lacks of perfection, it has brought great good to a great number—a great and growing number of all sorts and conditions of men, women, and children—not to just a minority of the people.

The system is admired by our friends among the nations. It is undoubtedly secretly envied by our Communist potential enemies.

Why, then, is there a serious proposal before FCC and Congress (it belongs in Congress) to abandon free television for the toll system?

One guess is enough: huge and growing profits.

Telemeter Corp., thus far the only applicant for FCC license to operate toll television, has given a frank and really a twofold answer to the question:

We ask merely for the authority to sell, if we can, something which is now being given away.

Subscription television would initially cost the networks much money, and their minority subscribers would also pay substantially.

But Telemeter apparently finds compensatory assurance in the estimates to this effect: with only a small number of the 50 million families going into subscription television, the financial take would be around $6 billion a year.

The lure, to those able to respond, is better programs. It is only an assertion of better programs, but this much is true: with the tremendous sums flowing in from pay television, the new sponsors would siphon off from free television the best actors, the best programs, the best that more money can always buy.

This is the explanation for an otherwise somewhat puzzling statement by Columbia Broadcasting System and other networks opposing pay television. These networks recognize the fallacy in the glib argument that coexistence is possible for free and pay television. They frankly say that, if Congress authorizes toll programs, they will go over to the pay system as a matter of self-preservation.

It is unnecessary to discuss the tests further than one point. Prolonged tests, which would be necessary, would cost all concerned so much that it would be difficult at the end not to authorize pay television.

Not incidentally, pay television would be a prohibitive cost for the average family.

But no test is necessary to arrive at a plain yes or no on a clear-cut, fundamental question, the question on which the whole case for toll television must stand or fall:

Are the people's representatives in Congress willing to set up a monopoly of toll television, for the entertainment and instruction of the few able to pay, and for the exclusion of the majority not able to meet the bill?

Postal Rates

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD MARTIN
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, February 20, 1958

Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a very good editorial on the subject of postal rates, published in the Easton Express of Monday, January 27, 1958.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

POSTAL RATES MUST BE RAISED

A few days ago Postmaster General Arthur Summerfield wrote in clear terms on a Senate committee's Belshazzar's wall the "Mene, Mene Tekel" of the United States postal operation. The system has in the last decade or so incurred a $6-billion deficit. True, when purists explain the operation as a service rather than a business then it does not really incur deficits, any more than other pure service responsibilities of Government can be considered as such.

But the concept of the mails as a service in the pure sense ended when the first fee was charged for delivery. The use of stamps and the cost of other services to mailers has supported part of the cost of the postal operation. It is not breaking any long-rooted principle, therefore, to raise the postal rates, and this is one method recommended by Mr. Summerfield and the administration in cutting down on the system's annual losses.

Not since 1932 has there been an increase in the first-class mailing rates, although during the 1st session of the 85th Congress the administration, backed by informed public sentiment, supported by organizations such as the National Association of Postmasters, tried to have the letter rate increased from 3 to 4 cents. In the face of this legislative reaction it may seem unrealistic for the administration now to seek a 2-cent instead of a 1-cent rate raise, but maybe the extra penny has been tacked on as a factor in bargaining with the lawmakers.

The administration also is trying to create rate reforms in other mails functions. Mail advertising—the junk mail addressed to "Boxholder," which forces the postman to stop at every home, and creates handling crises in the post offices, is an undeserved subsidy to those who use this form of advertising. And a fair share of the cost of the postal operation is not paid by some users of second- and third-class mail services, despite recent rate and other adjustments in these areas of service.

In many of the problems created by outmoded equipment and antedated personnel policies, the postal service officials could create effective reforms by following through with many of the recommendations made by the Hoover Commission. Action in this phase of the problem in fact would in some degree minimize the fiscal squeeze on the system and have a commensurate bearing on new rate considerations.

Again it must be realized that the postal operation never has been wholly a service, and it probably never will pay its own way. Both Congress and the administration must approach realistically the fact that while rates have remained relatively fixed, operational costs have moved upward at a pace generally in keeping with the rest of the national economy. The only sensible thing to do is to make the rate adjustments that are indicated—or make an official policy recognition of the need for sufficient tax appropriations to end the so-called deficits.

The Regulation of Imports by Quotas

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 20, 1958

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the following statement of Mr. O. R. Strackbein, chairman of the nationwide committee on import-export policy, as submitted to the Boggs Subcommittee on Foreign Trade Policy of the House Ways and Means Committee:

STATEMENT OF O. R. STRACKBEIN, CHAIRMAN, THE NATIONWIDE COMMITTEE ON IMPORT-EXPORT POLICY, ON THE REGULATION OF IMPORTS BY QUOTAS, SUBMITTED TO THE BOGGS SUBCOMMITTEE ON FOREIGN TRADE POLICY, OF THE HOUSE WAYS AND MEANS COMMITTEE

The tariff has been the principal means employed by the United States throughout its history for the protection of its industry from foreign competition in the home market. Until recent years the tariff was relied on almost exclusively as our instrument of protection. In more recent times import quotas have been used as a supplementary device to protect certain agricultural products.

The aim of this paper is to examine the relative merits of the tariff and the quota as means of regulating import competition.

The use of the tariff as a flexible instrument was more widespread in the past than it is today. In recent years, particularly since the signing of the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade in 1947, the tariff as such has been made much less flexible through wider acceptance of the most-favored-nation clause and the general principle of nondiscrimination.

The United States in sharp contrast with most of the other leading trading nations has continued to rely for the most part, and with respect to industrial products, exclusively, on the tariff as its principal protective instrument. It is also faced with the fact that some of the important trading nations do not adhere as we do to the uncon-

ditional most-favored-nation clause. As a result this country lacks the flexibility enjoyed by other countries in their protective devices.

These facts, among others, have done much to bring the tariff under closer scrutiny in the United States in recent years. The tariff's failure to fit particularly serious competitive situations has been revealed as a glaring weakness as imports of one product after another have since 1948 eaten into our market at will, gaining an ever increasing share of the whole.

There may be a wide gap, for example, between the prices on the same goods coming from different countries. A given tariff rate, say one of 25 percent, might be suitable with respect to the goods coming from some countries but wholly inadequate when these goods come from other parts of the world. A rate as high as 100 percent or 200 percent might be necessary in such cases to provide the same braking power as the 25 percent rate in the other cases.

Yet any given tariff rate under the most-favored-nation clause and the principle of nondiscrimination must be applied to the same goods coming from all countries without distinction. This fact, on the other hand, has made the tariff almost useless as a protective instrument with respect to many products.

Contrary to some economic theories, high cost of goods does not necessarily arise from relative inefficiency. It may and often does arise from unequal social legislation that imposes higher cost burdens on producers in one country than those borne by their competitors in other countries. This fact often places the higher standard countries at a relative disadvantage.

Quite aside from the unequal braking power of the tariff when employed by itself, it has other deficiencies.

Specific rates, based as they are on some measurement of quantity, for example, do not respond to the changes in price levels that occur over a period of time. Exclusive of the tariff reductions made under the trade agreements program, the protective incidence of our specific duty rates has fallen as much since 1934 as prices on our imports have risen. No compensation has been provided by the United States to offset this shrinkage although other countries have in many cases raised their rates in keeping with the rise in prices.

Purely ad valorem rates, on the other hand, offer least protection precisely where and when prices of imports are low and can do the most damage. This defect has already been mentioned as arising when the same imports come respectively from lower and higher standard countries. It shows itself just as disastrously when the general price level itself has fallen and imports aggravate an already bad surplus situation. The ad valorem rate is then at its weakest.

Undoubtedly the greatest failure of the tariff, used alone, is encountered when a surplus position has developed on a broad front and a buyer's market threatens a recession or a depression.

It is on such occasions that a more flexible instrument is needed. Protection of industry and labor and of the economy as a whole from competitive imports is never more important than in times of surplus accumulation.

If under these circumstances imports remain out of control their unimpeded flow can wreck all the efforts of domestic producers to make the necessary adjustment of supply to demand. A single, fixed tariff rate is then of little or no avail. What is needed is an instrument that is responsive to the needs of the occasion. Such an instrument would serve the double purpose of protecting not only a given industry but the economy in general.

An import quota, either alone or in combination with the tariff, lends itself to the requirements of a flexible instrument.

Such a stabilizing influence and such a prop to confidence would be of immeasurable value to domestic production and employment because of its effect on planning forward commitments and expansion proposals. If the trend of imports is such that grave doubt is cast upon the future market for the domestic product, confidence cannot thrive. Planning then labors under a severe handicap. A damper falls upon plans to expand plant capacity; and outlays for development and promotion fall under a spell of fear. Such an atmosphere is essentially the atmosphere of panic, of negative behavior and eventual defeat. It is wholly contrary to the needs of an expanding economy.

A decline in exports has not nearly the panic-impelling power as an increase in imports. Control of imports should therefore give us the greater concern.

The reason is that imports much more than exports confront the domestic producer with an unknown potential for trouble that is not only unpredictable but is wholly beyond his control.

If the domestic industry is a small one, composed of a number of competing producers, a running battle with imports is almost certainly a losing engagement. The funds necessary for research and development, product improvement, promotional activity, so badly needed, will probably not be available or if on hand will be needed in the struggle itself.

The natural reaction of domestic producers, faced with an overstock of high-priced goods, when confronted with an increasing tide of imports, is to curtail production in order to reduce inventory losses and, if possible, to adjust to the new situation. This means laying off employees or putting the force on a short workweek. In any case, it means unemployment and shrinking payrolls.

The sacrifice of a domestic industry not only cannot be justified in behalf of a national policy that may itself be faulty, either in its conception or execution, but is abhorrent to a sense of justice and national self-respect. There is no clear cause-and-effect relationship, for example, between increasing imports of some product that is not essential to the national defense, and the success of any sound foreign policy. A policy that suggests such a relationship is more likely to be at fault itself.

It would be more compelling to say that any legitimate American industry is entitled to continue its existence in this country if it can supply a product that the consumer demands, at prices the consumer is ready and willing to pay and high enough to return a reasonable profit.

An import quota system should be designed, either by itself or in combination with the tariff, (1) to afford protection against undue encroachment of imports on the domestic market without introducing unnecessary rigidity into the trend of trade; (2) to introduce greater certainty into planning, scheduling and pricing in domestic production so that development of products, renewal or expansion of plant and equipment and greater employment may proceed in an atmosphere of greater confidence in the future, freed from the panic-potential of unimpeded import competition; (3) to provide for sharing of the domestic market with imports under conditions that make it possible for domestic producers to live with the type of competition involved; and (4) to assure a maximum of trade by setting up an orderly system of fair competition in place of a chaotic and disruptive operation in the name of a liberal trade policy.

By putting a ceiling on imports, either absolute or approximate, the import quota deprives import competition of its most objectionable feature, namely, the creation of uncertainty and therefore the destruction of confidence, as described above.

A tariff quota would in all instances be preferable to an absolute quota if a suitable tariff rate or combination of rates could be determined. This follows from the greater ease of administration of a tariff quota. Also a tariff quota does not close the market absolutely. Goods may still come in so long as they can surmount the limiting tariff barrier.

Objections are often raised against import quotas as a means of regulating foreign trade on the grounds that quotas are too restrictive and tend to put trade into a straitjacket.

Unquestionably import quotas could be used, as they have been, to produce precisely these effects. That fact, however, does not condemn quotas as such for the simple reason that their use need not produce such results, and indeed can be designed to avoid them.

There is no call for a general upward revision of the tariff; but there is an urgent need for supplementing the tariff with flexible quota provisions and in some instances for substituting absolute but flexible quotas for the tariff.

What is called for therefore is enabling legislation that would empower an agency of the Congress, such as the United States Tariff Commission, to impose an import quota either in combination with the tariff or separately, in accordance with guidelines set forth in the legislation.

The usual complaint that import quotas tend to stifle trade and prevent its growth could be overcome by shaping the quota system with the necessary degree of responsiveness to the needs of commerce and industry.

Economic disruption and distress attributable to import competition, in the form of unemployment, upset prices, mounting surpluses, and loss of confidence need not be regarded as a necessary and unavoidable accompaniment of foreign trade. The import quota, properly prepared legislatively and intelligently administered, could be the savior of a liberal trade policy.

Agricultural Research

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. STROM THURMOND

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, February 20, 1958

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, in recent months the people of this country have become very much interested in the subject of basic and applied scientific research, as it applies to the matter of national security. Sometimes, perhaps, some of us get the idea that intensive scientific research is something new.

One example of a research program that has been continuing for a long time, and with excellent results, can be found in the field of agriculture.

There is no line of human endeavor more important than that pursued by the farmer. He produces everything we eat and almost everything we wear. He is doing it more efficiently every year because agricultural research is going forward constantly.

I ask unanimous consent that a very informative review of agricultural re-

search, entitled "Research in Agriculture Adds to Practical Uses," which appeared in the February 1958, issue of the South Carolina Farmer, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESEARCH IN AGRICULTURE ADDS TO PRACTICAL USES

Basic research is a systematic, intensive search directed toward increase of knowledge in science. It discovers the order in the universe and accounts for the happenings in our everyday environment. It establishes new laws and concepts that are often put to practical use by applied research. It dispels ignorance, and creates more ignorance.

Progress in applied research and development depends heavily on the growth and encouragement of basic research; without it, technological advance would be slowed down to a snail's pace.

The concepts, objectives, and methods of basic research and common to all science and all nationalities. Its results have universal application. Advances brought about as a result of such research in a particular area lead to totally unexpected developments in a wide range of unrelated sciences.

Creative, pioneering studies that give us new scientific laws and principles have always had a place, but not always the same emphasis, in USDA research. Emphasis on basic research is currently increasing, with more money and effort backing it up now than ever before. Basic research comprises 17 percent of USDA's total research effort at the present time, and the figure is rising.

Such research—in widely varied sciences—has already given us tremendous insight into fundamental processes and helped change our way of life.

But there's still a great deal that we need to know—things like the mysteries of chlorophyll formation; the light-sensitive trigger mechanism that regulates flowering, seed setting, and germination; the forms of radiation that profoundly affect life; the complex exents that make a hen lay an egg.

What the implications of basic discoveries like these may be are limited only by man's imagination. Unraveling these mysteries may give us entirely new approaches to our practical problems, such as feeding a population of 300 million people (expected by the year 2000) a nutritious diet resulting in greater vigor, stature, and life span. Elimination of harmful insects and plant and animal diseases could go a long way to reduce human disease. Shedding more light on synthesis of amino acids, life's main building blocks, might enable us to reproduce chemically some form of life. Bringing about mutations of living organizisms by radiation or chemical means may permit scientists to regulate heredity.

Actually, we don't even know what such work can give us because we can't accurately visualize what the future holds. Who would have dreamed 50 years ago of today's fantastic achievements, such as harnessing atomic power? A research breakthrough in agriculture might have the same kind of effect.

BASIC WORK IMPORTANT IN EARLY RESEARCH

Scientific research has been one of USDA's main functions since its inception in 1862. Much early research developed to meet emergencies. But basic research played an important role, too. It was often necessary to perform fundamental work before solving many practical problems of the day. This led to some great contributions.

The close of the 19th century, for example, found USDA scientists working on tick fever, then taking a dreadful toll of cattle. It wasn't long before researchers pinpointed protozoa-laden ticks as the carriers. Of course, this discovery got rid of tick fever. But it did something even more important. In showing that protozoa could carry disease, it laid the foundation for the new science of protozoology and opened the way for many public-health and preventive-medicine activities.

FEDERAL LAWS PROMOTE FUNDAMENTAL STUDIES

Basic research continued to gain because of a growing need of fundamental knowledge to provide a base for finding answers to more complex practical problems. This need was reflected in the passage of Federal laws providing for basic research. Among them was the Bankhead-Jones Act of 1935, which established nine regional laboratories. The act also expanded support for research in State agricultural experiment stations.

Surprisingly, basic research slowly declined after passage of the Bankhead-Jones Act, reaching a low ebb of 1947. It's not hard to see why. Funds under this act—as well as other research funds—weren't increased to keep pace with decreasing dollar value. In addition, emphasis during the war years was on applying all background knowledge on hand. Nevertheless, much significant work emerged. We now have a better understanding of such matters as nature of clays, the biology of insects, and the effects of light on plant growth.

NEW PIONEERING SCIENTISTS FOLLOW OWN LEADS

A great step forward in basic studies is the formation of pioneering research laboratories presently moving forward in ARS. These are being organized around outstanding scientists who have demonstrated a capacity for creative research. The scientists are developing their own research programs, following leads they think important. They have been relieved of administrative duties to devote all their time to basic studies.

Plans for these laboratories began to take shape in February 1957. Already set up are pioneering research laboratories for mineral nutrition of plants, plant physiology, blood antignes, insect pathology, insect physiology, seed protein, plant fibers, and microbiological chemistry. Others are being planned.

Pioneering researchers hope to provide answers to some of agriculture's most puzzling questions. Example: How can an inorganic ion move from a dilute solution in the soil into a much more concentrated plant says? By all known laws, the movement should be the other way.

The recent steady growth of basic research in USDA probably can best be shown by comparing research expenditures for fiscal years 1947 and 1957.

Research funds used by USDA in 1947 totaled $33 million. A little more than $2 million, or 6 percent went into basic research. In 1957, USDA was spending nearly $73 million for research, with over $12 million or 17 percent going into basic research. Largest share of the research appropriation went to ARS major research agency of USDA. ARS received over $54 million; over $11 million or 21 percent went into basic research.

Other USDA agencies doing basic research are the Agricultural Marketing Service and Forest Service.

Research by the State agricultural experiment stations has contributed enormously to the Nation's agricultural economy. An estimate made in 1954 indicated that approximately 23 percent of the State experiment station research funds were devoted to basic research. Research authorizations for these stations for fiscal year 1958 total $120 million, $90 million supplied by the States, $30 million by Federal grants.

Along with this growth in basic research has come a great increase in the complexity of agricultural science. Today, such fields as animal husbandry, agronomy, and horticulture include researchers in a wide variety of disciplines from atomic science to zoology.

Safeguarding America's Industries

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLEVELAND M. BAILEY
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 20, 1958

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Speaker, I wish to call the attention of my colleagues to a communication from Mr. W. A. Harris, Jr., president of the Edwin M. Knowles China Co., located at East Liverpool, Ohio, and signed by 587 of the 650 employees of the plant protesting a renewal of our present Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act which would provide for further reduction of import duties on high-grade chinaware.

Mr. Harris' letter states in detail the difficulty of American china producers in meeting the unrestricted imports of this type of ware from foreign competitors. Since this is one of the major plants of this kind, it is my thought that the Congress would not want to seriously consider a program that would close a plant of this size and eventually close out an industry which is one of America's oldest and most substantial.

His letter and the signatures follow:

THE EDWIN M. KNOWLES CHINA CO.,
Newell, W. Va., February 13, 1958.

Hon. CLEVELAND M. BAILEY,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: We are enclosing lists containing 583 signatures of employees in our plant who oppose extension of the Trade Agreements Act. This list represents over 90 percent of the people on our present payrolls and could have contained 100 percent except for illness and absence of the balance of our employees. We are sending a similar list of names to Representative WAYNE L. HAYS, since he represents a large number of the workers who live in East Liverpool, Ohio, and vicinity. The names on the list being sent to Representative HAYS are the same as the names on your list.

Ten or 12 years ago our company employed as high as 1,050 people while today our employment is approximately 650, many of whom are working only part time. We appreciate that all business throughout the country is considerably below the volume of the last several years but wish to point out that our industry has been feeling the effects of foreign competition to a greater degree each year. According to my records 14 or 15 dinnerware plants throughout the country have closed their doors in the past 4 or 5 years, and in spite of the extra volume which should be available for those of us who are still in business our volume continues to decline. We are not opposed to a reasonable amount of imported dinnerware coming into the country but we do object to continually lowering the duties which in return make our market more attractive each year to the point of throwing out of work many, many thousands of American workmen. We are not looking for an expansion of our industry in spite of the increase in population each year but would like to keep our people working and our plants operating on a reasonable basis.

We recognize your stand with reference to tariffs and hope that your good efforts will be successful in the future. Tariffs are certainly low enough now to enable foreign competition to compete favorably with the American products and no further reductions are necessary for them to increase their imports into this country. We ask that the

present tariffs be no further reduced and that quota systems be put into effect without loopholes for evasion.

Sincerely yours,

W. A. HARRIS, Jr.,
President.

As an employee of the Edwin M. Knowles China Co., of Newell, W. Va., I oppose extension of the Trade Agreements Act. Our plant is working on a radically reduced schedule and many of us are getting only part-time work. Many others are drawing workmen's compensation. At least four major United States potteries have closed during the past year and others are faced with possible early failure. The Trade Agreements Act of 1955 is largely responsible for this situation.

Alfred E. Stoddard, Bertha A. Savage, Helen Downard, Alfred D. LaNeve, Ann LaNeve, Sandra M. Golden, Betty J. Aeschbacher, Eva L. Stoddard, Jean Scott, Gladys Whitehill, Peggy Norman, Florence McNecol, Sophie Gacasa, Jacoba Laneve, Penny Lee Arnott, Margaret Scott, Irene Morton, Ruth McKim, W. D. Parkman, W. G. Gaston, Louis C. Hassall, Alice B. Stark, Mildred A. Patton, Mary Helen Fowler, Harrison R. Burson, Virgil G. Hasson, Margaret Congrove, Neva Stone, Janet Maley, James E. Wright, C. Hermann, C. S. O'Hara, Roger A. Hall, W. D. Christopher, W. S. Harris, Jr., Eunice Oliver, Banna Maple, Clara Hurd, Esther King, Amelia Shilling, William B. Toledo, Charles Maloney, Iva Evans, Susan E. Shuman, Delmar C. Smith, William Sherman Pratt, Kenneth Brooks, James Cornell, Geo. Hanlon, Charles E. Hanlass, Donald B. Uselton, Earl C. Lowers, Burr H. Wright, Adam Goppert, Jim Walcott, Ashley J. Henderson, James Welch, George Gogel, Ralph Ronsh, Clyde Butler, Leslie Thornberry, Frank Kindle, Albert Leigh, Pauline Beaver, Shirley Haynes, Ruth Smith, Emma Davis, Joann Mink, Norma Wright, Jane Lee, Doratha Burlingame.

Cora Bunpus, Barma Maple, Paul Elliott, Annie Belbout, George A. Wilson, Albert A. Cronin, Sr., William H. Mills, Sr., Robert E. Carrolly, Bernard W. Jividen, J. L. Haugh, Wilbur Hammon, Charles Flowers, Bernard Holt, Earl Baso, John H. Cline, W. A. Husted, William H. Mills, Jr., Kenneth Wardles, John Wardles, Howard G. Rowand, John F. Quick, Earl E. Stearns, George E. Salsbourg, Everett McKinnon, James W. Salsberry, Everett Flowers, S. L. Dornon, William H. Hanlon, Thomas Wilson, James Adams, J. Ralph Allison, Samuel Howell, Edward Cranston, George K. Donaldson, Harold Finkbeiner, Jay A. Watkins, Frank McConnell, Mary P. Oliver, Jean F. Thornberry, Mary L. Garren, Rose McGaugh, William H. Weaver, James R. Mercer, George D. Haught, Lindora Hall, Paul L. Cunningham, Nina Roseberry, Mary Obenour, Walter Malone, Bertha Malone, Charlotte P. Foltz, Mary Hart, Elizabeth M. Novak, Will Bailey, Bernard Hanna, Howard Mirk, James McParnell, David Hanlon, Roy Jividen, Tim Arnats, Amanda Westfall, Freedona Neiser, Della Caywood, Eileen G. Lee, Mildred A. Pepin, Carola M. Smith, Beulah F. Higgins, LaVaun Walcott, Roby Anderson, Edgar Ewing, Clifford D. Bennett, Doris McElhany.

George Connelly, Elva R. West, Sarah J. Allison, Helen B. Coffman, Irene L. Smith, Virginia Seevers, Etta V. Dickey, Merle L. Bailey, Verna M. Wilson, Pearl M. Thomas, Gary R. Durham, Fred Brock, Olive M. Allison, Eva Sprouse, Irene A. Brooks, Mary Hayes, Magdalen Lafferre, Pearl Junkerman, Violet Boley, Margaret Cline, Virginia Visden, Alice Marshall, Venie Dawson, Ruth Elliott, Dorothy G. Holtzman, Juanita A. Birch, Bertha Williams, M. J. Duffy, Thomas Beaver, Ines Hill, Margaret E. Hanna, Beatrice R. Wooden, Norman D. Wolfe, Thomas C. Buckley, Elizabeth Donohew, Luella C. Orr, Omer N. Auksom, Perry Fletcheri, Lloyd C. Leasure, John M. Hammel, Clifford Knox, Robert C. Wolfe, Bernard Wolfe, Shirl Fletcher, Roy Tittle, Errett A. Allison, Charles F. Moore, J. Arlie Steuan, Alfred Nenbun, Donald Rhodes, Stanley Tittle, Steve Sproves, Clarence Van Fossen, Joe Van Fossen, Carl Bewer, Charles P. Slaughter, Arthur W. McElroy, John Shroades, Wm. Duncan, Norman Stillwell, Charles W. Bess, Roy D. Mellott, Forrest W. Moore, Ray Y. Allison, Chas. J. Kell, Carl L. Gorrell, Ralph Edwin Fletcher, Earl R. Asher, Alfred Ferber, Richard Watkin, Samuel Birch, Fred Chambers, Donald Meek, George Benton, Everett E. London, Theodore Johannes.

John P. Boyles, Sanford, Harvey, Homer Binegar, Addison Birch, Brady Tipton, John Boughy, Loran E. Swearinger, Cyril Plant, Leroy E. Kirchner, Herbert D. Gallop, Arthur Stevens, Charles Gatrell, Edgar Rice, W. C. Wolf, Floyd Kell, Charles Pierson, Harry Montgomery, Steve Sarajlija, Raymond E. Shanahan, Daniel B. Megaily, Edgar Potts. R. L. Brown, Alva R. Green, A. D. Simonds, Geo. Talbort, Barney Thomas, Arthur H. Smith, Robert G. DeBee, George H. Oliver, Florence I. Lank, Oliver L. Duke, Robert Heatherington, Victoria Beagle, Iona St. John, Wm. L. Meredith, Rose Ball, George Brock, Charles Moore, Bertha Yost, Elizabeth Dollins, Walter K. McMatt, Retta Malone, Helen McKenzie, Wilbur Brookes, Alfred R. Cartwright, Joseph S. Webber Monroe, William F. Bassen, B. R. Hamilton, Basil Rough, Audrey Tipton, Lula Barrick, Dorothy Thornberry, Margaret Reed, Helen Tipton, Bertha Magnone, Sidney Kraft, William L. Barrick, Creston C. Green, Wm. B. Hunt, John Six, Francis Nolan, Cash Croxall, Wm. Gillis, William E. Green, Frederick P. Fryman, James L. Babb, Roy Masker, Ray Emmerling.

Rexford W. Brock, Joseph J. Sullivan, Stanley Rose, Laurince E. Moore, Wm. M. Payne, Kenneth E. Payne, John J. Watson, Lewis E. Silliman, William L. Morris, Hugh W. Creal, Marie M. Rowley, Roy McVligh, Etta Piatt, Margaret Buckley, Orion T. Everson, Thomas Baker, C. B. Tipton, Margaret Westbrook, Anna Booth, Barbara McRodell, Macel Baker, Joseph Vanfossan, Donald D. Kennedy, Andrew G. Rawand, Isaac Jones, Thomas Siddall, Norman E. Marion, Otis Eddy, Albert M. Dean, Robert H. Dietz, Sr., William E. Leser, Lillian Forester, Elsie Winans, Betty Gotchall, Gertrude Heddleston, Sophia Mayles, Dorothy Reed, Earl F. Emmons, Roland Horton, Robert B. Knowles, Charles E. Burgess, Kinny Knowles, Ruby Fair, Judy Johnson, Clair Looman, Phyllis Roush, Margaret I. Holl, J. M. Barlow, Thelma Ward, Robert R. Moore, Robert F. Emmerling, Gerry M. Mays, Georgia Bucher, Alice E. Wright, Dorothy G. Bjers, Wilda M. Congrove, Annis I. Brown, Marvin Cunningham, Lucille Forester, Mildred V. Bates, Gertrude Hood, Blanche Putnam, Wm. J. McNisil, Thelma Locke.

E. W. Allison, Frances Savage, Rose Brindley, Anamae Parr, Donald Welch, Hazel Parsons, Louise Pierson, Alice C. Raimond, Iva Covert, Bonnie Eagle, Betty White, Mae Twyford, Stella Weight, Margaret Haught, Charlotte Gray, Rhea E. Stevens, Mildred Armour, Bernice C. Gatrell, Bessie Kood, Thelma Forester, Lola C. Plummer, Elizabeth Pavlos, May Mitchell, Helen Powell, Laura M. Laughley, Tressie Myers, Edith Sims, Gladys Thompson, Ann Stewart, Edna Earl, Bessiee Ginger, Evelyn Noah, Frances Figley, June O'Hara, Margaret Emmerling, Lucille H. Bennett, Delores J. Mercer, Goldie Gant, Thelma Reed, Frances L. McDowell, Virginia Chambers, Anna Gamble, Mary Fern Towsend, Ruth Dotson, Evert Perkins, Vera Hurford, Maude Spencer, Myra Walter, Lillian White, Dolly Swisher, Sarah Wells, Delia Robb, Alice Brock, Mary E. Boller, Mary Patterson, Myrtle Goddard, Clara Carson, James W. Buckley, Florence Stafford, Jessie Sloan, Josephine Croxall, Margaret E. Cunningham, Ruth M. Palmer, Helen Britton, Louise Walker, Curt Palmer, Rose Peterson, Hazel D. Wilson, Beatrice Lunger, Bernice Green, Leoan McGee.

Rose E. Callahan, Hilda N. Booth, Mary E. Miller, Ethel I. Johnston, Vada McMillan, Viola M. Mulligan, Dorothy A. Eddy, Edith Lockhart, Margaret K. Jackson, Dorothy Parker, Thelma Darby, Vera Knott, Clara N. Bond, Josephine L. Nolan, Hazel Long, Lewis A. Williams, Marie A. Edwards, Myrtle Dawson, Vesta Stine, Gary Jackson, Margaret Nicklin, Bennie Martin, Harry A. Fox, Alfred Holtzman, Gertrude Stephens, Charles Ross Watson, Walter Smoot, Fisher Booth, Pat E. Smith, Warren H. Brown, Robert E. Wells, Lawrence F. Haught, Okey Parsons, J. Floyd Peddycad, Ernest Brois, Wilbur Brookes, James R. Kelly, Paul McGrew, Curtis Palmer, Sr., Richard H. Rayle, Fred K. Osborn, James McDole, Alma Davis, Anna M. Link, Belle G. Massi, Edward E. Hupp, Mildred McKenzie, Delphia M. Harpold, Jane W. Pluntz, Gladys Rhodes, Mildred Nelson, Geo. M. Mullen, Sylvia Miller, Lou Anne Marklin, Lance Freeze, Dollie Martin, Leona Swiger, Louise Shambleu, Alice H. Wagner, Anna L. Kelly, Elva B. Elkins, Esther M. Withroe, Pearl Bamber, Mae Miller, Gertrude C. Nagel, Clara Clendenning, John M. Paterson, Walter J. Franzek, Fred McGillvary, George W. Curry, Albert Cummon, Donald L. Crotten, Roy Roy, S. A. Thomas, T. H. Wallace, Roy A. McCauley, Elmer Peters, Ray G. Campbell, Peter Franzek, Denver Fisher, Harold Heath, Shelton O. Sowards, Hugh T. McKernan.

Harry R. Daugherty, Warren A. Wolfe, Marie N. Fleak, Mary Douglass, Vera M. Sowards, Jennie L. Jackson, William R. Charlton, Mrs. Lola M. Widger, Raymond N. Gillespie, Clyde K. Ramsey, Jess W. Miller, Marvin M. Lemasters, Andrew L. Gahn, Oscar H. Townsend, Andrew Moon, Thomas D. Enochs, Alfred L. Weber, J. T. Cunningham, Paul E. Smith, James N. Haught, Frank J. Armstrong, Charles E. Church, C. E. Collins, Walter M. Clopsaddle, Harold R. Palmer, Irene Duffy, Nelly M. Smith, Harry L. Wood, Martha Cunningham, Carl W. Veigel, Melvin L. Smith, Charles Kennedy, Dean McShane, E. Clair Armstrong, Frank Capestich, Wilbur Hannon, Edward W. Lamp, Richard Hulme, John Mayer, John Semian, H. C. Hurd, Harold Taylor, Mildred M. Stewart, Grace McNicol, Irene M. Smith, Beulah A. Jennison, Mary E. Kuta, Anna M. Kuta, Letty Mattern, Alberta Rizar, Mae G. Roush, Lillian M. Poole, Dorothy Prescott, Carlos Sayre, Raymond West, George W. Knott, John C. Orr, Franklin R. Fletcher, Goldie C. Pelley, Bessie L. Archer, Frances M. Nonamaker, Pearl Ruth Huddleston, Mae Schooley, Helen Wedgwood, Margie Lamp, Bertha Porter, Maxine L. Smoot, Blanche Snyder, Hazel Monroe, Raynod Crands, John Wilson, William W. Hatcher, Zelaire D. Shilling, Joseph Blankenship, Henry A. Huff, Larry G. Adkins, George Ronald Bosworth, Charles B. Boso, John R. Kemp.

Congress Considers Law To Ban Smut Peddlers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN DOWDY
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 20, 1958

Mr. DOWDY. Mr. Speaker, the vicious destruction of morals caused by the dissemination of vile and indecent pictures and publications is well realized by the students in our colleges and universities.

The February 14, 1958, issue of the Reveille Echo, published by the students

of Bethany Nazarene College, Bethany, Okla., carried the following editorial by its editor, Eugene McElyea, of Crockett, Tex.:

CONGRESS CONSIDERS LAW TO BAN SMUT PEDDLERS

(By Eugene M. McElyea)

Distributors of obscene and lewd literature are known to be using the United States mail quite extensively for the distribution of their filth. The filth is indiscriminately reaching the children of America. Parents are concerned about the salacious matter arriving in the mail after junior has ordered a stamp collection from some so-called legitimate business house. This has to stop.

The growing criminal tendencies of our youth and the rise in juvenile delinquency necessitates a quick riddance of the foul literature boys. Congress has been called upon to act. The moral citizenry of our Nation are demanding an end to the smut peddler, even the sophisticated ones who use fancy slick paper stock. Some smut peddlers even have some of their filth copyrighted.

Congressman JOHN DOWDY, of Texas, has introduced two bills (H. R. 2542 and H. R. 3663) which should provide an effective remedy to the smut peddlers. The first bill allows them to be prosecuted where the obscenity is received. Previously they have mailed in big cities where punishment, if they were caught, was not so severe. The second bill would levy a fine from $5,000 to $10,000 and imprison the offender for not less than 5 years.

This sounds good to everyone. A House Judiciary Subcommittee has completed hearings on the bills and action is beginning. However, recent Supreme Court decisions have hindered punishing many smut peddlers because they have claimed that to keep them from mailing was to infringe upon their freedom of speech. Is that so? It will be unless each of us acts to let Congress know that freedom of speech is not freedom to debauch the lives of the youth of America. Only by the concerted action of responsible and decent citizens can this dealership in filth be eliminated. Won't you help, please?

H. R. 8002

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. CARLTON LOSER
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 20, 1958

Mr. LOSER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am including an excellent editorial which appeared in a great southern newspaper, the Nashville Banner, on February 15, 1958, expressing its views on H. R. 8002 which is pending in the House.

The editorial follows:

ADOPT H. R. 8002—SAVE BILLIONS

One an appropriation is passed by Congress, the lawmakers lose both track and control of it. That is, the sums budgeted to the several agencies are not necessarily spent in toto. They may accumulate (and do) in unspent billions; even so, the agencies come back, year by year, for the new fiscal period's operating funds.

That is the major defect in governmental financing which H. R. 8002—part of the Hoover Report legislation—would correct. It is expected to be introduced finally for action late in February. It needs action, forthright and decisive, now.

Under this measure Congress would recover some of the control of the purse—in the realm of expenditures—by appropriating them on a yearly basis and checking them by yearly review.

That makes sense. Any American household or American business operated on any other basis would swiftly go broke—and the same principle of solvency applies to government operation, or should, if solvency is to be maintained.

There are multiplied billions of dollars already appropriated, particularly in the Defense Establishment, but unspent. Not that Congress thus has been hypothecating a program far into the future. It is only that the money has been provided in sums greater than the agencies could spend within the time covered by annual appropriation. And to make it even worse, Congress doesn't know how many of these unspent billions exist, or where.

Actually, as long as that is true, the lawmakers responsible for providing the wherewithal are operating in the dark.

That costs money—extra money; the taxpayer's.

It is no exaggeration to say, as does the Hoover Commission, that billions could be saved by adopting this proposal, keeping the agencies annually accountable, not only for the money appropriated in a current budget, but for money carried over from past years.

Those billions should be saved. The safety of the Nation, as a matter of strength, rests as definitely upon its economic as upon its defense status.

H. R. 8002 should be adopted.

Aid to Dependent Children for Educational Purposes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. VICTOR L. ANFUSO
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 10, 1958

Mr. ANFUSO. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing a bill to amend title IV of the Social Security Act to authorize Federal assistance under the act to certain dependent children who are over the age of 18, just as long as they are attending school.

Title IV of the Social Security Act deals with grants by the Federal Government to the States for aid to dependent children. The purpose of this program is to encourage the care of dependent children in their own homes, or in the homes of relatives, by enabling each State to furnish financial assistance to needy children in order to help maintain family life and to afford them parental care.

According to this program, the State submits its plan for aid to dependent children. If the State program meets the specifications listed in title IV of the Social Security Act, then the Federal Government provides an amount up to certain prescribed limitations, and the State contributes the balance.

When the Social Security Act was originally enacted in 1935, a dependent child under this program was defined as a child under the age of 16. Under Public Law 880, adopted by the 84th Congress in 1956, the age maximum for dependent children was raised to 18. Thus, when such dependent child becomes 18 years of age, the Federal Government withdraws its share of the aid, regardless of the child's circumstances or conditions. Of course, the individual State may choose to retain the child on its aid rolls, and many do so.

I believe that this is a shortsighted step, certainly in such instances where a child desires to continue his education but is prevented from doing so because upon reaching his 18th birthday he finds that this assistance has been stopped. In 1954, the income-tax law was amended to provide that so long as a child, regardless of age, was a student and the parent furnished half of his support he could be counted as dependent entitled to an exemption.

Why not apply the same logic to dependent children who need aid? Why not give such children an opportunity to acquire an education? We talk about the shortage of scientists and engineers; we hear a great deal about the shortage of teachers. We seek means to eliminate these shortages at great costs. Yet, here we have needy children who desire to continue their education, but because of a quirk in the law which says that upon reaching their 18th birthday they cannot be aided we stand to lose future scientists and engineers and teachers.

For this reason, I am introducing my amendment to the Social Security Act to strike out the age limit in this program and to continue its aid to dependent children, even if they are over the age of 18, so long as they continue their education. This is a reasonable step. It is one from which the country will gain much more in the long run than the current outlay of funds to maintain this program.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the Congress to give this matter early consideration and to make the necessary change in the Social Security Act. This is a correction of the law which everyone can readily understand and which deserves general support.

Brotherhood Week

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KENNETH B. KEATING
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 3, 1958

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, overnight our world has been made a neighborhood. But we have yet to make it a brotherhood.

This thought might well be the theme of Brotherhood Week, which we observe this week. This annual commemoration, sponsored by the National Conference of Christians and Jews, is dedicated to the ideal that people shall live as one family of man.

Brotherhood is an ideal we must ever keep before us. The greater the stresses

and strains around us, the more important it becomes.

Brotherhood implies responsible freedom. It implies respect for the other fellow and his rights. It implies good will toward all others of the human race.

The age in which we live has excelled in the science of communications and in technological achievement. But much is left to be desired in the field of communication between men and between nations. It is to the task of clearing those channels of understanding that we should rededicate ourselves this week.

All our efforts for military, economic, scientific, and political progress will go for naught unless we can develop an ethical concept by which men can live in peace and harmony. With that goal in mind, each of us should this week resolve to hold high the ideals of respect for people and for human rights. That is the stuff of which a peaceful tomorrow can be made.

Mr. Speaker, the observance of Brotherhood Week lasts only a week. Its real meaning should be practiced every day of the year.

The Importance of Water to Wisconsin and America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, February 20, 1958

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, as the snow on the ground melts in all parts of the United States which have been hit by the recent heavy snowstorm, the cycle of nature is being renewed.

For, from the melting snow, comes the water which will nurture all forms of life—plant, animal, and human life.

From that water can come great good; or, in the case of potentially swollen rivers, perhaps much harm.

These thoughts occurred to me as I read a most interesting document entitled "The Future of Water in Wisconsin."

This document was prepared by the Wisconsin Federation of Conservation Clubs.

It was presented to my State's water resources committee of the legislative council and the natural resources committee of State agencies.

The purpose of the document is to point up the conservationist's approach to the precious resource of water.

Right now, the State of Wisconsin, thanks to the wise action of its legislature, is reviewing the whole question of water-use laws.

Water use for what?

For recreation, for agriculture, for industry, for drinking, and for varied public and private needs.

Of course, Wisconsin is blessed with an abundance of surface waters. Its lakes and streams represent one of the greatest natural advantages of the State.

There is no evidence that any serious problem of ground-water reserves exists for the time being in my State, contrary to the situation which some States face, especially in the Southwest.

But there is evidence that, in view of the expanding population of my State, in view of the, at times, clashing interests of rival water users, it is most important that future water use be well planned.

I commend this State study. I hope that other States will make similar comprehensive, factual analyses in which all private and public interests may be harmonized to the greatest possible extent.

I have selected a few excerpts from this Wisconsin federation document as submitted by Mr. Les Woerpel, executive secretary for the conservation clubs of my State.

I believe that these excerpts, which have been selected for their general public service character, wholly aside from some of the specific controversies involved, will be of much interest to my colleagues. These selections point up the role of water in outdoor sports, sound watershed management, and related phases.

Coincidentally enough, the excerpts conclude with a very beautiful and eloquent prayer from our own Chaplain, Dr. Frederick Brown Harris.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of these excerpts be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the excerpts from the statement were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

It is almost needless to repeat the needs of the recreational industries and hunting and fishing, camping, picnicking, swimming and boating recreations for large volumes of nonconsumptive waters for their use. Water is the key element in many kinds of recreation. It is indispensable to wildlife, which itself is valuable to recreation. With over a million fishermen and over 500,000 hunters depending on continuation and expansion of these water supplies, and willing to put money into perpetuation of their recreational resources, a prior use has been established * * *.

The recreational industry in Wisconsin rates as the third largest industry in the State. It is not completely evaluated, because only that portion which involves the selling of recreational pursuits or accommodations can be adequately included in it. Even then the Motel and Hotel Association claims that the tourist business based on recreation is around a $500 million business. The Crosley survey indicated that the resident hunters and fishermen of Wisconsin alone spent over $62 million in the pursuit of their sport. That figure does not include out-of-State hunters and fishermen, and Wisconsin normally draws the greatest number of out-of-State fishermen in the Nation in addition to a respectable number of out-of-State hunters. These moneys are spent in all types of establishments and service industries. They contribute to the financial welfare of the clothing industry, boats, tackle, guns, shells, baits, boots, swimming suits and equipment, hide tanneries, food, lodging, automobiles, gasoline, even building materials, fuel for heating and cooking, furniture, and all the rest. Hardly any industry in Wisconsin is not benefited by the recreational industry in some way or another. Economists say that every dollar brought into a community and spent creates an economic value five times the original amount spent. Would it astound you that the hotel and motel industries coupled with the hunting and fishing expenditures, including out-of-State revenues brought in by tourists, would create $3 billion worth of business in Wisconsin?

* * * * *

What would lowered rivers and streams do to this industry? It would decimate it, and in many cases it would wipe it out. A stream or river doesn't have to be completely dried up to make it useless for recreation. It only has to have its ecology changed rapidly several times, or it only has to be lowered slightly in some cases to make it worthless as a fisheries asset. * * *

WATERSHED MANAGEMENT

When we think of watershed management and watershed work we are inclined to visualize structures and practices which carry the water off of the land in the hilly sections of our State to prevent further damage, and repair past damage of heavy and quick runoff. Watershed management in the past has been aimed too much at getting the water off of the land in the quickest possible manner without material harm to that land. Actually, watershed management is much more than that.

Watershed management should include, rather than taking care of quick runoff as the primary purpose, methods of holding the water on the land for longer periods of time to allow greater utilization on the land where it falls. At the present time no other need is so great in Wisconsin as this.

While our watershed-management agencies point to the southwestern and western counties as being the locations where watershed-management work is most needed, they depreciate the need in the flatlands and plains of central and southeastern Wisconsin, as well as the in-between lands of the east and north.

While there is no question that it is the hilly country that exhibits the greatest damage from erosion, our water problems are most serious on the plains and flatlands of our State. Both problems are equally serious.

Most farms in the southern and central part of the State are arranged so as to eliminate spring thaw waters and the spring and fall accumulations of water from rains in the quickest possible time. As a result over a third of the water that falls in Wisconsin is subject to immediate runoff, giving little or no benefit to the lands on which it falls.

While there is no question that the watershed-management programs of the western and southwestern counties should be continued and increased, the State should be much more active in watershed programs in the rest of the State.

This is true because only as waters can be absorbed into the land can they be slowly released to sustain the streamflows throughout the summer and fall months. Only as they are absorbed in the land can they be percolated into the underground tables to recharge the everdiminishing supplies available from those sources. Only as they are held on the lands can they be of benefit to crops and vegetation.

* * * * *

The policies of the Federal Government in watershed work are on a sound base. The most successful operations are those that are on a cooperative basis between all of the conservation organizations of both the Federal Government and the State, because they recognize the interests of all segments of our society, and avoid the project for single purpose development. Many of the developments in watershed management are paid for by Federal subsidy or help, and they are a legitimate expenditure of Government when they are multiple purpose developments, because they protect a public interest and a public economy, both now and in the future. However, in Wisconsin most of the work of

the State has been paid for from the conservation fund, which is supplied by sale of fishing and hunting licenses. This is also a legitimate use of such funds, providing it isn't carried to too great lengths. In addition to these funds, which presently carry the biggest load of State aid in watershed projects, the State should contribute at least a like amount, and preferably double the amount contributed by sportsmen from their licenses, from the general fund.

But the responsibility of the landowner cannot, and should not, be minimized. It should be the direct responsibility of the landowner to do everything in his power to utilize as much of the average 31 inches of rainfall in Wisconsin as it is so possible for him to do.

* * * * *

I would like to end this presentation by quoting from a paper by Dr. Frederick Brown Harris, Chaplain of the United States Senate. However, I would like to point out that when he speaks of land he is referring to it as a complete entity, including land, water, and cover, as well as the human and animal occupants. He says:

"Whose land is it? It belongs to God, who only is our help and hope. And so, as the servants of the divine purpose, pledging our all to the author of liberty, the next thing to remember regarding this land of hope and glory is that it belongs to us.

"It belongs to us as trustees who temporarily possess it, who walk its soil, who cross its plains, who climb its mountains, who sail its lakes and rivers, who explore its wildernesses. We who have inherited it from those who kneeled around the cradle of the State must regard it as holy ground, whose beauty is to be reverenced, whose forests are to be guarded, whose soil is to be preserved, whose rivers are to be unpolluted, whose primitive wildernesses are to be unspoiled, and whose wildlife is to be protected. The unpardonable sin is to sacrifice our patrimony on the altar of commercialism which cares for nothing but greedy personal aggrandizement. Alas, that already disregard for what happens to the land has wrought tragic irreparable havoc. Wanton disregard of the people's rights in forests and rivers and mountain majesties has brought its tragic harvest in dustbowls, land erosion, privately channeled waterpower, desecrated park areas, and poisoned rivers. What we call our civilization, if uncurbed, will prove a creeping blight whose symbol is the bulldozer. Big trees must go down before big business. Crystal rivers must be contaminated with disgusting waste rather than to pay the cost for sewage disposal. Public lands must be exploited by devious undercover schemes for private gain. Get-rich promoters with predatory feet go forth to despoil the sanctuaries of the wilderness. Men who loudly advocate arming against foreign foes, for dollars become vandals of the very land of which they hypocritically sing, 'I love thy rocks and rills, thy woods and templed hills.' Whose land are they defiling? Yours and mine. * * *

"It belongs to those who come after us. There is a striking sentence in the Old Testament, 'The fathers have eaten sour grapes and the children's teeth have been set on edge.' That is an unforgettable way of saying that what the fathers do today will affect their children and their children's children. If we are not vividly conscious of our role as trustees of the future, then for some tempting expediency we may adopt policies in the present that will rob the generations following of the birthright it was intended should be theirs. We have no right to pilfer and misappropriate the capital of those who will take over the land when we leave it."

The Drive for the Natural Gas Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL H. DOUGLAS
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, February 20, 1958

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD two articles from the Oil and Gas Journal for February 17, 1958, revealing that the drive for the natural gas bill is by no means ended. I ask unanimous consent that a statement of mine concerning these articles also be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD as an extension of my remarks accompanying these articles.

There being no objection, the articles and statement were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Oil and Gas Journal for February 17, 1958]

TULSA, OKLA., February 17, 1958.—The oil industry is snake bitten on the gas bill.

Tendency is to write off the Harris bill as dead after disclosure of Porter letter inviting oilmen to the $100-a-plate appreciation dinner for Representative JOSEPH MARTIN.

But this is being changed by new strategy.

Plan now is to delay action on the bill, regroup oil's shattered forces in Washington, and work harder.

There's no doubt chances of the bill have been hurt.

But still the cause may not be lost.

[From the Oil and Gas Journal of February 17, 1958]

HOW TO GET THE HARRIS BILL PASSED

On the next 2 pages of this issue is a letter the Journal is sending to every Member of Congress in support of the Harris gas bill.

For many years the Journal fought along with producers for legislation primarily in the interest of producers. We all failed to convince the public that what is good for producers is good for the Nation.

Now we say that, for the first time, here is a gas bill primarily in the public interest. We believe that this is the only basis on which legislation can be—or should be—enacted.

Prevous failures to amend the law regulating gas production were due, we believe, to disregard of the attitudes and reactions of the general public.

Producers set up the cry that "we wuz robbed." They bored the public by rehashing the injustice and illogic of the Supreme Court's reasoning in the Phillips decision.

They bemused the public by recounting the hardships imposed on producers, thus arousing more skepticism than sympathy.

They confused the public with technical treatises and statistics on the geological occurrence of gas, reserve ratios, dry-hole percentages, and cost factors.

Such arguments are effective with the relatively few who understand them. But the general public—the gas consumers and their political and journalistic spokesmen—saw previous bills simply as a special favor for producers who didn't want their prices regulated.

And, to a large extent, that's what they were. Most of the advocacy of prior bills was pitched on the hardships of producers—a subject about which the general public couldn't care less.

This new Harris bill is different. It is designed to serve the public interest better than the special interests of any division of the gas industry. Perhaps that is why many distributors still oppose it and some producers aren't enthusiastic over it.

If the industry believes, as the Journal does, that this bill is in the public interest, then the industry should promote it on that basis and on that basis alone.

The way to do this is to convince Congressmen, and others interested, that most of the old arguments both for and against previous gas bills do not apply to this one.

Last week's disclosure of political bungling need not cloud the issue permanently. It can be overcome if the industry will promptly and earnestly stress the public-interest reasons for support of the bill.

The only way out of regulatory chaos is to demonstrate that here, at last, is a bill for the long-range benefit of the consuming public.

STATEMENT BY SENATOR DOUGLAS

Last Tuesday another crude effort of a well-known leader of the oil-gas industry, with campaign contributions, to bull through the passage of legislation to remove producers' prices of natural gas from effective regulation was made public. It was then generally assumed that the Harris gas price increase bill was dead—at least for this session. Even such an astute political observer as Hon. JOSEPH W. MARTIN was reported to have expressed the view that the legislation would not pass this year.

But those who believed and believe that the Harris bill is dead, underestimate the recuperative powers of this particular legislation. It rivals the cat with nine lives.

This oil-gas industry proposal has been introduced in varying forms in different Congresses going back more than 10 years. Twice it was vetoed, once on the merits and once in the wake of arrogant lobbying efforts that created a scandal. But the stakes are high. The owners of the oil and gas reserves would have their wealth increased by 25 to 30 billion dollars if this bill were to become law. The producers' income—and the consumers' cost—would rise by an estimated $700 million annually. The temptation, the prize, is just too great to expect the giants of the oil-gas industry to give up the fight. They have not given up the fight.

This is revealed by an authoritative spokesman for the industry, the Oil and Gas Journal, which in its issue of February 17, 1958, announces that all is not lost, the Harris bill can still be passed and that a new strategy has been evolved. The plan is to delay action on the bill, regroup oil's shattered forces in Washington, and work harder.

On page 61 of the same issue of the Oil and Gas Journal, the new strategy is spelled out in some detail in an editorial. The Journal says that the industry must try to convince the Congress that the gas bill, 1958 version, is not an industry bill, not a producers' bill, not even an oil-gas bill, but a bill "primarily in the public interest." Then on pages 62 and 63 in An Open Letter to the Congress on the Harris Bill, the industry publication says: "H. R. 8525 (the Harris bill) is different from previous gas bills. The Harris-Fulbright bill—vetoed by President Eisenhower in 1956—was, frankly, a 'producers' bill.' So was the Kerr bill, vetoed by President Truman in 1950. This new bill, H. R. 8525, is not."

Certainly the new Harris bill is different. It has a new number. It has a new date. Half its name is new. It is in a new form. But, it serves the same purpose—removal of producers' prices on interstate sales from effective regulation in the public interest. The gas bill, 1958 version, is supported by

the same oil-gas producer interests that supported the vetoed bills of 1950 and 1956. The 1958 version uses the same phony standard as in the 1956 bill, "reasonable market price"—which means whatever the traffic will bear—to try to fool the public into believing that the Federal Power Commission would still have regulatory authority over producers' prices. Interestingly enough, the Oil and Gas Journal two-page Open Letter to Congress omits this key fact, describing it vaguely as a "value approach."

The Oil and Gas Journal attempts to argue that the Harris measure is not a producers', pipelines', or distributors' bill, but that it is a public interest bill. But who wrote the bill? It appears to be generally conceded that the producers, the pipelines and the distributors furnished the basic draft. Chairman Kuykendall admitted in testimony before the House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee that he called upon selected representatives of these three elements of the industry to assist in drafting a bill. He and others revealed that industry spokesmen on their own initiative also worked on a draft, and that there was no attempt to bring representatives of the consumers into these drafting sessions. In fact, FPC Chairman Kuykendal told the House Committee that he did not know of "sufficient consumer groups" who could have been brought in.

Of course, more than three score mayors, dozens of State utility commissioners, many governors, and a long list of consumer groups have been publicly opposing such legislation for some years. These individuals and groups representing the public's interests, the consumers, were not in on the drafting of the Harris bill, but they have stated their vigorous opposition to it. I submit that the mayors, governors, utility commissioners, and other consumer representatives are better able to tell the Congress where the public interest lies than is the oil-gas industry.

One of the most interesting aspects of the open letter that the Oil and Gas Journal has sent to all Members of Congress is that while they claim that the Harris bill is different from previous gas bills, the arguments they use to support its passage are virtually identical to those used in support of the Harris-Fulbright bill in 1955 and 1956 and the Kerr bill in 1949 and 1950. I don't blame the oil-gas forces for not having changed their arguments—the essential aim and effect of the legislation have not changed. Its principal supporters and beneficiaries remain the giants of the oil-gas industry. Its principal opponents remain the mayors, governors, public utility commissions, and public interest groups from gas-consuming areas.

The Oil and Gas Journal articles give us fair warning that the gas bill is not dead. It is just being delayed "until the fire is cooled," to use the expression of the distinguished Member of the House quoted in the Oil and Gas Journal.

The opponents of the bill, therefore, would be well advised to continue to bring the issues involved in the substance of the gas bill before the American people. I hope there will be no relaxation of the effort to educate the public and the Congress on the true demerits of the Harris bill.

The fact that political leaders and Members of Congress are aware of the improper methods used to advance the gas bill is well and good. But quite apart from those disclosures, the bill is contrary to the public interest and should be argued and defeated on the merits. The improprieties of the industry boosters of this legislation merely afford a further opportunity to bring out the true facts about the bill while public attention is focused on it.

Essentially the bill would remove effective Federal regulation of natural-gas producers' prices on interstate sales and leave the more than 24.5 million natural-gas-consuming families the captives of the producers. Because of the distribution system, competition does not operate to keep producers' prices just and reasonable. On the basis of current prices demanded in the field, consumers' costs can reasonably be expected to be $700 million more annually than they are now if the bill should pass.

No one would profit from the passage of the bill except the gas producers, and the great bulk of our natural gas is produced by a few giant oil-gas companies and a handful of large pipeline companies. These oil-gas companies are about the most profitable enterprises in America today.

I want, therefore, to congratulate the mayors, governors, and others who have been taking this issue to the people. I hope they will keep it up and not relax their efforts. Thus, they may help us to defeat this measure on its merits.

Tough Indian Problem

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD L. NEUBERGER
OF OREGON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, February 20, 1958

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, an excellent discussion of the vexing and difficult Klamath Indian Reservation problem appeared on the editorial page of the Oregonian of Portland for February 11, 1958, under the title "Tough Indian Problem."

The viewpoint of the Oregonian is, in substance, very similar to my own. This largest daily newspaper in Oregon favors Federal purchase, as provided in my bill, S. 2407, as "the best solution, so far as Oregon and the Indians are concerned." However, should Federal purchase not seem likely of passage in the Congress, the editorial writers of the Oregonian believe that the administration bill, S. 3051, "which would give private buyers a chance to bid first, and would commit the Government to purchase all timberlands remaining" is far preferable to permitting the present termination law to run its ruinous course. The Oregonian emphasizes, quite accurately, that the termination bill passed in 1954 by Congress and signed by the President "was premature and unrealistic."

The editorial also stresses the important and cooperative role played in this entire situation by the Oregon Legislative Interim Committee on Indian Problems.

I ask unanimous consent that this timely and informative editorial be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TOUGH INDIAN PROBLEM

The sticker in proposals for either Federal or private purchase of the Klamath Indian Reservation, with its great pine forest, is that sustained yield cutting is essential yet the returns from such cutting may not equal the interest or tax costs of carrying the forest lands if the Indians are to be paid "fair market value."

A statement favoring the NEUBERGER bill, S. 2047, for Federal purchase of the reservation was adopted by the Oregon Legislative Interim Committee on Indian Problems. State Senator Leander Quiring, Hermiston Republican, and Democratic State Chairman David Epps appeared for the Oregon committee at a United States Senate subcommittee hearing last week.

The Klamath Termination Act, which would go into effect this year and would dump an estimated 70 percent of the reservation's 4 billion board-feet of prime timber on a stagnant market, would be ruinous if not implemented. It would wreck the economy of the Klamath Basin and the pine industry; it would result in grave underpayment of the Indians seeking withdrawal as the market declined; it would not take care of a 30,000-acre marshland invaluable to wildfowl and game; and it would threaten the water supply of the basin.

The Neuberger bill proposes that Congress advance the estimated $123 million to buy the reservation, turn the marshland over to the United States Fish and Wildlife Service, and start selling timber in large units under a sustained yield cutting rule.

The Oregon interim committee cites a report of management specialists showing that the timber will sustain an allowable cut of 90 million board-feet through 1964 and 76 million feet in perpetuity thereafter. This would yield net annual revenues of about $2,250,000—or total revenues of $230 million for a cutting cycle of 100 years. However, testimony at hearings indicated an annual cut of $3 million would not be enough to pay interest on the investment.

The Interior and Agriculture Departments have put in a bill, S. 3051, which would give private buyers a chance to bid first, and would commit the Government to purchase all timberlands remaining. General opinion is that there would be few if any bidders who would have to agree to pay the full appraised realization value and follow an enforceable sustained yield management plan. The Indians would have to wait a year to find out.

In the House, Representative AL ULLMAN has introduced a bill for Federal purchase, payment to tribal members over a 20-year period at an appraised price set by tribal, State, and Federal representatives, and sustained yield.

The best solution, so far as Oregon and the Indians are concerned, will be Federal purchase. But the likelihood of Congress gagging on the cost has everyone concerned. A solution has to be found, and quickly, to prevent unchecked dumping of timber on the market beginning this year. Or if none can be found, Congress must vote to delay liquidation of the Klamath Reservation until a formula can be devised. The 1954 act was premature and unrealistic.

Lithuanian Independence

SPEECH
OF
HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 13, 1958

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, I am honored and proud today to join my colleagues in the House in celebrating the 40th anniversary of Lithuanian independence.

Even the Iron Curtain has been unable to dim the fervor of the Lithuanian people for independence and freedom.

I am convinced that the Lithuanian nation will continue to fight for liberty until it is won; for there is no appease-

ment in Lithuania, and its noble people will never bow under the yoke of Soviet oppression and persecution.

Nor will their compatriots and countrymen in America abate their interest or cease their efforts until sovereignty and independence is secured for this unhappy land which has been stripped of its political rights and dragged into the orbit of Communist slavery.

Lithuania has a proud and inspiring heritage, and the people of Lithuanian descent in this country are among our best citizens. I have many Lithuanian people in my district, and I am proud of their contributions. They are God fearing and liberty loving. They are honest, industrious, loyal citizens devoted to our free way of life. They have demonstrated by their actions and by exemplary loyalty that they are willing to make every sacrifice to sustain American institutions.

Such a nation and such a people is entitled, not only to our sympathy and our moral support, but to our active, effective assistance in forwarding their high aims for the recapture of their liberties and the reestablishment of their sovereignty.

Our own great Nation must make it abundantly clear to all other nations that we stand for liberation from tyranny and oppression and for self-determination and freedom of choice for all peoples to ordain and to establish their own form of government under democratic processes.

All hail to Lithuania on the anniversary of its 40th birthday. May her courageous people soon regain their precious liberties.

A Contented Farmer

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANCIS CASE
OF SOUTH DAKOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, February 20, 1958

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, in these days when so much is said about the plight of the American farmer, it is exceedingly rare and truly refreshing to have a real family farmer paint a picture of satisfaction and contentment.

Such a contented farmer is Harold E. Boe, of Ralph, S. Dak. Mr. Boe, in a letter reprinted by Editor Donald L. Cammack, of the Buffalo (S. Dak.) Times-Herald, calls himself a submarginal farmer. But he says his is the most rewarding occupation that man can inherit on the face of the earth.

Mr. Boe's letter to the editor makes a thought-provoking appraisal of the farm situation. I ask unanimous consent that the letter be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

To the EDITOR:

I am a submarginal farmer. According to economic experts and swivel-chair farm advisers I should quit the farm because, no matter what happens, I never will make a living from my chosen vocation.

The net income from the unit I operate often runs less than $1,000 annually. Yet my wife, three daughters, and myself are well fed and happy with our lot.

We never know where the next dollar is coming from and we don't care. It is enough that we have plenty of food, excellent health, and the freedom of God's great outdoors.

Twelve years ago I was discharged from the Air Force after 3½ years in the service during World War II. Returning to the only life I knew I took up some land in western South Dakota.

I started construction of a shack on the bare prairie and I moved in with my war bride before the building was completed. It was true pioneering.

MODERN CONVENIENCES

Today our home has all the modern conveniences. This includes electric lights, indoor plumbing with hot and cold water. We own a good car and a television set. My wife and daughters dress well. And we eat beter than city folks having several times our income.

Our standard of living is high, but it takes very little cash. We have beefsteaks, roasts and hamburger any meal when we desire these choice items; when the supply runs low, we butcher another beef.

Fried chicken is on the menu the year around. Milk, cream, butter, and eggs are always available in superabundance. We raise plenty of potatoes.

From a big garden my wife cans countless quarts of peas, beans, carrots, corn, and pickles. They cost us no more than the labor, seed, and the lids for the jars. When fresh fruit is in season we buy many crates of peaches, pears and plums. This is made into sauce and jam, never less than an ample supply for a full year.

BUY WINTER SUPPLIES

In the fall we buy large quantities of flour, sugar, tea and yeast in one order. They cost less this way, seldom more than $100 for the lot. These staples last us all through the winter months and into the spring and early summer.

With a supply of food on hand we have no fear of winter weather or bad roads, even though our nearest town is 32 miles away.

From the basic raw materials in stock, my wife prepares delicious meals. She bakes bread, rolls, pies and cakes. Our economical yet sumptuous living would be impossible without her. A superb cook and diligent worker, my wife is truly a wonderful woman.

This is all the more remarkable because when I married her she was a sergeant in the Australian women's army service and had never seen a loaf of homemade bread or food canned in glass jars. In civilian life she had been a buyer in a Sydney, Australia, clothing store.

LEAVE IT TO FARMERS

It makes me smile when I read about the way the swivel-chair experts worry about the farm situation. Why not leave it up to the farmers? They will get off the land into the more rewarding occupations before they starve.

Maybe many feel the way I do: That they are already in the most rewarding occupation that man can inherit on the face of the earth.

Making money is not the most rewarding thing that one can accomplish in life. The fallacy of this philosophy embraced by the majority of the people in America today is that wealth and money are the mark of success and the gain of material possessions the only ambition worth cultivating.

Nobody is to blame for the predicament agriculture is in but the farmers themselves. They keep right on producing more crops that are already in huge supply. Only greed for more land and greater wealth moved them in this manner. They are aided and abetted by a benevolent Government offering guaranteed price supports.

I do not know of any inefficient submarginal farmers creating a social problem by existing on a low-level income, complaining about their lot. It is the big operators with their mechanized efficiency who are always squawking about the price-cost squeeze.

INEFFICIENCY NEEDED

Right now what is needed is more inefficient farmers. They produce little to swell the overwhelming surplus and those I know are making a splendid living from their submarginal farms if they don't crave too many foods from tin cans and fancy packages from the shelves of a grovery store. Surely they are a harmless lot.

It was the big-scale so-called efficient farmers who caused agriculture's technical revolution to run wild and gave the swivel-chair boys such a big headache.

HAROLD E. BOE.

RALPH, S. DAK.

Text on Radioactivity in Minnesota Water

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EUGENE J. McCARTHY
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 20, 1958

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, the President has recommended that the Congress terminate Federal grants of funds for the fighting of the pollution of our rivers and streams. This recommendation would end the program that the Congress enacted in 1956 to help the State and local governments combat the pollution of our national water resources.

This problem is one that is becoming more and more serious. The battle against water pollution has not really begun in this country, and yet the President asks the Congress to withdraw from the program. Our rivers and streams are daily becoming more and more choked and poisoned by human and industrial wastes. We must continue our efforts to purify our water supply, if this most essential natural resource is to be saved.

The Federal Government itself is directly contributing to this pollution of our water in a new way—the pollution by radioactivity resulting from the testing of nuclear bombs and other weapons. In the State of Minnesota, the Governor's committee on atomic radiation has reported that the level of radioactivity in Minnesota water after nuclear bomb tests has exceeded the limits set by the National Bureau of Standards as the provisional permissible level for drinking water.

This is pollution potentially more dangerous than any we have known. It is pollution directly caused by the acts of the Federal Government, and it is pollution that is likely to increase in the coming years as nuclear power is further developed.

The Federal responsibility to assist in the purifying of our national water supply is clear. The President is seemingly indifferent to this Federal responsibility in his request that the Congress withdraw from the antipollution battle. The Congress must not allow this failure to face a clear Federal responsibility to endanger the water supply of this country.

I include an article from the Minneapolis Star which gives the text of the report made by the governor's committee on atomic radiation:

[From the Minneapolis Star of February 12, 1958]

TEXT ON RADIOACTIVITY IN MINNESOTA WATER

(This is the text of the report made Tuesday by the governor's committee on atomic radiation. Task force members: Maurice Visscher, Ph. D., M. D., chairman; Richard S. Caldecott, Ph. D., William O. Caster, Ph. D., James F. Marvin, Ph. D., John B. Moyle, Ph. D., Sheldon C. Reed, Ph. D., and Jack Page Whisnant, M. D. Participating in discussions: Robert N. Barr, M. D., Warren R. Lawson, M. D., and Don G. Mosser, M. D.)

The governor's committee on atomic energy has received a report from its task group 6 on environmental radiation giving detailed measurements on radioactivity in air, rain, surface waters, and river waters in Minnesota. At its meeting on January 14, 1958, the committee referred these data to its task group on the biological effects of radiation for evaluation of the significance of these measurements to man and other living things. The latter group has studied the figures and related information and presents a following report which it recommends to the committee to be published as an interim report on biological significants of current levels of environmental radioactivity in Minnesota.

The data presented by task force 6 on gross levels of radioactivity in atmospheric air sampled near ground level in the State of Minnesota during 1957 do not approach levels currently considered to be significantly injurious to many or other living things.

However, the levels reported in collected rainwater, surface waters, and river waters in the State exceeded in a significant number of instances during periods following the testing of bombs and for some months thereafter, the limits set by the National Bureau of Standards as the provisional permissible levels for drinking water.

The provisional permissible level for gross radioactivity in drinking water is an estimate made by experts for the Bureau of Standards as to doses that could be tolerated without damage for several months and is itself of uncertain reliability. It could be in error in either direction. But it was intended to define the exposure level below which there was believed to be no observable effects on living organisms.

Although data on the distribution of radioactive materials in fallout from nuclear explosions are known in general, the distribution of various radioactive elements in the rainwater, surface waters, sediments and plant and animal bodies in rivers and streams in Minnesota is not known. It is therefore impossible to come to any firm conclusions as to the degree of hazard to which we, in Minnesota, have been exposed by the fallout from bomb testing in the past.

It is our unanimous opinion, however, that prudence dictates an aggressive program of acquisition of additional information of various sorts in order to be able to be warned of possible danger in the future and in order to be able, if it should unfortunately become necessary to do so, to institute effective protective measures.

The data available indicate that untreated rainwater and river water used for drinking purposes could constitute radiation hazards according to current standards. Of course, they would also constitute hazards to health by virtue of frequent bacterial contamination. Although adequate data to prove the point are not at hand, it is generally believed that conventional methods of water purification reduce considerably the content of radioactive material in contaminated water.

No samples of finished Minneapolis water tested last year showed gross radioactivity reaching the maximum permissible level. This fact should allay fears as to the current danger in the use of such water. Further, it should be noted that during November and December the gross radioactivity level in raw river and lake waters has usually ben well below the permissible level.

However, the resumption of bomb testing during the coming spring and summer can be expected to be followed by a new rise in gross radioactivity levels to values which may be higher than those reached in 1957 if similar bombs are exploded, because any new radioactivity will be added to the residual burden of earlier nuclear explosions. Consequently, one can anticipate gross radioactivity levels in Minnesota waters which may considerably exceed currently accepted permissible values.

Therefore, it seems necessary to urge very strongly that several types of study be promoted. The Minnesota State Board of Health has collected valuable information, but it requires additional money for equipment and especially additional scientific personnel, to obtain the information needed to provide the people of Minnesota with health protection in the event that environmental, especially water radioactivity, levels increase.

In order to evaluate the degree of hazard to health, it is essential to know the amount of particular elements, such strontium, cesium, iodine, cobalt, zinc and others, in Minnesota waters. It is also essential that the water supplies of all population areas be surveyed, because contamination is not uniform. It is also essential that milk from various sources be studied as to its burden of such elements as strontium 90.

This committee urges that emergency funds be supplied to the board of health, the University of Minnesota and other State agencies for such studies and further that civil-service classifications for positions necessary to obtain competent scientific personnel be arranged without delay so that this essential work can be begun promptly.

Another area in which study is required is in research into methods for reliable decontamination of water and foods, should the needs for such action arise. Such studies might be conducted in the university or industrial laboratories. A further area for study is in the province of the department of conservation.

Data at hand indicate that aquatic life, including fish, in Minnesota waters, have acquired significant amounts of radioactivity. It is essential that studies of the distribution of radioactive elements in fish and other edible forms be studied in various parts of the State.

In conclusion we wish to report that in our opinion the recent increase in environmental radiation burdens, particularly in water in Minnesota, although significant, and in the case of surface water sufficient to exceed for some months, the provisional permissible level, is not a cause for present alarm because these levels in "finished" city water have not been found to exceed the permissible value.

However, we cannot state with the degree of assurance we wish we could that there is no danger at all because we do not know among other unknowns, the amounts of particular radioactive elements which make up the total gross radioactivity.

Furthermore, because there is likely to be an increased burden due to future bomb testing and to disposal of industrial atomic wastes, it is obvious that prompt attention should be paid to the need for intensified study for future protection. The public and the State government should be alerted promptly to the urgency of this problem because it affects the future health and welfare of all of us.

Progress in South Dakota

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. E. Y. BERRY

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 20, 1958

Mr. BERRY. Mr. Speaker, I have asked permission to insert in the RECORD an editorial which spells the philosophy of the people of South Dakota as well as anything written for some time.

We are a State with no bonded indebtedness, yet with probably more miles of good, hard-surfaced highways per capita than any other State. Our school system is second to none. Our institutions of higher education are equal to any in the Nation with good buildings, equipment and facilities. Our taxes are reasonable, and yet our progress is rapid.

How have we done all these things without burdensome taxes? We are primarily a conservative people. We buy when we have the money to buy, we build when we have the money to build. We plan ahead, we work together, we do not waste our public funds in interest payments, we make every dollar serve as a producing dollar.

Following is a recent editorial from the Luverne (Minn.) Star-Herald:

Maybe we should organize to send some missionaries to South Dakota. Or, better yet, to try to divert some foreign-aid funds to this "backward country." How can this area endure its "low, low standards of submarginal existence"?

It's a funny thing but the South Dakotans seem to be living in blissful ignorance of the fact that they're underprivileged. Talk to the South Dakotan and he seems happy and content—he doesn't realize what he's missing. He doesn't seem to know all the frills in Government that he is getting along without.

There are so many things that are deemed absolutely essential in Minnesota that South Dakota gets along without. And the demand for more and more services is yet to come in Minnesota at the next legislative session. More workers to do more for more people at more expense to the taxpayers.

If you ever want to see an extreme contrast between a ruggedly independent State and one that embodies much of the welfare-state philosophy one only has to take a look at the difference between South Dakota and Minnesota.

It shows up in the tax bill, too. Recent figures show that a factory in South Dakota would pay about half, or less, the taxes there that the same factory would pay in Minnesota.

Northern States Power Co. did a lot of skirmishing around in pretending to hunt for a location for its atomic-energy plant. The facts are that one of the big reasons

behind the South Dakota choice, although not publicly stated, was because of the lower tax rate. Northern States Power had a fear of what future legislation might do to an already high tax rate in Minnesota.

There's nothing free in this world. The more Government services you demand the more you are going to have to pay. South Dakotans are still backward enough to think that they can make do without everything the liberals say is absolutely essential. And, strangely enough, the South Dakotan seems supremely content. He may be living in a "backward area" but it doesn't seem to bother him one bit. We can take a pretty good lesson in thrift from our neighbor to the west.

Illinois Needs Emancipation From Political Dictatorship

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PETER F. MACK, JR.
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 20, 1958

Mr. MACK of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I wish to include the fifth of a series of editorials by V. Y. Dallman, editor of the Illinois State Register, on problems and responsibilities of party organizations. Mr. Dallman expounds his views on the evils of a one-party system: "All of the vices and weaknesses of the one-party system are becoming more apparent—family control of political office, assumption of a vested interest by officeholders, vast unconcern for public desires, more elaborate and vaster occurrences of graft, and inability of the people to shake off the system."

The article follows:

[From the Illinois State Register of January 25, 1958]

ILLINOIS NEEDS EMANCIPATION FROM POLITICAL DICTATORSHIP

Illinois is under what amounts to a one-party system, Republican downstate: Democratic in Chicago and Cook County.

All of the vices and weaknesses of the one-party system are becoming more apparent in Illinois—family control of political office, assumption of a vested interest by officeholders, vast unconcern for public desires, more elaborate and vaster occurrences of graft, and inability of the people to shake off the system.

This is the more amazing because the economic, moral, farm and labor interest of Illinois require, by all the rules of logic, a strongly competitive two-party system, progressive legislation, and vigorous intraparty competition for positions of honor and trust.

The present situation is wholly illogical. It exists because too many elements in the upstate Democratic Party are content to maintain a statewide minority so long as they can control Chicago and Cook County. Downstate a minority group in a particular county is content so long as it can glean a few crumbs of Republican favors in return for letting Democratic affairs slide.

The power and influence of such county chairmen and others who are content to remain in the minority, who serve only as party fixtures, and who are unwilling to work in behalf of principles of the Democratic Party and its advancement, must be broken.

Such men will have to be replaced by vigorous and unselfish men of public spirit and recognized stature. They will have to be men who, on the record, are sound in character and judgment, who want to work without thought of personal gain to elevate the party to the highest level of unselfish and patriotic public service. In short, they must be the kind of men whose conduct will, in itself, erase the stigma which presently, in too many places, attaches to selfseekers in the Democratic Party.

The people of Illinois will welcome with joyous hearts and open arms a party of high ideals whose members, from the leadership down to the precinct level, are intent upon working for a better Illinois where scandals have shocked the Nation.

The slatemaking process is frequently defended on the grounds that it saves candidates the expenses of primary campaigns and permits them to concentrate their funds and efforts on general election campaigns, that it avoids party frictions and animosities, and that it produces the strongest possible candidates. Frequently, the defenders of the slate-making system point to Senator PAUL H. DOUGLAS to prove their case. However, the facts are that DOUGLAS was denied the nod in 1942 and made a whale of a primary fight, being defeated only in Cook County; and that he was slated in 1948 only after he said he would run with or without being slated.

Slatemaking does not save expenses. Instead of spending the funds in a primary, candidates who are slated are assessed a healthy sum according to the salary of the office for which they are slated. Instead of spending an a primary, they pay an assessment in return for being slated. If elected they pay with patronage and pelf.

Slatemaking does not avoid party friction and animosity: Prospective candidates and their followers who are denied the party nod swallow the insult and give on-the-surface support to the nominees. And the process keeps a subsurface volcano of discontent, frustration, and disappointment boiling. The unslated candidate is denied even the solace of defeat in a fair and open contest. If he dares to make such a contest, the cards are stacked against him from the very beginning.

It is utterly cynical for a few powers to get together, under the guise of constituting a high-minded, public-conscience committee to choose candidates, then await word from a half dozen superbosses as to whom, in their wisdom and public zeal, they are going to nominate.

This process permits all kinds of political horse swapping out of the public view, free from actual party desire or control, and invites nefarious finagling between Democratic committeemen or county chairmen and their Republican confederates.

It arrogates to a handful of men the right to tell the people of Illinois whom they shall be allowed to vote for. Their only recourse is to sit out the election. It permits the most disgusting sort of trading within the party.

Under slatemaking, politics becomes a matter of what the bosses dictate. This applies to a disgraceful degree to the Republican as well as the Democratic Party in Illinois today.

"Dear Murray," From "Sherm"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MELVIN PRICE
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 20, 1958

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, former President Truman has a way of putting things that the American people can understand.

In a few simple statements in reply to newsmen who greeted him as he alighted from a train at Union Station yesterday he summed up what the majority of Americans are today thinking of the Eisenhower administration.

One of the keenest observations of the workings of the Eisenhower administration comes in the concise statement, with which most people will agree, "that this Republican administration has the wrong attitude toward regulatory agencies."

This administration, Truman replied to reporters, is more interested in special interests.

When asked by the newsmen, who are in a good position to know, if there was a mess in Washington that needs cleaning up, Mr. Truman replied that was a Republican phrase which has come home to roost.

The symbol of the Eisenhower administration's growing political immorality could well be the "Dear Murray" letter from "Sherm."

One Percent for the Taxpayers' Money

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 20, 1958

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, the following article by Roscoe and William N. Fleming from the February 3, 1958, issue of the New Republic points up the ridiculous financial policies pursued by many public authorities. Bankers profit at the expense of the taxpayer:

ONE PERCENT FOR THE TAXPAYERS' MONEY

The people of most United States States get it both coming and going from tight money and high interest rates. They continuously have to pay more to borrow, either privately or for public purposes; but they are still putting many millions of dollars of inactive State funds into long-term deposits in banks, for which the latter pay low rates of interest or none at all.

In such States—and they constitute the large majority—the bankers are still riding the gravy-train even while chronically pinched State treasuries and legislatures look everywhere for more money to meet the rising cost of government, and reluctantly discuss imposing new taxes, though ignoring a source of funds right under their noses. Nationally, billions of dollars are still held by banks in such State deposits, on which they reap many millions of dollars yearly at the expense of taxpayers.

One State has revolted. In Colorado Gov. Stephen L. R. McNichols and State Treasurer Homer F. Bedford told the 142 banks holding $27 million in long-term State deposits that the money would be withdrawn as contracts expire, and loaned to the United States Government instead.

The reason:

The State is now getting only 1 percent yearly on most of this money, which it must agree to leave in the bank for a year; 1½ percent on a small fraction of it, which must be left for 2 years. Meanwhile, Federal interest rates have gone to such a height that even the Government's 91-day bills pay up to 3 percent, or even more. The new policies mean at least $500,000 more yearly for Colo-

rado, which like most States is hard pressed for more revenue.

More recently the Colorado officials have relented to the extent of saying that banks that will pay 3 percent can keep their State time deposits; but this did not satisfy the State bankers' association, which is not willing to pay more than 2 percent, but argues that the money would be more usefully employed in Colorado, than if loaned by the State to the Federal Government. So far the State officials are standing firm.

The situation in which most States get little or nothing for their time or savings deposits of many millions of dollars in banks is anachronistic. Hundreds of State subdivisions and other public agencies—cities, counties, school districts, highway departments, water departments and districts, welfare and pension departments, etc.—have worked out thrifty means of handling money they cannot spend at once, as when the proceeds of a bond issue can only be paid out to contractors over several years of a building program. Their treasurers so handle the extra money as to earn its keep, or almost so; and in some instances, when it was borrowed before recent high interest rates, a little more so.

One means of keeping such money at work is by buying the ubiquitous short-term Federal issues, including the Government's 91-day bills which enable local officials to keep their money working when idle for even 3 months. Thus such local officials make high interest rates work for taxpayers as well as against them.

Most such public agencies are allowed by law to invest their temporarily inactive money, as contrasted with the situation in many States. Where such an agency is being gypped in interest rates, it not due to law. For example, in 1955 a new three-member transit authority took over in New York City. E. Vincent Curtayne, the authority member in charge of finances and himself a banker, found that the authority had $16,125,000 in time deposits in banks which were paying only 1 percent interest. He also found an inordinately large drawing account that was producing no revenue at all. "This is ridiculous," he said to himself, and by May, 1957, had $25,396,000 in time deposits drawing 3 percent interest—or $761,895 yearly, rather than the $161,250 yearly earned by the old authority, a difference of $600,000 in favor of the taxpayers. Mr. Curtayne said that all it took was a few telephone calls.

States have found it different. Missouri was constitutionally prohibited from 1933 until 1956 from earning interest on any State deposits in banks. In the 1956 election the voters adopted a constitutional provision that made it possible for the State to charge interest.

But the bankers persuaded the legislature to adopt an enabling act that limits to 30 days the time the State might agree to leave its funds in banks—and by Federal law, interest on 30-day deposits is restricted to 1 percent yearly. The State expects eventually to put about $50 million in such deposits on which it will earn $500,000 yearly, as against nothing before; but it could earn $1.5 million or more on the same amount in Federal securities, into which some of its inactive money is going.

The Missouri situation approached the ridiculous in the autumn of 1957 when the State found no takers for $30 million of highway bonds, upon which by law it could pay no more than 3 percent interest; nor sell at less than par. So the State legislature had to meet to provide that such bonds could be sold for less than par, an effective way of raising the interest rates it would have to pay, even while lending millions of dollars of its own money at 1 percent.

Kansas had a somewhat similar experience. Like many other States it collected interest on time deposits before the depression, and from 1905 to 1938 the State earned $3.4 million for taxpayers by this means. In 1937, however, "to help the banks," the legislature forbade collecting interest on any State deposits. By 1956 the State had $78 million in time deposits in nearly 600 banks, on which it was drawing no interest at all. The legislative council, ordered by the legislature to look into the matter, reported that even at 1 percent interest, the taxpayers would have earned more than $6 million during the interim, and at 2.5 percent interest even then being earned by some States on inactive accounts, they would have earned $15.3 million.

The council recommended a law under which the State would have charged for inactive deposits one-half the interest rate on Federal issues of more than 1 year but less than 2 years' duration, thus tying the State's earnings to the money market; but even so leaving the bankers a handsome margin.

The latter, however, fielded this one deftly, too. Under the actual resulting 1957 law, the State can withdraw upon demand 20 percent of its inactive deposit in any bank, but cannot charge interest thereon. The remainder, or 80 percent, is deposited for 1 year—with a 60-day withdrawal notice—and unless the State serves notice of withdrawal, the agreement is automatically renewed each 12 months. Upon this 80 percent the State collects 1 percent; or an effective rate on the whole deposit limited to four-fifths of 1 percent. The legislature granted the State no power to withdraw this money and put it into short-term Federal securities, as originally proposed.

Kansas, as of September 30, 1957, had $70,823,780 in inactive accounts. Of this, $14,164,756 or 20 percent was drawing no interest. On the remainder, or $56,659,024, the State was earning 1 percent interest yearly, or $566,590. Kansas taxpayers are that much better off than with no interest at all, but at 3 percent on the whole amount they would be earning better than $2.1 million yearly. So Kansas bankers have retained a handsome amount of down, or more than $1.5 million yearly, with which to feather their nests.

Of course, and without saying that it now prevails in any State, the power of State treasurers or other officials to put huge sums of inactive money in banks at low interest or no interest, can lead to "sweethearting" in which State officials can do favors for banks, and receive political support or other favors in return. Such a situation prevailed in New Jersey before the Meyner administration came in to clean it up; and much "sweethearting" was disclosed by the Hodge scandals in Illinois.

In 1956 the Kansas Legislative Council queried the treasurers of all States as to State law and practice regarding inactive accounts, and disclosed an amazing variety. Some States were still forbidden by law or constitution to earn any money whatsoever on State deposits, others were earning as high as 2.5 percent. However, the bankers of most States still appear to be reaping a harvest aggregating many millions of dollars yearly from these antiquated and inflexible provisions, and will keep on doing so as long as taxpayers are kept in ignorance of their own tenderness to the banking fraternity.

Why Should We Pay To Be Brainwashed?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. CARLTON LOSER
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 20, 1958

Mr. LOSER. Mr. Speaker, on February 17, 1958, the Nashville Tennessean published an editorial, Why Should We Pay To Be Brainwashed? which will be of interest to all friends of public power.

Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am including this excellent editorial and commend it to the reading of my colleagues and the public:

[From the Nashville Tennessean of February 17, 1958]

WHY SHOULD WE PAY TO BE BRAINWASHED?

Taxpayers, and not just those in the TVA area, can be pleased by the ruling of Mr. Russell C. Harrington, Commissioner of Internal Revenue, that private power groups no longer can deduct the cost of advertising used to attack TVA.

Of all sweet subsidies that we have heard of, this takes the saccharine crown. The private power companies have reason to dislike TVA and to want it destroyed. One of the best aids to this destruction, they figured, would be a national advertising campaign, cleverly slated at the taxpayers and utilizing distortions and half-truths in an attempt to show that TVA is a massive drain, that it pays no taxes and hurts private enterprise.

The trick was to deduct this advertising outlay from taxes due the Government, and thereby, as Senator ESTES KEFAUVER remarked, charge the taxpayers and electric rate payers for their own brainwashing.

Senator KEFAUVER suspects that a cry will now be raised that the private power companies' free speech is being curbed.

Their speech, it must be admitted, was certainly free so far as they were concerned—the taxpayer footed the bill.

Stream Pollution

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MELVIN PRICE
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 20, 1958

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, I received the following letter concerning the Federal Water Pollution Control Act—Public Law 660—from Buford B. Gudeon, president of the Mascoutah Sportsmen's Club in Mascoutah, Ill. Mr. Gudeon expresses the concern of millions of sports fishermen that streams will be polluted and fish destroyed unless we continue to help local communities build needed sewage-treatment plants. His letter comes as a timely warning against halting funds for the pollution-control program:

MASCOUTAH SPORTSMEN'S CLUB,
Mascoutah, Ill.

Hon. MELVIN PRICE,
United States Congressman,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

YOUR HONOR: In the November issue of Sport Fishing Institute Bulletin our attention has been called to Public Law 660. (Federal Water Pollution Control Act.)

In the President's state of the Union message to Congress in January 1957, while calling for so-called partnership approach by all levels of government with private enterprise for conservation and development or renewal of natural resources, he pinpointed this important aspect. I would like to make special mention of programs for making the best uses of water rapidly becoming our most precious natural resource, just as it can be, when neglected, a destroyer of both life and wealth.

In October 1957 when asked for specific examples of Federal programs that could be dropped, the President mentioned the $50

million a year in grants to local governments to build water-pollution abatement plants. "That, I think," he remarked, "is strictly local in character and I think it belongs to local government."

Following up on this the joint committee met for the second time, on October 7 in Chicago. And there it voted specifically that the President should ask Congress in January of 1958 to discontinue the recently begun program of Federal grants to municipalities to build waste-treatment plants. Such an action apparently disregards the plain implications of the fact that Congress enacted the program under pressure from local officials. It's also inconsistent with the action of the Congress in voting large funds for it this year in the face of the strong drive for economy.

But, the polluters will have their way, if they can. Conservation and recreation interests, and the general public, will lose everything now if they fail to recognize this wolf in sheep's clothing. It's our guess that every effort will now be made to keep the administration from writing the water pollution program grants into the 1958 budget for Public Law 660.

If that happens you may have the consoling thought that about 170 million more Americans were sold down the sewer. After all, it's a well-known fact that misery loves company. You can count on it, if the new approach works. There'll be plenty of both in the future of our country.

It is with the above in mind that we ask you as our representative to fight to keep Public Law 60 in effect as it now stands. Our natural resources are ours to enjoy and ours to protect.

MASCOUTAH SPORTSMEN'S CLUB,
BUFORD B. GUDEON, *President.*

Results of the Public Opinion Poll on Current Issues Conducted Among Residents of the 20th Congressional District of Pennsylvania

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 20, 1958

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, through the cooperation of newspapers in my congressional district, over 2,000 residents clipped printed questionnaires from their favorite paper and returned them to me indicating their views on 15 current issues of national importance.

The tabulation which follows represents a cross section of occupations in the central Pennsylvania area and in some instances conveys the views of civic organizations, high-school classes, and service clubs. Many questionnaires were accompanied by explanatory letters either qualifying the votes on various questions or commenting on other issues of the day.

The tabulation of votes on the 15 questions is as follows:

	Yes	No
1. In view of the recent illness of President Eisenhower and the discussion that followed regarding his health, how to you feel on the subject? Please indicate whether you feel—		
He should continue in office despite his health	1,584	------
Or should he resign and let Vice President NIXON take over the Presidency	321	------
2. Do you favor increasing taxes to support expansion of our national defense, including the development of missiles, rockets, etc.?	1,126	1,143
3. Do you favor Congress approving the proposal to share our atomic secrets with friendly nations?	1,191	699
4. Should foreign aid be increased?	693	1,257
5. Do you favor conferences by the President with foreign leaders even though they would include heads of foreign nations with whom he does not always agree?	1,545	306
6. Should England discontinue trading with Communist China?	659	795
7. Do you favor admitting Red China to the United Nations?	402	1,509
8. Do you favor the sale and barter of farm surpluses to Communist nations?	816	1,066
9. Do you favor reduction of taxes before balancing the budget?	295	1,540
10. Do you favor Federal aid for schoolroom construction?	1,113	816
11. Do you favor putting the Post Office Department on a pay-as-you-go basis which would require increasing postage rates?	1,428	492
12. Do you favor federally subsidized power projects?	567	1,220
13. What do you think Congress should do about the Taft-Hartley Act?:		
Should it be repealed?	99	------
Retained or amended?	1,818	------
14. Which in your opinion represents the soundest agricultural program:		
High rigid price supports?	51	------
Flexible price supports?	945	------
No price supports?	816	------
15. Do you approve a program of Federal aid to distressed areas suffering from chronic unemployment problems?	1,293	833

Hospital and Medical Facilities Survey and Construction Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EUGENE J. McCARTHY
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 20, 1958

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter from the State of Minnesota Department of Health relative to the hospital and medical facilities survey and construction program:

STATE OF MINNESOTA,
DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
Minneapolis, February 7, 1958.

Re hospital and medical facilities survey and construction (Hill-Burton) program.

DEAR SIR: One of the major recommendations made at the conference of the Surgeon General, United States Public Health Service, with the State hospital and medical facilities survey and construction authorities in Washington last November was that of extending the Hill-Burton program for at least 5 years, with full congressional appropriations as authorized—$150 million under part C and $60 million under part G.

The President's budget to Congress recommends:

1. Fifty-two million eight hundred thousand dollars for hospital and public health center construction (part C—original program, Public Law 725, 79th Cong., as amended), which is $46,200,000 less than the 1958 fiscal appropriation of $99 million; and

2. Twenty-one million dollars for medical facilities (part G, 1954 amendment, Public Law 482, 83d Cong.), which is the same as that appropriated for each of the 4 years during which the Hill-Burton amendment has been in effect but which has proved to be exceedingly inadequate when related to the total unmet needs in the categories of nursing homes, chronic-disease hospitals, rehabilitation centers, and diagnostic and treatment centers.

In this connection, we would like to present pertinent data relative to Minnesota's needs for beds in the various categories of care facilities. More detailed information is contained in the attached exhibits, as follows:

EXHIBIT I. A LONG-RANGE STUDY OF THE NEED FOR ADDITIONAL BEDS IN MINNESOTA

The annual need for beds in all categories in order to liquidate existing bed deficits, to provide for the increasing population, and to replace and remodel existing facilities as they become obsolete, as well as the annual increase in bed deficits, are shown. This deficit of 2,708 beds is occurring each year, in spite of the fact that Minnesota's average annual construction volume was $16 million during the period from 1948 through October 1957. A total expenditure of approximately $36 million would be needed each year to keep abreast of the needs. Attention is directed to item E, on page 2, the Need for Facilities for the Chronically Ill and Aging.

EXHIBIT II

This material was developed in three sections:

(a) Proposed program (Hill-Burton) for 1959 based on a similar amount as appropriated in 1958 (parts C and G).

(b) The additional projects which could be assisted in 1959 based on the authorized appropriations under parts C and G.

(c) Other eligible projects which could be assisted during the next 2 years if there were no limitations on Federal funds. A total of at least 129 projects including 67 nursing homes would be in a position to proceed if financial assistance were available. This would involve $32.5 million in Hill-Burton funds ($21.7 million in part C and $10.8 million in part G).

There is considerable discussion at the national level regarding the feasibility of long-term, low-interest loans for construction rather than grants-in-aid. In our considered opinion, loans would transfer the burden of capital expenditures from the general public to the patient who is in the least position to bear this additional cost at the time of his hospitalization.

EXHIBIT III

Summarizes the projects completed since 1948, currently under construction and in the planning stage. The Hill-Burton pro-

gram has provided an excellent stimulus and demonstration in that Minnesota's total allotments of $22,148,582 in Hill-Burton funds represent only approximately 7.4 percent of the total of $301 million involved.

There is an urgent need for continuing and expanding the Hill-Burton program on a sufficiently long-range basis (at least 5 years but preferably 10 years) to permit sound planning and projection at the local, State, and Federal levels. There is a long sequence of events and a definite time schedule which must be maintained before all of the funds are actually paid out to the sponsor of a specific project. Hill-Burton funds are not actually encumbered for a project until the eligible sponsor has been active in planning and fund-raising for 2 or more years. Most hospitals require a year or more to complete and the final payment is not made until the project has been in operation for several months. This means that our staff is involved with a high priority community for a period of at least 4 to 5 years and frequently longer before the project is finally closed out with the final payment. It should be emphasized that Minnesota has utilized all of its Hill-Burton appropriations and by transfers of the exceedingly limited allotments under the amendment (part G) has been able to initiate several extremely worthwhile projects.

One of our most critical problems is the extreme shortage of nursing home beds. Minnesota has met less than 50 percent of its need for beds of this type and more than 9,000 additional beds are needed in modern, fire-resistive facilities to meet the present demands for beds in nursing homes and homes for the aged.

The volume of correspondence received from our Minnesota delegation is indicative of the local interest and support of the Hill-Burton program. Our responses have demonstrated the administrative problems we face in allocating such limited amounts of Federal funds with the needs as they exist.

We are convinced that the people of Minnesota will strongly endorse any action you may be in a position to take toward extending the Hill-Burton program for at least 5 years and supporting the maximum appropriations as authorized in the acts, namely $150 million under part C and $60 million under part G.

Respectfully,

ROBERT N. BARR, M. D.,
Secretary and Executive Officer.

Pay TV

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILL E. NEAL
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 20, 1958

Mr. NEAL. Mr. Speaker, one of my constituents, Mr. John A. Goodno, manager of the Palace Theater in my home city of Huntington, W. Va., has suggested that the whole question of pay TV needs to be viewed from all angles, that some catalytic agent must be found who understands the techniques of movie-making, and who likewise possesses a broad understanding of the problems encountered in the production of television shows. That man, Mr. Goodno suggests, is none other than Walt Disney.

His letter follows:

PALACE AMUSEMENT CO.,
THE PALACE THEATRE,
Huntington, W. Va., February 7, 1958.

Dr. WILL E. NEAL,
Member of Congress,
Huntington, W. Va.

DEAR DR. NEAL: Thank you for your invitation to make some expression on the toll-TV question.

Feel show business is suffering from the sale of pre-1948 movies to TV and the age of the movies apparently is no viewing deterrent.

Glad to report however not all is bad in our business and at this juncture it is my feeling that you are the most uniquely placed man in Congress by virtue of the fact you are a former theater owner, a physician of marked humanistic qualities, to consider the thought I now propose.

During all this toll-TV controversy one individual stands out alone in show business as a great public benefactor. A man who has grasped both the entertainment and educational significance of both TV and movies and fused them to the benefit of all.

That man is Walt Disney.

Not only has he contributed greatly to exhibition with superior entertainment, as so currently evidenced by his Old Yeller, but he has strengthened our faith in the future and brought to the public a production rich in the tradition of American literature affording present generations an emotional experience not unlike those felt by generations past in such classics as Huckleberry Finn and Tom Sawyer.

Old Yeller has broken all our 31-year attendance records here despite unemployment problems and this scene is doubtless being duplicated throughout our country, thus both exhibition and the public being enriched.

Which leads me to this thought: In Walt Disney the American people possess a man whose multiple artistic accomplishments are so vast that no one word in the English language completely conveys this, and in England such a man would have been knighted long ago. Is it not time our Congress consider an accolade to this great American?

Sincerely yours,

JOHN A. GOODNO.

Wiretapping

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FREDERIC R. COUDERT, JR.
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 20, 1958

Mr. COUDERT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include a memorandum opinion appearing in the New York Law Journal of January 3, 1958, by one of New York's most distinguished jurists, Hon. Samuel H. Hofstadter, justice of the Supreme Court of New York:

WIRETAPPING: ILLEGALITY OF ORDERS ISSUE IN PURSUANCE OF NEW YORK STATUTE

Under the recent decision of the Supreme Court of the United States in the Benanti case, an interception of a telephone communication, in violation of section 605 of the Federal Communications Act, is unlawful even though made by a State officer acting under an order issued in pursuance of the New York statute, and the order itself is unlawful. Applications for such orders should, therefore, be denied.

"'IN THE MATTER OF INTERCEPTION OF TELEPHONE COMMUNICATIONS,' DECIDED JANUARY 2, 1958

"Hofstadter, J.: Under the decision of the United States Supreme Court in *United States* v. *Benanti* (26 U. S. Law Week, 4045), decided December 9, 1957, no wiretap order pursuant to section 813a of the Code of Criminal Procedure [1] may lawfully be issued.

"As we have no system of advisory opinions in this State and, according to our practice, applications for wiretaps are made at special term, part II, this memorandum will apprise enforcement and prosecuting officers that while I preside at special term, part II, during this month no application for a wiretap order will be honored.

"Under the decision in Benanti, orders authorizing interceptions are contrary to controlling Federal law. Its authority requires me, therefore, to deny any application for such an order. For all wiretaps, whether 'authorized' or not, in this State are now illegal. *In Matter of Interception of Telephone Communications* (207 Misc. 69) I denied an application in the exercise of discretion; any further application would have to be denied because of lack of lawful competence.

"There may be those who differ from this interpretation of the Supreme Court decision. In that event, the result of these proceedings may be the salutary one that the view expressed here can be challenged and become the subject of authoritative determination by our State appellate courts; subject, of course, to any ultimate review in the United States Supreme Court.

"Recent decisions of the Supreme Court of the United States have adumbrated the expectancy that legal safeguards will provide the needed bridge between the moral and legal law. Time and again, the gap between moral and legal law has been spanned—sometimes by the slow and painful process of the innovation of time, and sometimes by a courageous leap into the future. Such an advance has been effected by the Benanti case. In clear accents it tolls the knell of all wiretapping, including so-called legal wiretapping in our State. Following the holding in *Weiss* v. *United States* (308 U. S. 321) it flatly proclaims, in language which no one can mistake, that an interception of a telephone communication, even by a State law-enforcement officer acting under an order issued pursuant to section 813 (a), constitutes a violation of section 605 of the Federal Communications Act (47 U. S. C. 47). Its expressions are compelling—it is explicit that the warrant of the order does not make the wiretap legal; it is implicit that the order itself is unlawful.

"New York police officers, suspecting one Benanti of dealing in narcotics, obtained a wiretap order from the court. As a result of the wiretap he was arrested. It was found that he was not a dealer in narcotics but a bootlegger of whisky. He was turned over to Federal agents for prosecution. On his trial the State officers were permitted to testify to the wiretapped conversations. On appeal from his conviction the United States Court of Appeals decided, as a matter of first impression that where there is no participation by a Federal officer the Communications Act does not bar, in a Federal court, the admissibility of evidence obtained by State officers by wiretaps in violation of the act.

"The Supreme Court disagreed with this conclusion. It held unanimously that wiretapping by New York State law-enforcement officers, although authorized by the State constitution and statutes, violated Federal law and that evidence was inadmissible. The Court found no exemption for State officials in section 605 of the Federal Communications Act of 1934, which reads: 'No person not being authorized by the sender shall intercept any communication and divulge or publish the

Footnotes at end of speech.

existence, contents, substance, purport, effect, or meaning of such intercepted communication * * *.'

"Chief Justice Warren said: 'The constitution and statutes of the State of New York provide that an ex parte order authorizing a wiretap may be issued by judges of a certain rank. * * * [It is not urged] that, constitutionally speaking, Congress is without power to forbid such wiretapping even in the face of a conflicting State law * * *. Rather, the argument is that Congress has not exercised this power and that section 605, being general in its terms, should not be deemed to operate to prevent a State from authorizing wiretapping in the exercise of its legitimate police functions. However, we read the Federal Communications Act and section 605, in particular, to the contrary. The Federal Communications Act is a comprehensive scheme for the regulation of interstate communication. In order to safeguard those interests, protected under section 605, that portion of the statute pertinent to this case applies both to intrastate and to interstate communications. * * * In light of the above considerations, and keeping in mind this comprehensive scheme of interstate regulation and the public policy underlying section 605 as part of the scheme, we find that Congress, setting out a prohibition in plain terms, did not mean to allow State legislation which would contradict that section and that policy (compare *Pennsylvania* v. *Nelson* (350 U. S. 497), *Hill* v. *Florida* (325 U. S. 538), *Hines* v. *Davidowitz* (312 U. S. 52)).'

"In the Benanti case, the United States court of appeals for this circuit has said: 'Despite the warrant issued by the New York State court pursuant to New York law, we have no alternative other than to hold that by tapping the wires, intercepting the communication made by appellant and divulging at the trial what they had overheard, the New York police officers violated the Federal statute.' *Nardone* v. *U. S.* (302 U. S. 379, 308 U. S. 338); *Weiss* v. *United States* (308 U. S. 321). Section 605 of title 47, United States Code, is too explicit to warrant any other inference—and the Weiss case made its terms applicable to intrastate communications (244 Fed., 2d, 389).

"These views of the court of appeals regarding the illegality of the 'authorized' wiretap were confirmed by the Supreme Court, but its ruling of the admissibility of the fruits of the tap was overruled, the Supreme Court basing its decision on the intent of the Federal Communications Act.

"After its first pronouncement, the United States court of appeals, several months later, reiterated its views on the illegality of intrastate interceptions, saying: 'Appellant next contends that the act does not apply to the calls he intercepted, because they were intrastate in character rather than interstate or foreign. This contention is completely refuted by *Weiss* v. *U. S.* (308 U. S. 321), wherein the court said at page 327: "* * * Plainly the interdiction thus pronounced is not limited to interstate and foreign communications. And, as Congress has power, when necessary for the protection of interstate commerce, to regulate intrastate transactions, there is no constitutional requirement that the scope of the statute be limited so as to exclude intrastate communications." And at page 329: "We hold that the broad and inclusive language of the second clause of the section is not to be limited by construction so as to exclude intrastate communications"' (*United States* v. *Gris* (247 Fed., 2d 860)).

"Thus, section 605, as interpreted by controlling Federal judicial authority, renders unlawful the interception of all telephone messages within our State, even by an officer acting under an order of this court; it cannot be within the competence of this court, properly exercised, to authorized such an unlawful act—section 813 of the Code of Criminal Procedure to the contrary notwithstanding. For in case of conflict, the State law, not an otherwise unobjectionable Federal statute, must give way under the Constitution (*United States* v. *Gris, supra*).

"The supremacy clause of the United States Constitution, article VI, clause 2, provides: 'This Constitution, and the laws of the United States, which shall be made in pursuance thereof * * * shall be the supreme law of the land; and the judges in every State shall be bound thereby, anything in the constitution or laws of any State to the contrary notwithstanding.' And, since *Gibbons* v. *Ogden* (9 Wheaton, 1), it has been firmly established that when Congress enacts legislation within its competence, and becomes the 'supreme law of the land' under the Constitution, State interests must yield to the paramount national concern. The law of the general Government governs. The exercise by Congress of its power is absolute—it precludes, modifies, or suspends—as the case may be—local legislation in conflict or inconsistent with Federal enactments.[2]

"In the interpretation and construction of Federal statutes, Federal judicial rulings are controlling.[3] The Supreme Court has held that the Communications Act is an 'express, absolute prohibition' against interception or divulgence of wiretapping with no qualifications—that when State officers indulge in wiretapping they are violating Federal law and subject themselves to Federal prosecution. So long, therefore, as section 605 of the Federal Communications Act remains the law, so much of section 813a of our Code of Criminal Procedure which permits interceptions, is inoperative.

"Hence, even when authorized, interceptions of telephone messages within this State are illegal. Yet, orders have been issuing and interceptions have been made. As Benanti and Gris now make it painfully clear, the orders so issuing out of the courts to 'authorize' interceptions, have been void because contrary to law.

"These decisions require that we now cease and desist, for it cannot be lawful to authorize what is an illegal act. It is more and worse than a mere futility—for if the police officer violates the Federal statute by tapping wires notwithstanding a warrant issued out of this court pursuant to New York law—if that act be illegal—those who set the act in motion have condoned if not instigated illegally. Clearly a judge may not lawfully set the wheels in motion toward the illegality by signing an order—the warrant itself partakes of the breach, willful or inadvertent, of the Federal law. Such breach may not find sanction in the orders of courts charged with the support of the law of the land and with enforcing that law.

---

[1] So far as here material, sec. 813-a of the Code of Criminal Procedure (enacted under art. I, sec. 12 of the State Constitution) reads: 'An ex parte order for the interception * * * of * * * telephonic communications may be issued by any justice of the Supreme Court * * * when there is reasonable ground to believe the evidence of crime may be thus obtained * * *.' Any reference in this memorandum to this section applies only to telephone interceptions.

[2] *Commonwealth of Pennsylvania* v. *Nelson* restated the rules for determining whether a Federal statute may be supplemented by a State enactment, where, as here, Congress has not stated specifically that its legislation fully occupied a field in which the States would otherwise be free to legislate. The touchstones for decision, said the Supreme Court, were: First, that the scheme of Federal regulation was so pervasive as to make reasonable the inference that Congress left no room for the States to supplement it. Second, that the Federal statute touched a field in which the Federal interest was so dominant that the Federal system must be assumed to preclude enforcement of State laws on the same subject. Third, that enforcement of the State statute would present a serious danger of conflict with the Federal program.

[3] *Sadowski* v. *L. I. RR.* (292 N. Y., 448, 453), *Brown* v. *Remembrance* (279 App. Div., 410, 412, aff'd 304 N. Y., 909), *Ruggiero* v. *Liberty Mutual Ins. Co.* (272 App. Div., 1027, aff'd 298 N. Y., 775), see also *Bailey* v. *Central Vermont R'y* (319 U. S., 350, 352), *Chicago, Milwaukee & St. Paul R'y* v. *Cooper* (271 U. S., 472, 474), *Jacobs* v. *Reading Co.* (130 Fed., 2d, 612, 614), *Albert Pick & Co.* v. *Wilson* (19 Fed., 2d, 18, 19). It is implicit in the cases constituting prevailing authority that authoritative Federal decisions even when not those of the Supreme Court, govern; it has been rendered explicit, too (see especially *Ruggiero* v. *Liberty Mutual Ins. Co., supra*)."

They Want a Charter

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 20, 1958

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the following article from the National Tribune-The Stars and Stripes of February 20, 1958:

THEY WANT A CHARTER

The Veterans of World War I of the United States of America, an organization devoted to the needs of the men who served between 1917–19, and including those who served in Russia after the November 11, 1918 armistice, has been growing by leaps and bounds.

Thousands of veterans of World War I are flocking to this group, having reached the conclusion that here is one group which gives its time and thought and energy to their comrades of the First World War.

These elderly veterans are not giving up their affiliation with older veterans' organizations, such as the Veterans of Foreign Wars or the American Legion, but they feel, at last, that here is an outfit they can join, knowing that this new but fast-growing veterans' group has as their first concern the men who fought with them in this country's first attempt to prove itself against the world.

What does this new organization seek? It asks for pensions for their aged and elderly comrades who are no longer able to care for themselves. This is a laudable effort and their leaders have been authorized to lessen their demands if some relief can be granted to their needy comrades of more than 40 years ago.

But much more, they are aking Congress to grant them a congressional charter which would put them on a par with other major veterans' organizations in acknowledgment by the Veterans' Administration of their growing prestige, and granting them the right to appear before boards of the Veterans' Administration in the prosecution of veterans' claims.

Here is a right which has been given to a number of veterans' and other groups, and rightly so, but which, up to the present time has been denied to this distinctive organization, greater by far in numbers and service than any other groups which have already been given this recognition by Congress.

The thought has been put forward that when the AMVETS were given a congressional charter this would be the last one that would be authorized for any veteran group.

Times change and there has arisen in our country the Veterans of World War I of the U. S. A. which represents a vast number of our veterans—a group growing by leaps and bounds each year.

We are reminded of a story told of the French Academy many years ago. It appears that the academy was limited in number and until one member died no other could be admitted.

There appeared on the horizon a gifted figure, one whom the academy would have liked to welcome as a member. Unfortunately, the rules were strict and there was no room for this individual, no matter how well the academy would have accepted him.

To honor this person the academy decided to hold a dinner in his honor. The feasting over, the president of the academy arose, spoke in glowing terms of their guest's ability and expressed the regrets of the academy because they could not accept him.

It so happened that, on the festive table, there were bouquets of roses. The honored guest, rising to accept the plaudits of his academy friends, plucked a soft petal from a rose in the bouquet nearest to him. He then filled a water glass until it was brimming over—until not another drop could be added without being spilled on the tablecloth. He then took the rose petal and placed it on the brimming glass. The rose petal floated on the water and not a drop of water was spilled. "You see, gentlemen," he said, "no matter how full the glass is, there is always room for one more."

The academy members understood and immediately accepted him as a member, changing their rules to meet the changing times and the recognition which was his due.

So, let the Congress of the United States recognize the changing times and the recognition due this worthy organization of Veterans of World War I and realize that the addition of this new flower will not detract but add to the list of those who have been granted congressional charters. It is their due.

Youngsters Who Behave

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEONARD FARBSTEIN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 20, 1958

Mr. FARBSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, much has been said, and a great deal more has been written in the newspapers in recent months, concerning juvenile delinquency, and the failure of modern teen-agers to live up to the standards of polite society. Very litle is ever said about those youngsters who behave as we would like to see our coming generation behave, and who, in my opinion, are in the overwhelming majority. Therefore, when the following letter was sent voluntarily to the principal of one of the parochial schools in my district, I felt it essential to bring it to the attention of all concerned so that the adverse publicity presently appearing in the newspapers about a small segment of New York students might be offset and all of the New York's students might not be judged by the slight minority:

YOUTH AID, INC.
New York, N. Y., January 30, 1958.

The PRINCIPAL,
Beth Jacob School,
New York, N. Y.

DEAR SIR: I would like to share with you a most pleasant experience. I have in the past 2 years done much traveling in the subway at the times when our school children are using public transportation. Like most people I deplore their manners in such places; they compare so unfavorably with the manners of the children of most other places in the civilized world. I teach in the public high schools and do appreciate the psychology of our teen-agers. I am dismayed, however, to find that my own classes seem totally uninformed on their obligation to give up their seats to elderly persons in the subway or on buses.

It was my good fortune today to see 2 girls rise with very gracious dignity and give their seats to 2 elderly women standing near them. This brought them next to me and I congratulated them on their good manners. The girls assured me that everyone in their school had good manners and would act properly in the subway or other public places.

You are to be congratulated on the training which produces results like this. The youngsters were proud to give me the name of their school but wanted no personal recognition of what they regarded as proper conduct. I hope that the Beth Jacob School will enjoy growth and influence for many, many years and will continue to give us young people as fine as the two girls I met today.

Sincerely,

ADELAIDE MCGLOIN.

National Invention Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 20, 1958

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I commend to the attention of our colleagues the following suggestion for a National Invention Day. I received this letter, which is dated February 11, 1958, from Jack J. Lande, general counsel of the Invention Industry Association:

INVENTION INDUSTRY ASSOCIATION,
Los Angeles, Calif., February 11, 1958.

DEAR MR. MULTER: Ingenuity manifested in invention is our country's greatest single natural resource and has made the United States the world's most plentiful nation. No other American asset has so directly affected our social, economic, and political life as has invention.

As a nation, the United States of America has been remiss in officially expressing its national appreciation to invention. Accordingly, we propose that the Nation annually, through the Congress and the White House, acknowledge its gratitude to American ingenuity and inventors by resolution and proclamation to set aside 1 day a year as a legal holiday.

Abraham Lincoln was the first and only President to ever receive a patent. Lincoln's birthday is not a legal holiday; therefore, we suggest his birthday, February 12, as the ideal date for National Invention Day. Since February 12, 1959, will be the 150th anniversary of the birth of Lincoln, it seems proper and fitting that the United States of America proclaim National Invention Day on that date.

Your active participation in achieving this objective will be gratefully appreciated by every man, woman, and child in America.

Sincerely yours,

JACK J. LANDE,
General Counsel.

When the Farmer's Throat Is Cut, So Is Your Own

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEE METCALF
OF MONTANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 20, 1958

Mr. METCALF. Mr. Speaker, among those who have had enough of the campaign being waged against American farmers, not only by the national community of business and industry but also by the administration, is Publisher Edward L. Fike of the Lewistown (Mont.) Daily News.

He says so in the following editorial from the issue of February 16:

WHEN THE FARMER'S THROAT IS CUT, SO IS YOUR OWN

Thumbing through a magazine the other day we noticed a very intriguing advertisement sponsored by the machine tool firm, Warner & Swasey, of Cleveland, Ohio.

"Who is this generous uncle who pays all the bills?" asked the ad which then went on to lament among other things that Uncle Sam is "going to keep farmers prosperous by having them do less work."

Here, out in the open, is an example of the unceasing campaign being waged against America's farmers and ranchers by the national community of business and industry.

The firm of Warner & Swasey, as most other great industrial firms, will quickly defend the questionable practice wherein the Federal Government grants huge subsidies to industry through quick tax writeoffs in defense contracts. And, these industries which reap quick millions from Government contracts seem to be the very ones which squeal loudest over any assistance extended to the struggling farmer.

Well, as Queen Victoria once said, "We are not amused."

We don't pretend to offer a solution to so complex a thing as the national farm problem, which defies the best brains in Government and agriculture. We do know this: If the farmer is not prosperous there can be no sustained national prosperity. Much of the current recession finds its impetus in our depressed farm situation even as the great depression of the 1930's was rooted in unsolved agricultural crisis. Even though our farmers compose a minority—only 21 million Americans now live on the farms—it follows as night the day that the Nation cannot be half prosperous and half depressed. High industrial wages and booming business do not last very long when the farmers are in depression.

Consider this:

Prices received by farmers have gone down 20 percent since 1951.

Farmer operating costs have gone up 15 percent since 1951.

Weekly factory wage rates have gone up 23 percent since 1951. Per capita farm income is now only about half the urban income rate.

The plain fact is that food in this country absorbs a smaller proportion of the consumer's spendable dollar than anywhere else in the whole world. (Eight minutes of United States labor will purchase a quart of

milk while in France it requires 16 minutes and in Soviet Russia, that workers' paradise, it takes 42 minutes.)

Farmers, in short, have been and still are subsidizing the consumers of America. And, because farmers are scattered and unorganized and because they are by nature individualistic, they are at the mercy of vast market conditions over which they have no control.

In this situation we find in Ezra Taft Benson a Secretary of Agriculture who is well intentioned but confused and who appears to be hostile to the very segment of the Nation which he is supposed to represent and serve.

Let us bring this matter home.

Secretary Benson has announced his intention to cut the price support for wheat in 1958 by 22 cents per bushel. According to ASC figures, this means that Fergus County ranchers will lose $651,868. This is easy to see. Our wheat allotment for 1958 is 157,635 acres which are expected to produce a normal yield of 18.8 bushels per acre. If we multiply acres by expected yield by the anticipated 22 cents reduction in the support we have our loss.

Judith Basin County with a wheat allotment this year of 81,041 acres and an expected yield of 17.4 bushels will lose $310,-224.

The wheat producing countries of central Montana alone can expect to lose upwards of $2 million this year because Secretary Benson has arbitrarily decided to cut wheat support by 22 cents.

There isn't a businessman on main street in any community in central Montana, and most of all in Lewistown, who will not feel this pinch. There is hardly a person living in central Montana who will not be adversely affected by Secretary Benson's decree.

It is well and good for sophisticated industrialists and businessmen to theorize against the farmer but farm prices and the farm-support program benefit far more than the depressed farmer.

In Montana and in many another State, the price of wheat is the economic lifeblood.

Last month President Eisenhower sent a message to Congress urging that farm price supports be reduced to 60 percent. This was a complete violation of his promises made during his campaign. For example, at Brookings, S. Dak., on October 4, 1952, General Eisenhower promised:

"The Republican Party is pledged to the sustaining of the 90 percent of parity price support and it is pledged even more than that to helping the farmer obtain his full parity, 100 percent parity, with the guaranty in the price supports of 90."

Whereas Secretary Benson now advocates an end of the family farm, Mr. Eisenhower in Columbia, S. C., on September 30, 1952, said:

"I am for programs to put a firm foundation under farm prosperity and to strengthen the family farm as the mainstay of our agricultural production."

Now this may seem just another case in which we are all for Government economy until the shoe pinches our own foot. But there is more involved here than Government economy. We must keep our agriculture healthy if it is to feed and clothe our Nation, not to mention our hungry allies. Our farmers who hold the soil in trust for posterity—for the feeding of future generations—must share in American strength and prosperity. And, our farmers and those of us who depend on farm prosperity, are entitled to enjoy the same benefit from the fruits of our labors as other segments of the national economy.

The National Guard

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN D. DINGELL
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 20, 1958

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I submit for publication in the RECORD a revealing excerpt from the National Guardsman for February 1958. It reflects the very real and justifiable concern of National Guard officials concerning the announced intention of the administration and the Defense Department to reduce Guard strength by 40,000 in the coming fiscal year. This is the second successive year during which cuts have been taken in the National Guard program, reducing it in numerical strength over that period by nearly 17¼ percent.

Maj. Gen. William H. Harrison, Jr., president of the National Guard Association of the United States, has expressed his deep concern lest our existing forces be so weakened as to jeopardize our national security while the emphasis is being placed on development of weapons systems which are still very much in the experimental stage and far from operational. It is sound for us to continue modernizing and converting our ground units to the pentomic structure or any other form that may be required to meet changing technology. But there is certainly nothing in the picture to indicate that it is safe to cut down our strength, either in the Active Army or in its Reserves.

In addition to the reduction of 40,000 in actual strength, the proposed budget would permit only 22,000 new guardsmen to undergo training under the 6-months program established by the Reserve Forces Act. Guard officials believe that a bare minimum of 55,000 is needed to compensate for normal losses.

We are all aware, I think, of the need to prepare ourselves for the grim possibility of nuclear warfare. Yet the distinct probability exists, as the tragic history of the Korean conflict must constantly remind us, that if war comes, its form will, likelier than not, be that of a peripheral, brush-fire war, a conflict of attrition. Since it is my firm conviction that the American people will never want to begin a nuclear war, I believe it essential for us to maintain sufficient conventional military strength to repulse conventional aggression when and if it should occur. Traditionally, the National Guard has been our insurance against unexpected attack. It was our insurance in World War I, in World War II, in Korea.

It seems to me that permitting this insurance to lapse because we bear a graver but unlikelier form of disaster is as foolish as discarding a simple life insurance policy in favor of one protecting exclusively against death by drowning.

The excerpt from the National Guardsman follows:

In a letter to adjutants general and guard commanders, General Harrison advised that the President's proposed budget includes only enough funds to support an enrolled strength in the Army guard of 360,000. There were 435,000 officers and men last May and, in accordance with the Memorandum of Understanding which came out of last year's Army-guard controversy, the number has been dropping to 400,000. There had been indications that that figure would stand up for a couple of years at least. But the new development means that we would drop another 40,000—a total loss of 75,000 trained, participating volunteers within a matter of months.

Though the details of the troop basis revision were kept under wraps, a little arithmetic with some known facts indicated a pretty clear picture. The active Army is taking a four-division cut, amounting to 20 percent of its divisions. It also has been indicated that the same ratio would be applied to the guard. That would mean 5 or 6 divisions. Carrying that same ratio over to the nondivisional units, and applying the cut to an aggregate of 5,500 divisional and nondivisional units, 20 by 5,500 indicates a projected loss of at least 1,100 companies, batteries, detachments, etc. Actually, the number could go much higher, inasmuch as in many instances the units left to us are supposed to be maintained at higher strength levels (about 65 percent) than they now are permitted, so as to be able to conduct unit training.

"This is not a reduction of paper units or units carried in a nebulous plan for some future activation, but rather a massive removal of existing organizations, units in operation, units with personnel, equipment, facilities and units with a historical background and tradition," General Harrison told commanders.

If anyone has worked out a formula for choosing how the cuts are to be worked out, he hasn't made it known. But elementary knowledge points the way to some possible approaches to picking divisions, for example, to be dropped. General Harrison listed these as:

1. One from each Army area, to be selected by the Army commander;
2. The six armored divisions;
3. The divisions which are considered to be least effective;
4. The lowest strength divisions;
5. One division from each State having two divisions;
6. Those divisions split between two or more States;
7. Those divisions without World War II history; or
8. A combination of the first 7 methods.

"On what basis the accompanying slash of nondivisional units might be accomplished is purely in the realm of conjecture," he wrote. "If such a massive reduction in personnel and units takes place, every unit in every State and Territory will be affected, because the units remaining in the troop basis will have to be redistributed among the States." One example might be a State having one division, and no spare parts outfits: its division is picked for elimination; the State might be given, from neighboring States, parts of their divisions, or some of their nondivisional outfits.

"While we are aware of the necessity of a reorganization of the Army National Guard to conform to the pentomic concept," General Harrison advised, "and have previously concurred therein, we are firmly of the opinion that—

"1. The present strength should remain at a minimum of 400,000;

"2. The existing 27 divisions should be retained;

"3. Necessary modification of the troop structure should be accomplished by reorganization, redesignation or conversion of existing divisional and nondivisional units."

National Wool Act Extension

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. HENRY ALDOUS DIXON

OF UTAH

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 20, 1958

Mr. DIXON. Mr. Speaker, one of the few agricultural programs which receives almost universal acclaim is the wool program. The House Agriculture Committee held hearings last week on my own and other bills to extend the National Wool Act. Not one person testified against the extension. All segments of the wool production, distribution, and processing industry want the program to continue. I believe it is urgent that Congress pass this extension, and I am here reproducing the excellent testimony of Marvin L. McLain, Assistant Secretary of Agriculture:

NATIONAL WOOL ACT EXTENSION

(By Marvin L. McLain)

I am happy to appear before your committee on behalf of the Department of Agriculture to recommend extension of the National Wool Act of 1954. This program was developed 4 years ago by the wool growers, the executive branch and the Congress as a measure to meet the special problems of our domestic wool industry.

With wool, we are dealing with an agricultural commodity in which our country is deficient in production. The cost and problems in producing wool are such that the production of wool even with price support through loans and purchases at the maximum level authorized declined over 40 percent following the beginning of World War II. Furthermore, in supporting wool prices through loans and purchases, domestic wool accumulated in the hands of the Government while imported wools supplied an increasing share of our requirements.

In his special message to Congress on agriculture 4 years ago, President Eisenhower recommended legislation for promoting the development of a sound and prosperous domestic wool industry as a measure of national security and in the promotion of the general economic welfare. We are producing only about one-third of our normal peacetime requirements. The foreign wool upon which we must rely to supplement our domestic production requires shipping over sealanes from 5,000 to 8,000 miles.

REASONS FOR DECLINE IN DOMESTIC PRODUCTION

Over the years, domestic woolgrowers have been faced with one uncertainty after another in the market outlook for their product. The tariff on wool was reduced in 1948 under the Trade Agreements Act. The protection afforded by the tariff has been further reduced by the rise in the general level of prices and costs. The tariff today provides protection equivalent to only approximately 20 percent of the price received by growers compared with 77 percent in 1930.

Woolgrowers have been facing increasing costs of labor, equipment, and supplies. They have been caught in the squeeze between higher costs on the one hand and relatively less protection from imports of foreign wool on the other. Specialized labor is of major importance in sheep ranching, especially in the western range areas. There has been a scarcity of competent labor and wage rates have increased more than any other major item of expense. Wool production became less attractive as an enterprise during a period when national income was rising to record levels and production of agricultural commodities already in surplus was on the increase.

The number of sheep shorn in the United States has declined from 49 million head producing 388 million pounds of wool in 1942 to 26 million head producing 226 million pounds in 1957. Yet our range and feed resources best utilized by sheep will carry a higher level of production.

Our situation with wool is a special one, like sugar. Wool and sugar are the two major agricultural commodities in which the United States is deficient in production. Both face heavy import competition with serious complications. Legislation and programs for commodities which are produced in surplus in this country just do not fit the problems with which we are confronted in the case of wool and sugar.

PLAN DEVELOPED AFTER FULL STUDY OF SITUATION

The plan of price assistance under the National Wool Act of 1954 was developed after considerable study and with the advice and counsel of all segments of the industry. Raising the tariff as a solution would be contrary to our aims for expanding foreign trade, particularly with our friends in the Southern Hemisphere. Also, achieving higher prices for wool by increasing the tariff, would adversely affect the competitive position of wool with other fibers. As mentioned, price support through loans was not maintaining domestic production and was getting the Government more and more in the wool merchandising business while losing markets for domestic wool.

Under the National Wool Act of 1954:

1. An annual production of 300 million pounds of shorn wool—about one-third more than we are now producing—is to be encouraged as a measure for our national security and promotion of the general economic welfare.

2. An incentive price is established to encourage this larger production.

3. The price will be obtained by means of payments to growers to bring their income from wool up to the incentive level, rather than by raising prices in the free market.

4. A portion of the duties collected on imports of wool and wool manufactures is appropriated to finance the payments.

5. Section 708 of the act provides a self-help feature whereby woolgrowers can work together more effectively in developing and financing advertising and promotion programs to improve the demand for the industry's products and thereby increase the prices received in the free market.

HOW PAYMENTS ARE MADE FOR SHORN WOOL

The incentive price has been set at 62 cents for each of the marketing years under the program to date. Growers sell their wool in normal marketing channels. After the year is over, and the average price received for wool sold during the marketing year is known, payments are made to bring the national average price received by all growers up to the incentive level.

The payments are made at one percentage rate—the percentage required to bring the national average price for wool sold in the free market up to the incentive level. This one rate is applied to the net sales proceeds received by each grower to determine the amount of his incentive payment. By making the payments on a percentage basis, growers are encouraged to improve the quality and marketing of their wool to obtain the best price possible because the higher the price the individual grower gets in the free market, the greater his payment.

The support for pulled wool is provided to maintain normal marketing practices; that is, prevent unusual shearing prior to marketing just to get the payment on shorn wool. This is being handled by making payments on all sales of unshorn lambs irrespective of whether they are sold for replacement, feeding or slaughter. Then if the new owner sells the lambs without shearing them, his payment will be adjusted downward by the amount due on the weight of the lambs purchased. Likewise, if he shears the lambs and sells the wool, his wool payment will be adjusted downward by this same amount. In this way, the original producer and the later feeder-or breeder-owner share in the payments.

Payments are made only to bona fide producers. To qualify for a payment, the applicant must have owned the sheep or lambs from which the wool was shorn or the unshorn lambs sold for at least 30 days.

The National Wool Act of 1954 provides for the support of mohair by payments similar as for shorn wool. The support price for mohair has been set at 70 cents for each marketing year. This price is near the minimum of the range authorized by the act with the incentive price for shorn wool at 62 cents. Production of mohair has been on the increase since 1952.

WOOL PRICES LOWER FIRST 2 YEARS THAN ANTICIPATED

The payments on wool under the program the first 2 years were greater than anticipated when 62 cents was first established as the incentive level. This resulted from a greater than expected decline in the price received for shorn wool in the free market. Part of the price decline may have been the cost of getting back to a free market after several years of support at fixed prices. Also, the CCC-owned wool accumulated from the previous price support loan programs was a bearish factor. These stocks totaling over 150 million pounds at the beginning of the incentive payment program were finally eliminated last month as a depressing influence on the market.

The average prices received by growers declined from around 50 cents in early 1955 to a low of about 38 cents in January 1956. We were optimistic about the recovery to 56.4 cents by June last year. However, that has been tempered by a softening of prices since. In mid-December the average was 46.4 cents and 45.2 cents in mid-January.

WOOL SITUATION

The decline since June was primarily due to lower prices in the world market. Curtailed buying by Japan and uncertainty of demand prospects in the United Kingdom and France have been depressing factors in the world market. At the opening auctions in Australia in late August and early September, prices were about 10 percent below their peaks last May. They declined further and by early January were 25 percent below last May. They are now down near the lows of 1955. Since the middle of January, wool prices in the British Dominion markets have firmed up and have shown a little rise.

As to our own situation, United States mill consumption of apparel wool has been running about 17 percent below a year earlier. In contrast, consumption of man-made fibers is up over 8 percent. The higher wool prices last winter and spring may not have been as advantageous to the industry as many thought they were.

RATES OF PAYMENT

As a result of the decline in shorn wool prices during the 1955 marketing year, the national average for the year was 42.8 cents. With the incentive level at 62 cents, that meant incentive payments at the rate of 44.9 percent. The average price received by growers in the market during the 1956 marketing year was 44.3 cents and the rate of payment 40 percent. For the 1957 marketing year to date, the average prices by months have ranged from 56.4 to 45.2 cents which indicate that the rate of payments for the current year may be from 15 percent to 20 percent of the price received in the market.

Prices received for mohair the first 2 years were above the 70-cent support level and no payments were required. The price for the 1957 year is reported at 88 cents so no payments on mohair will be required this year. However, with the recent softening of prices, payments may be required the fourth year.

FUNDS AVAILABLE FOR PAYMENTS

Under the act, the total payments are limited to 70 percent of the specific duties collected on imports of wool and wool manufactures from January 1, 1953. In this way, the payments for price assistance on wool are related to the duties collected under the protective tariff.

By the beginning of the first year of the incentive program, these amounts totaled about $68 million and thus provided a backlog of funds available for payments in years when the duties are not sufficient to cover the required payments. Payments totaled approximately $58 million the first year and around $53 million the second. Current duty collections available for payments amounted to about $31 million during the first year and $28 million the second. Thus the payments for the first 2 years exceeded current collections available for payments by about $52 million and reduced the backlog by that much.

With the general decline in wool prices in the world markets since last May, it appears that the backlog available for payments may be completely exhausted by the end of the fourth year. This is based on the assumption that the average price received by growers in the free market holds around 48 cents. Each 1 cent the national average price received for wool fails to equal the incentive price means $3 million in payments.

The price situation both in this country and abroad after the extension of the National Wool Act will determine whether the 70 percent of specific-duty collections on imports of wool and wool manufactures will be sufficient to maintain the incentive price for shorn wool at a truly incentive level over the years ahead.

TRENDS IN SHORN WOOL PRODUCTION

With regard to the progress being made toward increased production of wool in accord with the intent of the act, sheep numbers and wool production continue at low levels. The net decline in wool production in the last few years has been primarily due to reductions in sheep numbers in Texas and several of the Western States where severe drought conditions prevailed. Shorn wool production in 1957 was greater than a year earlier in 23 of the 35 native sheep States and in Arizona and South Dakota of the 13 western sheep States.

About 70 percent of our total production, of course, is in the 13 Western States, where range conditions and cattle prices influence sheep numbers. Furthermore, due to the nature of the enterprise, year-to-year increases in wool production can be expected to be only gradual, even under most favorable conditions.

ADVERTISING AND SALES PROMOTION UNDER SECTION 708

Section 708 of the National Wool Act of 1954 provides a method for growers to organize and conduct advertising and sales promotion programs for the industry's products and the financing of such programs by deductions from their payments. It thus permits growers to use their own money in efforts to increase the demand for and the returns from lamb and wool in the free market and thereby reduce the amount of payments from the Government to accomplish the objectives of the act.

Soon after passage of the act, growers and grower groups organized the American Sheep Producers Council to conduct advertising and sales promotion programs for lamb and wool. Growers, in a referendum held in 1955, approved deductions of not to exceed 1 cent a pound from incentive payments on shorn wool and not to exceed 5 cents per hundredweight from the payments on unshorn lambs for financing the advertising and sales promotion programs. Intensive programs of advertising and sales promotion for both lamb and wool are underway. So far the Secretary has approved the deductions from the payments for each of the three marketing years, 1955, 1956, and 1957. These deductions will be sufficient to finance the promotion and market development activities of the council for 3 years and provide a reserve sufficient to carry the program for a fourth year.

Upon extension of the National Wool Act, it is planned that the Secretary will hold another referendum to determine the continued willingness of growers to use a portion of their payments to conduct advertising and sales promotion of their products.

RESEARCH AND OTHER ACTIONS TO AID INDUSTRY

The Department has been giving increased attention to programs which will help the industry improve its production and marketing efficiency and thereby lessen the need for price assistance. Research and other action programs dealing with disease control, improvement of production and marketing practices, conservation measures to increase the carrying capacity of both public and private grazing lands and greater efficiency in processing and adapting the industry's products to consumer preferences all are contributing to the achievement of our objective.

EXTENSION OF NATIONAL WOOL ACT RECOMMENDED

The 1958 marketing year, beginning April 1, will be the fourth and last year for incentive payments under the existing legislation. The National Wool Act of 1954 limits such support to marketings during the period April 1, 1955, through March 31, 1959.

Your committee placed a termination date in the bill it reported to the House. The committee stated that this was not to be construed as meaning that they felt the wool program should be of a temporary character. They said that, on the contrary, they hoped and believed that the program would provide a relatively permanent solution to our wool problems, but since the program is new and different from any tried before, it would be well to review its operation and effect after a time and make such improvements and changes as experience might indicate.

We believe that the incentive-payment program under the National Wool Act is proving to be a sound solution to the special problem of wool. As I mentioned, in the case of wool we are on a net import basis. The program is providing the needed price assistance to our domestic woolgrowers without: (a) Adversely affecting foreign trade; (b) adversely affecting the competitive position of wool with imported wool and other fibers and (c) having the Government in the wool-merchandising business.

The program is restoring initiative and confidence in the industry. The tariff, designed to protect the industry, is also providing the financial assistance needed to meet increasing costs and competition from foreign imports. Reports coming to us indicate increased interest is being shown in sheep production as forage and range conditions permit. Due to the longtime nature of the enterprise, it is obvious that a continuing program is essential to retain the gains already made and give growers the confidence needed for them to proceed with their plans for increasing wool production. Early extension of the act is, therefore, recommended.

Educational Problems Facing the Nation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD L. NEUBERGER

OF OREGON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, February 20, 1958

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, two articles from the Pendleton (Oreg.) East Oregonian of February 11, 1958, offer informed opinion on education. The editor, J. W. Forrester, Jr., a member of the Oregon State Board of Higher Education, recommends for further consideration, by people seriously interested in the future of education, the 5-point program of the American Council on Education. Oregon Newspaperman Paul Harvey, of the Associated Press, whose byline from the State capital, Salem, appears in several Oregon dailies, has reported the experience-based opinions expressed by the Oregon State superintendent of schools, Dr. Rex Putnam.

Because these articles reveal the thinking and observations of two important voices in this field, I ask unanimous consent to have them printed in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. The editorial bears the title, "This Is the Big Problem," and Mr. Harvey's column the title "Dr. Putnam Thinks Much of Criticism Unjustified."

There being no objection, the editorial and article were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THIS IS THE BIG PROBLEM

Almost everybody thinks he sees something wrong with the educational system in this country and he has a remedy for it. That's good. It's good to take a look frequently at everything we are doing. It's good to ask ourselves why we do certain things and why we don't do others. If the questions are answered honestly the asker is sure to be benefited.

We are not acquainted with anybody in education who would be willing to say that everything that is being done from kindergarten through college is right; that certain things that are being done could not be discarded and that there is not a need to do more. We haven't come upon any educator who is carrying a chip on his shoulder in the face of all the criticism the public schools have been subjected to since the launching of Russia's sputnik.

But there is a growing number of educators who think it is time, now that most of the criticism has been thoroughly aired and recorded, to separate the wheat from the chaff. They think it is time to decide exactly what should be done. And they suggest that there are some organizations well qualified to make the final decisions.

One of these is the American Council on Education. We are sure that anyone who knows the makeup and work of the council will agree that it is eminently qualified to make decisions.

The council has in recent days published a paper on Higher Education and National Affairs. It has approval of many organizations that have been studying the problems discussed by the council.

The council prefaces its proposed program of Federal action to strengthen higher education in the service of the Nation with this observation: "Unwise imitation of Russian education could be as disastrous for the

United States as imitation of our eduactional system would certainly be for the ruling clique in the Kremlin. The fundamental problem facing the American people is how to improve and strengthen our educational structure, not to remake it in blind admiration for the Russian model."

The council presents a five-point program: (1) The Federal Government can and should assist in increasing the supply of qualified college teachers; (2) the Federal Government can and should provide financial assistance to approve institutions of higher learning for the expansion of facilities; (3) the Federal Government can and should assist in removing financial barriers to higher education for qualified students; (4) the Federal Government can and should modify existing Federal programs affecting higher education in order that they may no longer constitute financial drains on the resources of colleges and universities; (5) a permanent council of educational advisors to the President of the United States should be established.

This writer's somewhat limited study of the problems of higher education has convinced him that the problem which demands solution before all others is teacher supply—where and how to get enough qualified teachers to properly educate all those who will have the abilities and desire to attend institutions of higher education.

We have no fears that the necessary money will be found to build college classrooms and dormitories. But we are constantly troubled by the thought that enough qualified teachers will not be found to do the high-level job that absolutely must be done in our institutions of higher education.

In view of this, we think it well to look at what the American Council on Education has to say on that subject:

"A recent survey by the National Education Association indicates that shortages of qualified college teachers now exist in nearly all areas, and it is evident that as enrollment rises, such shortages will be more acute unless remedial action is taken. This problem is the key log in the jam. It is obviously unwise to urge more students to demand advanced instruction in mathematics, science, engineering, or any other subject, if there will be no qualified persons to teach them. The central need is to increase, immediately and dramatically, the output of the graduate schools offering doctor of philosophy degrees, and to develop, during the graduate program, the interest of the students in continuing academic careers after receiving their degrees.

"Secretary Folsom, among others, has suggested that unused capacity for this purpose exists. He has stated that 'there are in the United States today some 162 institutions which award the doctorate degree. But a mere 10 of them award 36 percent of the Nation's doctorates. About 110 of these institutions award less than 20 percent of such degrees annually.' Valuable as they are, present national fellowship programs, both governmental and nongovernmental, by awarding fellowships to individual students and permitting freedom of choice as to the graduate schools attended, encourage even greater concentration of enrollment in a few schools.

"A. It is therefore recommended that the Federal Government establish a system of grants to graduate schools offering the doctor of philosophy degree for the purpose of increasing their output by.

"1. Offering fellowships to students now in residence to relieve them of outside nonacademic employment, which it is known many of them are forced to undertake, and thus help them to complete degree requirements in less time, or allow them to participate in teaching assignments without excessive financial hardship, and

"2. Offering fellowships to prospective graduate students in academic areas where the instructional capacity of the institution is not being used to the fullest possible extent. These fellowships should be graduated in amount to take account of the financial needs of these students.

"It is proposed that the dean of each graduate school initiate for each subsequent fiscal year and that the president submit, on behalf of his institution, a proposed plan for the above purposes, indicating the total sum that could be effectively used and the academic areas in which the graduate students receiving benefits would study.

"Since the purpose of this plan would be to establish and maintain a reasonable balance of qualified faculty members in all disciplines, the Federal agency charged with the administration of the program would have the responsibility for adapting the program from time to time to demonstrated differences in the degrees of shortage in various areas. For example, the survey by the National Education Association previously cited, which enumerated teaching positions in colleges and universities for which funds had been budgeted but for which no satisfactory applicants had been found in 1955–56 and 1956–57, indicated that at the moment there are 3 times as many vacancies in engineering as in education, 5 times as many in the physical sciences as in English, and nearly twice as many in mathematics as in the social sciences. These ratos will presumably change from year to year and will suggest desirable modifications in the future allocation of funds and the manner of their employment."

Dr. Putnam Thinks Much of Criticism Unjustified

(By Paul Harvey)

SALEM.—Dr. Rex Putnam, Oregon's superintendent of public instruction for the past 20 years, isn't bothered by the current wave of criticism of the public schools.

He has just completed a research project which, he says, proves that ever since 1845, there have been waves of criticism of how the schools are run. These waves occur about once each generation.

And, he adds, the same things are being said now that were said 100 years ago.

He cites some needs

Dr. Putnam feels that definite improvements can be made. He specifically cites a need for better cooperation between the parents and teachers, and better guidance for high-school pupils.

Hundreds of teachers have been working for 2 years on a project whereby everything that is being taught in the schools is being reevaluated. This project will be completed in about a year.

But, Dr. Putnam says, some people in every adult generation believe their children are receiving an education which is inferior to that given to the adults. Dr. Putnam disagrees sharply.

Most schools offer them

Since the start of the sputnik era, the schools have been blamed for America's apparent failure to keep up with the Russians.

While most high schools offer science and mathematics courses, the problem is getting the pupils to take them.

Dr. Putnam says high schools have pretty good guidance programs under which teachers try to influence the brighter pupils to take these courses. But, he adds, such guidance is almost worthless unless the parents support the teachers.

Dr. Putnam's department does not have much real authority over the schools. The real bosses are the school boards of each district. His department can guide and suggest, but that's all. And he doesn't favor having more authority for his department.

"We must keep local autonomy," he says "in order to maintain the sanctity of the individual. If we lose it, we'll be like Russia, and will be sunk.

"We get many letters from people asking us to come in and straighten out their school districts. We can't do that, and even the governor or the President of the United States couldn't. And it's a good thing.

"Some people say our schools aren't as good as those in Europe. If that's true why is there a constant stream of European educators, as well as from other continents, coming here to study Oregon's school system? Right now, eight of them are here."

They could be improved

Without reflecting upon those teachers who have emergency certificates because they don't have the educational requirements, Dr. Putnam thinks teachers could be improved.

"We can get better teachers if we pay them better," he says.

"They should be paid enough so the promising college graduates will choose teaching as a career.

"Teachers don't have enough prestige. The public attitude toward them often is not good. Yet the job they do is extremely important."

It should be expanded

He admires the school principals and administrators, saying "I'll match them against executives in any field as to downright ability and efficiency."

He thinks the program to speed up the education of gifted children should be expanded greatly. It's just getting started.

"Education," he says, "is a cooperative situation between the parents and teachers. If the parents aren't much interested in what their child takes or does in school, chances are that the child won't care, either. Almost all teachers encourage parents to visit school. But not many parents do."

Lowering Retirement Age Will Solve Unemployment Crisis

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL A. FINO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 20, 1958

Mr. FINO. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a bill which, in my opinion, will solve the serious and dangerous unemployment crisis that has hit this country.

This tragic unemployment problem which continues to worsen each week should and must be tackled now before it develops into a depression from which we will be unable to recover without having caused incalculable human suffering and a severe blow to our American economy and standard of living.

Mr. Speaker, my bill would amend the Social Security Act by authorizing the President to lower the retirement age for men and women to 60 during periods of acute unemployment. As you know, under the present law the retirement age is 65 for men and 62 for women.

With 4½ million unemployed and with all signs pointing to an even higher figure, the President and the Congress have the unshirking responsibility of taking immediate and affirmative action toward not only preventing any further increase

in unemployment but restoring full employment.

A recent survey of Government figures shows that the largest group of unemployed men and women are those between the ages of 25 and 45 and the number of men and women in the 60–65 age bracket covered by social security is over 4 million persons.

The purpose of my bill is to alleviate conditions during periods of acute unemployment by offering an incentive to older workers to retire in order to make room for younger people in the employment market.

This proposal would not lower the retirement age automatically or permanently but would give the President discretion, within certain limits, to determine under what circumstances he would invoke the provisions of this legislation. The limits set by the bill are that the President must first determine that a condition of acute unemployment exists generally throughout the United States which there is little likelihood of abating within a foreseeable period of time. The reduction in the retirement age would last only as long as the President determines that such unemployment exists.

I believe that my proposal would be beneficial during the present economic crisis in two ways. In addition to opening up job opportunities for about 4 million younger unemployed workers, it would provide earlier retirement for elderly people who want to quit work but cannot because of the present age restrictions.

We must recognize the enormity of this problem now if we are to keep our American economy strong and healthy.

Case Institute of Technology

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM E. MINSHALL
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 20, 1958

Mr. MINSHALL. Mr. Speaker, at this moment, when America is concerned as never before with the quality of its engineering and scientific education, I would like to pay tribute to a Cleveland institution that has been a dynamic force in engineering education for more than three-quarters of a century. Case Institute of Technology, a privately supported school of engineering, science, and management, has recently more than redoubled its efforts to provide the trained leadership this Nation demands. The dramatic story of the progress of Case is told by T. Keith Glennan, in a recently issued report summarizing his 10 years as fourth president of Case Institute of Technology. This report gives definite proof that his institution has had the foresight to recognize our need for quality in preparing for the challenge of the future. Under Dr. Glennan, Case Institute has made progress at a rate unparalleled in the history of American technical education. It has become, in the past decade, one of the outstanding engineering schools in the entire Nation, pioneering in such fields as operations research, management development, nuclear physics, and aerodynamics.

Fortunately, the contributions of Case and Dr. Glennan are not only recognized in Cleveland, but in an increasing broad area across the Nation. An editorial in the Cleveland Press, headed "Ten Exciting, Useful Years," said:

By any yardstick, the growth of Case Institute of Technology in the past 10 years has been spectacular. The physical plant has doubled. The faculty has expanded from 132 to 189 and, by the academic measure of degrees and other honors, has also increased immeasurably in distinction. The financial resources of the school have been tremendously strengthened and faculty salaries have been raised by half. Case has, as well, substantially increased its student body, thus responding ably to the immense pressure for more and better engineers. This report is brimming with detail, but it is notably silent on what is unquestionably the main reason for the progress it describes. That reason is Glennan himself. He has projected Case into the front rank of engineering schools, and the exciting forward thrust which has carried it upward shows no signs of faltering.

The Cleveland Plain Dealer had this to say, editorially:

Case Institute of Technology has been taking giant strides, and President T. Keith Glennan provides informative and impressive reading in his current report in which he summarizes his 10 years at the helm. For the future of Case, President Glennan notes the need for other buildings (a $6.5 million campaign is in progress) and still more buildings after 1960, as its part in the extensive University City—the circle master plan announced 3 months ago.

In all of this progress—future as well as past—money must be mixed with brains. That Case has a tremendous array of intellectual leaders from Dr. Glennan on, is amply proved day after day in classrooms and labs. That it must be generously supported with gifts from business and individuals must be remembered and repeated. The reason our material progress is at the level we enjoy, and the reason we can hope to see that level elevated is that Case and schools like it have functioned as free institutions guided by dedicated men.

Another excellent summary appeared in the editorial columns of the Cleveland News. It said, in part:

The fine vision and progress of Case Institute of Technology over the last 10 years has been, in a sense, anticipatory: the school is now geared to meet the great industrial and scientific challenge which confronts the Nation. Case Tech has enlarged its stature and influence tremendously. Behind this promotional enterprise and revision of curriculums are the drive, foresight, and personality of Case's fourth president, Dr. T. Keith Glennan, its astute board of trustees, and a vitalized alumni.

Cleveland is proud of Case and its scholarship and the guiding genius of Dr. Glennan. Its direction is clearly toward an even larger future.

These quotations are an indication that the American people are not only aware of the continuing and increasing importance of education, but that in institutions like Case and its president, we have had the educational leaders who early set themselves to work to assume their responsibilities to this Nation.

Equalizing Federal Benefits for World War I Veterans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL A. FINO
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 20, 1958

Mr. FINO. Mr. Speaker, I would like to invite the attention of the House to H. R. 5011, a bill I introduced on February 19, 1957. This bill proposes to grant a pension of $100 per month to all honorally discharged veterans of World War I who have attained the age of 60 years.

The veterans of World War I have come to be known as the forgotten men among those categories of veterans for whom the Federal Government provides benefits. The fact that these men have been forgotten becomes clearly evident when the benefits to which they are entitled are compared to the benefits made available for Spanish-American War, World War II, and Korean conflict veterans.

Let us glance, for a moment, at some of the differences which Congress has established. The veterans of Chateau Thierry, Belleau Wood, and their comrades have been given adequate reason to conclude that their country has passed them by.

Spanish-American War veterans are not only eligible for more liberal provisions, but the requirements for qualifying for these benefits are considerably less exacting. Any survivor of the Spanish War who has reached 62 years of age, or who is 10 percent or more permanently disabled through non-service-connected causes, is entitled to $101.50 per month provided he served 90 days and received a discharge other than dishonorable. The age requirement is obviously meaningless since the war was concluded 57 years ago. The payment under similar conditions for men with a minimum service of 70 days is $67.73 per month. Should the condition of the veteran require the regular aid and attendance of another person, the payment in the case of the 90-day-or-more veteran is $135.35 per month, while for the 70-day service it is $88.04.

World War I veterans presently receive no pension on the basis of their age, nor as a result of partial disability for non-service-incurred causes. Disability must be permanent and complete before any eligibility for pension is legally established.

The veterans of World War II and the Korean conflict also fared much better than World War I personnel. World War I servicemen had nothing to compare with the GI bill of rights—the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944—with its broad and valuable provisions covering both World War II and Korean veterans. Only after World War II were such impressive provisions established by Congress as the special allowances for vocational rehabilitation and education at all levels, credit for wartime military service under social security, guaranties

for GI loans for homes, farms, and businesses, preferences in the purchase or rental of houses, and the availability of readjustment allowances for those unemployed.

The discrepancy with respect to the World War I veteran appears all the more ironical when we consider several other major challenges which these men were called upon to meet. Survivors of the First World War were the only veterans who were required successively to endure a violent war which caused them to be exposed to the ravages of poison gas, and which forced them to fight in the mud and filth of trench warfare. Both of these unusual and drastic wartime conditions served to undermine the health of thousands upon thousands of unfortunate soldiers.

Shortly after these men resumed civilian pursutis, they were again forced to surmount a tremendous hurdle—the greatest upheaval our national economy has ever experienced. The great depression which began with the severe stock market crash of 1929 served immeasurably in helping to cast so many World War I veterans into the lot of the "lost generation."

Let us not overlook the fact that the veterans of World War I are rapidly becoming old men. It has been reported that they are dying at the rate of 90,000 per year. The survivors are finding it increasingly difficult and almost impossible to compete in the exacting labor market. Under present legislation, moreover, relatively few numbers are able to obtain pensions or compensation. We cannot long continue to ignore the desperate plight of these deserving veterans. We must soon make the crucial and inevitable decision through the adoption of favorable legislation. I urge you to take the decisive step today.

Second-Class Postal Subsidies Must Be Limited

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE M. RHODES
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 20, 1958

Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, the Senate Post Office and Civil Service Committee is currently holding hearings on postal-rate legislation passed by the House last year. This bill contains my amendment, adopted by the House, to limit annual second-class postal subsidies to $100,000 per individual publisher.

As I pointed out during the debate on the postal-rate bill last year, 10 leading magazines in the United States received subsidies amounting to more than $32 million. At the same time, these 10 magazines were receiving advertising revenues amounting to almost $400 million for the year, while profits in the publishing industry reached unprecedented high levels.

The big magazine publishers, as might be expected, are making strenuous efforts to kill the subsidy-limitation amendment. In the course of their campaign they are resorting to misleading, if not deliberately inaccurate, statements. The leading front in this fight is the Magazine Publishers' Association, the trade group for some 100 members who publish 375 magazines of all types, having a combined per issue circulation of 165 million copies.

Yesterday the MPA sent to Members of Congress a booklet entitled "Postal Primer," a statement of the magazine industry's position on postal policy and rates. Of course, Mr. Speaker, they have every right to petition Congress in behalf of the self-interest of their members. However, we must recognize the tremendous financial stake this organization has in the postal rate bill, and more particularly in the Rhodes amendment. We must therefore be careful in taking at face value the statements they make.

For example, page 1 of the MPA booklet attempts to show the dire financial consequences to a number of publishers if second-class postage rates were increased. In a footnote the following statement is made:

> In 1965, 35 publishers of 124 magazines reporting to MPA averaged 2.7 percent profit after taxes. Dollar profits were $21,218,000; second-class postage expenditures were $31,353,000.

These figures, Mr. Speaker, are grossly misleading. They represent only about one-third of the members of the MPA and it is obvious that the largest publishers have been excluded, since the 1956 net profits after taxes of only 4 leading publishers amounted to $32 million.

Why should the American taxpayers continue to subsidize the magazine publishers who are engaged in a profitmaking enterprise, and who can well afford to pay their fair share of the costs of handling and delivering their magazines through the mails?

Second-class postal subsidies have cost the taxpayers over $2.5 billion during the past 11 years. What could have been done with this amount of money to benefit all the people of our Nation? We could have provided a twelve-fold increase in our current research programs for cancer, heart disease, mental illness, and other crippling and killing diseases. Or we could have provided enough school classrooms to meet the critical shortages throughout the Nation. Or we could have increased the Hill-Burton hospital construction program by two and a half times and provided several hundred thousand additional beds in our VA hospitals.

Mr. Speaker, last week Mr. Robert MacNeal, president of the Curtis Publishing Co., testified before the Senate committee that my amendment to the postal rate bill would cost his company $22 million a year more postage to mail the 320 million copies of their 2 major publications, Saturday Evening Post and Ladies' Home Journal.

In a statement to the House committee last year he said that the proposed 4 annual 15-percent rate increases would add $11 million to his company's postage bill. Thus by his own statement, Mr. MacNeal admits that the Curtis Publishing Co. is receiving a staggering annual subsidy of more than $11 million on just 2 magazines.

The most recent Post Office Department estimate shows that their annual losses in handling these 2 magazines was $6,087,000 for Saturday Evening Post and $1,917,000 for Ladies' Home Journal, or a total of $8,004,000. It is therefore clear that the oft-criticized cost analysis methods of the Department in figuring second-class mail subsidies are actually on the conservative side. Curtis is actually receiving more than $11 million a year subsidy on these 2 magazines, instead of the $8 million previously estimated by the Post Office Department. Advertising revenues on these 2 magazines last year amounted to more than $117 million.

Mr. Speaker, the principle of limiting second-class postal subsidies is of great importance to all citizens. Throughout our history, subsidies have been curtailed or eliminated entirely when they were no longer required. Many airlines are now off subsidy payments. Last year Congress enacted a law reducing subsidies to industries through the 5-year tax write-off device. A limitation was placed on acreage reserve and conservation reserve payments to farmers participating in the soil-bank program. The magazine publishing industry is no marginal, shoestring operation. It is a growing, prosperous, profitmaking business which does not need, nor deserve special postal subsidies at the expense of the American taxpayers.

Contrary to statements made by those seeking to retain this gigantic handout to magazine publishers, my subsidy-limiting amendment is considered administratively workable and enforceable by the Post Office Department. This assurance was given to me personally by the Postmaster General and was repeated to a nationwide television audience over Ed Murrow's See It Now report on the Post Office Department last October.

Mr. Speaker, I am hopeful that the Congress will resist the tremendous pressures being exerted by the magazine publisher's lobby and vote to retain the principle of limiting second-class postal subsidies in any postal rate legislation acted upon this year.

Wall Street Jitters

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 20, 1958

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I commend to the attention of our colleagues the following article from the New Republic of December 23, 1957. The article points out the instability of our financial markets and suggests possible remedial action:

WALL STREET JITTERS

"It was an Eisenhower market again this week," the AP Financial Roundup on Sunday, December 1, began. "The President's health was by far the dominating factor in Wall Street. On Tuesday came the news of Eisenhower's illness and it was one of the year's sharpest breaks. Overnight news of the President's progress was enough to send stocks bouncing back vigorously in a surprising recovery." Why should our financial markets, at this stage of their maturity, be subject to such whimsies? In part, it is because our stock-exchange system is archaic.

United States stock exchanges are auction markets, and therefore free markets in the true sense of the term. Each stock issue is allotted a special locale on the exchange floor where the agents for buyers and sellers are required to go to make their transactions. For each major stock there are 1 to 3 licensed dealers or specialists who, in consideration for their licenses, are supposed to minimize fluctuation of prices of stocks in which they deal.

Why, then, when ileitis or coronary occlusions occur, do not the specialists prevent wild gyrations in the market? Largely because they are not adequately capitalized, experts say. When small stockholders, frightened in times of crisis, rush into the market to sell, the specialists should be able to absorb most of the offerings until the large buyers have time to come in with their orders. Exchange members say frankly that today most specialists do not have the money to do this.

The result is that small investors get hurt in the squeeze and the public loses confidence in stocks as a long-term stable investment.

The Securities and Exchange Commission could do something about this. The simplest and most effective move would be to raise the capital requirement for licensed specialists. The exchange objected when this was first proposed in the early thirties. (The specialists constitute a majority on the board of the exchange; they want the privileges of their position without the obligation to keep order.) The SEC might also require the exchanges to supervise the movement of stocks more closely and intervene to defer quotations temporarily when crises occur.

Certainly some new shock absorbers are needed.

Why 5 Years?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HALE BOGGS
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 20, 1958

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following three articles:

[From the Washington Post of February 1, 1958]

WHY 5 YEARS?

The Trade Agreements Act should of course be permanent law. The President's request for a 5-year extension of the act beyond its present expiration date on June 30 would nonetheless give the reciprocal trade agreements program the longest fixed lease on life that it has ever enjoyed. The protectionist bloc seems to recognize that it cannot kill the act, but by requiring renewal every year or two, this bloc has been able to inhibit the full operation of the law and to abet the frequent torpedoing of its objectives in unwarranted escape clause proceedings. If a longer extension would tend to relieve the administration of the law from some of these pressures, it would be a tremendous gain.

But, as the President observed, one truly pressing reason for a longer extension of the act than has been customary is a thoroughly pragmatic one, which even the opponents of freer trade (if they will concede that it is not feasible to return to congressional tariff-writing) ought to understand. Apart from the no less valid arguments in trade relations with other countries, the compelling fact is that in the next several years, the European common market will begin functioning. With its projected common tariff against the rest of the world, the market will be a powerful force in world trade. Unless the United States has a solid and assured basis for negotiating reciprocal arrangements with the European bloc, this Nation's export-import situation could be seriously disadvantaged and with it the entire domestic economy. The longer extension is thus a matter of prime national importance which Congress must somehow be brought to understand.

[From the Wall Street Journal of December 17, 1957]

THE WEAPON OF TRADE

Trade not aid never got far beyond the slogan stage. It is time for the United States to put some real meaning into both sides of the idea.

Part of the growing Soviet challenge is subversion of economically backward countries. We have seen it in Egypt and Syria in the Middle East; we are seeing it, on a somewhat different pattern, in Indonesia in the Far East. It could happen in Burma, India, and elsewhere, and the point does not need laboring that the loss of the Middle and Far East to communism would be serious for the West.

The response of the United States to this challenge consists of military aid in some cases, propaganda and economic aid generally. The military aid is largely irrelevant to the problem of subversion, the propaganda is largely ineffective, and the economic aid is largely useless.

Economic aid, which is the principal weapon against subversion, not only does not prevent nations from falling into economic chaos, it also helps turn them Socialist, which helps prepare them for communism.

If, however, the United States were to practice the free trade it preaches, a quite different set of circumstances would ensue. It would give a lot of these nations what they really need to help them industrialize—and that is markets not handouts. Instead of charity it would give them firm and respectable economic ties to the United States. Since world trade is still largely a private undertaking, it would kindle their capitalism instead of socialism.

Naturally the protectionists have some things to say about any such proposal, not to mention some influence in Washington. Basically they say that free trade would wreck some domestic industries and dislocate the economy generally. Perhaps it would But there is one key point that should be noted about protectionism.

Tariffs, quotas, and other trade-restricting devices are inverted subsidies paid by the American consumer in higher prices. They do not serve the economy as a whole but only particular industries in it. In the long run it is a question whether they serve even those industries.

For protectionism protects, among other things, those who can't compete. Just as farm subsidies keep the inefficient farmer on the farm he would long since have left for other employment in the absence of the subsidies, so protectionist regulations keep the inefficient business in a business it would otherwise long since have got out of. Thus protectionism is stultifying for the economy as a whole.

Still, as a practical political matter it would be impossible to tear down the walls of protectionism overnight, and the administration wisely does not suggest anything so extreme. The question, though, is whether the administration goes far enough.

It wants authority to cut tariffs by 25 percent over the next 5 years, with a maximum reduction of 10 percent in any 1 year. This seems reasonable, but is it enough to forge economic bonds with the nations the West is in danger of losing? Moreover, the program is silent on import quotas, which are often more effective barriers to trade than tariffs.

We do not contend that a genuinely liberal United States trade policy would save any other nation from communism, though it would obviously help. But we do say there can be no logical quarrel with the following propositions:

Even if there were no threat of Communist subversion, a liberal trade policy is the only kind of policy the United States should have because it benefits the consumers, spurs long-term economic growth and conforms to the spirit of a free economy.

Since, in adidtion, the Communist threat exists in newly aggravated forms, a liberal trade policy is a weapon we had better start testing before much more time, and many more countries, are lost.

And unless we test it, our talk of saving the Middle and Far East with Government economic aid and Government propaganda will be talking through our hats.

[From the Oregonian of January 1, 1958]

HOLE IN TRADE POLICY

Advocates of a liberal foreign trade policy, an important element in America's approach to its allies, are expressing concern over escape-clause provisions in the administration's reciprocal trade program announced in mid-December.

In a joint statement issued by the Departments of State and Commerce, it was revealed that the Executive will seek from Congress a 5-year extension of presidential authority to adjust tariff rates on a reciprocal basis. So far so good. But the announcement also disclosed a significant relaxation in the official attitude on the escape clause, which permits the Tariff Commission to recommend and the President to approve increases in particular tariffs as a safeguard to certain domestic industries.

The present reciprocal trade law permits such increases to a maximum of 50 percent above the rates of July 1, 1945. The new proposal would change the base date to July 1, 1934, when tariff rates were generally much higher.

"European dissatisfaction with American trade policies," writes Brendan M. Jones in the New York Times, "has been concerned mainly with uncertainties arising from escape-clause actions. The basis for invoking the clause to oppose imports has been steadily broadened under protectionist pressure. This has made for marked instability in a field where long-term development is essential." He points out that the common-market grouping of six western European nations, which becomes effective January 1, will make more necessary than ever a freer, rather than a more protective, trade policy. Free trade supporters, he adds, may actually oppose the administration's free trade program because of the escape-clause change.

President Eisenhower has rejected the bulk of escape-clause petitions under the current law, but he has approved increases in tariffs on such important imports as watches and bicycles.

There are no longer clear-cut party lines on the tariff issue. Congressional Democrats have grown more protectionist minded as

the South has grown in industrial activity. And many Republicans in the North have been influenced by the dependence on world markets by such vast enterprises as the automobile and appliance manufacturers. In the last Senate struggle on the reciprocal trade program, in 1955, Oregon's Democratic Senator RICHARD L. NEUBERGER went down the line for the Eisenhower program, whereas his colleague, Senator WAYNE L. MORSE, opposed it at some points, although he voted for the final bill. All Pacific coast Senators, Democrats and Republicans, joined in the favorable action on the 3-year act.

The division is by economic rather than partisan interest. Oregon berry and nut growers have determinedly opposed trade concessions, which have weakened their domestic markets. But Oregon's wheatgrowers depend, in good measure, on foreign trade. Should the former gain their ends, the latter would certainly suffer.

An escape clause is an essential part of the reciprocal trade program, as a safeguard against real hardship. But it could be the destruction of the program itself if overdone. Reciprocity is by definition a process of give and take. Those who fancy they are required to give too much must come to understand that reciprocal trade negotiations are an essential economic tool serving the overall interest of the United States and its allies—an overriding interest even for those whose industries give in the form of tariff concessions.

Kansas Wheat

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. FLOYD BREEDING
OF KANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 20, 1958

Mr. BREEDING. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I should like to call attention to an exceptionally interesting and comprehensive article which appeared in the Hutchinson (Kans.) News of February 11, 1958. The item not only answers the question "Is Kansas losing out to the rest of the Nation in wheat production?" it also presents a clear-cut picture of the operation of the country's wheat production program.

The article follows:

KANSAS HAS BEEN HOLDING ITS OWN IN WHEAT ACREAGE

(By Don Kendall)

Is Kansas losing out to the rest of the Nation in wheat production?

There are arguments on both sides. Certain States in recent years have grown wheat where previously none was raised.

Counties in parts of Kansas have lost acreage and others have gained.

The 15-acre wheat farmer of the East has been a thorn in the sides of Wheat Belt producers and Congressmen.

Let's take a look at the situation (a favorite remark of politicians as well as farm writers).

ALLOTMENT THE SAME

In 1939 the Department of Agriculture set the national wheat allotment at 55 million acres—just what it is today.

Any decrease in a State's acreage results in increases for one or more others, and vice versa.

Since 1939, using the 1958 allotment figures, Kansas has decreased 3.9 percent. In 1939 the State was allowed 11,067,349 acres, compared to 10,638,208 acres this year.

Consider how the 1958 allotment was computed. First, the national allotment of 55 million acres was distributed among the States, and the State allotment to the counties.

Basis for this was the average wheat acreage in each State and county for the 10-year period 1947 through 1956.

ADJUSTMENTS MADE

Adjustments were made for abnormal weather, war crop credit, diversion of crops under previous allotment programs, and for trends in seedings in accordance with provisions of law.

Out of the Kansas allotment of 10,638,208 acres, the State keeps a reserve for farms missed in the allocations, corrections, and appeals of one-tenth of 1 percent or 10,639 acres.

The State agricultural stabilization and conservation office, which administers the program, also keeps in reserve the same amount for "new farms" which come in for allotments for the first time.

The remainder of the acreage was apportioned to each county on the previously described basis of wheat grown 1947 through 1956.

Two other steps come in at this phase. In addition to the 10-year acreage average, a period of wheat planting from 1952 through 1956 was also computed in each county.

These two periods of acreage were averaged. The result was the preliminary "county base average."

Total of the 1958 county base averages was 16,021,387 acres. A "scaling factor" was obtained by dividing the State allotment available for apportionment to counties by the total of the county base averages.

It takes some long, long division to do this or else a mighty fast slide rule. But the answer was 0.6626725.

What all this gobbledegook means is this: The average 1958 county wheat allotment was about 66.27 percent of the county base acreage.

In 77 counties for 1958 the allotments were slightly higher than in 1957. They were slightly lower in 27 and exactly the same in 1 county.

Similar procedures exist in other commercial wheat States. The Department of Agriculture says a "commercial" State is one having more than 25,000 acres of wheat—less than one-tenth of Ford County's allotment.

SMALLEST DECLINE

Let's look at some of the States which have decreased allotments since 1939. It should be noted that Kansas, with 3.9 percent, has experienced the smallest decline.

Maine has had the biggest cut percentagewise. But 1939 allotment was only 4,387 acres and declined 65.4 percent to 1,519 acres. Many a grower in western Kansas has a larger plot.

Of States having more than a million allotted acres, Minnesota has been reduced the most—48.6 percent—from 1,418,702 in 1939 to 729,866 acres now.

North Dakota, which outproduced Kansas in 1957, has been cut 11.9 percent in 21 years from 8,300,000 acres to 7,309,992.

Missouri dropped 25.3 percent from 1,705,277 acres in 1939 to 1,273,623 in 1958.

Two other comparatively big wheat States cut were South Dakota and Ohio, with 7.1 and 6.1 percent reductions, respectively.

In all, 24 States were reduced in allotments since 1939 and 24 gained.

Some of the gains, percentagewise, appear to be absurd. Mississippi, for example, has had a 21,867 percent increase.

In 1939, Mississippi had an allotment of 74 acres. For 1958, this Cotton Belt State has 16,256 acres—still not commercial.

Alabama went up 390 percent from 4,734 acres to 23,240 in 21 years. Five States had no wheat allotment in 1939.

They were Louisiana, now with 6,302 acres; Florida, 3,383; Massachusetts, 702; Connecticut, 587; and Rhode Island, 539.

OKLAHOMA GAINS

Oklahoma has undergone a 1,075,681-acre increase since 1939 for a plus 28.4 percent.

Colorado, also in the hard winter wheat business, has boomed allotment by 105.9 percent or a net increase from 1,314,022 acres in 1939 to 2,704,917 acres now.

What has happened in Colorado?

Remember how the Department of Agriculture figures, State and county base average, was computed?

After World War II, many thousands of acres of Colorado high plains farmland was broken out and sown to wheat.

There are other factors such as mentioned in the description of computing base averages, but it was this plow movement which mainly increased Colorado's wheat allotment.

Much the same thing happened in Wallace County and in Oklahoma. Here is a table showing changes in allotments of 10 western Kansas counties, principally in the northwest:

County	1939 (acres)	1942 (acres)	1955 (acres)	1958 (acres)	Percent of 1939
Cheyenne	96,846	115,125	116,907	120,227	124.1
Rawlins	166,403	161,923	127,653	128,274	77.1
Sheridan	157,248	153,061	127,032	122,604	78.0
Sherman	139,432	140,974	162,458	157,034	112.6
Thomas	240,685	224,785	191,263	196,486	81.6
Greeley	111,600	105,539	142,665	143,085	128.2
Lane	157,754	148,125	116,260	118,585	75.2
Logan	77,165	75,650	119,698	111,884	145.0
Ness	235,900	217,303	195,022	197,431	83.7
Wallace	34,553	33,739	89,916	84,227	243.8

The substantial decrease in allotments for Lane, Ness, and other counties on the eastern edge of the principal summer fallow area is due in part to the increased adoption of summer fallowing during this base period.

Much of the area didn't have extensive summer fallow practices prior to World War II. As it caught hold fewer acres of wheat were planted each year and the base average went down.

This doesn't mean that these counties produced less wheat, because in most cases summer fallow improved production and made up for less acreage.

How does western Kansas stack up with the rest of the State in percentage of allotments?

In the 31-county area including Clark County straight north, the region had 38.7 percent of State allotment in 1943; 40.1 percent in 1951; 39.8 in 1954; the same for 1955; 39.2 in 1956; 39.3 in 1957, and 39.2 percent in 1958.

Central Kansas from Clark County through Sumner and north, including Sedgwick, Harvey, Marion, etc., has averaged from 48.6 percent of the State allotment in 1943 to 49.1 percent in 1958.

LITTLE IN EAST

The much-lambasted area of eastern Kansas may not be so guilty of encroaching on wheat as many persons believe.

In 1943, the remainder of the State, including 39 eastern counties, had 12.7 percent of the allotment.

The lowest was 11.5 percent in years 1954 through 1956. For 1958, eastern Kansas has 11.7 percent of the total Kansas allotment of more than 10 million acres.

Nationally, the wheat picture is similar to a leaky jug setting in a washtub.

The jug still contains most of the water but some is dribbling out. Most anyone would admit that the jug is the more efficient drinking utensil.

But the tub will still contain what is dribbling out.

That is what has happened to wheat. States like Mississippi, Florida, and Massachusetts are the inefficient tub catching the lifeblood of the Great Plains.

An Editor Studies the Carl Rowan Series on Small Communities in Light of His Own Area's Problems

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. COYA KNUTSON
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 3, 1958

Mrs. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I ask permission to insert in the RECORD, together with chapters 9 and 10 of the Carl Rowan serial in the Minneapolis Morning Tribune, the implications of Mr. Rowan's conclusions on small communities for the Thief River Falls, Minn., area as discussed by the editor of the Thief River Falls Times:

[From the Thief River Falls Times of February 10, 1958]

GROW OR DIE

In an interesting series of articles on rural and small-town problems, Carl Rowan of the Minneapolis Tribune concludes that small towns "must grow or die." Not all will agree with this conclusion, and, of course, it is only partially true. The articles serve the good purpose, however, of calling attention to a trend that already has made much progress and which will continue to change the social and economic relations in the farming areas of the State.

In defying his small town Rowan used the population figure of 3,000, and it probably is true in general that communities of less than 3,000 population are confronted with more difficult problems than communities that are larger. But whether it is a city of three or five or fifteen thousand, his conclusion is equally applicable. In this sense ours are all small towns.

In considering the probability that we either must grow or die we must keep in mind that our growth or decline will always be in some measure influenced by the progress of the area we serve. Small towns may be highly competitive to each other, and all grow in an area that is productive and prosperous.

Here in the large agricultural area in which Thief River Falls has a trade interest, the city has an interest in common with many other small towns in the overall development. And at the present time there is a very urgent need for a better understanding among all of us of this fact.

Applying the Rowan conclusion to our agricultural community, we now are in a serious decline, and unles we reverse the trend we soon will be in a critical condition.

[From the Minneapolis Morning Tribune of February 12, 1958]

GROW OR DIE—THE ROLE OF LABOR UNIONS IN SMALL-TOWN MINNESOTA

(Ninth in a series)

(By Carl T. Rowan)

You are listening in, by tape recorder, as a few business leaders are discussing the plight of their small town's salaried employees.

"DOCTOR. What is the basic minimum a hired employee with an average family should get in this town in order to hold his own without going into debt?"

"GROCER. I'd say $90 or $95."

"DOCTOR. And no one is getting that?

"GROCER. No one I've heard about."

"YOUNG MAN (taking over father's business). Fellow working for us gets $75 and I don't think he's lacking anything. Just bought a new house, which may be why he owes you, doctor, and only pays you $5 every now and then. But his family's not lacking anything."

"GROCER. Maybe I misunderstood. You can exist on less than $90, but you can't live. He doesn't drive a new car—well, at $75 a week somebody in that family is lacking something."

"YOUNG MAN. But he bowls once a week, which is quite an expense."

There is general laughter as someone mumbles teasingly, "Well aren't you the whip cracker."

"RETIRED BUSINESSMAN. I live fairly conservatively but I don't get by on $100 a week."

"HATCHERY OWNER. And the way you live. If you don't get by on $100 a week, what about these guys working for $75?"

The scene shifts to a small home a few blocks away. The wife of a hired employee is speaking:

"What this town needs is a good labor organizer. The men could do it themselves if they'd get together. It's the laboring man's fault. They just won't get together. It has to be all of them, not just 1 or 2."

Leaving these two sessions (I heard similar ones in many towns) one might conclude quickly that small-town Minnesota is ripe for a campaign by labor unions.

It isn't necessarily so.

For one reason, even the most complaining employees murmur in resignation that "you can't get blood out of a turnip." Many concede that, as things stand, their employers cannot pay more.

Other employees say, as did one man, "When I can afford the gas, I drive by the boss' summer lake home, just to keep reminding myself he's no pauper."

Although my travels in these small towns overtaken by a changing social revolution convinced me that the economic squeeze is severe and the immediate outlook is not rosy, I also learned that—to paraphrase an old spiritual—everybody talking 'bout the poorhouse ain't going there.

One operator of a business which has been extremely profitable over the last decade told me, "Anybody wanting to shed any tears can weep for poor guys like me. My profits are down to where I'll be lucky to make 2 percent on my money this year.

"I could get more than that on it by putting it in a savings account."

A bit of checking revealed that this man pays himself and his wife sizable salaries before he figures the firm's percentage of profit.

Townspeople add that his initial investment was less than half what he pays his wife per year.

State records show he violated the State wage minimum and paid back wages to 2 employees in 1956.

Yet, no one can doubt that many small-town businesses are operating on the thinnest of margins and that any substantial jump in labor costs would mean bankruptcy.

There is spirited debate on the matter, though.

"What right has anybody got to say he is justified in taking another man's sweat, with little reward, because that's the only way he can keep his business going?" says one rural resident. "He ought to get out of business."

"But that would only mean the further collapse of this town," argues the marginal businessman. "There are five families eating off my little place. Maybe they're not eating the best, but they're eating. I say a marginal business is better than none."

Whether marginal or fantastically prosperous, businessmen in Minnesota's small towns all seem to fear nothing more than organized labor.

Their feelings were expressed pretty well by a store owner in one town whose employees recently voted against a union. The store owner admits he struggled desperately to keep the union out.

"I fought because I'm not set up to cope with a union dictating terms," he explained. "I don't think I'm anti-union, but I am afraid of them politically.

"Look at that Hoffa. A few years more and he'd have been running this country.

"Yet," he reflected, "I wouldn't be surprised to see every store in this town unionized in 5 years."

An automobile dealer agreed that the prospect was unpalatable. "You can live with these unions, but it's not comfortable," he said.

"They keep the small businessman dangling on a string," he continued. "A man works harder and runs his business a bit better so he can make a bit more and the union is waiting to take it away from him at the next bargaining table."

"Well, in this town we woke up to the fact we were inviting unions in with the wages we were paying," interrupted a clothing store owner. "So we got together. Now people have stopped trying to figure out how little they can pay for how much work. We want to pay as much as possible for as little labor as is reasonable."

"Many employees who complained loudest in these towns also hold misgivings about organized labor. They wish for a solution to the economic problems of their towns—but a solution short of unionization.)

Leonard George, a raspy-voiced organizer for Local 909, Teamsters Joint Council 34, says the change of heart among businessmen just isn't that great—either in the town just referred to, or anywhere in Pipestone, Luverne, Jackson, Tracy, or Worthington—the places we know about.

"Worthington is very anti-union because of the farmers," says George, whose office is there. "Why farmers are antiunion I haven't figured out, but we just can't seem to get our story across to them.

"We had a dreadful battle 2 years ago while organizing drivers of the Nobles County Co-op. The farmers fought us tooth and nail, but we won fair and square."

George figures the co-op drivers average $450 a year more income since they were unionized; co-op officials say it isn't so, that some drivers may even have less take-home pay.

George thinks it "abominable" that in a big places like Worthington restaurants can pay $12 to $20 a week to waitresses (those I talked to get more—$25 for a 54-hour week) and make 'em divide tips with the kitchen help.

"Men store clerks average $50 a week, the women average $27.50," he continued.

He says Worthington mechanics are greatly interested in a union but nobody's come in to organize 'em.

George says he has organized two business places in Tracy.

"Now the fear of the Lord is in those business people," he chuckled, "and they have boosted pay a nickel or dime an hour, hoping to keep the union out. Same thing in Pipestone."

He admits that teamster power in the area arises mainly from the fact that the relatively large Campbell Soups plant in Worthington is organized on an agency shop basis. The great majority of workers are union members, but even those who aren't must pay $4 a month dues.

"You have no idea what I go through in this town arguing with the chamber of commerce and these businessmen," he said.

I asked if his opposition wasn't a bit more widespread than that—if there weren't some workers who felt the teamsters were a bit tainted.

"Oh, we get razzed some on Hoffa's troubles," he said, "but they know that in these rural areas we're independent of Hoffa.

"They also know we're not trying to get a metropolitan wage—just a living wage."

"Honestly," I asked, "do you think many of them can pay more now?"

"Not at the present time, with this tight-money situation," George conceded, "but they could have given a living wage in the past. They didn't."

[From the Minneapolis Morning Tribune of February 13, 1958]

GROW OR DIE—BRAHAM: THE TOWN THAT REFUSED TO DIE

(Tenth in a series)

(By Carl T. Rowan)

BRAHAM, MINN.—This is one little town that refused to die.

By every ordinary economic measurement, Braham should be withering away.

The land is only so-so quality in terms of productivity per farm.

In recent years farmer after farmer has decided he no longer can make a living on the 40- 80- and 120-acre tracts so common in this area.

More recently, the dairy industry, which for years has been the backbone of the economy in this area, has been having its troubles.

Braham is not a county-seat town, nor is it on the main line of any railroad—two major advantages for any small town in the race for survival.

What should have been even more lethal is Braham's location—right in the center of a triangle formed by three thriving county-seat towns.

Cambridge, Mora and Pine City all are well within 20 miles of Braham, providing trade competition that always has been a major problem of this community of 800.

Still, Braham grows. The town's businessmen report that for the last several years each year has brought higher volumes of business at better profits than the preceding year.

The community has a prosperous hospital at a time when towns twice as large haven't even a clinic and are convinced that they cannot support one.

Braham has 2 doctors and a dentist, yet many larger communities are struggling vainly to get or keep 1 doctor.

There is considerable evidence that Braham retains a much larger percentage of its high-school graduates than do similar towns that I visited.

Braham is the home of the State's largest (and the Nation's 12th largest) REA co-op.

Braham, the "doomed" little farm town of yesteryear, today can count on an annual industrial payroll of almost a million dollars—dollars to provide stability against agriculture's fickle trends.

"Braham is growing because of a tremendous bootstrap-lifting job," says James W. Clark, State commissioner of business development.

"The people there recognized very early that the only means by which a small town can preserve itself is to provide employment for a substantial number of people who would not get jobs in a strictly agricultural economy," he adds.

Clark calls Braham a wonderful example of what small towns can do if the people in those towns really want to see their communities grow.

"You look at those businesses in Braham and you know that ordinarily nobody would name Braham as the place to locate them," Clark says.

Why, then, did Braham get these businesses?

Clark points to a jolly, joke-telling Norwegian named Oscar Olson, the town's banker, as the man whose leadership proved that our small towns need not become meek victims of an agricultural revolution.

"What this State needs is more bankers like Oscar Olson," Clark asserts.

In a nearby town, a businessman speculated that "Braham is lucky as the devil, primarily because it doesn't have a bunch of retired farmers living there like some towns do."

The businessman added, "Nothing saps the spirit of a small town or robs it of aggressiveness like having a block of conservative, money-scared people who are opposed to change or anything else that might cost a tax dollar."

Businessmen at Braham concede that a large group of retired people, worried about how they will live on a fixed income, can be a handicap to a small town, but they insist Braham's strength is positive, that basically it is the degree to which Braham businessmen cooperate.

"Nothing can kill a small town faster than a feud," says George Olson, the banker's son. "We have managed to avoid having those bitter little cliques grow up here."

I saw the significance of this point in many towns. In some cases, communities actually have lost businesses because warring cliques could agree on nothing.

The extent of cooperation in Braham is indicated by what seems a very simple agreement—that it was foolish for virtually every business in town to have its own batch of calendars printed.

Now, rather than deluge community residents with dozens of different calendars, the town's businessmen got together and had one calendar made on which the names of all the town's businesses appear.

Braham is winning its uphill fight against the revolution in rural life because Braham residents saw the writing on the wall early—in 1936, when highway 65 was rerouted around the town.

This alone could have been a fatal blow.

Oscar Olson was convinced Braham ought not do what a large number of Minnesota towns are doing today: pretend nothing is very wrong, that time will solve all these economic problems, that "we'll just wait till the first tinge of a depression hits and the people will come running back to the small town because they know they can eat here," or, as one businessman's wife put it, "I don't worry because I know a war or something always comes along."

Braham businessmen refused to trust their future to fate, so they created an organization called Braham Builders, Inc., to help finance and create projects that would provide more employment and make our town a better place in which to live.

They started with the assumption that without people the town would have nothing. So they built a theater in the hope that it would bring nearby farm families to Braham and keep Braham's teenagers out of the surrounding county seat towns.

In 1939, when a co-op group called the East Central Electric Association was looking for a home, Braham Builders constructed a building. This association has become the Nation's 12th largest.

Out of this East Central venture the rural powerplant at Elk River was organized, with Oscar Olson's bank making the first loan of $20,000.

This plant now supplies power for several cooperatives and is scheduled to become the Nation's first experimental Federal atomic powerplant.

Next, the businessmen got farmers to cooperate in building a small locker and meat-packing plant.

Braham businessmen smile these days when members of almost 900 farm families who rent these food lockers make their weekly visits to town. The businessmen know that a man coming to town to visit his locker probably will fill his car with gasoline, buy groceries, and even a new dress for the wife.

In 1946 the businessmen and farmers took over the Braham community hospital. They have operated it so efficiently that in 1955 a $90,000 addition was paid for from net profits and a grant of $10,300 from the Ford Foundation.

The hospital alone provides employment for 31 people.

Olson is praised as a banker because he believes that "banks should lend money, not be check-cashing institutions"—this reference to the fact that some banks in this State make a great share of their profits by taking the commission on checks cashed.

People in the area say that if a business deal appears to be a good one, Oscar Olson's bank will lend the money—and that nobody asks whether the man seeking the loan is "on Olson's blacklist" or is his close friend.

"Oscar believes a banker hurts a town when he starts letting his little idiosyncracies dominate his lending policy," one businessman in the area said.

Perhaps it was this attitude that led Olson to make a move which turned out to be a really big one for Braham.

After hearing the story of a man who during the depression had lost his farm and virtually lost his little Isanti County firm where he manufactured horse-drawn potato diggers, Olson nursed the man along with financing and helped him redeem his farm.

The man moved to Grandy, Minn., and continued manufacturing potato diggers and chains. In 1951 Braham Builders financed a building and the man moved his business—Dahlman Manufacturing Co.—to Braham.

With new, experienced men in control, business increased rapidly. A few years ago the sales organization, Dual Manufacturing and Sales Co., moved from St. Paul to Braham.

Last year this firm did $1½ million worth of business. It is the Nation's largest manufacturer of potato harvesting equipment. About 110 people are employed there, more than half of them ex-farmers, or part-time farmers, who might long ago have moved to other areas had this employment not been available.

The businessmen who based their future on cooperation and on what Braham builders might accomplish have been repaid in many ways. Since 1936 not a businessman has lost a dollar in Braham investments. In fact, each has been paid 4 percent interest on what he invested.

Beyond that, they have seen the whole economic level and the morale of Braham residents raised by their activities.

In several communities of much larger size State wage-and-hour investigators have found firms paying as little as 35 cents an hour.

In one community in our best farming area an investigator went down the main street and quickly found 17 businesses violating the minimum-wage provisions.

The last State investigator to visit Braham did not report a single wage violation.

Employees at Dahlman work a 40-hour week at $1.65 to $2.90 an hour. They get time and a half for overtime, 2 weeks' paid vacation, health and accident and life insurance, sick leave, and an annual Christmas party. Other Braham firms have raised their pay levels to keep them in line with the new economic standard, although a few businessmen admit they did so with initial reluctance.

Braham waitresses are being paid almost twice as much an hour as are waitresses in some Minnesota communities.

"The merchants here find that they have to pay good people well to keep them, to compete with industry, and to compete with other towns," Oscar Olson said. "The sooner the merchants in any small town face up to this fact of life the better their chances of survival."

Can other Minnesota towns do what Braham has done? Absolutely yes, says Clark.

Walter Paulson, president of Dahlman, says that if the people in these towns wish to succeed they can never afford to forget what Braham found to be the key word—cooperation.

"We talked to Oscar Olson and these people here, and we knew we'd get cooperation in this town," Paulson said. "Without that, you can be sure we'd have gone someplace else."

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D. C., at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer plus 50 percent: *Provided*, That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized bookdealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by bookdealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. No sale shall be made on credit (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).

CHANGE OF RESIDENCE

Senators, Representatives, and Delegates who have changed their residences will please give information thereof to the Government Printing Office, that their addresses may be correctly given in the RECORD.

RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD is located in Statuary Hall, House wing, where Mr. Raymond F. Noyes is in attendance during the sessions of Congress to receive orders for subscriptions to the RECORD at $1.50 per month, and where single copies may also be purchased. Orders are also accepted for the printing of speeches in pamphlet form.

PRICE OF THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

The Public Printer is authorized to furnish to subscribers the daily RECORD at $1.50 per month, payable in advance.

Remit by money order payable to Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D. C.

PRINTING OF CONGRESSIONAL RECORD EXTRACTS

It shall be lawful for the Public Printer to print and deliver upon the order of any Senator, Representative, or Delegate, extracts from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the person ordering the same paying the cost thereof (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 185, p. 1942).

LAWS AND RULES FOR PUBLICATION OF THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

CODE OF LAWS OF THE UNITED STATES

TITLE 44, SECTION 181. CONGRESSIONAL RECORD; ARRANGEMENT, STYLE, CONTENTS, AND INDEXES.—The Joint Committee on Printing shall have control of the arrangement and style of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and while providing that it shall be substantially a verbatim report of proceedings shall take all needed action for the reduction of unnecessary bulk, and shall provide for the publication of an index of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD semimonthly during the sessions of Congress and at the close thereof. (Jan. 12, 1895, c. 23, § 13, 28 Stat. 603.)

TITLE 44, SECTION 182b. SAME; ILLUSTRATIONS, MAPS, DIAGRAMS.—No maps, diagrams, or illustrations may be inserted in the RECORD without the approval of the Joint Committee on Printing. (June 20, 1936, c. 630, § 2, 49 Stat. 1546.)

Pursuant to the foregoing statute and in order to provide for the prompt publication and delivery of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the Joint Committee on Printing has adopted the following rules, to which the attention of Senators, Representatives, and Delegates is respectfully invited:

1. *Arrangement of the daily Record.*—The Public Printer will arrange the contents of the daily RECORD as follows: First, the Senate proceedings; second, the House proceedings; third, the Appendix: *Provided*, That when the proceedings of the Senate are not received in time to follow this arrangement, the Public Printer may begin the RECORD with the House proceedings. The proceedings of each House and the Appendix shall each begin a new page, with appropriate headings centered thereon.

2. *Type and style.*—The Public Printer shall print the report of the proceedings and debates of the Senate and House of Representatives, as furnished by the Official Reporters of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, in 7½-point type; and all matter included in the remarks or speeches of Members of Congress, other than their own words, and all reports, documents, and other matter authorized to be inserted in the RECORD shall be printed in 6½-point type; and all rollcalls shall be printed in 6-point type. No italic or black type nor words in capitals or small capitals shall be used for emphasis or prominence; nor will unusual indentions be permitted. These restrictions do not apply to the printing of or quotations from historical, official, or legal documents or papers of which a literal reproduction is necessary.

3. *Return of manuscript.*—When manuscript is submitted to Members for revision it should be returned to the Government Printing Office not later than 9 o'clock p. m. in order to insure publication in the RECORD issued on the following morning; and if all of said manuscript is not furnished at the time specified, the Public Printer is authorized to withhold it from the RECORD for 1 day. In no case will a speech be printed in the RECORD of the day of its delivery if the manuscript is furnished later than 12 o'clock midnight.

4. *Tabular matter.*—The manuscript of speeches containing tabular statements to be published in the RECORD shall be in the hands of the Public Printer not later than 7 o'clock p. m., to insure publication the following morning.

5. *Proof furnished.*—Proofs of "leave to print" and advance speeches will not be furnished the day the manuscript is received but will be submitted the following day, whenever possible to do so without causing delay in the publication of the regular proceedings of Congress. Advance speeches shall be set in the RECORD style of type, and not more than six sets of proofs may be furnished to Members without charge.

6. *Notation of withheld remarks.*—If manuscript or proofs have not been returned in time for publication in the proceedings, the Public Printer will insert the words "Mr. ——— addressed the Senate (House or Committee). His remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix," and proceed with the printing of the RECORD.

7. *Thirty-day limit.*—The Public Printer shall not publish in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD any speech or extension of remarks which has been withheld for a period exceeding 30 calendar days from the date when its printing was authorized: *Provided*, That at the expiration of each session of Congress the time limit herein fixed shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee.

8. *Corrections.*—The permanent RECORD is made up for printing and binding 30 days after each daily publication is issued; therefore all corrections must be sent to the Public Printer within that time: *Provided*, That upon the final adjournment of each session of Congress the time limit shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee: *Provided further*, That no Member of Congress shall be entitled to make more than one revision. Any revision shall consist only of corrections of the original copy and shall not include deletions of correct material, substitutions for correct material, or additions of new subject matter.

9. The Public Printer shall not publish in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the full report or print of any committee or subcommittee when said report or print has been previously printed. This rule shall not be construed to apply to conference reports.

10. *Appendix to daily Record.*—When either House has granted leave to print (1) a speech not delivered in either House, (2) a newspaper or magazine article, or (3) any other matter not germane to the proceedings, the same shall be published in the Appendix except in cases of duplication. In such cases only the first item received in the Government Printing Office will be printed. This rule shall not apply to quotations which form part of a speech of a Member, or to an authorized extension of his own remarks: *Provided*, That no address, speech, or article delivered or released subsequently to the final adjournment of a session of Congress may be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

11. *Estimate of cost.*—No extraneous matter in excess of two pages in any one instance may be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD by a Member under leave to print or to extend his remarks unless the manuscript is accompanied by an estimate in writing from the Public Printer of the probable cost of publishing the same, which estimate of cost must be announced by the Member when such leave is requested; but this rule shall not apply to excerpts from letters, telegrams, or articles presented in connection with a speech delivered in the course of debate or to communications from State legislatures, addresses or articles by the President and the members of his Cabinet, the Vice President, or a Member of Congress. For the purposes of this regulation, any one article printed in two or more parts, with or without individual headings, shall be considered as a single extension and the two-page rule shall apply. The Public Printer or the Official Reporters of the House or Senate shall return to the Member of the respective House any matter submitted for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD which is in contravention of this paragraph.

12. *Official Reporters.*—The Official Reporters of each House shall indicate on the manuscript and prepare headings for all matter to be printed in the Appendix, and shall make suitable reference thereto at the proper place in the proceedings.

SENATORS WITH RESIDENCES IN WASHINGTON

OFFICE ADDRESS: Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.

[Streets northwest unless otherwise stated]

Vice President, Richard Nixon

Aiken, George D., *Vt.*—Carroll Arms
Allott, Gordon, *Colo.*—Cleveland House
Anderson, Clinton P., *N. Mex.*—6 Wesley Circle
Barrett, Frank A., *Wyo.*—The Woodner
Beall, J. Glenn, *Md.*
Bennett, Wallace F., *Utah*
Bible, Alan, *Nev.*
Bricker, John W., *Ohio*—The Mayflower
Bridges, Styles, *N. H.*
Bush, Prescott, *Conn.*
Butler, John Marshall, *Md.*
Byrd, Harry Flood, *Va.*—The Shoreham
Capehart, Homer E., *Ind.*—The Westchester
Carlson, Frank, *Kans.*—Sheraton-Park
Carroll, John A., *Colo.*
Case, Clifford P., *N. J.*
Case, Francis, *S. Dak.*—4635 Mass. Ave.
Chavez, Dennis, *N. Mex.*—3327 Cleveland Ave.
Church, Frank, *Idaho*
Clark, Joseph S., *Pa.*
Cooper, John Sherman, *Ky.*
Cotton, Norris, *N. H.*
Curtis, Carl T., *Nebr.*
Dirksen, Everett M., *Ill.*
Douglas, Paul H., *Ill.*
Dworshak, Henry C., *Idaho*
Eastland, James O., *Miss.*—5101 Macomb St.
Ellender, Allen J., *La.*
Ervin, Samuel J., Jr., *N. C.*
Flanders, Ralph E., *Vt.*
Frear, J. Allen, Jr., *Del.*
Fulbright, J. William, *Ark.*
Goldwater, Barry M., *Ariz.*
Gore, Albert, *Tenn.*
Green, Theodore Francis, *R. I.*—University Club
Hayden, Carl, *Ariz.*
Hennings, Thomas C., Jr., *Mo.*
Hickenlooper, Bourke B., *Iowa.*—5511 Cedar Parkway, Chevy Chase, Md.
Hill, Lister, *Ala.*
Hoblitzell, John D., Jr., *W. Va.*
Holland, Spessard L., *Fla.*—Sheraton-Park
Hruska, Roman L., *Nebr.*
Humphrey, Hubert H., *Minn.*
Ives, Irving M., *N. Y.*
Jackson, Henry M., *Wash.*
Javits, Jacob K., *N. Y.*
Jenner, William E., *Ind.*
Johnson, Lyndon B., *Tex.*
Johnston, Olin D., *S. C.*
Kefauver, Estes, *Tenn.*—4929 Hillbrook Lane
Kennedy, John F., *Mass.*
Kerr, Robert S., *Okla.*
Knowland, William F., *Calif.*
Kuchel, Thomas H., *Calif.*
Langer, William, *N. Dak.*—2101 Conn. Ave.
Lausche, Frank J., *Ohio*
Long, Russell B., *La.*
McClellan, John L., *Ark.*
McNamara, Pat, *Mich.*
Magnuson, Warren G., *Wash.*—The Shoreham
Malone, George W., *Nev.*—The Mayflower
Mansfield, Mike, *Mont.*
Martin, Edward, *Pa.*
Martin, Thos. E., *Iowa.*—4545 Conn. Ave.
Monroney, A. S. Mike, *Okla.*
Morse, Wayne, *Oreg.*—5020 Lowell St.
Morton, Thruston B., *Ky.*
Mundt, Karl E., *S. Dak.*—122 Schotts Court NE.
Murray, James E., *Mont.*—The Shoreham
Neuberger, Richard L., *Oreg.*
O'Mahoney, Joseph C., *Wyo.*—Sheraton-Park
Pastore, John O., *R. I.*
Payne, Frederick G., *Maine*
Potter, Charles E., *Mich.*
Proxmire, William E., *Wis.*
Purtell, William A., *Conn.*
Revercomb, Chapman, *W. Va.*
Robertson, A. Willis, *Va.*
Russell, Richard B., *Ga.*
Saltonstall, Leverett, *Mass.*—2320 Tracy Pl.
Schoeppel, Andrew F., *Kans.*
Scott, W. Kerr, *N. C.*
Smathers, George A., *Fla.*
Smith, H. Alexander, *N. J.*—Sheraton-Park
Smith, Margaret Chase, (Mrs.), *Maine.*
Sparkman, John J., *Ala.*—4928 Indian Lane
Stennis, John, *Miss.*
Symington, Stuart, *Mo.*
Talmadge, Herman E., *Ga.*
Thurmond, Strom, *S. C.*
Thye, Edward J., *Minn.*
Watkins, Arthur V., *Utah*
Wiley, Alexander, *Wis.*—2122 Mass. Ave.
Williams, John J., *Del.*
Yarborough, Ralph W., *Tex.*
Young, Milton R., *N. Dak.*—Quebec House So.

OFFICERS OF THE SENATE

Secretary—Felton M. Johnston.
Chief Clerk—Emery L. Frazier.
Sergeant at Arms—Joseph C. Duke.
Secretary for the Majority—Robert G. Baker.
Secretary for the Minority—J. Mark Trice.
Chaplain—Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D.

STANDING COMMITTEES OF THE SENATE

Committee on Agriculture and Forestry

Messrs. Ellender (chairman), Johnston of South Carolina, Holland, Eastland, Humphrey, Scott, Symington, Talmadge, Aiken, Young, Thye, Hickenlooper, Mundt, Williams, and Schoeppel.

Committee on Appropriations

Messrs. Hayden (chairman), Russell, Chavez, Ellender, Hill, McClellan, Robertson, Magnuson, Holland, Stennis, Johnson of Texas, Pastore, Bridges, Saltonstall, Young, Knowland, Thye, Mundt, Mrs. Smith of Maine, Messrs. Dworshak, Dirksen, Potter, and Ives.

Committee on Armed Services

Messrs. Russell (chairman), Byrd, Johnson of Texas, Kefauver, Stennis, Symington, Jackson, Ervin, Saltonstall, Bridges, Flanders, Mrs. Smith of Maine, Messrs. Case of South Dakota, Bush, and Barrett.

Committee on Banking and Currency

Messrs. Fulbright (chairman), Robertson, Sparkman, Frear, Douglas, Monroney, Clark, Proxmire, Capehart, Bricker, Bennett, Bush, Beall, Payne, and Case of New Jersey.

Committee on the District of Columbia

Messrs. Bible (chairman), Morse, Frear, Clark, Proxmire, Beall, Morton, Javits, and Hoblitzell.

Committee on Finance

Messrs. Byrd (chairman), Kerr, Frear, Long, Smathers, Anderson, Douglas, Gore, Martin of Pennsylvania, Williams, Flanders, Malone, Carlson, Bennett, and Jenner.

Committee on Foreign Relations

Messrs. Green (chairman), Fulbright, Sparkman, Humphrey, Mansfield, Morse, Long, Kennedy, Wiley, Smith of New Jersey, Hickenlooper, Langer, Knowland, Aiken, and Capehart.

Committee on Government Operations

Messrs. McClellan (chairman), Jackson, Symington, Ervin, Humphrey, Thurmond, Lausche, Mundt, Mrs. Smith of Maine, Messrs. Martin of Iowa, Curtis, Revercomb, and Capehart.

Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs

Messrs. Murray (chairman), Anderson, Jackson, O'Mahoney, Bible, Neuberger, Carroll, Church, Malone, Watkins, Dworshak, Kuchel, Barrett, Goldwater, and Allott.

Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce

Messrs. Magnuson (chairman), Pastore, Monroney, Smathers, Bible, Thurmond, Lausche, Yarborough, Bricker, Schoeppel, Butler, Potter, Purtell, Payne, and Cotton.

Committee on the Judiciary

Messrs. Eastland (chairman), Kefauver, Johnston of South Carolina, Hennings, McClellan, O'Mahoney, Ervin, Carroll, Wiley, Langer, Jenner, Watkins, Dirksen, Butler, and Hruska.

Committee on Labor and Public Welfare

Messrs. Hill (chairman), Murray, Kennedy, McNamara, Morse, Thurmond, Yarborough, Smith of New Jersey, Ives, Purtell, Goldwater, Allott, and Cooper.

Committee on Post Office and Civil Service

Messrs. Johnston of South Carolina (chairman), Monroney, Scott, Neuberger, Church, Yarborough, Proxmire, Carlson, Jenner, Langer, Martin of Iowa, Morton, and Hoblitzell.

Committee on Public Works

Messrs. Chavez (chairman), Kerr, Gore, McNamara, Neuberger, Scott, ———, Martin of Pennsylvania, Case of South Dakota, Kuchel, Cotton, Hruska, and Revercomb.

Committee on Rules and Administration

Messrs. Hennings (chairman), Hayden, Green, Mansfield, Talmadge, Curtis, Cooper, Javits, and Case of New Jersey.

UNITED STATES SUPREME COURT

Mr. Chief Justice Warren, of California, Hotel Sheraton-Park, Washington, D. C.
Mr. Justice Black, of Alabama, 619 S. Lee St., Alexandria, Va.
Mr. Justice Frankfurter, of Massachusetts, 3018 Dumbarton Ave.
Mr. Justice Douglas, of Washington, 4852 Hutchins Place.
Mr. Justice Burton, of Ohio, the Dodge.
Mr. Justice Clark, of Texas, 2101 Connecticut Ave.
Mr. Justice Harlan, of New York, 1677 31st St.
Mr. Justice Brennan, of New Jersey, 3037 Dumbarton Ave.
Mr. Justice Whittaker, of Missouri, 6920 32d St.

OFFICERS OF THE SUPREME COURT

Clerk—John T. Fey, 2931 Cathedral Ave.
Deputy Clerk—Edmund P. Cullinan, 4823 Reservoir Road.
Deputy Clerk—Richard J. Blanchard, 427 St. Lawrence Drive, Silver Spring, Md.
Marshal—T. Perry Lippitt, 6004 Corbin Road.
Reporter—Walter Wyatt, 1702 Kalmia Rd.
Librarian—Helen Newman, 126 3d St. SE.

UNITED STATES JUDICIAL CIRCUITS

JUSTICES ASSIGNED

TERRITORY EMBRACED

District of Columbia: Mr. Chief Justice Warren. District of Columbia.

First judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Frankfurter. Maine, Massachusetts, New Hampshire, Puerto Rico, Rhode Island.

Second judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Harlan. Connecticut, New York, Vermont.

Third judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Brennan. Delaware, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Virgin Islands.

Fourth judicial circuit: Mr. Chief Justice Warren. Maryland, North Carolina, South Carolina, Virginia, West Virginia.

Fifth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Black. Alabama, Canal Zone, Florida, Georgia, Louisiana, Mississippi, Texas.

Sixth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Burton. Kentucky, Michigan, Ohio, Tennessee.

Seventh judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Clark. Illinois, Indiana, Wisconsin.

Eighth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Whittaker. Arkansas, Iowa, Minnesota, Missouri, Nebraska, North Dakota, South Dakota.

Ninth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Douglas. Alaska, Arizona, California, Idaho, Montana, Nevada, Oregon, Washington, Guam, Hawaii.

Tenth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Whittaker. Colorado, Kansas, New Mexico, Oklahoma, Utah, Wyoming.

Appendix

Service Rendered by the Disabled American Veterans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES E. POTTER
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, February 21, 1958

Mr. POTTER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement I have prepared relative to service rendered by disabled American veterans.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR POTTER

As a life member of the DAV, I was impressed by the following statements in the editorial in the January 30, 1958, issue of its official publication:

"We also say adios to the DAV semimonthly and its 37 years of service to the DAV and to America's disabled veterans and bid welcome and success to the DAV Monthly and its 1958 news policy. Our paper is being changed to 12 issues a year in place of the 22 of the past for several reasons, including economy."

Particularly significant were the expressions "its 37 years of service to the DAV and to America's disabled veterans" and "for several reasons, including economy." Why should economy need to be a primary reason for such change, in view of its long period of service since its formation in 1920, which has so substantially benefited all of America's compensated disabled veterans—some 2 million—and their dependents.

All social-minded and patriotic Americans should be concerned about any diminishment of the DAV rehabilitation service program, as repeatedly emphasized by various Congressmen in their statements in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, as follows:

"Americans who help to provide security for America's disabled defenders thereby help to provide security for America." (Senator Homer T. Bone, of Washington, July 17, 1941.)

"Helping disabled veterans to help themselves and getting the help of the Nation for those who need help—a big dividend-paying investment in real Americanism—is the self-appointed task of the DAV." (Representative Andrew Edmiston, of West Virginia, September 24, 1942.)

"Seeing to it that America's disabled war veterans are adequately provided for is a big investment in the future patriotism of our youth. Providing adequately for the Nation's defenders is an investment in patriotism which brings huge dividend returns to every community, to every State, and to our country." (Representative Raymond S. Springer, of Indiana, May 27, 1943.)

"By promoting and providing for the welfare of America's disabled defenders and their dependents we thereby help to promote, protect, and preserve America and its democratic institutions. (Representative THOMAS E. MARTIN, of Iowa, July 7, 1943.)

"It is significant to remember, I believe, that an important factor in our all-out war efforts is for America adequately to provide for its present defenders, and their dependents, as well as for its disabled defenders and their dependents." (Representative OVERTON BROOKS, of Louisiana, December 14, 1943.)

"The determination of the DAV to see to it that America's disabled veterans are adequately provided for should be supported as a public investment in the future patriotism of our youth, and is practical patriotism which brings huge humanitarian and financial dividends to every community, to every State, and to our country." (Representative Walter G. Andrews, of New York, May 9, 1944.)

"It is definitely in the interest of all Americans that the fight for justice must be made for those who have sacrificed their youth and a part of their bodies or their health in our country's most hazardous occupation, its military and naval services during time of war." (Representative Joe Starnes, of Alabama, June 23, 1944.)

"Active servicemen, discharged veterans, and the dependents of veterans, have the privilege of requesting needed advice and assistance from the service officers of the several congressionally chartered service organizations: The Disabled American Veterans—referred to as the DAV—which is composed exclusively of American citizens who have been either wounded, gassed, injured, or disabled while serving honorably in the Armed Forces of the United States, or of some country allied with it, during time of war." (Representative JOHN LESINSKI, of Michigan, June 23, 1944.)

"Only through the active suport of civic, business, and social leaders can the DAV realize the full success of its human and economic reconstruction program on behalf of our disabled ex-servicemen." (Senator ALEXANDER WILEY, of Wisconsin, July 2, 1945.)

"Americans who have sacrificed their bodies or their health to preserve the American way of living, deserve richly an opportunity for themselves to live a normal American life." (Senator Edwin C. Johnson, of Colorado, November 6, 1945.)

"The welfare of America's disabled defenders is inevitably linked with our country's future welfare and security, because our country's potential future war veterans will naturally be impressed by the fact that our Nation enables its disabled war veterans to become useful civilians." (Representative CHARLES E. BENNETT, of Florida, May 29, 1956.)

"Mr. Speaker, Americans who are grateful for the sacrifices of America's disabled defenders, of parts of their bodies or of their health, will generously support the vitally important service program sponsored by the Disabled American Veterans Service Foundation and so effectively operated by the congressionally chartered 36-year-old (now 38) Disabled American Veterans—DAV." (Representative LAURENCE CURTIS, of Massachusetts, July 27, 1956.)

Very heartily do I concur with all of such statements. Because America's possible future war veterans will naturally be impressed if our country does not permit its disabled defenders to become mere forgotten heroes, but enables them to become self-sustaining tax-paying civilians, the future welfare and security of our country is inevitably linked up with the welfare of its disabled war veterans and their dependents.

Chartered by special act of Congress, the DAV was formed in 1920, to extend free expert, personalized rehabilitation assistance to, for, and by America's disabled defenders—to help them to help themselves.

Governmental benefits for handicapped war veterans are not automatically awarded. More claims have been denied than granted by the United States Veterans' Administration. Expert advice from an experienced service officer, who knows what is required, under many complicated laws, to justify favorable decision by the VA, is sorely needed by the average disabled veteran as to his claims for service connection, disability compensation, hospitalization, medical treatment, prosthetic appliances, vocational training, etc. Scores of thousands of disillusioned, disabled veterans are thus assisted each year in the proper preparation and presentation of their worthy claims for various governmental benefits—legally available only under certain conditions.

Because it must act as judge and jury, in effect, in deciding whether evidence submitted is sufficient proof of entitlement, the United States Veterans' Administration recognizes that the accredited service officers of service organizations can, and do, thus perform a very valuable service, and therefore furnishes office space, and the authority to look through official claim folders.

Because the DAV has less than 200,000 dues-paying members—less than 10 percent among the some 2 million American war veterans in receipt of monthly disability compensation checks—it has been enabled to maintain its nationwide setup of full-time service officers only by reason of the support of social-minded Americans. Very helpful have been their donations, in response to their receipt of miniature automobile license tags, which have enabled the DAV to return about 100,000 sets of lost keys each year to their owners.

Unfortunately, because the DAV has not received enough of such donations, its nationwide staff of full-time national service officers has been gradually reduced from 450, the high figure in 1948, to about 150 at the present time.

The DAV deserves and needs more generous donations to enable it to extend much needed personalized services to many more scores of thousands of discouraged disabled veterans, including those who receive medical treatment in the some 170 hospitals of the United States Veterans' Administration—most of whom have not yet established the service connections of their disabilities.

The DAV itself owns and operates its Ident-O-Tag project at its national headquarters at 5555 Ridge Avenue, Cincinnati, Ohio, mostly with handicapped veterans, their wives, widows, and other handicapped Americans, directly under DAV National Adjutant Vivian D. Corbly. A wounded veteran of World War II, Paul E. Frederick, Jr., of Cincinnati, is the present national commander.

DAV national service officers serve under its national director of claims, Cicero F. Hogan. Located in DAV national service headquarters at 1701 18th Street NW., Washington, D. C., he also has a large staff of expert service officers to assist claimants as to their appeals to the central office of the Veterans' Administration.

Also located there are the assistant national director of claims, Chester Cash; the DAV national legislative director, Maj. Omer W. Clark, former Deputy Administrator of Veterans' Affairs; his able and affable assistant, Elmer Freudenberger, also a former VA official; and John W. Burris, the DAV's national director of employment and national civil-service officer.

Although all DAV national service officers are grossly underpaid, they continue to serve because of their devotion to the welfare of less fortunate war veterans who have sacrificed a part of their bodies or their health, to protect our American way of living. The

DAV has, unfortunately, needed to practice economy, at their expense—and now further economy with its national publication—in order to be able, with limited funds, to continue to serve as many war-handicapped veterans and their dependents as possible.

Such gradual decrease in the number of its full-time service officers has occurred notwithstanding the fact that, during the last 10 years, it has received appropriations aggregating $3,240,000 from its incorporated trustees, the Disabled American Veterans Service Foundation, 631 Pennsylvania Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.

The depleted reserves of the DAV Service Foundation can again be built up by more considerate supporters by their designations in insurance policies, assignments of certificates of stocks and bonds, bequests in wills, irrevocable trusts—which can reduce their taxes and increase their own future incomes—and by the establishment of perpetual rehabilitation funds in multiples of $100—spontaneously started by some concerned disabled veterans in Montana recently—as to which only the interest earnings are available for appropriation to the DAV for its use in maintaining service offices in the State of origin thereof.

Ranging from $100 to $1,000, so far, each perpetual rehabilitation fund is listed on a memorial honor roll in the order in which received, with the name and State of location of each benefactor. Such benefactors include disabled veterans, DAV departments, chapters, and auxiliary units, and an increasing number of patriotic Americans.

An updated memorial honor roll of perpetual rehabilitation funds will be included in each DAV annual report to the United States Congress, which is then printed as a House document by the United States Government Printing Office.

More and more social-minded Americans can thus perpetuate their concern for America's disabled defenders. Such reserve funds can thus gradually accrue, so as to assure future DAV ability to continue to maintain much needed rehabilitation service in each State.

Incidentally, the DAC Service Foundation is governed by 13 trustees, all prominent in and outside the DAV, including a Congressman; a retired Air Force general; a banker; a judge; a New York City police supervisor; a personnel expert for a large oil company; 3 lawyers; a general construction contractor; an undertaker; a national service officer; and a general insurance agent, John L. Golob, of Hibbing, Minn., who is the president and chairman. Five of them are DAV past national commanders, and another past national commander is its executive secretary.

Donations to the DAV Service Foundation—toward support of its sponsored service program, as operated on a nationwide basis by the congressionally chartered DAV—constitute investments in the future security of America which will bring huge dividend returns to many more distressed and disabled war veterans and their dependents, to their communities and their States, and to our country.

Save the Soil

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD J. THYE

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, February 21, 1958

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, there appeared in the St. Paul Pioneer Press of February 18, 1958, an article written by Alfred D. Stedman entitled "Save the Soil Is Theme at Meet of Conservation Men in Mill City."

I fully concur with the statements of the article, and I therefore ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SAVE THE SOIL IS THEME AT MEET OF CONSERVATION MEN IN MILL CITY

(By Alfred D. Stedman)

In Minneapolis perhaps the greatest conservation conclave since the Teddy Roosevelt-Gifford Pinchot days has a worry that would have flabbergasted those two daddies of the American conservation movement.

Occasion is the 12th convention of the National Association of Soil Conservation Districts. Opening Monday to continue through Thursday, it jammed the Hotel Leamington with American men and women having one thing in common. They believe this Nation's future prosperity if not her survival, depends on her conservation of soil, waters, forests, and outdoor values.

The worry is strange but real. It is that the billions of dollars now pouring out of the United States Agriculture Department in the name of agriculture may be spent—some say frittered away—without preventing those natural resources from "going down the drain."

The story wasn't to be found in any one speech. It wasn't formulated in any single resolution brought before the resolutions committee. But it stalked like a ghost everywhere. It cropped up in every other speech, in corridor conversations, and in about one out of every three or four recommendations coming in from States.

THE WORRY

The story of the worry is this: That the two-thirds of a billion to be spent this year by the annual or acreage reserve part of the Federal soil bank program, that the $100 million or so more going into the longer range or conservation reserve part of that program, that the 3 billions or so a year going for losses on Federal farm price supports, the quarter billion more or less going for what are called agricultural conservation payments—that all these and other Federal spending in agriculture's name will leave undone the one job that they see as overshadowing all others. That's the job of saving these national resources, especially the soil, to feed the American people forever.

All agreed in public and in private that a glorious job of building the foundations has been done. One foundation is the soil conservation districts and the cooperating State and Federal programs. In 11 years, 90 percent of the Nation's farm and ranch lands has been organized into soil conservation districts, mostly following county lines. In these districts, each farmer gets help of a soil technician when one is available in drawing a conservation farming plan for his farm. This plan shows how to contour and plow and crop the land and how to protect it with terraces, grassed waterways, dams, and tree plantings so that terrific waste of soil by wind and water erosion will be stopped.

Another foundation is the Federal small watersheds act. This expands the farm planning to cover a small watershed. It purports to offer communities Federal help in getting an engineering plan providing dams and works to stop erosion in a creek valley. It aims to hold runoff on the headlands, not letting them loose to rage through fields and turn into destructive floods. It is called upstream flood control.

But the worry stalking the soil conservation convention is the hard time being encountered in getting action on these farm-by-farm and watershed-by-watershed kinds of permanent protection of resources. Billions for farm subsidies but pittances for lasting conservation. That's the trouble.

As yet only about one-third of the Nation's and Minnesota's croplands are effectively protected by conservation plans. There's no money at all in the new Federal budget for staffing new soil conservation districts to be organized this year, so said Nolen J. Fuqua, president, in his annual report.

Nearly 2½ million farmers and ranchers still need to develop basic conservation plans for their farms. Three-fourths of the soil conservation districts reported serious shortages of conservation scientists and technicians. Many had only half enough help. Two-thirds said that woodland conservation is being neglected.

FUNDS CUT

The funds for ACP payments that, though at times misspent, are still rated high as practical help toward conservation have been halved, Fuqua said.

And the small watershed program, described as grand, is flooded with applications, but has had a budget cut of $11,500,000 or 45 percent, Fuqua said. Reports from the districts said they need Federal help on 12,000 small watersheds.

But Federal action on them lags in Washington. Hundreds are waiting for approval and funds. The Mill Creek watershed project near La Crosse, Wis., for instance, has been pending in Washington a year without action.

Meanwhile, Minnesota alone counted its soil destruction at more than $100 million in last year's floods alone. And a flood on Mill Creek in 1951 washed out the village of Boaz, laid waste many fields, and drowned 5 people.

Southern Great Plains Soil and Water Conservation Research

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH W. YARBOROUGH

OF TEXAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, February 21, 1958

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, the Association of Texas Soil Conservation Districts, Inc., has adopted a resolution favoring the establishment of a soil and water conservation research laboratory in the Southern Great Plains. I wish to go on record in support of the resolution. Recent surveys indicate that approximately 11 million acres of Texas croplands have been badly damaged by drought and floods, and that many additional thousands of acres of both cropland and livestock land have lost at least 25 percent of their topsoil. This presents a serious problem in Texas, a State which has large areas of good, but often shallow, topsoil.

Texans have always been presented with two basic problems, when it comes to soil conservation. In the beginning, our State soil resources were so great that early settlers got in the habit of soil exploitation. Second, when it became obvious that there was a vital need for soil conservation, Texans were slow to realize that much of our land was better adapted to livestock production than to raising crops.

The organization which took the lead in the vital job of teaching and practicing soil conservation was the Association of Texas Soil Conservation Districts. Since our soil conservation programs in Texas have been constantly improved over a period of three decades, the money expended has been repaid many times in economic returns.

To further improve the important job of soil and water conservation, the Association of Texas Soil Conservation Districts is pressing for the founding, in the Southern Great Plains area, of a laboratory to conduct badly needed research projects. A copy of the association's resolution was recently sent me by Mr. W. C. Howard, president of the organization. I ask unanimous consent to have the resolution printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESOLUTION BY ASSOCIATION OF TEXAS SOIL CONSERVATION DISTRICTS, INC., ON A SOIL AND WATER CONSERVATION RESEARCH LABORATORY IN THE SOUTHERN GREAT PLAINS

Whereas the conservation of soil and water resources for future generations and the efficient use and management of these resources for present needs is a major objective of the Association of Texas Soil Conservation Districts; and

Whereas the Great Plains region includes 98 Texas counties and is beset with a wide variety of soil and water conservation problems as recognized by the United States Congress in authorizing the Great Plains conservation program; and

Whereas the Association of Texas Soil Conservation Districts recognize a very great need for an intensified research program on the soil and water conservation problems in the Southern Plains in order that the Great Plains conservation program be of maximum benefit to the Nation: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Association of Texas Soil Conservation District go on record as favoring a major soil and water conservation research laboratory for the Southern Great Plains, and urge the United States Congress to appropriate funds for such a soil and water conservation research facility; furthermore be it

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be given to each Member of the Texas delegation in the United States Congress, a copy be sent to the president of the National Association of Soil Conservation Districts, a copy be sent to the Secretary of the United States Department of Agriculture, and a copy be sent to the administrator of the Agricultural Research Service, United States Department of Agriculture.

Statehood for Alaska

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD L. NEUBERGER

OF OREGON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, February 21, 1958

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, because the Senate is soon scheduled to debate the entire question of statehood for Alaska, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an effective article on this great question entitled "Colonialism at Home." The article appeared in the January 1958 issue of the Progressive magazine. The author of the article is thoroughly qualified to discuss this issue because he is Ernest Gruening, who served as Governor of Alaska from 1939 until 1953, the longest such tenure in Alaska's eventful history as a Territory of the United States.

Ernest Gruening today, by election of the people of Alaska, is 1 of the 2 Tennessee-plan Senators from Alaska, working with all his might and main in our National Capital in behalf of statehood for Alaska. I support his efforts.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

COLONIALISM AT HOME

(By Ernest Gruening)

Ninety-one years ago, on March 30, 1867, the United States acquired Alaska from Russia and pledged that "The inhabitants of the Territory * * * shall be admitted to the enjoyment of all the rights, advantages, and immunities of citizens of the United States."

To date that pledge has been honored in the breach. Alaskans are making an all-out effort to validate it. Having failed to secure statehood in the 12 years since they voted for it in a referendum provided by their 1945 Territorial legislature, they adopted a vigorous course of action.

The 1955 legislature passed an act providing for a constitutional convention to draw up a constitution for the State of Alaska, and appropriating $300,000 for that purpose. Fifty-five delegates met for 75 days at the University of Alaska and drafted a document which political scientists declare to be at least the equal of any other State charter. The people of Alaska ratified it at an election in April 1956. At the same time they approved an ordinance authorizing the election of two United States Senators and a Representative to go to Washington to knock at the door of Congress for admission. In so doing they followed well-established, but not widely known, precedents made early in our Nation's history. Tennessee began the practice in 1796, followed in chronological order by Michigan, Iowa, California, Minnesota, Oregon, and Kansas.

The 1st session of the 85th Congress has held hearings and has reported similar Senate and House bills favorably. The test will come in the first few months of 1958 when Congress reconvenes.

The desire of Alaskans for the full citizenship promised them is akin to that felt in the 35 States admitted to the Union since the original 13. Their need for statehood, they believe, is at least as imperative as that which motivated their predecessors. Alaskans can present a list of grievances beginning 91 years ago, and little abated to date, which they sum up in the contemporarily challenging word "colonialism."

The ask which confronts the three "Alaska-Tennessee Plan" emissaries, who have been at work since their election in October 1956, is to convince the members of Congress of the justice and soundness of Alaska's cause. Their evidence is far too extensive to treat adequately in this article, but a few examples may suffice.

The United States originally established no government in Alaska, which was merely made a customs district. While 4 administrations and 8 Congresses came and went it was not possible in Alaska to acquire a square foot of land, stake a claim, transfer or deed property, get married, punish crime. In 1884 Congress passed an Organic Act which proved unworkable and was the object of unremitting protest by five successive presidentially appointed governors. Only at the turn of the century, in response to the outcries of some thousands of gold rushers—still voters in their home districts—Congress began to act. However, most of its Alaska legislation, based on lack of knowledge, was unsatisfactory. Alaskans since 1881 had been actively asking for a delegate in Congress, such as other territories had had, to represent them. Congress delayed this gift till 1906. By then Alaskans were seeking the minimum of self-government afforded all other territories—a legislature—but did not achieve it until 1912.

The Organic Act of 1912, granted only after 45 years of flagrant neglect, was a vast improvement over its worthless predecessor but was notable chiefly for the things it forbade Alaskans to do. It prohibited the territory from passing any basic land legislation, thus impeding settlement and foreshadowing a continuing near-totality of public domain. It forbade the creation of counties. It provided that only a Federal judiciary could dispense justice, at the same time making no provision for salaries to its lower court judges who to this day must subsist on the fees they can collect from the public—incomes insufficient for a livelihood for five-sixths of them. It maintained the management and regulation of the fisheries and wildlife under Federal control. For the following 45 years efforts to liberalize the act have failed.

The fishing interests of the west coast, endowed by the Treasury Department for the first 40 years of United States rule with a monopoly of the rich Pribilof Islands fur-seal fishery, early began also to exploit the Pacific salmon, for many years the Nation's most valuable fishery resources. Despite the protests of Alaska's voteless Delegate, James Wickersham, they were able to write continuing Federal control of the fisheries into the new act, although they lost out in their effort to prevent the Territory from taxing the industry's product, canned salmon.

Throughout Alaska's history under the United States, this powerful absentee industry, through its lobbyists in Washington and Juneau, has gone far to control the political and economic life of the Territory. Opposing any increase in Alaska's autonomy (and highly successful in that endeavor to date), resisting essential conservation measures while giving them public lipservice, it has managed to dominate in varying degree the successive regulatory agenices—in Treasury, Commerce, and Interior—regardless of whether the administration was Republican or Democratic.

During his first 3 years President Eisenhower found it necessary to declare Alaska's fishing villages disaster areas, wrought not by "acts of God" but by acts of men. The pack has dwindled from a high of 8,454,948 cases to 2,938,662 cases in 1957. The victims are the Alaska fishermen and the inhabitants of the coastal communities long dependent on the salmon economy. The owners, who have retired their original investment many times, can get by with a small pack at higher prices.

Alaskans attribute the depletion to the fishtrap, a structure anchored in the path of the salmon returning from the sea to spawn in the rivers and lakes, which catches large quantities of fish—too large for conservation. The fishtrap has been abolished in the other Pacific salmon areas—British Columbia, Washington, Oregon—where local control has managed to obviate depletion of the same resource. For 45 years, Alaskans, through unceasing legislative memorials, by bills repeatedly introduced by their Delegates, and by popular referenda, have requested the abolition of fishtraps and the transfer of the fisheries to Territorial management. Statehood would automatically transfer the fisheries and be followed by abolition of the traps. Hence the canned salmon industry's opposition.

To this opposition is added the resistance of certain transportation interests. In 1920 Congress passed the Maritime Act of 1920.

The act provided the interchangeable use of domestic and foreign carriers—foreign meaning principally Canadian—for transporting freight across the continent and over the oceans beyond. But in the heart of the act were inserted the words "excluding Alaska." Their effect was to deny Alaskans the use of nearer and less costly Canadian ports and compel all shipments by way of Seattle. Budding Alaskan industries could not support the higher costs and were compelled to shut down, while others have been prevented from starting. Alaska was thereby burdened with the highest maritime freight costs in the world.

Statehood would eliminate this grave injustice and is, therefore, not favored by those in the United States who have benefited from the 38-year-old status quo, which Alaska's voteless Delegates have vainly sought to repeal session after session. The shipping lobby is too powerful.

The financial burden placed on Alaska in maritime transportation has been greatly augmented by discrimination in railroad tariffs. During the past half century, American railways have developed import-export tariffs for overseas freight, which are substantially lower than those on domestic shipments. The areas around the Pacific eligible for them now include all those except Alaska and western Canada (to which no maritime traffic goes from the States). This means that any Alaskan consignment to or from Seattle, Alaska's port of entry and exit, to or from any point in the States, pays a higher rate than if destined for or coming from any other area in the Pacific, including Australia, Asia, South America. For example, household appliances shipped from Iowa to the Orient pay on that part of the haul between the point of origin and Seattle $1.58 per hundred pounds. If destined for any point in Alaska, the identical service costs $3.80, or well over twice as much. Of all Pacific areas, foreign or domestic, Alaska alone is penalized.

Other discriminations of similar origin afflict Alaska, including many in the field of highway aid. Altogether, these indefensibly inequitable practices by the mother country have added greatly to the high cost of living in Alaska. They are manmade and made in the United States of America.

Alaskans hope for relief through the American principle of government by consent of the governed. Both party platforms pledge "immediate statehood." Public opinion supports statehood overwhelmingly. The last Gallup poll, taken in June 1957, shows a 9-to-1 favorable vote. Virtually every important national organization—business, labor, patriotic, service, fraternal—has endorsed statehood for Alaska.

Whence, then, comes the opposition apart from the special interests mentioned above? What are the negative allegations and what are the answers to them?

1. The recurring argument, found in nearly all previous debates on other States' admission, is that it would be unfair to the more populous States to give Alaska's 225,000 people two Senators.

Had this view prevailed ours would still be a Nation of 13 States. Actually Alaska has more population than two-thirds of the 35 States at the time of their admission. Moreover, if admitted, Alaska would not remain a State small in population. Released from its throttling restrictions, it is certain to become an American equivalent of Scandinavia.

2. Alaska cannot afford statehood.

This argument was also cited against other Territories prior to admission and was always disproved by events. Alaska has been operating all the public services found in the States except those Congress has prohibited. Alaska has far more resources and potential revenues than many States.

3. Partisanship. Some Republicans oppose Alaska's admission because they feel it is likely to send Democrats to Congress.

The answer is that the issue should be above partisanship. Actually, however, Alaska would be a swing State. In the past 40 years its legislative elections have been followed by the same result recorded partywise in congressional elections. Alaska has been an unfailing political barometer, in electing Republicans and Democrats.

4. Some southern Democrats oppose Alaska's admission on the ground that it would weaken the South's bloc in Senate votes on cloture.

While it is not possible to predict what position Alaska's future Senators might take on national issues, Alaskans feel that such opposition is carrying regional problems too far afield, and certainly does not justify blocking the promised and long overdue extension of the democratic process to other Americans. Also, Alaska's long subjection to central government control is likely to make its Senators State's righters on many issues.

5. Noncontiguity. Some Members of Congress voice opposition to admitting an area not touching the 48 States.

In this rapidly shrinking world, Alaska is nearer the national capital in travel time—the current measure of distance—than were many States at the time of their admission. There is also the instantaneous communication of the radio telephone.

Positive arguments for Alaskan statehood are numerous. The national economy would be strengthened. New frontiers of opportunity would be opened. Our Nation cannot afford to maintain colonialism at home while preaching against it abroad. Materially and spiritually it would strengthen our position in the world to permit Alaska to fulfill its logical destiny. That destiny is to become not merely a bulwark of defense for the hemisphere, but a shining example of what free men can accomplish in those high latitudes, long ignored by most Americans, in contrast to the adjacent Soviet police state.

All that Alaskans—and the great majority of Americans who support the cause of Alaskan statehood—are asking is that the United States apply to Alaska the most basic of American principles, that of government by consent of the governed.

World Day of Prayer

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, February 21, 1958

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, it has been my pleasure on many occasions to point out the value of prayer in solving personal, national, and international problems.

Today, February 21, Christians in more than 25,000 communities of the United States and in more than 140 other countries throughout the world are participating in World Day of Prayer observance.

By this means they are seeking divine guidance and inspiration. They are seeking to make themselves better instruments for the divine will.

I send to the desk the text of an article published in the Milwaukee Journal of February 13, describing the sponsorship of the United Church Women of the World Day of Prayer observance. I ask unanimous consent that the text of the article be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WORLD DAY OF PRAYER SCHEDULED FOR FEBRUARY 21—PEACE, BLESSINGS FOR ALL MANKIND IS AIM OF SERVICES THAT WILL FOLLOW THE SUN

World Day of Prayer services sponsored by the United Church Women of the Milwaukee area will be held in several churches February 21. The central services will be at 10:30 a. m. and 1:30 p. m. at Grand Avenue Congregational Church, 2133 West Wisconsin Avenue. The Reverend E. N. Vergis, rector of Annunciation Greek Orthodox Church, will speak at both of those services. Offerings will be taken for mission work, and a skit on mission work is scheduled for the afternoon program. The service of the evening United Church Women's group will be at 8 p. m. at Lake Park Lutheran Church, 2647 North Stowell Avenue.

WILL FOLLOW THE SUN

Christians in more than 25,000 United States communities and in more than 140 other countries will participate in the World Day of Prayer observance.

Prayers will be offered for peace and blessings for all mankind.

An unbroken chain of prayer will follow the sun. The international vigil will start on Tonga in the Friendly Islands of the South Pacific. Queen Salote will lead her people in prayer at sunrise.

The chain will end at sunset at St. Lawrence Island in the Bering Sea off Alaska.

OTHER SERVICES SLATED

Other World Day of Prayer services scheduled in the Milwaukee area are: First Congregational Church of South Milwaukee, 1111 North Chicago Avenue; Emanuel Evangelical and Reformed Church, 10627 West Forest Home Avenue, Hales Corners; Bay Shore Lutheran, 1200 East Hampton Road, Whitefish Bay, all at 1:30 p. m.; First Lutheran Church, 1530 South 74th Street, West Allis, 7:45 p. m.; Oak Creek Community Evangelical United Brethren, 8675 South 13th Street, 7:30 p. m.; and Calvary Memorial Evangelical and Reformed, 4515 North Lovers Lane Road, Wauwatosa, 2 p. m.

Also, World Day of Prayer services will be held at 7:30 a. m., February 24, at Goodwill Industries workshop, 2102 West Pierce Street, and at 6 p. m., February 21, at the Milwaukee Protestant Home for the Aged, 2449 North Downer Avenue.

"Bread of Life" will be the theme of the United Church Women's observance throughout the world. The worship service has been prepared by women of Australia.

American Automobile Association Supports Senator Kuchel's Proposal for Billboard Control

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS H. KUCHEL
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, February 21, 1958

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, a few weeks ago I introduced a measure to encourage the States to control outdoor advertising along the Interstate Highway

System. This proposal is entirely the result of research and study by my staff and me, with excellent technical assistance by the staff of the Bureau of Public Roads.

I have been delighted and encouraged to learn that the American Automobile Association has announced its vigorous support of my bill. This is the first time this association has endorsed any Federal bill or proposal in this field.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that 2 news releases of the American Automobile Association and 2 letters which I have received from 2 automobile clubs in California be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the releases and letters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AMERICAN AUTOMOBILE ASSOCIATION SUPPORTS KUCHEL BILL TO CONTROL ADS ON INTERSTATE ROADS

WASHINGTON, D. C., February 4.—Vigorous support for the bill introduced in the Senate on February 3 by Senator THOMAS H. KUCHEL, Republican, of California, to encourage State action for the control of outdoor advertising along the National System of Interstate and Defense Highways was voiced by the American Automobile Association today.

Harry I. Kirk, of Chicago, president of the AAA, said: "We believe the motorists of America are strongly opposed to having their interstate routes walled in by billboards, and will support the approach to the problem recommended by Senator KUCHEL which is to give the States a 1 percent bonus in addition to regular interstate funds when States cooperate by passing reasonable and just legislation to control advertising signs adjacent to the interstate routes. Such legislation would carry forward the recommendation made by President Eisenhower in his budget message to the Congress in which he called for prompt enactment of legislation to control advertising on the Interstate System."

AMERICAN AUTOMOBILE ASSOCIATION MEMO OF FEBRUARY 6, 1958

NEW COURSE FOR ROADSIDE PROTECTION

Proponents of roadside protection are rallying their forces around a new approach to roadside protection incorporated in a bill recently introduced by Senator THOMAS H. KUCHEL, Republican, California.

The American Automobile Association, a longtime foe of blight resulting from uncontrolled roadside development, promptly threw vigorous support behind the measure.

In brief, the Kuchel bill establishes a national policy under which the Federal Government will encourage and assist the States to control outdoor advertising along the National System of Interstate and Defense Highways outside of incorporated municipalities. Certain types of signs are specifically exempted. Each State entering into an agreement with the Federal Government to carry out this national policy would get a bonus in the form of a 1 percent increase in the Federal share of the cost of building interstate projects. In the light of revised estimates of the cost of bulding the 41,000-mile system, the rural portion will probably result in Federal expenditure of $18 billion or more. Thus, it can be conservatively estimated that over the lifespan of the highway program the Kuchel bill carries a $180 million reward for States which cooperate in protecting the roadsides of the Interstate System.

Meanwhile, the AAA points out that outdoor advertising interests which protested to Congress last year that control of advertising along the roadsides should be left to the States, are already bitterly opposing State action in this area. In Virginia, for example, a bill which would regulate commercial advertising within 500 feet of the interstate highways in Virginia, is now being fought strenuously by outdoor advertising interests claiming that such restrictions would cripple the tourist industry of the State.

Outdoor advertising interests in the State have circulated literature to property owners threatening all kinds of dire results if the legislature acts to protect the interstate routes. This, they suggest, is but a step on the road toward legislating what color a man may paint his house.

"The experience in Virginia," said Harry I. Kirk, president of the AAA, "shows clearly that outdoor advertising interests will fight regulation of any kind at any level of government. They will battle against control, whether it be a little 'snipe' sign along a country road or a barn-sized panel along the Interstate System.

"There has been much talk of codes and voluntary cooperation. But the bald fact is that when the chips are down the outdoor advertisers oppose any restraint on their erection of signs wherever they please. Highway users, who are paying for the roads, feel that the time has come to face this problem squarely and to enact just and proper laws to protect highway roadsides. In the words of the Kuchel bill, such action would 'promote the safety, convenience, and enjoyment of public travel'."

(NOTE.—A copy of the letter to Virginia property owners mentioned above is attached for your information; we believe you will find more than usual interest in both the points of view expressed and the tactics used:)

JANUARY 31, 1958.

DEAR PROPERTY OWNER: This letter is being sent to you by the sign company that rents space from you for one or more signs on your land.

The General Assembly of Virginia is considering a law which would prohibit you from leasing space, on your own property, for advertising signs along the Interstate Highway System.

Your land may not be along the Interstate Highway System now but it very well may be in the future. Also, the people back of this law would like to see signs prohibited along all highways in Virginia.

Who wants to cut off your income by stopping you from renting space for signs? Not businessmen, not farmers, not motor courts, not hotels, not the general public. Who then? A very small group of people, mostly ladies' garden clubs and city people, who are not interested in your income but who are interested only in beautifying the highways at your expense.

The members of these garden clubs and other similar clubs have written or talked with every member of both houses of the general assembly. They have done such a good job that a great many members of the general assembly think that the rest of the people in the State feel the same way as this small group of ladies. This is absolutely not true and can be proven.

What can you do about it?

The best thing is to see your delegate and State senator and tell him how you feel. But there isn't time for this unless you can see him immediately.

The next best thing is to write a letter but that takes time which you may not be able to spare. So we are enclosing a printed postal card for you to mail today to your State senator and one to mail to your State delegate.

Important:

1. Be sure to sign the card with your name and address.

2. On the address side be sure to add the name of your State senator and your State delegate to the postal card. His address in Richmond has been printed on the card.

3. If you don't know the name of your State senator and your State delegate, look for your district on the enclosed list of senators and delegates. Be sure to send a card to both your senator and your delegate.

If the law can tell you that you can't rent your own land for advertising signs or use it for any other legitimate purpose, what will be next? Your barns or outbuildings which someone may not think are beautiful? Your house, the color of which may not suit someone's idea of beauty?

It is your land and your money. Act now to protect your rights.

VIRGINIA HIGHWAY ADVERTISING ASSOCIATION.

AUTOMOBILE CLUB OF SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA,
Los Angeles, Calif., February 10, 1958.

Senator THOMAS H. KUCHEL,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR KUCHEL: May we congratulate you upon your introduction of S. 3218 to encourage the control and improvement of areas adjacent to the national system of interstate and defense highways.

We believe that your approach to this problem is the one most feasible of accomplishment, and that the objectives are most desirable.

Allen Davis and I join in extending to you our best regards.

Sincerely yours,

NORMAN P. THOMPSON,
Executive Vice President.

CALIFORNIA STATE AUTOMOBILE ASSOCIATION,
San Francisco, Calif., February 10, 1958.

Senator THOMAS KUCHEL,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR TOM: I have read with interest S. 3218 authored by you and dealing with the problem of unrestricted display of outdoor advertising signs along the rural portions of the Interstate and Defense Highway System. Your new proposal is a much sounder approach to the problem at hand than to seek direct Federal control over matters which, historically, have always been the responsibility of the several States.

The American Automobile Association, whose policies, as you know, the California State Automobile Association has not always followed, recently revised its policy statement on roadside protection to urge State and local governments to take appropriate action to protect roadsides from unrestricted advertising displays and uncontrolled commercial development.

This policy is entirely in accord with our own views and your bill, S. 3218, would appear to be a most effective way of encouraging the States to assume their responsibility in this field.

Our compliments to you, and my personal good wishes.

Sincerely,

EDWIN S. MOORE,
Executive Vice President.

Bless the Soil Savers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD J. THYE
OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, February 21, 1958

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, an editorial which appeared in the Minne-

apolis Star of February 18, 1958, is entitled "Bless the Soil Savers." I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BLESS THE SOIL SAVERS

Minneapolis is host this week to one of the most helpful and even-tempered groups in existence—the National Association of Soil Conservation Districts. When some farmer organizations meet the hall is filled with denunciation, argument and politics. Not so with the NASCD. The delegates are cooperative, polite and efficient.

They would like the Government to devote more funds to their work, for the movement needs technical direction for the growing number of districts. But the people who belong to soil districts assume most of the burdens themselves.

In 20 years the movement has embraced 2,775 districts, 1,750,000 farmer cooperators, a billion and a half acres. When the crusade started, attention was focused on the individual field and farm. They still are important.

But now whole watersheds (the area drained by a stream) are being protected from drought, flood, and erosion. And the individual farmer conservationist is just about as interested in the program for his area, his State and the Nation as he is in the rehabilitation of his own farm.

In his presidential speech Monday, Nolan Faqua, of Oklahoma compared the volunteer efforts of soil district supervisors to that of Red Cross workers. The analogy is fitting, and it's pleasant to have these good folks in town.

Politics Rides Over Postal Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, February 21, 1958

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, it is not often that a Republican newspaper takes the administration to task for partisanship in the civil service.

For that reason, I wish to call the attention of my colleagues to an editorial from the Des Moines Tribune, of Des Moines, Iowa. This editorial is entitled "Politics Rides Over Postal Service."

This involves a case which should be looked into carefully by our Senate Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

POLITICS RIDES OVER POSTAL SERVICE

Edith Johnson's experience proves that civil service offers no real protection for a postmaster who doesn't belong to the right political party.

Miss Johnson was discharged as postmaster of Des Moines last September. The charges, which seemed trivial and possibly trumped up, were denied orally by Miss Johnson. She sought a hearing on them before the Federal Civil Service Commission. Now she has been informed by the Chairman of the Civil Service Board of Appeals and Review that she cannot have a hearing.

Civil service officials presumably have followed the letter of the law in Miss Johnson's case. Miss Johnson was entitled to a hearing, under the regulations, only if the procedures followed in removing her were not fair or legal. She wasn't entitled to a hearing to determine the truth or falsity of the charges. (She would have been entitled to such a hearing only if she were a veteran.)

Under such circumstances, civil service is no protection to a Democratic postmaster serving in a Republican administration. Miss Johnson was a Democratic political appointee when she got the job in 1940, but she has been under civil service, after passing the required examination, since 1941. Her case was handled as a civil service matter.

So, if other cases are handled as Miss Johnson's case has been, no civil service employees in the postal department are assured of a hearing on the merit of charges against them. The Civil Service Commission—now composed of three Eisenhower appointees—can refuse to grant such a hearing, as it has refused to do for Miss Johnson.

This violates traditional American standards of fairness. Employees should have the opportunity to attempt to refute the charges brought against them. If the charges against them are trivial or manufactured, the employee should not be deprived of a job.

One other method of appeal has been open to Miss Johnson, that of taking the case before the Postmaster General. Miss Johnson did write a letter to the Postmaster General but she didn't get a hearing.

The postal department says she wasn't discharged for political reasons. It maintains that she didn't cooperate with the assistant postmaster and some other postal officials and did not carry out some recommendations promptly. She denies the truth of these charges and maintains her dismissal was due solely to politics.

The refusal to grant a hearing on the merit of the charges indicates to us that Miss Johnson has been forced out of her job for partisan reasons. The least that should be done, to protect all civil service employees, is to have a hearing on the validity of the charges against her.

The Cobbler and the Archbishop

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES E. POTTER

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, February 21, 1958

Mr. POTTER. Mr. President, on behalf of the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. PURTELL], who had to leave the city to return to his State, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "The Cobbler and the Archbishop," which was published in Parade magazine for February 16, 1958.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE COBBLER AND THE ARCHBISHOP

(By Jack Harrison Pollack)

NEW BRITAIN, CONN.—This is the story of a kindly Jewish cobbler and an alert young Irish boy who grew into a great priest of the Catholic church—and of their warm and touching friendship that bridged two generations and two religious faiths.

Here in New Britain, where the two once lived on opposite sides of Lawlor Street, they still tell the story, speaking familiarly of "old Sam" and his young friend. Old Sam Greenberg is dead now, but his friend still lives, archbishop of one of the greatest sees in America, and he still holds their friendship dear.

So dear, he said recently, that he has a real horror of capitalizing on it. So, in keeping with his wishes, the modest archbishop will not be named; in this story, he will be called Jack, although his real name is more distinctly Irish than that. But in this town nearly everybody knows who he is, and so do many of his million-member flock.

The story of old Sam and young Jack needs no names. The important thing is the spirit of brotherhood that pervades it. It is particularly fitting this week, when Christians and Jews join hands to mark Brotherhood Week.

The story really begins in Kiev, Russia, more than a half century ago, where lived a young cobbler named Samuel Greenberg. When the czarist government began slaughtering Jews, he set out for America.

Alone, he came to Hartford. Carrying a battered satchel, he walked 10 miles to New Britain and opened a shoe store in a poor neighborhood. Occasionally, he sold a pair of shoes, but mostly he repaired old ones. If his neighbors couldn't afford to pay, Sam would mend their shoes free. Whenever he heard that a child couldn't attend school because of not having shoes, he promptly gave the youngster a pair.

"But we'll end up in the poorhouse," protested his young bride Sonya.

"I found heaven in America," smiled Sam. "It's more important, wife, to live a good life here than just to become rich."

Sam, who was then childless, took a fatherly interest in all the youngsters in the neighborhood. When ever they committed a boyish prank—such as tipping over a thirsty passerby's pail of beer and running away—they could always hide in Sam's store. Sam never squealed on them.

HELP FOR A FATHERLESS BOY

But some of the children were unkind. They teased Sam because of his poor English, because he kept the sabbath on Saturday, and went to the synagogue.

Among the neighborhood boys was 12-year-old Jack, who lived across the street from Sam with his widowed mother and brother. Jack didn't see Sam, or anyone else, as an objec of ridicule. He deeply respected the simple cobbler. A thoughtful lad, he was impressed by Sam's philosophy that there was more to this life than living by bread alone. Jack's gasworker father had died when he was young, and Jack soon became very fond of the simple shoemaker.

One day Sam said to Jack's mother. "Open a grocery store downstairs and, with God's help, you'll make a few pennies to send Jack to school." The plucky woman did so, and her store soon prospered.

Sam grew to love Jack as a son. "The boy has something special." Sam confided to Sonya. "Jack isn't like other kids."

For one thing, he was more versatile. He was an excellent student, a nimble baseball player (he could run 100 yards in 10 seconds) and quick with his fists, if need be. One day he used them o a bully who slandered Sam.

Sam and Jack had long talks while Sam worked. They discussed their respective religions and Sam's youthful dream of becoming a rabbi.

"Education is the greatest thing in the world." Sam used to tell Jack. "You can lose money, but you can never lose your education." Many evenings when he returned to his cobler's bench, Sam saw Jack studying by lamp across the street.

Jack grew deeply religious. When he was an altar boy at St. Mary's Church here, he

told Sam that he wanted to enter the priesthood." "You'll make a wonderful priest Jack," Sam encouraged him. "The world needs people like you to do God's work."

After graduating from St. Thomas Seminary in Hartford at 17, Jack sailed to France to study theology. Recalled to this country at the start of World War I, he later completed his training at St. Bernard's Seminary, Rochester, N. Y., and in 1916, he was ordained at Hartford.

"Jack, you're now a priest," Sam joyously greeted him. "My dream is starting to come true."

The young priest's first assignment was as an assistant pastor in a nearby town, and, in 1919, he was called to an important office in the Hartford diocese. For 15 years, he served there. During that period, he regularly visited his mother in New Britain. And each time, he dropped in to see his old friend Sam. Together the educated Catholic priest and the unschooled Jewish cobbler discussed the state of the universe.

Sam closely followed his friend's career with fatherly pride. In the thirties, Jack was consecrated bishop of another New England diocese. He was the youngest bishop in the United States. Sam frequently visited him in his new city.

Meanwhile, during the depression, idealistic Sam lost his shoestore. But he paid all his bills and decided to spend all his time doing God's work. He organized a Hebrew free loan society which lent money without interest to needy persons of all faiths.

Almost single handed, Sam launched dozens of local projects, ranging from a Golden Age Club for elderly folks to a Christmas toy collection for children. Despite his patched pants and soiled ties, he was made a welfare commissioner, a park-board member, an adviser to mayors. He himself was dubbed Mayor of Hartford Avenue. Hundreds came to him with troubles. "People didn't talk to Socrates as they did to Sam Greenberg," a Hartford editor recently recalled.

ELEVATION OF A BISHOP

One day, Sam breathlessly read in the newspaper that his friend the bishop was being considered as archbishop in one of America's most historic cities. Sam, the Jewish student of Catholic history, was delighted. "I've always told Jack that that was the place for him," he exclaimed to Sonya.

Soon afterward, following World War II, Sam's dream came true: his friend the bishop had been elevated to archbishop. "I'm so happy," Sam cried, tears salting his eyes. "We never had a son, Sonya, but I couldn't feel any closer to one than I do to Jack."

Sam was sick in bed when arrangements were being made to install—during Brotherhood Week—his Jack as archbishop. Then one morning invitations arrived for him and Sonya to attend the installation ceremony. Arrangements also were made for railroad tickets. Sam jumped out of bed. "I'm not sick any more," he said. "I can't miss seeing Jack made archbishop."

Sam didn't realize that only a few of the archbishop's many friends and relatives could be invited. The basilica seated merely 800 persons, and hundreds of prominant Catholic churchmen and laymen had to be accommodated. There hardly seemed room for Sam and Sonya, who also were of a different faith.

But at the railroad station a priest met and drove them to the cathedral. Promptly they were ushered into a pew reserved especially for them. The cathedral brimmed with dignitaries of church and state, including archbishops, bishops, governors, senators, and mayors.

Most of all, though, Sam was awestruck by the breathtaking scene of medieval splendor. He had read many of Jack's books on church history, but he never had dreamed that the consecration of an archbishop was such an impressive ritual. Overhead was a baldachin, a canopy of jeweled metal with a white dove suspended in the center. Behind the throne hung the red cardinal's hat of one of the archibishop's predecessors. The altar sparkled like a jewel.

The ceremony began—a ceremony that was hallowed in antiquity when America still was a wilderness. After the colorful procession of churchmen, a century-old bell tolled overhead as the organ and choir rang out Ecce Sacerdos Magnus (Behold the Great Priest). The new archbishop was led to his marble throne after a young priest read, first in Latin and then in English, the papal decree of appointment. From the apostolic delegate to the United States the new archbishop received the symbol of his office, a golden crosier—a long staff hooked at one end like a shepherd's crook.

"HOW ARE YOU, SAM?"

After his elevation, the archbishop walked slowly down the aisle blessing clergy and laymen. A quarter of the way down, he caught the eye of a familiar face. Handing his crosier to a nearby priest, he left the procession of church dignitaries.

Approaching the pew of a little old man, he leaned forward, placed his hand on the man's arm, and amid the stilled silence said simply, gratefully, "Hello, Sam. How are you?" Sam was too dumbfounded to answer.

The new archbishop then rejoined the procession, greeting no one else by name.

Sam Greenberg's stunned face was flushed. His lips trembled, his heartbeat quickened, his entire body blazed with joy. In those glowing minutes, he felt more than rewarded for any good he had ever tried to do.

"Hot tears from God fell from my eyes," he said later. "It was the greatest moment of my life."

That evening, Sam and Sonya were escorted to a dinner receiption for the archbishop. There, amid the Catholic festivities, they learned that a kosher meal had been specially prepared for them. The archbishop invited them to remain as his guests for a week, but they could stay only 2 days.

This week, the archbishop celebrates the 10th anniversary of that day. The humble cobbler who helped to shape his character will not be there, for recently Sam Greenberg died. But one of the happiest memories he took to his grave for his true bond of brotherhood with another humble yet noble man, with a heart very like his own.

Euthusiastic Reaction to Senator Wiley's Special Report to Wisconsin Students

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, February 21, 1958

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, America must have better-trained, better-educated youngsters. This is the unanimous opinion voiced throughout the land.

America's educational system, its library system, are challenged as never before in our history to help equip youngsters for the complex problems of this space age.

Better training in science, better training in the liberal arts and the humanities—these have become musts if this Republic is to endure.

In order to do my part to help stimulate youngsters' thinking about their future careers, I have been happy to send out a special two-page report. It is addressed directly to high school and junior high school students of my State.

I am more than pleased to say that the response to this report has been perfectly wonderful.

Literally thousands of copies have been requested and distributed to interested teen-agers.

School principals, superintendents, librarians, guidance, and personnel officers of schools, parents, and others, have written in, stating how much they appreciated the report.

I mention this now not from a personal standpoint of taking any particular credit.

Rather I mention it because this report, or any comparable report sent out by other Members of the Congress, will help to fill a great need.

The youngsters of this land are ready, willing, and eager to receive such reports, and to respond to this challenge.

It is up to us to give them the wherewithal to do so.

The youngsters of America are not lazy. They are not indifferent to the needs of this country.

If we, their teachers, their parents and grandparents, stimulate our children, if we inspire them, if we give them helpful advice, then the youngsters will respond adequately.

Let us not criticize the teen-agers, let us help them.

I send to the desk now two items. The first is the actual text of my report on careers to the youngsters.

The second is a series of excerpts from a few of the many Wisconsinites who have responded so graciously to this report.

I may say that all of these messages from library and school officials are spontaneous; none were solicited; all of them are appreciated.

I ask unanimous consent that both items be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letters and excerpts were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SENATOR WILEY'S SPECIAL LETTER TO WISCONSIN STUDENTS ABOUT CHOOSING THE RIGHT JOB SO AS TO SERVE AMERICA AND YOURSELF

Someday, one of you reading this very letter, may be United States Senator from Wisconsin.

One of you may be in our House of Representatives. One of you may have succeeded Gov. Vernon Thomson, as chief executive of our State in Madison.

Perhaps others among you will include a future mayor of your hometown, a member of the State legislature from your area. Others of you may be in the executive branch of our Government in Washington or be leaders in our Armed Forces.

There are, among you, also, future scientists, lawyers, doctors, nurses, engineers, and every other calling known to man.

The purpose of this letter is to urge you to achieve the best that is within you by making the most of your education.

You have almost unlimited opportunities in this wonderful country of ours.

You are growing up in a great State. Some day, it may look to you—I mean you—as one of its finest citizens.

But, whether you personally become famous or not, a whole lifetime of opportunity and growth lies before you.

You can bring untold happiness to yourself, your mother and father, to other members of your family, to your teachers, and your friends.

"DISCOVER YOURSELF" AND USE YOUR TALENT

How? By doing the most important two things that anyone of us can do in this world: "Discover yourself" and then "do the very best with what you discover."

You, personally, have hidden talents and abilities which you have probably only begun to explore. In the years up ahead, there is probably some particular job, some profession, which you can perform better than almost any other kind of skill.

Your goal should be to find that type of work—the highest type—for which you are best suited. (Not the easiest type of work, nor even the best paying, but the kind that will give you the most satisfaction and that will utilize the best that is within you.)

Far more important than simply making a living, is to make a whole life. In other words, develop your appreciation of the good things of life. All around you and me there are constructive things going on. There is goodness and honestry, purity and beauty, wholesome pleasures, and constructive activities. Participate in them and contribute to them.

Remember this, too: These days, as you know, your country urgently needs able citizens more than ever before.

We are in a tough, technical race with Soviet Russia. Victory in this race depends on you.

YOUR RUSSIAN COMPETITORS

On the other side of the world, there are youngsters, very much like you, studying in the Soviet school system. Those youngsters work very hard at school and after school. Many of them are studying science. When they grow up, they will help determine whether their country, Russia, is ahead of our country; not only in military affairs, but in civilian science, in industry, agriculture, and every other pursuit.

It is up to you to compete successfully with them.

But unlike them, you are going to have to compete—not being ordered to do so, but by your own self-determination and patriotism.

You are infinitely freer than a Soviet youngster. You have far more voluntary choices.

But you should use your freedom wisely. Please don't fritter it away. For example, don't just take easy courses, or read easy books, because they are snaps. Don't just try for passing grades.

Remember that the harder you work, the harder you study, the more you will tend to learn. And the greater will be the dividends to yourselves and to your country.

TWO FREE PRICELISTS OF JOB PUBLICATIONS

I want to mention now that your Federal Government has made available a number of publications which may help you to find your way in life. Two of these publications are free. They may be obtained by writing to my home office: 119½ Bridge Street, Chippewa Falls, Wis. Here they are:

1. Occupations—Professions and Job Descriptions. (An 11-page list issued by the Government Printing Office. It sets forth scores of booklets about different types of professions. Most of these booklets can then be obtained by sending 5 cents each to the Government Printing Office, or, sometimes 10 cents or 25 cents.)

2. Occupational Outlook. (A 2-page leaflet also published by the Government Printing Office. It lists publications also available for 5 cents, 10 cents, or so. Each describes the actual job outlook for jobs ranging from architects to diesel mechanics, draftsmen, lawyers, librarians, and others.)

3. Here is a third—available for a dime. How To Get and Hold the Right Job. (A splendid 19-page publication issued by the United States Employment Service. This can be purchased directly from the Superintendent of Documents, United States Government Printing Office, Washington, D. C.)

SEEK SOUND ADVICE

Even better help that is provided in these publications can come to you from person-to-person talks with people whose judgment you should respect. In this library, where you pick up this letter, is your friend—your librarian, who can be a most helpful aid to you. Your library itself represents an invaluable accumulation of the experience and the wisdom of vast numbers of people over a long period of time.

Your teachers can provide excellent counsel for you. Teachers have been wonderful sources of inspiration for most of us. Naturally, your parents, who know you so well, may give you the personal kind of guidance which almost no one else can possibly match.

Don't hesitate to consult with your clergyman, too. He can see in you, and in life, itself, very important things which might otherwise miss the attention of others.

Great opportunity lies before you. For your own good, for the good of those who love you and whom you love and respect, plan to make the most of your life.

Remember, however, that there are very few things that are worthwhile which don't require work—hard work, and lots of it. Many good things don't come easily. They come from long preparation, from devotion, from sacrifice.

That is why I hope you will work hard in your studies, so as to make the most of yourselves. I have faith in you.

One of you is going to occupy my job some day. One of you in our State may even be in the White House as the No. 1 citizen of our land. Why not?

There is no limit to the good you can accomplish if you set your mind to it and if you pick the right path.

Good luck, and let me hear from you.

Sincerely yours,

ALEXANDER WILEY.

GRASSROOTS REACTIONS TO SENATOR WILEY'S REPORT TO TEEN-AGERS ON SELECTING THE RIGHT CAREER

Thank you so much for your inspiring special letter for students. Please send 500 copies for distribution to all our students. (The Arrowhead High School, Hartland, Wis.)

Thank you so much for the wonderful letter you wrote to Wisconsin students. We greatly appreciate it. (Westboro Public School, Westboro, Wis.)

Will you kindly send 35 copies of your letter to Wisconsin students? I think it is very worthwhile and would like to place one in the hands of each of my social studies students. (Amberg, Wis.)

I have just completed reading your special letter to Wisconsin students concerning their choosing the right job. I am very much impressed by this letter and would like at least 50 more copies. (De Pere public schools, De Pere, Wis.)

Thank you for your letter about choosing the right job. May we have about 60 more copies? Our guidance leader is much impressed with your letter. (Durand High School, Durand, Wis.)

Thank you for your special letter to Wisconsin students. If possible, I would like enough copies so that each of our juniors and seniors may have one. (Tomorrow River Schools, Amherst, Wis.)

I shall be very happy to distribute copies of your wonderful letter of advice to students. It is most important today that we awaken our students to the seriousness of the business at hand. (Unity School District, Balsam Lake, Wis.)

After reading your special letter to Wisconsin students and the sound advice it contains, our librarian and I feel that it will be of great benefit to our students. It contains much the same advice that we constantly try to put across to our students, but coming from you it will carry the added prestige of your high office and they will perhaps be more attentive to it. I am sure it will be very helpful. Thank you for your generous interest. (Coleman public schools, Coleman, Wis.)

We would be especially pleased to have additional copies of your special letter to Wisconsin students. And thank you so much; we feel it to be very worthwhile and who knows what spark it may kindle. (Matheson Memorial Library, Elkhorn, Wis.)

Your special letter to Wisconsin students interested me because of its excellent guidance point of view. (Menasha High School, Menasha, Wis.)

We feel this letter is extremely helpful to us in working with our ninth-grade pupils in helping them to plan for the future. (Lincoln ninth-grade advisers, Lincoln Junior High School, Beloit, Wis.)

Please send us 50 letters of special letter to Wisconsin students for our senior class. (Cornell, Wis.)

An Editor Warns of the Dangers to the National Economy Inherent in the Farm Depression

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. COYA KNUTSON

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 3, 1958

Mrs. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, the Bemidji Daily Pioneer, Bemidji, Minn., has reprinted an editorial from the Wadena Pioneer-Journal which points out that widely publicized, but misleading, figures on the farm subsidy programs have prevented general understanding of the extent and the danger of the present farm depression. Under unanimous consent, I include in the RECORD this thoughtful editorial with its stark warning to other segments of our economy and to the administration:

NOT AS IT SEEMS

Cost of the farm program has been widely publicized which, in effect, creates the impression that the farmer is receiving the entire proceeds of the money expended. In all fairness it should be pointed out that this is not true, that substantial portions of all appropriated money goes to large segments of labor employed in handling farm crops for which support prices are provided.

A recent issue of the Land O'Lakes News points out that while $806 million was paid to farmers for the commodity support program $600 million was paid to private industry for storing and transporting these commodities.

It is self-evident that the national economy is largely sustained through agricultural prosperity. For proof of that assertion we need only cite the depression of the thirties when farmers were broke and wholesale foreclosures of farm mortgages were a common occurrance; 17-cent butterfat and 15-cent corn made it impossible for farmers to survive and a Government bank holiday was in-

voked while the administration sought means of alleviating the situation.

Despite the loud clamoring of the politicians, farmers today are generally in good economic condition and it seems the better part of wisdom to continue the support program until such a time as some practical method can be devised by Government agencies to remedy the situation.

Subsidies have been paid for years to private industry such as the railroads, airlines, shipping, etc. All this has been accepted as a necessity. During the era of recent prosperity, however, criticism has been directed solely at the farm program despite the fact that the farmer was at the bottom rung of the economic ladder while all other segments of industry and labor were enjoying the greatest era of prosperity in their history.

Now labor is again demanding higher wages and shorter hours, airlines are pleading for higher rates and the railroads have painted a gloomy picture of operating losses and asking for an opportunity to work themselves out of the economic straightjacket that now seems to threaten bankruptcy.

All this simply means higher prices for everything the farmer has to buy and one of the surest methods of plunging the country into another depression is to deprive agriculture of a fair return for what it has to sell. War demands stimulated increased production and it becomes therefore, Government responsibility to provide a solution for the situation of its own making.

Proposed Tax Revisions Threaten Mutual Savings Banks

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 18, 1958

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I wish to call to the attention of our colleagues the effect of a tax bill now pending in the House. The following article by Earl B. Schwulst appeared in the February issue of the Savings Bank Depositor.

Mr. Schwulst is president, board chairman, and a trustee of the Bowery Savings Bank; a director of the Savings Banks Trust Co.; a trustee of the Teachers Insurance and Annuity Association of America, a faculty member of the Graduate School of Banking at Rutgers University, and a trustee of Barnard College. Among the posts he has held are special assistant to the board of directors of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, Director of the Commodity Credit Corporation, president of the RFC Mortgage Company, president of the Savings Banks Association of the State of New York, president of the National Association of Mutual Savings Banks, and president of the Greater New York Fund.

The article written by this distinguished banker follows:

PROPOSED TAX REVISIONS UNFAIR TO 10,000,000 NEW YORK DEPOSITORS—FAIL TO RECOGNIZE BASIC DIFFERENCE BETWEEN THE TYPES OF INSTITUTIONS

(By Earl B. Schwulst, president, the Bowery Savings Bank)

The commercial banks in their quest for what they call equable taxation bring to mind the busy executive with a headache. He complained to his doctor:

"I'd feel better and do better if my competitors had my headache too."

In effect, what the commercial banks are seeking is a headache for the savings banks, in the form of a changed tax law that would impair the functions and threaten the future of the mutual savings banks of New York State.

NO HEADACHE RELIEF

And these tax law alterations, sought by the commercial banks, would not relieve their headache by bringing needed corrections in the tax law as they apply to commercial banks.

This is a matter of concern, not only to the banking industry at large, but also to every person who saves a dollar.

It is of immediate and special concern to the more than 10 million depositors of New York State's mutual savings banks whose deposits total more than $18 billion.

For this is the very time when our growing national economy calls for constant capital formation; in short, new savings.

Industrial expansion, consumer lending, and the construction of new homes must all be financed by the savings of the people. To injure the vital part played by the savings banks in carrying out their historic function would work a disservice on the people of the State and the Nation itself.

Under the present Federal income tax law, a savings institution may make tax-free additions to its reserve for bad debts until its surplus (including such reserve) reaches a level of 12 percent of deposits. Under the so-called Curtis bill, sponsored by Representative Thomas B. Curtis, Republican of Missouri, the present 12-percent limit would be reduced to only 5 percent.

Further, the Curtis bill, which is supported by the New York State Bankers Association, would require savings banks to pay taxes on dividends over 3 percent of withdrawable accounts.

WOULD INJURE SAVERS

Now the New York State Bankers Association wants the Curtis bill amended to permit the savings institutions (including the savings and loan associations) to distribute tax free only the percentage of interest on savings deposits allowed commercial banks by the Federal Reserve Board.

Before examining the very likely results of such suggested tax law revision, we should note three salient points regarding this charge of alleged Federal income tax discrimination favoring the savings banks, as compared with commercial banks with savings deposits. The Savings Banks Association of the State of New York believes that this charge is made:

1. Without benefit of an analysis of exactly how the Internal Revenue Code applies the income tax to the savings banks.

2. Without consideration of the very fundamental differences between the purposes and organization of the two types of banking institutions.

3. Without knowledge of the fact that many savings banks actually are taxable under the code.

It should be noted that so far a relatively small tax has been paid by savings banks. This is principally because of allowable deductions against income, notably the taking of bond losses and the payment of increasing amounts and proportions of earnings to depositors. But, it should also be noted, commercial banks are permitted the same deductions.

It is true that a savings bank may use its taxable income, after expenses, for the payment of interest to depositors and the taking of bond losses, to an extent to which a commercial bank could not, and still pay dividends to its stockholders and the resulting taxes.

THE BASIC DIFFERENCE

But this is a difference that arises, not from tax discrimination, but from the fact that one institution has stockholders and the other does not.

The commercial bank keeps its interest rate to savings account depositors at a minimum so that dividends to stockholders may be kept at a maximum.

Indeed, when a commercial bank finds that the accommodation of savings deposits does not result in commensurate profits for the stockholders, it does not hesitate to discourage further savings accounts by drastically reducing or ceasing the payment of interest.

Because savings banks have no stockholders, their earnings after expenses are used exclusively to pay interest to their depositors and for addition to surplus and reserves for the protection of present and future depositors.

WHAT WOULD HAPPEN

How would this proposed tax revision affect New York State's savings banks and their 10 million depositors?

It would cut by more than one-half the amount of earnings that could be placed by the savings banks in their reserves for the protection of their depositors.

Further, the savings bank, which is mutually owned and thus has no stockholders, lacks the commercial bank's power to raise capital by selling new stock issues.

PROTECTION FOR SAVERS

The only way the savings bank can gain additional capital funds to provide the utmost in safety to its depositors, present and future, is to retain a proper percentage of its earnings.

The commercial bank, however, has both this source of capital funds and the power to gain additional funds by selling new stock issues (funds, incidentally, which are tax free to it).

The Federal income tax provisions which allow the tax-free accumulation of a bad debt reserve until surplus (including such reserve) equals 12 percent of deposits, recognize this basic difference between a mutual savings bank and a stockholder-owned commercial bank.

EVERYONE SHOULD KNOW

What is vitally important today is that this basic difference be abundantly recognized by every man and woman who saves, by every family that owns a savings bank-financed home, indeed by every person concerned with the future progress of the State and the Nation.

What the British Think of Us

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANTE B. FASCELL
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 19, 1958

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, I have recently read a very interesting report by Doris and Edward L. Bernays, What the British Think of Us, a study of British hostility to America and Americans and its motivation, containing recommendations for improving Anglo-American relations.

Last year, I visited England with a committee of Congress. Even during the very short time we were there, I encountered sufficient evidence which permits me to concur in the basic conclusion of the authors of this study, which is that there is much hostility against the United States in Great Britain.

To better accomplish the objectives of the free world, it is obviously imperative

that the peoples and the governments of two major countries act constructively to eliminate any misconceptions or misunderstandings about each other.

Accordingly, I call my colleagues' attention to this very fine study and submit for their consideration the authors' interpretation of what they found and the recommendations which they made.

Edward L. Bernays has been a professor of public relations at New York University and the University of Hawaii and has delivered lectures at Yale, Harvard, Princeton, and other universities on public relations. He is the author of Crystallizing Public Opinion, Propaganda, Public Relations, Speak Up for Democracy, and Take Your Place at the Peace Table, and editor of the Engineering of Consent. His international experience includes service in World War I with the Committee on Public Information here and in Paris. Since then he has advised many departments of the United States Government. He has served as counsel on public relations to outstanding American organizations since 1919. He is chairman of the National Committee for an Adequate Overseas United States Information Program.

Mrs. Bernays is a former member of the New York Tribune staff. She is the author of A Wife Is Many Women and the partner of Mr. Bernays in counsel on public relations at 26 East 64th Street, New York City.

The report follows:

WHAT THE BRITISH THINK OF US

INTERPRETATION

Our survey showed there is much hostility against the United States in Great Britain. We cannot pin it down in decimal points quantitatively or qualitatively, but the undisputed fact is that there is enough of it to cause us concern about the future.

Some authorities believe present British feelings of hostility to the United States are transitory and illusory. We believe they are unduly optimistic. But whether they are or not, realistic approach to the problem dictates we should not depend solely on the hope that the grand alliance is permanent and indestructible and therefore nothing need be done to safeguard or strengthen it.

Recent years have seen altogether too many examples of propaganda infiltration and violent swings to the right or left among publics and their leaders, previously thought reliable and stable. Even transitory hostility may be exploited effectively to our disadvantage by our enemies.

In the light of conditions, everything possible should be done to get Americans and British to see and act on the mutual need for Anglo-American interdependence. We recognize the great importance of top echelon activity, such as the visits to the United States of the Queen and her consort and the recent conferences here of Prime Minister Macmillan and President Eisenhower. But such symbolic activities must be implemented further by a program to bring about real understanding by each other of the people of Great Britain and of the United States. Only thus can we insure the strength and continuity of what is done at top levels.

Understanding is brought about by communicating. There are many ways of communicating. Archibald MacLeish has put it well in his introduction to McMurry's and Lee's The Cultural Approach:

"Whether governments like it or not, people will communicate directly with each other through the innumerable channels of print, of radio, of trade, of travel, of goods, of songs, of scientific achievements, of architecture, of agricultural practices, of business methods, of works of art. What is important to all governments—and even more important to the people of the world who hope for peace—is that the nature of the communication should be such that understanding and not misunderstanding will result; that comprehension and not prejudice or hatred will be disseminated throughout the world."

Political, economic, military, and diplomatic decisions made between our two countries depend for their effectiveness on public opinion. Fortunately, despite basic psychological, economic, and political reasons for disaffection, strong factors function in favor of understanding between us. We share a cultural heritage and traditions, a common language. We were allies in World Wars I and II. The British identify themselves with English-speaking people through the world, although this community of feeling may often not be as firmly based as we think it is. The common language emphasizes the differences, as well as similarities between the two countries. English is common to our two countries as a language, but not always as a semantic value. Many thoughtful Britons among group leaders, opinion molders, and the general public constitute a hard core of sympathizers with the United States. They worry about the present ill feeling and would like to help remedy the situation.

Foreign Secretary Selwyn Lloyd, in his talk before the Conservative Party conference at Brighton on October 10, said: "I believe my main task as Foreign Secretary is to build up Anglo-American friendship on a basis of confidence and respect, as a real partnership."

Over and over again personal contacts of our own have confirmed this point of view.

An Irishman in London wrote emphatically that it has never before "been so vitally important * * * that the two nations should be bound together by the strongest possible ties of friendship." And he adds that if they are not bound together and we do not cement a friendship and understanding "all that we hold dear may be engulfed by the new barbarianism."

A telephone worker wrote: "* * * to present America and its way of life to the British people is of paramount importance."

Any program to supplement political, military, and economic policy demands that certain basic truths be taken into consideration. The task is difficult. A considered approach is essential in dealing with the problem. Facts must be faced.

1. Customary information methods used in an effort to penetrate British mass media with material favorable to the United States are not enough. Publication of such material in the majority of cases runs counter to the predisposition of those who control the media. Most of the press lords conceive it to be in their interest to build circulation by sensational news and by catering to what they believe is the public's anti-Americanism.

2. It is difficult to achieve penetration on TV and radio for the same reasons.

3. The need in Great Britain, therefore, is to convert those in control of the media and the top level leadership in general to a recognition that British and Americans have common goals and that our mutual interests demand our working together. There must be pro-American leadership on the part of those who dominate British culture in order to create a new climate of opinion in Great Britain. Only through such constructive leadership can information favorable to the United States be broadly projected and accepted. How to accomplish this conversion is the problem.

4. Social scientists have found that information by itself is no persuader. People evade and avoid it if they are unwilling to accept it. Therefore, one must start at a higher level than that of information.

5. Dealing directly with today's antagonisms and conflicting interests is difficult and usually impossible. By stressing common goals, hopes for the future and other areas of agreement, we can make broad acceptance, understanding, and cooperation possible.

The recommendations we make in the following pages are no substitute for the basic economic, military and political elements that enter into the relationship between Great Britain and the United States.

But whatever these factors are, our relationship can be improved by constructive efforts to increase the understanding between the two people.

RECOMMENDATIONS

We recommend that immediate steps to improve the attitudes of the British toward the United States be taken by the United States Government, the British Government, the British and American Governments jointly and through voluntary activities of citizens in both countries.

A comprehensive program to improve attitudes of Americans toward the British is also essential, but this memorandum restricts itself to one side of the double problem.

1. United States Government activities

(A) New Emphasis for USIA

The process of communication and persuasion has been studied intensively by social scientists in the past few generations. We are convinced, therefore, that certain recommendations are in order to make the most effective use of the proven findings of the social scientists. We recommend, therefore, that:

1. The USIA reorient its policies and emphasis and expand personnel and activities.

2. The Agency modify certain basic assumptions about communications and persuasion which shape its present policies and activities so that they will conform with findings of the social scientists. For example, the present assumption that facts in themselves are necessarily accepted as evidence is not in accord with social science knowledge.

3. Research should be undertaken to prove or disprove all other assumptions now being acted upon, but which have not been scientifically validated.

4. Basic assumptions should be applied uniformly. (This should not in any way vitiate dealing with local situations in conformity with local conditions.)

5. Focus emphasis on personal contact with British officials and private individuals, group leaders and opinion moulders who influence public attitudes, to convince them that our goals are the same and that therefore we must understand each other and work together.

6. Assign to this function top flight Americans capable of discussing Anglo-American relations with Britishers who guide public attitudes. These United States representatives should be given titles that give due emphasis to the importance of their functions.

7. USIA continue efforts to disseminate news, opinions and fact in whatever the form, in spite of the barriers erected by media against unsensational and pro-American material.

Communications media in Britain do not provide sufficient data, opinion or background to give the British a true picture of America and its aims. But the present ineffectiveness of efforts to secure a hearing before the British public through mass media will be changed when men of influence in Britain realize that there can be no solid Anglo-American cooperation without mutual understanding of our common goals.

Statesmanlike attitude of English leaders on all levels will undoubtedly open the way in the mass media for publicizing of truthful and favorable material about America.

8. USIA representatives should demonstrate to British leaders that England needs most of all to know intimate facts about the private daily life of ordinary Americans as distinct from lurid tales about juvenile delinquents, Hollywood scandals, gangsters, and other deviations. The USIA should continue to supply information about day-to-day habits of people with whom English people can identify themselves.

(B) Spending Power of United States Personnel in England

Make an immediate study to establish a sound policy relative to the spending power of military and civilian United States personnel in England. Examine the differential between British and American salaries. Decide whether the advantages or disadvantages of high salaries should be the guiding consideration in determining policy. Higher spending causes friction and jealousy in the English, who feel they can't compete for girl's favor or purchase products, and bitterness among Americans who are overcharged by some merchants and landlords. On the other hand, this extra spending is a favorable force for the British economy.

Investigate the soundness of limiting money of American personnel for use in England and holding the remainder of their salary in America.

(C) Orientation of United States Personnel

Our Government's services and civilian departments should give more orientation on English customs and habits to Americans going on missions to England. Help in understanding the life, culture, history, government, economy, and ways of life in England should continue during their stay in that country.

A United States interdepartmental committee should pool resources and experience of all Government agencies and departments in plans of orientation. It should enlist services of sociologists, anthropologists, psychiatrists and social psychologists.

(D) Overseas Personnel

Civilian Government employees who will have personal contact with Englishmen should be selected with particular reference to their adaptability, their ability to appreciate British customs.

The advantages of continuity of service should modify systems of rotation, and men should not be transferred just when they have become acclimated and useful in England. Personnel returned to the United States from time to time should be reassigned to their English post.

Civilian employees should be encouraged to participate in English daily community life. Attention should be given to the friendship potential of members of the immediate family and other dependents of American personnel. Many of them may be useful in building better relations.

(E) Tourists and Tourism

A national commission on tourism should be established by our Government to stimulate travel from Britain to America and from America to Britain. Private travel agencies, transportation companies, allied industries, educational and civic oganizations should be recruited to assist work of the commission. This commission would increase peoples-to-peoples contacts by employing methods of advertising and promotion usually carried on by national tourist commissions of other countries. It should also give tourists informative pamphlets on British manners and customs similar to some now distributed by a few private organizations.

(F) Student and Leader Exchange Visits

The United States should increase student exchanges by providing greater numbers of scholarships for British and American students. To derive the greatest benefit from student exchanges, selection procedures should ensure that qualified students participate. Intensive orientation courses should be provided in the customs and folkways of the prospective host countries, England or America. Sponsors and host institutions should aid in finding satisfactory living quarters and facilitating social contacts to minimize loneliness and feelings of insecurity.

(G) Books and Magazines

The United States should ratify without delay the Florence Convention, often called International Agreement on the Importation of Educational, Scientific and Cultural Materials, by removing tariffs on books and by making foreign exchange available to libraries and educational institutions for purchase of books abroad.

The United States and Great Britain should lower the international book postal rate from 12½ cents to 6¼ cents a pound, a step which has been taken by most other major publishing nations.

Weight limit for printed matter should be raised, costs should be reduced and efficiency improved.

We recommend United States conversations with the British Government to relax circulation restrictions on American magazines and newspapers in Great Britain.

2. What can the British Government do?

We recommend that the British Government consider having its central office of information play a dynamic role in correcting distorted and untrue information about the United States disseminated in England. We further recommend that the British Government evaluate their textbooks and other educational publications for factual accuracy about the United States.

3. British and American Governments jointly

We strongly recommend British and American governmental communications cooperation through their information services. The British Information Services, the General Office of Information and the USIA should work closely together to correct distortions or untruths about the United States that are detrimental to the grand alliance.

British and American information services in other countries should work together in a united front to ensure that the truths about both countries will defeat untruths and misconceptions.

We recommend that the British and American Governments cooperate to orientate American civilian and military personnel. Lending its own personnel for this educational program would be helpful.

4. British and American voluntary activities

American and British individuals and groups in the United States and Great Britain should cooperate in a dynamic program of activities to improve understanding between British and Americans. Here are some examples of methods:

(A) Joint British-American conferences, like that held by the American and British Bar Associations in London last summer, should be multiplied. Such opposite number meetings of people in the same vocation at every level of social, economic, cultural, and political life would broaden areas of agreement and decrease areas of disagreement. Scientists, policemen, farmers, publishers, teachers, artists, artisans, meeting their colleagues in England, would understand each other and stimulate broad British-American friendship and interest in common problems and aims.

It has been found that meetings of people with common vocational interest tend to establish an immediate rapport.

(B) American businesses with interests in Britain should indoctrinate their representatives and employees in England on British customs and encourage active participation in British life.

Private industry on both sides of the Atlantic should stagger vacation schedules so that travel across the Atlantic may be made in off seasons.

(C) Leaders in the communications fields in both countries should form a Joint British-American Committee for Common Understanding. Leading editors, publishers, publicists, opinion molders, and communication experts will give professional direction in disseminating fact and point of view in both countries.

The work would include publicizing similarities of Americans and British, bringing prejudice and antipathy to light, and so help to dissipate them, publicizing achievements of Britishers in the United States and of Americans in England, and exclaiming to the British the differences between American and British cultures.

This group should deflate lies and false rumors present on both sides of the water.

Such activity would increase mutual understanding and appreciation. The committee would emphasize Anglo-American relationships and focus public attention on future goals.

(D) British-American voluntary organizations in England should encourage showing of films that portray the ordinary American against the background of his daily life of work and play.

Voluntary groups should urge schools and colleges in Great Britain to expand study of the United States.

Timing Is Important on Tax Reduction

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MELVIN PRICE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 17, 1958

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call to the attention of my colleagues in the House some very sound advice contained in an editorial in the St. Louis Post-Dispatch of Wednesday, February 19, on the importance of timing in the consideration of a suggested tax cut to counter the present recession.

Of particular interest in the editorial is a reference to an idea generated by a vice president of the Ford Motor Co., Mr. Theodore Yutema. Mr. Yutema proposed a suspension of witholding for 10 percent of the year. If Mr. Yutema suggests merely putting off withholding to a later date, then he would be likely to contribute to the recession by getting the consumer deeper into debt.

However, carry this idea a step further and make it a complete forgiveness of withholding for 10 percent of the year or 20 percent and we would have a real, immediate shot in the arm for our economy which would pull us through the recession as effectively as the expiration of the 10 percent Korean war tax did the job in 1954.

The forgiveness of withholding in this manner would be the quickest way to work out a tax reduction should it be found necessary to counter the recession by bolstering consumer buying.

The Post-Dispatch editorial follows:

If It Were Done

Undoubtedly the administration is right in saying that this is not the time to counter the recession by cutting taxes. But if it heeds the lessons of 1953–54, it will keep an open mind and be ready to move in that direction the moment circumstances so suggest. Good timing will be of the essence.

As in 1954, the key to the Nation's ability to snap out of this recession is consumer buying. The unemployment we are now experiencing has been brought about by a decline in capital investment for new plant and equipment, reinforced by a rapid decline in inventories. Should these forces now be compounded by a serious drop in consumer demand, the country could be in real trouble. If consumer buying resists the trend instead of magnifying it, we can hope to be out of the woods by summer.

It was just such a resurgence of consumer demand that put the skids under the 1954 recession. Administration leaders will find useful instruction in reviewing the circumstances and most particularly the timing.

By March 1954, unemployment had reached 5.8 percent of the labor force—a greater proportion than is out of work now—yet consumers went on buying at an expanded rate and signs of recovery soon set in. Why did consumers behave in this way? Unquestionably, because on January 1, 1954, they had received a 10 percent tax cut. The Korea emergency increase of 10 percent in personal income taxes had been due to expire on that date, and the Eisenhower administration during the previous September had taken the politically unavoidable step of announcing that the expiration would be allowed to take effect.

The important thing to remember is that it was not a prospective but a real, tangible, in-hand tax cut that gave consumer demand the decisive stimulus. Should a similar stimulus prove necessary 3 or 4 months from now, it may not be enough to promise a tax cut in 1959 or to start planning public works that cannot make a significant contribution to purchasing power for 2 or 3 years. An instantly effective injection of purchasing power could make all the difference. And the required dose might well be smaller if administered in the time than if too long delayed.

One of the most interesting ideas for quick action of this sort has been suggested by Theodore Yntema, a Ford vice president, who says that if Congress decrees a moratorium on tax withholding, "the depression will vanish like the mist under the sun." As we understand him, Mr. Yntema is proposing that if Congress should decide to cut taxes 10 percent the reduction, instead of being dribbled out over a long period should be made instantly effective by suspending withholding for 10 percent of the year, or about 5 weeks.

The time may come when emergency action like this must be considered. If taxes have to be cut to sustain consumer demand, they should be cut in the most massively effective way. In Macbeth's words, "if it were done when 'tis done, then 'twere well it were done quickly."

Reciprocal Trade Agreements Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HALE BOGGS

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 6, 1958

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorials:

[From the Washington Post of February 19, 1958]

Sinclair Weeks: Protectionist

Secretary of Commerce Weeks has put the reciprocal trade agreements program into just the right perspective by pointing out that it is, itself, a powerful instrument of protection for American business and for American political interests abroad. Too long the opponents of freer trade have beguiled Congress and the public with the notion that only they had at heart the defense of this countrys business, that only they were interested in protecting the American standard of living from dilution through foreign trade.

Mr. Weeks, appealing for an extension of the Trade Agreements Act, appropriately preempted the semantics of the protectionist bloc by showing how a retreat from a policy of reciprocal easing of trade barriers would jeopardize millions of jobs and American exports worth billions to this Nation's economy. Last year these exports totaled nearly $20 billion—greater than the value of all consumer automobile purchases, or of all nonfarm housing construction, or of all consumer purchases of furniture and household equipment. Although imports have been rising, they lag behind exports by a wide margin.

Altogether, some 7 percent of the American working force—about 4½ million workers—derives its livelihood from foreign trade. The high tariff protectionists, in their zeal to insulate a few industries from competition—competition of the sort which these same groups generally insist upon in the domestic economy—would deny to the foreign purchasers of American exports the means to pay for them. They would thus imperil a major segment of this country's industry and restrict the economy's opportunities for growth.

Mr. Weeks, by his own admission, is no doctrinaire free trader. But, as his Department has entered into increasing responsibilities for the administration and development of the trade-agreements program, he has evidently come to see that this country's own long-range security is interwoven with the economic growth of the free world. With good reason, he points to the growing trade of the Soviet Union in areas like South America, where this country's trade policy has tended to be dictated more and more by domestic interests unwilling to meet the challenge of competition. If the Soviet Union did not exist, a broad conception of American self-interest still would demand the steady promotion or world trade. With Moscow very much in the trade and aid picture, this interest takes on a newly critical aspect. Congress can best serve this truly protectionist interest by extending the Trade Agreements Act for 5 years, as the President proposes.

[From the New Orleans (La.) Item of February 19, 1958]

Silent, Idle Ships

"What we need is a sputnik in the foreign economic field."

These words were used by a Congressman to express his concern over the lack of interest and understanding by his constituents toward foreign aid and the need for reciprocal trade.

The lawmaker would not let his name be used—he is already being pressured by protectionists back home.

But if the Soviet Union has not used any device to dramatize its gains in foreign trade it doesn't mean it hasn't moved ahead. Russian trade with Western countries has greatly increased in the past year—perhaps as much as 30 percent.

Let's take a look at United States figures. The first half of last year, United States exports were at a postwar high—at a rate of $5.7 billion a quarter. By the end of the year, the rate was down to $4.9 billion a quarter—and decreasing.

There's another man concerned over lack of interest by the public in foreign trade. He is Richard W. Freeman, president of International House in New Orleans. He is thoroughly alarmed over opposition in Congress to the extension of our Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act.

In a recent speech he said:

"* * * All that the United States has worked for for more than a generation in liberalizing of trade throughout the world is about to be lost * * * we are about to hand the Soviet Union another cheap and greatly significant victory in the cold war.

"Our people, generally speaking, do not know that we export 34 percent of our earth grading machinery, 23 percent of our sewing machines, 14 percent of our typewriters, 17 percent of our printing machinery, 16 percent of our trucks and buses, 8 percent of our refrigerators, 35 percent of our complete civilian aircraft output, and 13 percent of our agricultural machinery.

"More than a quarter of our entire production of cotton, tobacco, and wheat is exported, and I need not tell you what would happen to southern economy if we lost those great cotton and tobacco exports. Yet protectionism is gaining strength rapidly in the South; it is a selfish, blind, unreasoning protectionism which would help a few and hurt hundreds of thousands, but it exists.

"* * * Between three and four million five hundred thousand Americans owe their jobs to goods and services going into export; yet not more than 100,000 jobs would be vitally affected if we went over completely to free trade, with no tariff barriers whatever.

"Foreign trade averages about 5 percent of our gross national economy, but the corresponding figure for Holland is 40 percent, for West Germany 15 percent, for Great Britain 18 percent, for Italy 12 percent, and Japan about 15 percent."

And, here are the words of another man, revealing a specific example of how Russia is sending her economic tentacles into the Western Hemisphere. In a cablegram just last week:

"Regret to advise that Russia has won her first important victory against United States in economic race in Latin America by signing trade treaties with Argentina in Moscow last week and by marvelous display of her products at Industrial Fair in Buenos Aires recently opened."

These were the words of American businessman, John A. Hastings, president of the Transportation Research Corp., in a message to his friend, Senator Homer Capehart, Indiana, Republican.

Hastings had more to say in his cablegram about the Industrial Fair:

"* * * Over 1 million people so far attended exhibition and all were deeply impressed as I was by Russia's excellent exhibits."

While a million Argentinians are being impressed by Russian machine exhibits, what is happening to one of our closest allies in Europe, Britain?

These words were written by John Allan May, correspondent for the Christian Science Monitor in London. They were published February 3.

"If you go down any of the great estuaries of Britain these days—the Clyde, London River, the Severn, Falmouth—you will see the moorings filled with silent, idle ships. Their lines stretch away and fade eventually as shadows in the rain and mist.

"Right now there are more tramp ships and tankers laid up in the ports of this island of ships than ever since the jobless 1930's.

"Falling freight rates and lack of trade are blamed for this state of affairs. * * *

"Here is the way the situation appears to Britain:

"* * * Economics beats space travel in continuing importance. And the major economic problem that the West has yet to overcome is that of combining a steady price level with expanding trade."

"We are about to hand the Soviet Union another cheap and greatly significant victory. * * *"

"Regret to advise that Russia has won her first important victory against United States in economic trade in Latin America. * * *"

"* * * Moorings filled with silent, idle ships."

These are words Members of Congress should weigh as they consider extension of this Nation's Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act.

[From the American Farm Bureau Federation Newsletter of February 17, 1958]

WHY WE NEED THE RECIPROCAL TRADE AGREEMENT PROGRAM—TRADE AGREEMENTS HAVE 24-YEAR HISTORY

The Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act was first passed by Congress in 1934. It has continued uninterrupted for 24 years.

The act has been extended 10 times. The most recent extension expires on June 30, 1958. The administration has requested a 5-year extension with several amendments.

Since the outset, Farm Bureau support has been a significant factor in the passage of reciprocal trade agreements bills.

The material in this series of articles is designed to provide pertinent information on (1) the background and history of this legislation; (2) the proposal of the administration to extend it; and (3) its importance to American agriculture.

The Constitution of the United States empowers the Congress to lay and collect taxes, duties, imports, and excises; and to regulate commerce with foreign nations.

Tariffs were originally imposed in this country as a means of raising revenue. The Tariff Act of 1789 instituted duties which then provided 90 percent of our Government revenue. In the years before 1860, tariffs were generally low and applied to few commodities.

Between 1860 and World War I the tariff became primarily a protective device for the new industries that were coming into being in the United States.

After World War I, due to an apparent desire to make the United States self-sufficient regardless of the efficiency with which the Nation's needs could be produced, tariff rates began to rise at a rapid rate. This culminated in the Smoot-Hawley Act of 1930.

This act set the highest tariff rates in the country's history. Rates applied to some 500 commodity classifications and provisions were enacted so that new articles would also have duty imposed upon them based on similitude to known articles.

In the post-World War I period, when duties began to rise and tariffs were expanded, our total exports dropped from $5.2 billion annually (during the years 1919–23) to a low of $1.4 billion (in fiscal year 1932–33). Correspondingly, United States imports declined from around $3.7 billion to $1.1 billion.

The Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act of 1934 delegated to the President for a 3-year period the power to conclude agreements with other nations without specific congressional approval. It limited his power to reduce tariffs to 50 percent of existing duties as of January 1, 1934.

Congress extended this authority in 1937, 1940, and 1943 without significant amendments.

In 1945 Congress extended the program for 3 years and gave the President the additional authority to lower rates by 50 percent of the existing duties as of January 1, 1945. Thus, any item which had been reduced by 50 percent in the period 1934–45 was subject to another possible reduction of 50 percent (or a 75 percent reduction in all) in return for concessions from other countries.

In the first 12 years (1935–47) of the reciprocal trade program, the United States concluded trade agreements with 29 countries. Exports rose in value from $2 billion in 1935 to $14 billion in 1947. Over $11 billion of that trade was with countries with whom the United States had agreements under the Trade Act.

Of the great increase in exports, the largest portion was to countries which had given concessions to the United States. For example, of the $20 million of pork products exported in 1939, over $15 million entered the other country under concessions which had been gained under the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act. The same was true of other items—such as lard, dairy products, barley, corn, rice, wheat, and a long list of fruits.

This was also true of tobacco and raw cotton. And substantial concessions were made to the United States and its exports of refrigerators, radios, iron and steel products, paints, and tractors, and other agricultural machinery.

In 1948 the trade agreements program began to encounter opposition. Protectionist measures were presented to Congress with increasing frequency.

In that year Congress voted to extend the act for only 1 year. At the same time, the so-called peril-point provision was introduced.

This provision required that, before any agreements were entered into, the Tariff Commission should report to the President as to the limit to which such modifications might be extended without causing or threatening serious injury to domestic industries producing like, or directly competitive articles.

In 1949 Congress repealed the 1948 extension with its peril-point provisions and extended the original act for another 2 years.

But in 1951 not only was the peril-point clause restored, but a tight escape clause was added.

A less stringent escape clause had been in effect since 1943 when the Executive agreed to include it in all future trade agreements. In 1947 there was an Executive order to that effect. Under it, the United States or a foreign country could break an agreement which seriously injured a domestic industry in either country.

The new escape clause—which operates today—allows a domestic industry to apply to the Tariff Commission for a finding that it has been seriously injured. If such a finding is made the President is authorized, though not required, to take action.

There was a short-lived revival of optimism among the advocates of the trade program with the appointment by the President of the Randall Commission in 1953.

The act was extended for only 1 year at that time to allow the Randall Commission to study the question of trade and tariffs.

After exhaustive study the Commission presented a weakened version of the act. The President then asked for a 3-year extension. But the administration finally agreed to accept just a 1-year extension. Moreover, a provision exempting defense industries from tariff reductions was passed.

In 1955 Congress acceded to the administration's request for a 3-year renewal. However, the extension bill further tightened both the peril point and escape clause provisions.

As a substitute for amendments to limit imports of specific commodities, an amendment was accepted which authorized the President—at his discretion—to limit imports of any product entering the United States in such volume as "to threaten or impair the mutual security." The amendment provided for initial advice in such a case by the Director of the Office of Defense Mobilization, and, if the President agreed, a subsequent investigation.

It is this 10th (1955) extension of the Trade Agreements Act that expires on June 30 of this year.

Since 1945 the United States has entered into four multilateral trade negotiations. Negotiations which were bilateral have become multilateral.

Today the principal instrumentality for making the trade agreements authority effective is no longer a series of bilateral trade agreements but a single multilateral mechanism, the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade—better known as GATT.

GATT began with negotiations among 18 countries 10 years ago. It has now grown to include 37 nations.

Farm Bureau feels that GATT should be an important element in our foreign economic policy.

Section 22 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act provides that when the President determines that imports are materially interfering with—or are practically certain to materially interfere with—any domestic agricultural program operated by USDA, he shall impose such additional fees or import quotas as he determines are necessary to prevent this interference.

It was first enacted in 1935, reenacted in 1937, and amended in 1940 to authorize the President to impose fees up to 50 percent ad valorem when necessary.

It was in 1940 that two important features were added to section 22: (1) Section 32 programs including export subsidy programs were brought under the act; and (2) it was made clear that section 22 could be invoked not only when imports were being imported but also when they were practically certain to be imported.

In 1948 Congress expanded section 22 to include any loan, purchase, or other program undertaken by USDA.

When the General Agreements on Tariffs and Trade was made effective in 1948, there was a conflict with section 22, since GATT permitted import quotas only in conjunction with restrictions on domestic production or market supply. Therefore, section 22 was amended in that year to conform to GATT.

However, section 22 was again amended in 1951, giving it priority over any trade agreement. Since that time the contracting parties of GATT have granted a waiver to the United States so that the import restrictions required by section 22 are not considered as being in violation of GATT.

Another protection provided United States agriculture against excessive agricultural imports is the tariff quota, provided by section 350 of the Tariff Act of 1930. In a number of instances, the United States has limited the application of a reduced duty on an agricultural commodity to a specific volume of imports. This is a method of limiting the increase in imports resulting from a duty concession.

For example, the tariff rate on the first 200,000 head of cattle (under 200 pounds) is 1.5 cents per pound. The duty on all cattle over this quota is 2.5 cents per pound. At the present time tariff quotas are in effect for the following agricultural commodities: cattle; whole milk, fresh or sour; cream, fresh or sour; butter; walnuts; certified seed potatoes and table stock potatoes.

In 1951, section 104 was added to the Defense Production Act. The objective—as stated by proponents of this legislation—was to prevent imports from interfering with USDA programs for dairy products, fats and oils, peanuts, and rice. Without public hearings, it left the restriction of these commodities to the discretion of the Secretary of Agriculture. It tied the essential security interests of the United States directly to restrictions of imports. In 1953 this section was repealed in favor of action under section 22. Farm Bureau opposed section 104 and favored the transfer to section 22.

Dedication of $2.5 Million Post Office, St. Petersburg, Fla., Is Symbolic of What Can Be Done Under the President's Proposed Extended Lease Program for Post Office Construction, and Lack of Wisdom in Permitting Lease-Purchase Expire Last Year—Address by Deputy Postmaster General E. O. Sessions at Dedication

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM C. CRAMER
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 19, 1958

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, at the dedication of the new $2.5 million post office, mail handling facility at St. Petersburg, Fla., a challenge was offered to Congress by Deputy Postmaster General E. O. Sessions on February 15, 1958—a challenge to go forward with the President's announced $2 billion post-office construction program—and a challenge to enact much needed and overdue equitably distributed postal rate increase legislation in an effort to put the Post Office Department on a business-like pay-as-you-go basis.

The magnificent 167,000 square-foot modern facility, which includes four drive-in windows, stands as a monument to the partnership of the Federal Government with private enterprise in serving the best interests of the people—in making much needed Federal facilities available on the local level. There is no excuse, to my way of thinking, why adequate, modern facilities should not be made available throughout the country—the Post Office being the closest and most frequent contact by the people with their Federal Government—and being our greatest communication medium.

This building was built under the extended lease program, the very type of program the President is asking Congress to authorize—$1.5 billion of the $2 billion to be provided by private capital. Thus, without actual appropriations for public works in this field, private enterprise could make available hundreds of local post offices on a lease basis. It is most unfortunate that last session of Congress permitted the lease-purchase program to lapse, particularly when such a public building program could have already helped in staving off an extended letdown in our economy if it had been permitted to go forward without threat of expiring. It is my hope that the lease-purchase program will be reinstated and that the President's $2 billion construction program will be approved. Congress must also face up to the problem of trying to put the Post Office Department on a sound business basis by providing for reasonable, well-distributed revenue increases.

I commend "General" Sessions remarks to the Members of the House for consideration:

Mr. Chairman, Congressman CRAMER, colleagues from the postal service, and friends, I would like to begin my remarks with a simple statement of fact: I consider it an honor and a privilege to be here among you today.

My only regret is that Postmaster General Arthur E. Summerfield, himself, could not be with us at this memorable event, marking the dedication of the St. Petersburg Post Office. He asked that I extend to each of you here, and particularly the many members of the postal family, his personal greetings and congratulations. I am also happy to see with us today Mr. Norman R. Abrams, formerly our Assistant Postmaster General in charge of the Bureau of Operations.

A dedication such as this symbolizes the aims and the purposes of this postal administration: To give the American people the kind of modern, efficient mail service they should have.

This new St. Petersburg Post Office is radically different from the traditional and monumental edifices which have served as post offices in the past. It is modern in concept and clean in line. It is also designed not only for the efficient handling of your mail, but to be a good place for our employees to work, and for our patrons' comfort and convenience.

This post office will be an important factor in the everyday life of every citizen in the community. It will be a pleasant place for you to do business in and it will be a pleasant place for our employees to work.

Just imagine how effective we could be in giving the people of this country a truly modern postal service if modern and efficient facilities such as this were the rule rather than the exception.

For reasons beyond our control we have been faced with the problem of attempting to handle a fantastic and perennially increasing growth in our mail volume without any appreciable expansion or modernization of the facilities in which we must handle the mail.

There has been no new Government-owned post office built with Federal funds since 1938—and since that time our mail volume has grown by more than 100 percent.

St. Petersburg should realize the rate of postal growth more than the citizens in most other communities. In 1938 your revenues in this post office came to $439,000. Last year they amounted to two and a third million dollars—an increase of 540 percent in 20 years. Since postal receipts are a pretty accurate barometer of postal volume, you can see how crowded your old post-office facilities must have been—and under what crowded conditions our employees had to work to serve you.

You know, it is fashionable among unthinking persons to say unkind things about the postal service.

The postal service, on the one hand, is something that everyone takes for granted. On the other hand, no one is ever really satisfied with it.

But, if the average person saw the conditions under which most of our postmasters and supervisors and employees must work to keep the mail moving under an ever-increasing volume, I think he would be extremely thankful for the dedication and the tireless ingenuity of the 500,000 fine American citizens who make up our work force.

The annual growth in our mail volume is staggering and it accelerates every year.

We anticipate an overall volume for this fiscal year of 61 billion pieces of mail—more than all the rest of the free world put together.

That would mean an increase of about 3 billion pieces over last year.

The amount of that expected increase alone, 3 billion pieces in 1 year, is equivalent to the entire mail volume of Holland. It amounts to one-third the mail volume of France and one-sixth the mail volume of England.

A large percentage of our post offices were built in this country 50 years ago, and with the volume growing so swiftly, it is obvious that we cannot long continue to give truly 20th century service out of inadequate 19th century facilities. We simply must modernize our postal plants all over the country, just as we have here in St. Petersburg.

I would like to point out also that the Post Office is forbidden under existing law to plow back any part of its revenues into a modernization program, as would be the case in any other normal business operation.

We don't get the use of our revenues at all—they are turned over directly to the Treasury. We live under congressional appropriations under fiscal limitations set by the amounts of money voted by Congress for us to spend.

During the past 4 years the Post Office Department has gained valuable experience from its leasing program whereby about 2,000 new postal buildings have been built to our specifications by private investors and leased to the Department.

These postal buildings pay local taxes, are sound investments for their owners, eliminate the need for Government capital, and insofar as the taxpayer is concerned, they are economical, in that they are more efficient for modern mail-handling methods.

The new buildings erected to date have been leased at less cost per foot than older, less satisfactory space.

During this same period of time, the Post Office Department has had a research and engineering program underway whereby modern mechanical mail-handling equipment has been developed to the stage it can now be introduced in new postal facilities.

The only capital investment made by the Government under these conditions is for mail-handling equipment and vehicles for these new buildings.

The balance of the funds, probably up to eighty percent of the total, comes from private investors.

The Post Office Department today is losing about $700 million a year, primarily because we are forced to charge postage rates that are ridiculously low.

Postage rates on your first-class letters are the same today as they were in 1932—and, since that time our costs have increased about 108 percent. Furthermore, considering the decrease in the purchasing power of the dollar, a letter taking a 3-cent stamp in 1932 would cost 6 cents today.

Any business on earth which attempted to operate by charging 1932 prices and paying 1958 costs would go bankrupt—and the Post Office is no exception.

No one in this administration has ever claimed that the Post Office should make money. We perform some public services which have little or nothing to do with the postal service itself—and the cost of these services should be borne by the taxpayer and not by the actual users of the mail.

But the cost of these public services has been grotesquely exaggerated by the opponents of any increase at all in postage rates. It is relatively minor in respect to the overall postal deficit; about $30 million in contrast to a $700 million deficit.

The fact is that, if one excludes these public service items from our postal costs, then the Post Office traditionally was run on a break-even basis from its very inception up until 1947—and in the years since the war skyrocketing costs and static postage rates have combined to bring about a nearly $6 billion combined deficit for those years.

Here is another point to remember. First-class mail—the ordinary letters you write—has traditionally paid about 40 percent more than its cost. It is the preferred service and should pay more than its cost.

But today—because of rising costs and static rates—first-class mail—for the first

time in history—brings in less money in revenues than it costs us to handle it.

So, the postal deficit has nothing sacred or traditional about it. It has no historical significance. It is purely and simply a post-World War II inflationary phenomenon.

The United States is the only major nation in the world with a substantial postal deficit.

And, despite the fact that we pay, by far, the highest wages of any country, and are faced with the highest transportation costs—we charge the lowest postage rates of any major country in the world.

The reason I mention all this is quite simple. Right at this moment the Post Office Committee of the Senate is considering a bill to increase postage rates.

The bill passed the House of Representatives last year—and I want to pay special tribute today to the efforts of your own fine Congressman, WILLIAM CRAMER, in supporting our policies over the years. BILL CRAMER has done a terrific job representing you in Washington—and has done a terrific job in supporting the policies of President Dwight D. Eisenhower. You should be proud of him.

The rate bill which is so vital to the future welfare of the postal service is closer to passage now than it has been at any time during the last 5 years.

President Eisenhower, as you know, has asked the Congress to raise postage rates even higher—to 4 cents for local letters and 5 cents for out-of-town letters.

Last Tuesday night he outlined a $2 billion modernization program for the postal facilities of the Nation.

The Government's share of this program—about $875 million in 5 years—would come from applying that extra penny in the nickel out-of-town letter rate to modernization purposes. The remainder—approximately $1.5 billion—would be supplied by private capital, which would provide and lease real estate and buildings according to our specifications.

This program—which depends upon a 4-cent local and a 5-cent out-of-town postage rate bill being passed—could revolutionize our postal service and keep it the most modern in the world for the next two decades.

This administration of your postal service will never be satisfied until we can guarantee next-day delivery of your letters between any two cities in the United States.

Although we have made progress—considerable progress in speeding up the mails—we are still a long way from that goal. We shall never reach that goal unless we can modernize our postal facilities and install modern automatic devices which will move the mail through post offices much more quickly than it is moved today.

We have developed, with the help of the electronics industry and the United States Bureau of Standards, a series of mail-handling devices, some of which are unique in that they represent entirely new art in the field of handling mail. For instance, we are now putting together in the Washington post office a culling machine which is capable of sorting letters from all the other types of mail that comes into our post offices. This machine culls out large envelopes, assorted packages, and even such items as hotel keys, and delivers separately letter-size mail which is then available to go into an automatic facing and canceling machine which we will have operating no later than this June. This machine will take the culled letter-size mail and face it; that is, turn it so it can be made ready for canceling, and cancel it at the rate of 30,000 letters per hour.

We also have developed a unique sorting machine which will take the canceled letters and present them to an operator who will read the address and punch a key on a keyboard which will then drop the letter in a slot corresponding to its destination. This first machine will sort letters to 300 destinations and we have under development a more sophisticated sorting device which will sort to 1,000 destinations.

In addition to these automatic devices, we have other equipment such as the Mail-Flo system which transports the letters mechanically through various operations rather than having to place them in hampers and push them around the floor by hand.

These devices will be of enormous benefit when they are placed not only in our huge gateway post offices but also in hundreds of medium-size post offices throughout the United States.

As I say—the postage rate bill—which is so important to the modernization of the postal service—is now being considered by the Senate Post Office Committee. We hope it will soon be considered by the Senate as a whole. If you agree that the United States mail service should become truly modern and efficient—even if it would cost you 5 cents a piece for out-of-town letters—I think your two United States Senators would appreciate having the benefit of your thinking. Every good public servant is grateful for receiving the opinions of his constituents as a guide to his decisions. Now is the time to let yourself be heard on this matter of tremendous public importance.

I would like to leave this thought with you before I conclude.

All over the world this Nation is looked to—with admiration or with envy, as the case may be—as the center and the ultimate rampart of personal and political liberty.

And one of the principal symbols and manifestations of that liberty is our postal system—the most vital and most personal system of communications ever devised by the mind of man.

Consider this for just a moment. Freedom and a free and uncensored postal system always go hand in hand. They must exist together. Neither one can exist without the other.

That is why the postal system, such as we know it, is always freedom's first creation and tyranny's first target.

Over half the world's surface today, men and women, created in God's image and intended by Him to be free—are denied any part of this freedom of communications which we take so much for granted. A word of criticism about the regime in power—if written in a letter—could place both the sender and the intended receiver between 12 gleaming muzzles and a wall.

Is it too much then to ask that this manifestation of freedom—our postal system—in this, the strongest and wealthiest Nation in the world, should be so efficient that it is the paragon of all postal systems everywhere, the envy of freemen and the despair of despots?

This is a matter that is almost entirely out of the hands of the postal administration. It is in the hands of the people of this country through our representatives in Washington.

We are hopefully awaiting the answer.

We know that people of this country want the strongest military defense and the hardest hitting military offense that money and brains can supply.

We also feel certain that they want the finest postal system in the world.

And we feel sure in our hearts that if the people know that a stronger defense and a truly modern postal service will cost them a 5-cent stamp, they will be more than willing to pay the price.

And with this thought in mind it gives me great pleasure to declare this truly modern St. Petersburg post office officially open for business.

Newest News From Slovakia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MELVIN PRICE
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 17, 1958

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include herewith an article which appeared in the Cleveland (Ohio) Slovak News entitled "Newest News From Slovakia":

NEWEST NEWS FROM SLOVAKIA

(The following was the text of a radio address on the Slovak Hour, station WERE, on January 26, in Cleveland, Ohio, by Rev. Father Andrew Pier, O. S. B., managing editor of the Slovak News:)

Latest reports from the Slovak capital city of Bratislava indicate that despite the ironclad rule of the Czechoslovak Communist Party during the past decade in which it flooded Slovakia with thousands of Czech Communist officials, the country has experienced a strong resurgence of nationalism recently. At a meeting on January 9 and 10 in Slovakia's capital, the Slovak Communist Party, headed significantly enough by a Czech politician, Karel Bacilek, the latter complained that "bourgeois nationalism has become extremely effective in Slovakia in connection with the economic reorganization." He charged that the Slovak film industry, press, radio, and television, as well as the central administration, have become honey-combed with what he calls "former capitalists kulaks and former officials of the Slovak fascist state"(meaning the Slovak Republic which was established before World War II, and dissolved by the postwar Czechoslovak-Communist regime).

Bacilek's recommendation for a unified correlation for the entire Czechoslovak state was accompanied by denouncing Slovak separatism, that is, the aspirations of 4 million Slovaks to have their own free independent democratic state, as a movement supported by foreign reactionaries. In well-informed circles Bacilek's charges not only reveal the failure of the Czechoslovak repression of the Slovaks but prepare the way for another purge of unreliable elements (namely, the few remaining Slovaks in the Slovak regional government). The first to go in an immediate shakeup was Stefan Sebesta, Deputy Premier, who was replaced by Jan Stencl. A communique from the central committee of 61 of the Slovak Communist Party states that Sebesta has been dropped from membership and is accused of bourgeois (middle class) nationalist deviations.

Not content with the religious and political domination of Slovakia, the Prague-directed Communists who gradually liquidated Slovak Communists like Husak and Novomesky, are now determined to purge even the small group of minor native officials in their homeland. The drive to crush Slovak opposition to the postwar regime today, after more than a decade of rule by terror, repression, liquidation, imprisonment, and persecution of people because of religious and political beliefs, is manifestly an admission of the failure of the Czechoslovak regime to destroy the Slovak nation's will to resistance in Czechoslovakia. In a public statement Bacilek, who is the Secretary of the Slovak Communist Party, declared that the struggle against bourgeois ideologies and nationalism, as well as revisionist tendencies, will be intensified. Moreover, the economic

exploitation of the Slovaks and their lands is indicated in Bacilek's words that there is an economic decentralization in Slovakia—and since all Slovak officials in the administration are charged with being tools of foreign reactionaries they must be removed, according to the all-powerful party secretary who gets his orders from Prague. Another series of arrests, trials and conviction are foregone conclusions in Slovakia. And another chapter of injustice, persecution and man's inhumanity to man will be written on the indelible pages of history.

The New York Times and St. Louis Post-Dispatch carried several interesting articles on these latest developments in mid-January. Thanks to Mr. John Sedlacek of East St. Louis, Ill., for sending several of these invaluable newspaper clippings to me. They are a welcome addition to our Slovak Institute Historical Archives in Cleveland.

This, then, is the picture of Slovakia in our times. A country of 4 million freedom-loving people who declared their national independence before World War II, maintained it during the war only to have it snatched away from them by the so-called liberators. Slovakia is still suffering under the Red cloud of tyranny of the Czechoslovak Communists who came to power after the war.

The new policy of repression is official. The reports have been confirmed by all the international news agencies during the past week.

In view of these developments, the situation calls for a complete reorientation of the outlook of the free world. We must no longer allow ourselves to be hoodwinked and befuddled by erstwhile allies whom we befriended and aided in their hour of trial, for they have sold out freedom, democracy and human rights because of self-interest and expendiency. Instead, we must help those small nations that have kept the faith despite prolonged oppression. Among these is the Slovak nation that has endured 13 years of suffering for its faith in freedom and freedom of religion. Any nation that has been tried by the fire of persecution and has remained firm in its resistance to the forces of evil deserves our admiration and support. Such is the Slovak nation from which we proudly trace our ancestry. We have always cherished our heritage for which so many Slovaks suffered and died not only in centuries in the dim past but in our own times. We hope and pray that Slovakia will soon see the rebirth of its lost freedom.

Letter From Family Farmer Illustrates Danger to National Economy Inherent in Present Farm Depression

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. COYA KNUTSON
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 3, 1958

Mrs. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, in another place in this RECORD there is reprinted an editorial which gives clear warning of the prairie-fire character and danger of the present farm depression. A letter has come to me which directly and clearly illustrates the editorial's point. Under unanimous consent, I include in the RECORD the letter from Mr. Walter Maack, a farmer of Fergus Falls, Minn.:

FERGUS FALLS, MINN.,
February 17, 1958.

DEAR COYA: Thanks for sending me a copy of the hearings of Subcommittee on Family Farms held at Fergus Falls. I did not get to testify, so would like to let you know some of the problems since then.

Four of us brothers started farming all in Otter Tail County. I stayed on the farm, the rest sought employment other places. Two went in the iron mines and the other one in the airplane factory. The two that went to the mines have been unemployed for sometime and the other one says the contract for building planes ran out in June. So how can we that do what our Secretary of Agriculture recommends survive?

By the way, we all own our farm or have bought them.

Making this brief, if you would like more information on this please feel free to ask for it.

Thank you again.

WALTER MAACK.

You can use this letter for helping farm legislation if it will help any.

The Nickel May Regain Power Via Post Office Coup

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM C. CRAMER
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 10, 1958

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, I have long enjoyed the column, presented daily in many of the papers in the country, written by Robert Ruark. In the item he has written appearing in the Miami Herald, which I have included here for the RECORD, I find that his very fine sense of humor has been used to bring several important points in regard to the present postal dilemma into sharp focus. I am pleased to include this article for the information of the Members:

NICKEL MAY REGAIN POWER VIA POST OFFICE COUP

I can see no quarrel with Ike's idea of the 5-cent stamp for intercity letters, if only for the reason that it would bring the nickel back to common usage and perhaps restore a little of its badly tarnished dignity.

Pennies, even from heaven, don't mean anything any more. Tacking a couple of extra coppers on the stamp act would hurt nobody severely, and it would give the Government another 700 million bucks to waste on false friends abroad.

It is time the nickel came back to view. I remember well when it had dignity and strength in the market.

Two nickels made a dime, and a dime would buy you two hamburgers or a thick milkshake.

But about all a dime will buy you today is a phone call.

I foresaw possibly the world's end when the phone people upped the price of speech from 5 cents to 10 and was moved, in collaboration late one night with an itinerant musician named Joe Hushkim, to write a song called The Fickle Nickel Blues.

This song aroused widespread disinterest, even from the rippling right hand of Master Bushkin, but it was a sad, sad song, and poignantly indicative of the mood of the century.

The only really appreciative audience to this threat to Gershwin was Bernard M. Baruch, who had been preaching the ills of inflation for some years, and he reckoned that if our ditty did not comprise pure art, it sure as hell put the finger on what ailed the country.

But if I am paying this wistful currency, 5 cents, for a mere stamp, I want a little more action out of the Post Office Department for my dough.

I want Saturday afternoon and Sunday delivery, for instance. Telephones work on Sunday. The telegraph works on Sunday, and certainly the letter is as much a valid means of communication as phones and wires.

Instead of handing another bundle to some ingrate of a foreign neighbor who will promptly ask for more or threaten to turn to the Communists, I would like to see the United States post office spend the extra loot on streamlining itself and bring itself up from the days when post meant a guy galloping along on a horse with a letter in his teeth.

You cannot knock the airmail, which has to fight weather conditions.

I wager I can send a letter faster from London or Paris or Barcelona to New York than you get an ordinary letter from Brooklyn to Manhattan.

There must be some sort of possible reform in mail handling, and this extra dough ought to be devoted to it.

Speaking seriously, I think we have always paid too little for a service more necessary than speech, and there is no real reason why people who use the mails should not pay more.

The Virtues of Debate and a Free Press

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK THOMPSON, JR.
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 4, 1958

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, the able Washington correspondent of the New York Post, William V. Shannon, wrote the other day that—

It is one of the paradoxes of our political system that the House of Representatives often has good debates but nobody pays any attention, while the Senate rarely has debates in any real sense but the press and the public pay much closer attention to its proceedings.

Within the past year a perceptive journalist has written that the House is not "carrying its weight" and is in danger of becoming a rubber stamp for the Executive, while another veteran Washington reporter has termed the Senate "the one touch of genius in the American political system."

Now it is evident, as the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. UDALL] observed in a major article in the New York Times magazine of January 12, 1958, that—

Cubits are added to the stature of the Senate by the ease with which some of its Members catch the public eye. Although Senators speak for entire States and deserve greater attention than Representatives, their reputations frequently loom larger than life as a result of preferment accorded them by newsmen. A striking example of this type of upstaging occurred in 1955 when a policy statement issued by 20 of my colleagues got footnote treatment in the press; and a Senator, to our chagrin, made the front pages a week later by advancing the same ideas.

The situation has not changed one iota as far as this uneven treatment by the press is concerned. On Monday, January 27, 1958, a number of my colleagues and I engaged in a debate on foreign policy. The New York Times, which last

year compared the House unfavorably with the Senate, failed to carry a line about this House debate. A week later, however, the New York Times carried a front-page account of a speech on foreign policy and disarmament by one of the ablest of contemporary Senators.

Mr. Shannon's comment on the virtues of debate is so important that I include it here for the information of my colleagues and I invite comment upon it. I also include a letter and two editorials which I think will be of interest:

[From the New York Post of February 9, 1958]

THE VIRTUES OF DEBATE

(By William V. Shannon)

It is one of the paradoxes of our political system that the House of Representatives often has good debates but nobody pays any attention, while the Senate rarely has debates in any real sense but the press and the public pay much closer attention to its proceedings. The difference between the debate on foreign affairs in the House on January 27 and the speech of Senator HUMPHREY, (Democrat, of Minnesota), in the Senate this past Tuesday underscores this paradox.

A good debate is one in which the participants direct their remarks to one another (not to the press gallery, the folks back home, or the universe), "mix it up" with some spontaneity (not simply read a prepared speech), meet the intellectual issue in dispute, and develop some rewarding information and ideas through give-and-take.

By these standards, the House had a debate; the Senate had a production.

HUMPHREY, the chairman of the Senate Disarmament Subcommitte, had prepared an interesting and carefully developed address on disarmament and its wider ramifications for our entire foreign policy. This is a coptroversial subject worth everybody's attention, but throughout Tuesday afternoon the Republican side of the Senate was empty. Individual Democrats drifted in from time to time, but their questions and interjections did not constitute a debate. It was a genteel colloquy hedged around with the swollen courtesies in which the Senate delights ("I am pleased to congratulate the very able and very distinguished Senator * * *").

HUMPHREY, however, like most Senators, was trying to speak not to his colleagues but to the Nation. He succeeded. His speech made the front page of Wednesday's Times, a paper which had not carried a line about the House debate of the week before. (Your correspondent writes from a glass house: he wrote a news account of HUMPHREY's speech and did not cover the House debate.)

Representative BENTLEY, (Republican, of Michigan), opened the debate in the House. He had 60 minutes of time, in which he delivered a lusty defense of Secretary Dulles, pointedly and properly raised the issue of whether Dean Acheson was speaking for the Democratic Party in his recent statements. He generously yielded time to colleagues on both sides of the aisle for questions and comments. BENTLEY said nothing earthshaking, but if President Eisenhower is going to insist upon keeping Dulles in office, then some Republican Congressmen ought to defend that decision. BENTLEY saw his partisan duty and did it.

Representative REUSS, the thoughtful second-term Democrat Congressman from Milwaukee, then received 60 minutes to answer for the Democrats. REUSS is one of the more active of the 20 or more "Young Turks" on the Democratic side in the House.

It is both significant and unfortunate that these younger men, most of them first- and second-termers, come generally from the marginal districts, not the safe seats. This means waiting to obtain power through seniority is rather unpromising for them. The very intellectual qualities that make them useful Members stir them to impatience with the House. (Does anybody rally care what I do here? Is anybody listening?) This impatience prompts them to make often suicidal bids for seats in the Senate; and so, either through defeat for the House in national landslides like 1946 and 1952 or through the risks of senatorial ambition, they are often lost to national politics.

REUSS' remarks serve to remind us that some members of the Democratic Party in Congress do try to keep intellectually fresh and alive on great foreign policy issues.

He recalled that in March 1955 he and 16 other House Democrats proposed the neutralization and demilitarization of a unified Germany and of the Russian satellites once they are freed. Again, in December 1956, after the horrof of Hungary, 12 members of this group wrote General Eisenhower suggesting, among other points, the following:

"Creation of a demilitarized area without the capacity to make aggressive war for 1,000 miles from the Rhine to Russia's historic boundaries, and with demilitarization and the security of the area guaranteed by the East and West."

The signers of this proposal were REUSS, ADDONIZIO (New Jersey), RODINO (New Jersey), RHODES (Pennsylvania), MACDONALD (Massachusetts), ASHLEY (Ohio), BOYLE (Illinois), DINGELL (Michigan), MCCARTHY (Minnesota), SISK (California), and ROOSEVELT (California).

Speaking for himself, REUSS renewed his plea for military disengagement in Europe.

Whatever the flaws in his argument, REUSS and the colleagues who joined him in that little-noticed debate in the House a fortnight ago performed a public service. They helped to keep alive the tradition, if such it can be called, of party debate, critical responsible concern and openmindedness on foreign affairs.

As REUSS observed, "if Mr. Kennan were a member from Pennsylvania, as he might have been, and Mr. Acheson a representative of the District of Columbia in this body—and who would be a better one when home rule for the District comes true?—the marvelous vehicle of debate would, I am sure, with all of us participating, narrow the differences between them, and between us and each of them, and produce a stream of new ideas that no one person had in the beginning. Because we debate, we have an advantage. We should do more of it."

The Congressman may be overly optimistic about the stream of new ideas likely to flow from debate, but there is no doubt that the House—and the Senate, too—should do more of it. Debate is one way to induce thinking, and only thinking can save us.

NATIONAL COUNCIL OF THE
CHURCHES OF CHRIST IN THE
UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,
New York, N. Y., February 11, 1958.

The Honorable FRANK THOMPSON, Jr.,
House of Representatives Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. THOMPSON: Thank you for calling to my personal attention your participation in the foreign-policy debate on Monday, January 27, as recorded in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD which you sent to me, with your speech on pages 948–950. While we do have the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD read for us, I have taken the time to give my personal attention to this interesting debate.

I was encouraged by the general direction of the debate on both sides of the aisle. Your statement is a crisp, orderly presentation of some of the important issues and principles which are strategic for decisions which must be made at this time. I find considerable agreement between some of the principles which you have set forth and some of those which the churches represented in the national council have advocated.

I was interested in your other points of participation in the debate as well, and the way in which you put certain of your points about the necessary support for the reciprocal-trade program and other constructive policies.

I was interested in the parallels between some of your thinking and some of that which we have been doing in our department in these weeks. I have written an editorial for our publication, the Outlook, of which I am sending you a copy under separate cover. In the editorial, from a nonpartisan perspective, I attempted to make some of the same points which I discover you making in this debate—such as the need for more imagination and more demanding programs which will elicit the kind of response which I believe the people of our Nation will make to inspired leadership.

Again, may I express my appreciation to you for calling to my attention this particular debate and your significant part in it. I am inclined to agree with the remarks of your colleague, Mr. UDALL, that it was a most useful occasion when Members of the House could engage so early in the session in such serious debate on foreign policy, and that these are some of the House's finest moments.

Sincerely yours,

KENNETH L. MAXWELL,
Executive Director, Department of International Affairs.

[From the Outlook, National Council of Churches of Christ in the United States of America, February 1958]

BILLIONS FOR DEFENSE; BUT HOW MUCH FOR PEACE?

Two tasks face us as a Nation now, said the President in his state of the Union message: One, "to insure our safety through strength." The other? "We could make no more tragic mistake than merely to concentrate on military strength. For if we did only this, the future would hold nothing for the world but an age of terror. * * * And so our second task is to do the constructive work of building a genuine peace. We must never become so preoccupied with our desire for military strength that we neglect those areas of economic development, trade, diplomacy, education, ideas, and principles where the foundations of real peace must be laid."

In his call to "wage total peace," the Chief Executive specified action items which he called "imperative": mutual aid, mutual trade, science cooperation, education, and research, disarmament, persistent negotiations, and other works of peace.

He declared that such actions demand two things of the American people: "sacrifice and of high degree of understanding."

But when the administration budget for 1959 went to the Congress, within a week, where was the call to "sacrifice," the understanding" of the revolutionary nature of this period of history?

For the military task—for defense—some increase was proposed. But for the "constructive work of * * * peace"—for mutual aid and cooperation in international affairs through 1959 budget expenditures—the President actually requested less than last year.

The tragedy of this timid response in the new nuclear-space era is clearly seen in the statistics: For defense—over $45 billion. For international aid and cooperation—about $1.3 billion. Amounts for education, science, information services, and other works of peace, to say nothing of other strategic domestic programs, are also correspondingly small. It should be kept clear that, while this budget is the biggest peacetime budget in dollars, it is not so in proportion to population, buying power, or gross national product.

But why should Christians be concerned about such mercenary measures as budgets? Budgets can be a symbol of relative values. Jesus declared of men, what can also in this case be true of nations: "Where your treasure is, there will your heart be also."

Where is the heart, the sense of values of the people of the United States? Does it center on military preparedness almost to the exclusion of other concerns for other peoples of the world?

Representatives of the churches at the general assembly of the National Council of Churches, addressing themselves to the present crisis, called for balanced concern for the whole range of problems confronting us.

They declared that "the present crisis with its dangers and opportunities, while partially military and scientific, is of broader and deeper nature. It is also educational, political, psychological, economic, diplomatic, and cultural. Even more fundamentally, it is moral and spiritual." They urged: redoubled efforts for reduction and regulation of armaments toward the goal of world disarmament in the framework of the United Nations; more science, "primarily to promote human well-being and values"; more emphasis on education, and in the humanities as well as the sciences; recognition of the basic needs of the newly developing areas of the world; making maximum use of the United Nations and strengthening coalitions in accord with the U. N.'s purposes in responsibilities for economic, political, and social well-being of people. They called for new United States initiative in constructive economic, political, diplomatic and ideological policies and programs.

In separate action on international aid and trade the general assembly declared: "As Christians we feel compelled to give our special support to the further development of foreign economic policies of the United States which will reflect our interest in man's welfare in other countries as well as in our own. We believe that constructive policies of international aid and trade are essential to the creation of conditions of peace with justice and freedom."

The policy statement supported the principle of the Reciprocal Trade Agreements with the hope that this program will be extended for at least another 5 years without weakening amendments. It also endorsed United States participation in necessary international machinery such as is planned for in the proposed Organization for Trade Cooperation. It also asked for measures to assist areas, industries, and people adversely affected by efforts for the larger good.

On mutual aid, they declared: "Both private and public aid, in the form of technical cooperation and capital is indispensable."

In summary, they said: "This assembly advocates balanced, expanding programs of international aid and trade."

The churches have taken such actions and others in these crucial weeks. They have hoped that officials in our Government, both in the administration and in Congress would take new power initiatives in constructive actions for developing the conditions of justice and peace.

Now have come the administration's proposals for so relatively little for the works of peace. What then should the churches do? The churches have a three-fold responsibility: to support as fully as possible the admittedly limited administration proposals, where they are in keeping with their principles. To encourage possible new initiatives in Congress. To judge society, including Government, which means not simply condemning, but evaluating proposals and performance and setting prophetic goals toward which Government can move.

The churches have a prophetic responsibility for suggesting that magnitudes of economic and technical aid should be multiplied to be more commensurate with military expenditures. Possible objections raised about such expenditures in a period of economic decline actually point to an argument for more mutual aid, because more than 75 percent of expenditures for mutual aid find their way directly into the United States economy in payments for goods and services.

The churches have a prophetic responsibility for suggesting that motivation is also crucial in what our country seeks to do in mutual aid and other works of peace. An obvious reason for stepping up such programs is the effort to restrain and reduce Communist influence in the world. However, anticommunism alone is not sufficient motivation for adequate United States international undertakings. Even if there were no Soviet Communist threat in the world, our Nation would have major responsibilities toward the rest of mankind.

In an interdependent world of revolution with hundreds of millions of people in scores of nations seeking bread, health, dignity, and freedom, the United States must be more responsive to these aspirations. Policies and programs must be developed to help meet them.

Both in our own national self-interest and in our responsibility to the human race in an interdependent, revolutionary, nuclear-space era, the United States must take massive new initiatives. As one of the wealthiest, most powerful nations on earth, our Nation should develop economic, political, and ideological programs which will help the peoples of the world to help themselves in meeting basic human needs and aspirations.

The call of the new president of the National Council of Churches in his inaugural address for massive reconciliation and works of peace has struck a responsive chord among hosts of people from coast to coast. Now, with Government making only such limited proposals, and primarily military ones, for meeting the present crisis at the threshold of the nuclear-space era, will other church leaders and ministers and laymen across our land speak out to those in government and to public opinion, expressing real leadership by the people demanding much more imaginative and extensive programs in the things that make for peace?

TIME FOR MORE CHRISTIAN INITIATIVE

How will the church respond to the challenge of the nuclear-space age?

We are crossing the threshold into an era of fearful and awesome proportions. Old defenses have become obsolete. The new concept, we are told, is active defense—stopping war before it starts.

But there's another side to the picture. Apparently the vast majority of all people everywhere want peace; not arms control, but peace. They are growing insistent about it. If everyone everywhere knew this, it might make a difference. Peace can be waged as well as war.

Moscow has successfully seized the initiative in the launching of earth satellites. But in an all-out "peace offensive" the initiative can only be taken by those whose concept of the brotherhood of man is derived from a humble recognition of the fatherhood of God.

Perhaps it was for just such a time as this that there came into being a National Council of Churches in 1950 to provide machinery for effective cooperation. It can be used for whatever the situation may demand, if enough Christians are disposed to make use of it. This is a day in which neither nation nor denomination can hope to stand alone, and in which the strong must help the weak. It is a day for the churches to resolve to do nothing separately that can be done better together.

It may be that the critically important potential of radio and television will make these mass mediums the catalysts to unite the churches on a course of action geared to the world situation. The cost of using them effectively comes high. It forces a consideration of how this use shall be related to all other means of furthering the churches' objectives, and what new strategy it demands of the church locally, and of the individual Christian.

Many communions—Methodists, Presbyterians, Baptists, Lutherans—have been giving consideration to what may be involved in using these mediums to meet the challenge of the hour. So have the national council's major departments and its broadcasting and film commission. The radio-TV leaders of councils of churches have formed a Council Broadcasters' Fellowship and are cooperating in a nationwide study of the religious use of radio and television in the major cities. The national council's general assembly approved a study commission on the role of radio, television, and films in religion. Conversations are being carried on at the station and network levels, and between the faiths, on the function and importance of religion in the broadcast schedule. Bold new experimentation, aimed at making the broadcasts themselves more potent and at involving the church locally in an active partnership, is in process. Very special attention is being given to the program needs of children and youth. Negotiations are afoot for better broadcast hours—when the "faithful" can see and hear what they are being asked to support and to promote. Electronic improvements are not far off that may revolutionize American television by making programs available in all parts of the country at the same clock hour.

Much of this is on the agenda of the broadcasting and film commission at its mid-February meeting in New York City. In a very real sense "all the past is prelude." Like the Israelites, who were given the promised land "to go in and possess it," we too are the people of a promise. We, too, have a part in its fulfillment: the all-out exercise of our Christian initiative.

Need for Improving the Condition of Older Persons

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM C. CRAMER
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 19, 1958

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, press comments regarding the innumerable bills introduced into the Congress dealing with older persons has been infrequent.

A number of articles have, however, appeared during the past month in the Vintage Years, a syndicated newspaper column for senior citizens. They are written by R. O. Beckman, a recognized authority in the field of aging, and executive director of the Senior Service Foundation, a nonprofit corporation in behalf of older persons. Its headquarters are in Miami, Fla., although it has national objectives.

I commend to interested persons the following comments from the Vintage Years column which have recently appeared in the Newark (N. J.) News and other newspapers:

[From the Newark (N. J.) Evening News]

THE VINTAGE YEARS: WHY CONGRESSMEN GROW OLD—FIVE HUNDRED BILLS ON AGED CONFRONT CURRENT SESSION

(By R. O. Beckman)

Your Congressmen deserve your tolerant sympathy, and perhaps your pity and prayers.

Not only are they expected to support more expenditures for defense and to anticipate boosts in taxes and the national debt but they will be faced with a thousand other difficult decisions—all in an election year. Among the demands that cannot be overlooked are those of senior citizens existing on fixed and inadequate incomes in a day of inflation. In this area alone your Congressman is being asked to consider more than 500 bills affecting older persons.

It looks as though Congress will have to teach all of us that we cannot have our cake and eat it too, if we want to preserve our freedom in the world and also keep our older generation from starving.

Bernard Baruch says that western democracy will be defeated unless it is willing to make necessary sacrifices through self-discipline and thrift. More taxes mean tightening our belts, curtailing private expenditures, and getting our money's worth for what we spend in Washington and at home.

Economists make it clear that the growth of our basic resources can provide for the nonworking aged at an increasingly generous level.

Among the bills before Congress are 13 for establishment of a special unit in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare in behalf of seniors and 11 for temporary study commissions to suggest more suitable answers to questions of old age and security. Six bills propose a flat benefit national pension program, including the Townsend plan. Health insurance is involved in 23 bills.

EDUCATION PROPOSAL

Others call for adult education, recreation, and housing, and affect income tax provisions. The largest number propose various changes in the coverage, benefits, beneficiaries, retirement or eligibility age, and earnings restrictions of the Old Age and Survivors' Insurance Act. Numerous changes also are proposed in the Railroad Retirement Act.

The more important bills in the field of the aging which may reach the floor of Congress instead of gathering dust in committees will be reviewed in a subsequent column. In the face of pressure for action in so many other areas, our senior team will be lucky to gain a few yards in the 1958 congressional scrimmage.

There will be support, however, from a number of sources. Organized labor is stepping up its drive for health protection. Labor Secretary James P. Mitchell is a staunch friend of those in the second half of life. He may be expected to exert himself to expand employment for older workers and to help prevent raids on senior benefits.

Senior citizens' clubs, which are blossoming widely, are not organized for lobbying but will be able to express themselves on proposed legislation. The clamor of the Townsend Clubs will help keep the pot boiling.

Lastly, but of prime importance, is the large number of Members of Congress who have taken the trouble to inform themselves of the predicament of a substantial part of our older population.

[From the Fort Lauderdale Daily News of January 13, 1958]

THE VINTAGE YEARS

(By R. O. Beckman)

"For age is opportunity no less
Than youth, though in another dress."

Soaring costs of medical care, of vital concern to the country's elder population, ought to command the serious attention of Congress also, despite the urgency of international problems.

A 78-percent rise in our annual expenditures for health care during the past decade is reported by Edwin S. Hewitt & Associates, consultants on employee-benefit plans. More than $12 billion was spent last year.

Inflation accounts for 40 percent of the increase; population growth for 21 percent, and increased use of medical services and facilities for the remainder. Medical service costs are reported to have increased nearly twice as much as the general cost of living.

Several million elderly retired persons live in constant fear of illness that may deplete their precious life's savings or force them to apply for public assistance.

Here's an example: an elderly man, stricken with a heart attack and other complications, was kept alive with an oxygen tent and many other services for 6 weeks although physicians had practically given him up.

When he died, bills for $5,000 were presented to his indigent widow. Since a county hospital was involved, the State had a lien on her home.

VITAL PROBLEM

Public and private welfare agencies are seeking frantically to cope with the rising medical needs of their clients. Longer life has swelled the ranks of the over-75 population most prone to illness. Emergency measures for medical care often cost more than is necessary and do not necessarily provide the best solution.

Many of the aged infirm in hospitals and institutions could remain happier and healthier, at less expense, if permitted to stay in their own homes with temporary assistance from visiting nurses and homemakers. The cost of institutional care for indigent oldsters adds to the taxes of younger wage earners.

About 70 percent of the entire population is covered by voluntary health insurance but less than half of the persons over 65 have such protection. Older persons are ineligible for most regular hospital and surgical insurance despite extravagant claims made by companies that are going all out to sell such policies.

The Blue Cross plan continues to renew policies for members after 65 but other companies scale down the benefits and may cancel policies with increasing age. Blue Cross claims more than 50 million subscribers but it is reported that rates are being boosted substantially in some States.

Only the well-to-do can afford to be ill these days. A census survey shows that nearly 40 percent of older couples with income of less than $3,000 a year receive no medical service compared with 25 percent of those with $10,000 incomes.

This appears to be largely because of the costs involved. Oldsters on old age assistance or limited social security benefits are hardest hit; there are few hospitals where service can be paid for in proportion to the patient's income.

Some relief was sought 2 years ago when President Eisenhower endorsed a proposal to have the Government coinsure or guarantee health insurance issued by reputable companies. Congress now has before it a number of bills proposing more extensive plans for health care.

From the viewpoint of the Nation's economy, the American Medical Association cannot be censured for its opposition to socialized medicine as exemplified in H. R. 3764, introduced by Representative DINGELL (Democrat, Michigan).

This national insurance act provides every kind of medical, dental, nursing, and auxiliary service free of charge to any individual. The Federal Government is expected to wave a magic wand and provide the billions of dollars that will be needed to pay for all of our doctor bills.

A more reasonable plan for medical service is that proposed by other House bills, of which H. R. 9467 by Representative FORAND (Democrat, Rhode Island) has the broadest scope. It provides 60 days of hospital service or 120 days of nursing home care for OASI beneficiaries. It thus broadens the base of the Social Security Act to furnish medical care as well as cash benefits.

[From the Camden (N. J.) Courier-Post]

THE VINTAGE YEARS: SENIOR CITIZENS HOLD IMPORTANT VOTE BLOC

(By R. O. Beckman)

Among the hallmarks that make the United States Congress an assembly of distinction is the statistic that 72 percent of its Members are over age 50. More than half of the Senators and nearly a third of the Representatives are, in fact, over 60. Some 57 Members of both Houses are 70 or more.

These figures raise the question of their effect upon the vote for legislation in behalf of older persons. The wisdom and experience that come with age normally supply better understanding of the socioeconomic difficulties faced in later life. Kindly and tolerant consideration of social security and old-age measures, more or less influenced by an election year, may therefore be expected of legislative timber that had been well seasoned.

Three obstacles must be surmounted, however, in order to improve the status of hundreds of thousands of older persons leading lives of quiet desperation.

FLASHBACK TO 1930'S

The first is the tendency to subordinate all other legislation to measures relating to national defense. The second is the trend toward economy in other expenditures.

Budget proposals already cut welfare and labor funds by 6 percent. It is unthinkable that Congress should withhold adequate funds for improvement to the social-security structure and in public health at a time of inflation, when standards of living for many retired persons are as low as they were during the depression of the thirties. That would revise Marie Antoinette's dictum: "Let them eat cake." The pump needs to be primed, not shut off.

The final point affecting the hopes of 15 million congressional constituents over age 65 is the difficulty of getting bills out of committee onto the floor where they can be voted on. Such action could be furthered if nonpartisan groups of senior Congressmen were to meet in caucus to decide on which measures should be put to a vote. Such a selection will be difficult.

WHICH COMES FIRST

A number of readers, including representatives of welfare agencies, have asked: Just what legislation should I encourage my Congressmen to support? Correspondence with authorities well versed as to the needs indicates that the following measures may be appropriate for consideration:

1. Proper recognition of the needs of an aging population by establishing in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, a bureau of older persons to plan, coordinate, and demonstrate necessary activities in this field. A typical proposal along this line is the Hill-Kennedy bill.

2. Extension of the security program to provide hospital and surgical benefits to OASI and old-age beneficiaries and cope with inflated costs of health care. The Forand bill (H. R. 9467) meets most of this need.

3. Removal of the limitation on the amount of outside income a social security beneficiary may earn. The St. George bill (H. R. 7141) is desirable.

BENEFIT BOOST PROPOSED

4. Increases in the payments available under the social security law, as proposed in a score of bills before Congress, also deserve consideration in view of the rise in living costs.

5. Provision for a national mortgage corporation to further the construction of housing for elderly persons, S. 1694, by Senator CLARK calls for this.

The foregoing measures, in order of relative importance, seem to be those on which realistic but conservative students of the issues at stake are likely to agree.

THE VINTAGE YEARS—REPRESENTATIVE ST. GEORGE HEADS FIGHT FOR OLD FOLKS

(By R. O. Beckman)

"For age is opportunity no less
Than youth, though in another dress."

St. George, according to the legend, slew the ferocious dragon and became England's patron saint. During the middle ages, English knights invoked his name in their battle cry as they assaulted the enemy.

Millions of Americans aged 65 or more now have another St. George dedicated to slaying one of the dragons that threatens their security. The Congressional Directory lists this 20th century champion as KATHARINE PRICE COLLIER ST. GEORGE. She represents 4 New York counties just north of the Jersey State line. The directory does not give her age, but says she was a member of the town board of Tuxedo Park for 15 years and a Member of Congress for 11, so you see she may have reason to be interested in middle-aged and older people.

IS DAR MEMBER

Representative ST. GEORGE is a member of a number of civic organizations and of the Daughters of the American Revolution. She comes from the same Hudson River country as State Senator Thomas Desmond, who has done more than anyone to advance State legislation in behalf of seniors.

This Congresswoman has raised the banner to wipe out restrictions in the social security law which cancel your benefits if you earn more than $1,200 a year. "I have a real grudge against Uncle Sam," says she. "He has forced 7½ million Americans into a below-par living bracket and held them imprisoned there."

"The Government urges business to hire older persons and then holds a club over the heads of those lucky enough to get a job. A man can draw social security if he makes $100,000 a year from investments—or the horse races—but not if he tries to earn a living by the sweat of his brow. We send money all over the world for foreign aid, yet ignore oldsters right under our nose who are trying to help themselves."

INTRODUCES BILL

Mrs. ST. GEORGE recently introduced H. R. 7141 to remove the ceiling from earned incomes. Opponents of the bill claim it will add a million names to the social-security rolls and cost an added $2 million a year. They do not mention that much of this would be offset by increased prosperity and income taxes from many who are not now working because of the fear of losing their benefits. The present $1,200 limit practically eliminates jobs for beneficiaries paying from $1,200 to $3,500. For example, the husband of a couple now receiving $162 a month has to earn at least 50 percent more than that to attain the average income of younger workers and improve his marginal living standard.

This forthright Congresswoman urges you to prod your elected Representatives to act. Congress has now adjourned to mend its fences back home and may be open to persuasion. If you believe the present restrictions unjust, you can send a letter to your Representative and your Senators telling them why, from your own experience, you think H. R. 7141 should be enacted.

HALTED CUTS

Another man to whom seniors are indebted is Representative JOHN E. FOGARTY, of Rhode Island. Almost singlehanded, he halted cuts in the United States Labor Department's budget last summer in such a way that they would not be at the expense of the older worker employment program.

Many older persons in need of work will doubtless rally to the banner of ST. GEORGE. A law which limits the constructive effort of individuals is a bad one and should be repealed.

PRICE OF THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

The Public Printer is authorized to furnish to subscribers the daily RECORD at $1.50 per month, payable in advance.

Remit by money order payable to Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D. C.

PRINTING OF CONGRESSIONAL RECORD EXTRACTS

It shall be lawful for the Public Printer to print and deliver upon the order of any Senator, Representative, or Delegate, extracts from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the person ordering the same paying the cost thereof (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 185, p. 1942).

CHANGE OF RESIDENCE

Senators, Representatives, and Delegates who have changed their residences will please give information thereof to the Government Printing Office, that their addresses may be correctly given in the RECORD.

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board, or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D. C., at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer plus 50 percent: *Provided*, That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized bookdealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by bookdealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD is located in Statuary Hall, House wing, where Mr. Raymond F. Noyes is in attendance during the sessions of Congress to receive orders for subscriptions to the RECORD at $1.50 per month, and where single copies may also be purchased. Orders are also accepted for the printing of speeches in pamphlet form.

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. No sale shall be made on credit (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).

SENATORS WITH RESIDENCES IN WASHINGTON

OFFICE ADDRESS: Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.

[Streets northwest unless otherwise stated]

Vice President, Richard Nixon

Aiken, George D., *Vt*.....Carroll Arms
Allott, Gordon, *Colo*.....Cleveland House
Anderson, Clinton P., *N. Mex.*, 6 Wesley Circle
Barrett, Frank A., *Wyo*.....The Woodner
Beall, J. Glenn, *Md*.....
Bennett, Wallace F., *Utah*...
Bible, Alan, *Nev*.....
Bricker, John W., *Ohio*.....The Mayflower
Bridges, Styles, *N. H*.....
Bush, Prescott, *Conn*.....
Butler, John Marshall, *Md*..
Byrd, Harry Flood, *Va*.....The Shoreham
Capehart, Homer E., *Ind*...The Westchester
Carlson, Frank, *Kans*.....Sheraton-Park
Carroll, John A., *Colo*.....
Case, Clifford P., *N. J*.....
Case, Francis, *S. Dak*.....4635 Mass. Ave.
Chavez, Dennis, *N. Mex*.....3327 Cleveland Ave.
Church, Frank, *Idaho*.....
Clark, Joseph S., *Pa*.....
Cooper, John Sherman, *Ky*..
Cotton, Norris, *N. H*.....
Curtis, Carl T., *Nebr*.....
Dirksen, Everett M., *Ill*....
Douglas, Paul H., *Ill*.....
Dworshak, Henry C., *Idaho*..
Eastland, James O., *Miss*...5101 Macomb St.
Ellender, Allen J., *La*.....
Ervin, Samuel J., Jr., *N. C*...
Flanders, Ralph E., *Vt*.....
Frear, J. Allen, Jr., *Del*.....
Fulbright, J. William, *Ark*..
Goldwater, Barry M., *Ariz*...
Gore, Albert, *Tenn*.....
Green, Theodore Francis, *R. I.*, University Club
Hayden, Carl, *Ariz*.....
Hennings, Thomas C., Jr., *Mo.*
Hickenlooper, Bourke B., *Iowa*, 5511 Cedar Parkway, Chevy Chase, Md.
Hill, Lister, *Ala*.....
Hoblitzell, John D., Jr., *W. Va*.....
Holland, Spessard L., *Fla*...Sheraton-Park
Hruska, Roman L., *Nebr*....
Humphrey, Hubert H., *Minn.*
Ives, Irving M., *N. Y*.....
Jackson, Henry M., *Wash*...
Javits, Jacob K., *N. Y*.....
Jenner, William E., *Ind*....
Johnson, Lyndon B., *Tex*....
Johnston, Olin D., *S. C*.....
Kefauver, Estes, *Tenn*.....4929 Hillbrook Lane
Kennedy, John F., *Mass*....
Kerr, Robert S., *Okla*.....
Knowland, William F., *Calif.*
Kuchel, Thomas H., *Calif*...
Langer, William, *N. Dak*...2101 Conn. Ave.
Lausche, Frank J., *Ohio*....
Long, Russell B., *La*.....
McClellan, John L., *Ark*....
McNamara, Pat, *Mich*.....
Magnuson, Warren G., *Wash.*, The Shoreham
Malone, George W., *Nev*....The Mayflower
Mansfield, Mike, *Mont*.....
Martin, Edward, *Pa*.....
Martin, Thos. E., *Iowa*.....4545 Conn. Ave.
Monroney, A. S. Mike, *Okla.*
Morse, Wayne, *Oreg*.....5020 Lowell St.
Morton, Thruston B., *Ky*....
Mundt, Karl E., *S. Dak*....122 Schotts Court NE.
Murray, James E., *Mont*...The Shoreham
Neuberger, Richard L., *Oreg.*
O'Mahoney, Joseph C., *Wyo.*, Sheraton-Park
Pastore, John O., *R. I*.....
Payne, Frederick G., *Maine*..
Potter, Charles E., *Mich*....
Proxmire, William E., *Wis*...
Purtell, William A., *Conn*...
Revercomb, Chapman, *W. Va.*
Robertson, A. Willis, *Va*....
Russell, Richard B., *Ga*.....
Saltonstall, Leverett, *Mass*..2320 Tracy Pl.
Schoeppel, Andrew F., *Kans.*
Scott, W. Kerr, *N. C*.....
Smathers, George A., *Fla*...
Smith, H. Alexander, *N. J*...Sheraton-Park
Smith, Margaret Chase, (Mrs.), *Maine.*
Sparkman, John J., *Ala*.....4928 Indian Lane
Stennis, John, *Miss*.....
Symington, Stuart, *Mo*.....
Talmadge, Herman E., *Ga*....
Thurmond, Strom, *S. C*.....
Thye, Edward J., *Minn*.....
Watkins, Arthur V., *Utah*...
Wiley, Alexander, *Wis*.....2122 Mass. Ave.
Williams, John J., *Del*.....
Yarborough, Ralph W., *Tex*..
Young, Milton R., *N. Dak*...Quebec House So.

OFFICERS OF THE SENATE

Secretary—Felton M. Johnston.
Chief Clerk—Emery L. Frazier.
Sergeant at Arms—Joseph C. Duke.
Secretary for the Majority—Robert G. Baker.
Secretary for the Minority—J. Mark Trice.
Chaplain—Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D.

STANDING COMMITTEES OF THE SENATE

Committee on Agriculture and Forestry

Messrs. Ellender (chairman), Johnston of South Carolina, Holland, Eastland, Humphrey, Scott, Symington, Talmadge, Aiken, Young, Thye, Hickenlooper, Mundt, Williams, and Schoeppel.

Committee on Appropriations

Messrs. Hayden (chairman), Russell, Chavez, Ellender, Hill, McClellan, Robertson, Magnuson, Holland, Stennis, Johnson of Texas, Pastore, Bridges, Saltonstall, Young, Knowland, Thye, Mundt, Mrs. Smith of Maine, Messrs. Dworshak, Dirksen, Potter, and Ives.

Committee on Armed Services

Messrs. Russell (chairman), Byrd, Johnson of Texas, Kefauver, Stennis, Symington, Jackson, Ervin, Saltonstall, Bridges, Flanders, Mrs. Smith of Maine, Messrs. Case of South Dakota, Bush, and Barrett.

Committee on Banking and Currency

Messrs. Fulbright (chairman), Robertson, Sparkman, Frear, Douglas, Monroney, Clark, Proxmire, Capehart, Bricker, Bennett, Bush, Beall, Payne, and Case of New Jersey.

Committee on the District of Columbia

Messrs. Bible (chairman), Morse, Frear, Clark, Proxmire, Beall, Morton, Javits, and Hoblitzell.

Committee on Finance

Messrs. Byrd (chairman), Kerr, Frear, Long, Smathers, Anderson, Douglas, Gore, Martin of Pennsylvania, Williams, Flanders, Malone, Carlson, Bennett, and Jenner.

Committee on Foreign Relations

Messrs. Green (chairman), Fulbright, Sparkman, Humphrey, Mansfield, Morse, Long, Kennedy, Wiley, Smith of New Jersey, Hickenlooper, Langer, Knowland, Aiken, and Capehart.

Committee on Government Operations

Messrs. McClellan (chairman), Jackson, Symington, Ervin, Humphrey, Thurmond, Lausche, Mundt, Mrs. Smith of Maine, Messrs. Martin of Iowa, Curtis, Revercomb, and Capehart.

Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs

Messrs. Murray (chairman), Anderson, Jackson, O'Mahoney, Bible, Neuberger, Carroll, Church, Malone, Watkins, Dworshak, Kuchel, Barrett, Goldwater, and Allott.

Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce

Messrs. Magnuson (chairman), Pastore, Monroney, Smathers, Bible, Thurmond, Lausche, Yarborough, Bricker, Schoeppel, Butler, Potter, Purtell, Payne, and Cotton.

Committee on the Judiciary

Messrs. Eastland (chairman), Kefauver, Johnston of South Carolina, Hennings, McClellan, O'Mahoney, Ervin, Carroll, Wiley, Langer, Jenner, Watkins, Dirksen, Butler, and Hruska.

Committee on Labor and Public Welfare

Messrs. Hill (chairman), Murray, Kennedy, McNamara, Morse, Thurmond, Yarborough, Smith of New Jersey, Ives, Purtell, Goldwater, Allott, and Cooper.

Committee on Post Office and Civil Service

Messrs. Johnston of South Carolina (chairman), Monroney, Scott, Neuberger, Church, Yarborough, Proxmire, Carlson, Jenner, Langer, Martin of Iowa, Morton, and Hoblitzell.

Committee on Public Works

Messrs. Chavez (chairman), Kerr, Gore, McNamara, Neuberger, Scott, ———, Martin of Pennsylvania, Case of South Dakota, Kuchel, Cotton, Hruska, and Revercomb.

Committee on Rules and Administration

Messrs. Hennings (chairman), Hayden, Green, Mansfield, Talmadge, Curtis, Cooper, Javits, and Case of New Jersey.

UNITED STATES SUPREME COURT

Mr. Chief Justice Warren, of California, Hotel Sheraton-Park, Washington, D. C.
Mr. Justice Black, of Alabama, 619 S. Lee St., Alexandria, Va.
Mr. Justice Frankfurter, of Massachusetts, 3018 Dumbarton Ave.
Mr. Justice Douglas, of Washington, 4852 Hutchins Place.
Mr. Justice Burton, of Ohio, the Dodge.
Mr. Justice Clark, of Texas, 2101 Connecticut Ave.
Mr. Justice Harlan, of New York, 1677 31st St.
Mr. Justice Brennan, of New Jersey, 3037 Dumbarton Ave.
Mr. Justice Whittaker, of Missouri, 6920 32d St.

OFFICERS OF THE SUPREME COURT

Clerk—John T. Fey, 2931 Cathedral Ave.
Deputy Clerk—Edmund P. Cullinan, 4823 Reservoir Road.
Deputy Clerk—Richard J. Blanchard, 427 St. Lawrence Drive, Silver Spring, Md.
Marshal—T. Perry Lippitt, 6004 Corbin Road.
Reporter—Walter Wyatt, 1702 Kalmia Rd.
Librarian—Helen Newman, 126 3d St. SE.

UNITED STATES JUDICIAL CIRCUITS

JUSTICES ASSIGNED

TERRITORY EMBRACED

District of Columbia: Mr. Chief Justice Warren. District of Columbia.

First judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Frankfurter. Maine, Massachusetts, New Hampshire, Puerto Rico, Rhode Island.

Second judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Harlan. Connecticut, New York, Vermont.

Third judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Brennan. Delaware, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Virgin Islands.

Fourth judicial circuit: Mr. Chief Justice Warren. Maryland, North Carolina, South Carolina, Virginia, West Virginia.

Fifth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Black. Alabama, Canal Zone, Florida, Georgia, Louisiana, Mississippi, Texas.

Sixth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Burton. Kentucky, Michigan, Ohio, Tennessee.

Seventh judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Clark. Illinois, Indiana, Wisconsin.

Eighth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Whittaker. Arkansas, Iowa, Minnesota, Missouri, Nebraska, North Dakota, South Dakota.

Ninth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Douglas. Alaska, Arizona, California, Idaho, Montana, Nevada, Oregon, Washington, Guam, Hawaii.

Tenth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Whittaker. Colorado, Kansas, New Mexico, Oklahoma, Utah, Wyoming.

REPRESENTATIVES WITH RESIDENCES IN WASHINGTON

OFFICE ADDRESS: House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

[Streets northwest unless otherwise stated]

Speaker, Sam Rayburn

Abbitt, Watkins M., *Va*.....
Abernethy, Thomas G., *Miss*. 6278 29th St.
Adair, E. Ross, *Ind*.....4000 Mass. Ave.
Addonizio, Hugh J., *N. J*.....
Albert, Carl, *Okla*.....5115 Allen Terrace
Alexander, Hugh Q., *N. C*.....
Alger, Bruce, *Tex*.....
Allen, John J., Jr., *Calif*.....
Allen, Leo E., *Ill*.....University Club
Andersen, H. Carl, *Minn*.....4000 Mass. Ave.
Anderson, LeRoy H., *Mont*.....800 Crescent Dr., Alexandria, Va.
Andrews, George W., *Ala*.....3108 Cathedral Ave.
Anfuso, Victor L., *N. Y*.....
Arends, Leslie C., *Ill*.....4815 Dexter St.
Ashley, Thomas L., *Ohio*.....
Ashmore, Robert T., *S. C*.....
Aspinall, Wayne N., *Colo*.....Arlington Towers, Arlington, Va.
Auchincloss, James C., *N. J*.....113 S. Lee St., Alexandria, Va.
Avery, William H., *Kans*.....
Ayres, William H., *Ohio*.....
Bailey, Cleveland M., *W. Va*.....
Baker, Howard H., *Tenn*.....
Baldwin, John F., Jr., *Calif*.....
Barden, Graham A., *N. C*.....2601 Woodley Pl.
Baring, Walter S., *Nev*.....
Barrett, William A., *Pa*.....
Bass, Perkins, *N. H*.....
Bass, Ross, *Tenn*.....
Bates, William H., *Mass*.....
Baumhart, A. D., Jr., *Ohio*.....
Beamer, John V., *Ind*.....110 Maryland Ave. NE.
Becker, Frank J., *N. Y*.....
Beckworth, Lindley, *Tex*.....
Belcher, Page, *Okla*.....
Bennett, Charles E., *Fla*.....1530 38th St. SE.
Bennett, John B., *Mich*.....5804 Bradley Blvd., Bethesda, Md.
Bentley, Alvin M., *Mich*.....
Berry, E. Y., *S. Dak*.....118 Schotts Court NE.
Betts, Jackson E., *Ohio*.....
Blatnik, John A., *Minn*.....
Blitch, Iris Faircloth (Mrs.), *Ga*.
Boggs, Hale, *La*.....
Boland, Edward P., *Mass*.....
Bolling, Richard, *Mo*.....3409 Lowell St.
Bolton, Frances P. (Mrs.), *Ohio*. 2301 Wyo. Ave.
Bonner, Herbert C., *N. C*.....Calvert-Woodley
Bosch, Albert H., *N. Y*.....
Bow, Frank T., *Ohio*.....4301 Mass. Ave.
Boykin, Frank W., *Ala*.....The Washington
Boyle, Charles A., *Ill*.....
Bray, William G., *Ind*.....
Breeding, J. Floyd, *Kans*.....
Brooks, Jack, *Tex*.....
Brooks, Overton, *La*.....4413 46th St.
Broomfield, William S., *Mich*.
Brown, Charles H., *Mo*.....3606 Gunston Rd., Alexandria, Va.
Brown, Clarence J., *Ohio*.....Alban Towers
Brown, Paul, *Ga*.....Boston House
Brownson, Charles B., *Ind*.....
Broyhill, Joel T., *Va*.....
Buckley, Charles A., *N. Y*.....
Budge, Hamer H., *Idaho*.....
Burdick, Usher L., *N. Dak*.....
Burleson, Omar, *Tex*.....2737 Devonshire Pl.
Bush, Alvin R., *Pa*.....
Byrd, Robert C., *W. Va*.....
Byrne, Emmet F., *Ill*.....
Byrne, James A., *Pa*.....
Byrnes, John W., *Wis*.....1215 25th St. So., Arlington, Va.
Canfield, Gordon, *N. J*.....
Cannon, Clarence, *Mo*.....
Carnahan, A. S. J., *Mo*.....
Carrigg, Joseph L., *Pa*.....
Cederberg, Elford A., *Mich*.....
Celler, Emanuel, *N. Y*.....The Mayflower
Chamberlain, Charles E., *Mich*.
Cheif, Frank, *Ky*.....
Chenoweth, J. Edgar, *Colo*.....
Chiperfield, Robert B., *Ill*.....1713 House Office Building
Christopher, George H., *Mo*.....
Church, Marguerite Stitt (Mrs.), *Ill*. 2122 Mass. Ave.
Clark, Frank M., *Pa*.....3735 Gunston Rd., Alexandria, Va.
Clevenger, Cliff, *Ohio*.....The Jefferson
Coad, Merwin, *Iowa*.....
Coffin, Frank M., *Maine*.....
Collier, Harold R., *Ill*.....
Colmer, William M., *Miss*.....
Cooley, Harold D., *N. C*.....2480 16th St.
Corbett, Robert J., *Pa*.....
Coudert, Frederic R., Jr., *N. Y*.
Cramer, William C., *Fla*.....Hunting Towers, Alexandria, Va.
Cretella, Albert W., *Conn*.....
Cunningham, Glenn, *Nebr*.....
Cunningham, Paul, *Iowa*.....
Curtin, Willard S., *Pa*.....
Curtis, Laurence, *Mass*.....3314 O St.
Curtis, Thomas B., *Mo*.....
Dague, Paul B., *Pa*.....
Davis, Clifford, *Tenn*.....4611 Butterworth Pl.
Davis, James C., *Ga*.....
Dawson, William A., *Utah*.....
Dawson, William L., *Ill*.....
Delaney, James J., *N. Y*.....
Dellay, Vincent J., *N. J*.....
Dempsey, John J., *N. Mex*.....2500 Q St.
Dennison, David S., Jr., *Ohio*.
Dent, John H., *Pa*.....
Denton, Winfield K., *Ind*.....
Derounian, Steven B., *N. Y*.....
Devereux, James P. S., *Md*.....
Dies, Martin, *Tex*.....
Diggs, Charles C., Jr., *Mich*.....
Dingell, John D., *Mich*.....
Dixon, Henry Aldous, *Utah*.....2828 Conn. Ave.
Dollinger, Isidore, *N. Y*.....
Donohue, Harold D., *Mass*.....
Dooley, Edwin B., *N. Y*.....
Dorn, Francis E., *N. Y*.....
Dorn, W. J. Bryan, *S. C*.....
Dowdy, John, *Tex*.....
Doyle, Clyde, *Calif*.....3877 30th St. N., Arlington, Va.
Durham, Carl T., *N. C*.....The Lee House
Dwyer, Florence P. (Mrs.), *N. J*.
Eberharter, Herman P., *Pa*.....3101 4th St. N., Arlington, Va.
Edmondson, Ed., *Okla*.....
Elliott, Carl, *Ala*.....
Engle, Clair, *Calif*.....3840 Lorcom Lane, Arlington, Va.
Everett, Robert A., *Tenn*.....
Evins, Joe L., *Tenn*.....5044 Klingle St.
Fallon, George H., *Md*.....
Farbstein, Leonard, *N. Y*.....
Fascell, Dante B., *Fla*.....
Feighan, Michael A., *Ohio*.....
Fenton, Ivor D., *Pa*.....3725 Macomb St.
Fino, Paul A., *N. Y*.....
Fisher, O. C., *Tex*.....Calvert-Woodley
Flood, Daniel J., *Pa*.....The Congressional
Flynt, John J., Jr., *Ga*.....
Fogarty, John E., *R. I*.....3627 Chesapeake St.
Forand, Aime J., *R. I*.....4108 Dresden St., Kensington, Md.
Ford, Gerald R., Jr., *Mich*.....514 Crown View Dr., Alexandria, Va.
Forrester, E. L., *Ga*.....
Fountain, L. H., *N. C*.....The Westchester
Frazier, James B., Jr., *Tenn*.....Fairfax Hotel
Frelinghuysen, Peter, Jr., *N. J*.....3014 N St.
Friedel, Samuel N., *Md*.....
Fulton, James G., *Pa*.....
Garmatz, Edward A., *Md*.....
Gary, J. Vaughan, *Va*.....
Gathings, E. C., *Ark*.....6377 31st Pl.
Gavin, Leon H., *Pa*.....
George, Myron V., *Kans*.....3801 Rodman St.
Glenn, Milton W., *N. J*.....Arlington Towers, Arlington, Va.
Gordon, Thomas S., *Ill*.....
Granahan, Kathryn E. (Mrs.), *Pa*.
Grant, George M., *Ala*.....4801 Conn. Ave.
Gray, Kenneth J., *Ill*.....
Green, Edith (Mrs.), *Oreg*.....
Green, William J., Jr., *Pa*.....
Gregory, Noble J., *Ky*.....2401 Calvert St.
Griffin, Robert P., *Mich*.....
Griffiths, Martha W. (Mrs.), *Mich*.
Gross, H. R., *Iowa*.....
Gubser, Charles S., *Calif*.....
Gwinn, Ralph W., *N. Y*.....
Hagen, Harlan, *Calif*.....
Hale, Robert, *Maine*.....2722 N St.
Haley, James A., *Fla*.....
Halleck, Charles A., *Ind*.....4926 Upton St.
Harden, Cecil M. (Mrs.), *Ind*. The Congressional
Hardy, Porter, Jr., *Va*.....
Harris, Oren, *Ark*.....1627 Myrtle St.
Harrison, Burr P., *Va*.....
Harrison, Robert D., *Nebr*.....
Harvey, Ralph, *Ind*.....110 Maryland Ave. NE.
Haskell, Harry G., Jr., *Del*.....
Hays, Brooks, *Ark*.....314 2d St. SE.
Hays, Wayne L., *Ohio*.....1323 Barger Drive, Falls Church, Va.
Healey, James C., *N. Y*.....
Hébert, F. Edward, *La*.....26 Cockrell St., Alexandria, Va.
Hemphill, Robert W., *S. C*.....
Henderson, John E., *Ohio*.....
Herlong, A. S., Jr., *Fla*.....
Heselton, John W., *Mass*.....
Hess, William E., *Ohio*.....
Hiestand, Edgar W., *Calif*.....
Hill, William S., *Colo*.....110 Maryland Ave. NE.
Hillings, Patrick J., *Calif*.....
Hoeven, Charles B., *Iowa*.....100 Maryland Ave. NE.
Hoffman, Clare E., *Mich*.....100 Maryland Ave. NE.
Holifield, Chet, *Calif*.....
Holland, Elmer J., *Pa*.....
Holmes, Hal, *Wash*.....
Holt, Joe, *Calif*.....
Holtzman, Lester, *N. Y*.....
Horan, Walt, *Wash*.....
Hosmer, Craig, *Calif*.....
Huddleston, George, Jr., *Ala*.
Hull, W. R., Jr., *Mo*.....
Hyde, DeWitt S., *Md*.....
Ikard, Frank, *Tex*.....
Jackson, Donald L., *Calif*.....
James, Benjamin F., *Pa*.....200 C St. SE.
Jarman, John, *Okla*.....
Jenkins, Thomas A., *Ohio*.....The Mayflower
Jennings, W. Pat, *Va*.....
Jensen, Ben F., *Iowa*.....2120 16th St.
Johansen, August E., *Mich*.....
Johnson, Lester R., *Wis*.....3816 Pope St. SE.
Jonas, Charles Raper, *N. C*.....
Jones, Paul C., *Mo*.....1111 Army Navy Dr., Arlington, Va.
Jones, Robert E., *Ala*.....
Judd, Walter H., *Minn*.....3083 Ordway St.
Karsten, Frank M., *Mo*.....
Kean, Robert W., *N. J*.....2435 Kalorama Road
Kearney, B. W. (Pat), *N. Y*.....
Kearns, Carroll D., *Pa*.....Sheraton-Park
Keating, Kenneth B., *N. Y*.....1612 34th St.
Kee, Elizabeth (Mrs.), *W. Va*.
Kelly, Edna F. (Mrs.), *N. Y*.....
Keogh, Eugene J., *N. Y*.....The Mayflower
Kilburn, Clarence E., *N. Y*.....The Gen. Scott
Kilday, Paul J., *Tex*.....3507 Albemarle St.
Kilgore, Joe M., *Tex*.....4848 Upton St.
King, Cecil R., *Calif*.....
Kirwan, Michael J., *Ohio*.....
Kitchin, A. Paul, *N. C*.....
Kluczynski, John C., *Ill*.....
Knox, Victor A., *Mich*.....
Knutson, Coya (Mrs.), *Minn*.
Krueger, Otto, *N. Dak*.....112 Schotts Court NE.

Lafore, John A., Jr., *Pa*.....
Laird, Melvin R., *Wis*.....
Landrum, Phil M., *Ga*.....
Lane, Thomas J., *Mass*.....
Lankford, Richard E., *Md*...
Latham, Henry J., *N. Y*.....
LeCompte, Karl M., *Iowa*...Sheraton-Park
Lennon, Alton, *N. C*.....
Lesinski, John, Jr., *Mich*....
Libonati, Roland V., *Ill*.....
Lipscomb, Glenard P., *Calif*.
Long, George S., *La*.....2136 31st St. SE.
Loser, J. Carlton, *Tenn*.....The Congressional
McCarthy, Eugene J., *Minn*..419 Raymond St., Chevy Chase, Md.
McCormack, John W., *Mass*..The Washington
McCulloch, Wm. M., *Ohio*...4000 Mass. Ave.
McDonough, Gordon L., *Calif*.
McFall, John J., *Calif*.....507 Robinson Ct., Alexandria, Va.
McGovern, George S., *S. Dak*.
McGregor, J. Harry, *Ohio*...The Westchester
McIntire, Clifford G., *Maine*.220 2d St. SE.
McIntosh, Robert J., *Mich*..
McMillan, John L., *S. C*.....1201 S. Barton St., Arlington, Va.
McVey, William E., *Ill*.....The Coronet
Macdonald, Torbert H., *Mass*.
Machrowicz, Thaddeus M., *Mich*.115 Dale Dr., Falls Church, Va.
Mack, Peter F., Jr., *Ill*.....
Mack, Russell V., *Wash*.....
Madden, Ray J., *Ind*.....
Magnuson, Don, *Wash*.....
Mahon, George H., *Tex*.....Alban Towers
Mailliard, William S., *Calif*..
Marshall, Fred, *Minn*.....
Martin, Joseph W., Jr., *Mass*.The Hay-Adams
Mason, Noah M., *Ill*.....The Baronet
Matthews, D. R. (Billy), *Fla*.
May, Edwin H., Jr., *Conn*...
Meader, George, *Mich*.....3360 Tennyson St.
Merrow, Chester E., *N. H*....
Metcalf, Lee, *Mont*.....
Michel, Robert H., *Ill*.....
Miller, A. L., *Nebr*.....2801 East-West Highway, Chevy Chase, Md.
Miller, Edward T., *Md*.....2901 Conn. Ave.
Miller, George P., *Calif*.....
Miller, William E., *N. Y*.....3708 Calvend Lane, Kensington, Md.
Mills, Wilbur D., *Ark*.....2701 Conn. Ave.
Minshall, William E., *Ohio*..8120 Kerry Lane, Chevy Chase, Md.
Mitchell, Erwin, *Ga*.....
Montoya, Joseph M., *N. Mex*..
Moore, Arch A., Jr., *W. Va*...
Morano, Albert P., *Conn*....
Morgan, Thomas E., *Pa*.....
Morris, Toby, *Okla*.....220 2d St. SE.
Morrison, James H., *La*.....4301 Mass. Ave.
Moss, John E., *Calif*.....204 Jefferson St., Alexandria, Va.
Moulder, Morgan M., *Mo*....
Multer, Abraham J., *N. Y*...
Mumma, Walter M., *Pa*.....The Coronet
Murray, Tom, *Tenn*.....
Natcher, William H., *Ky*....
Neal, Will E., *W. Va*.....
Nicholson, Donald W., *Mass*.
Nimtz, F. Jay, *Ind*.....
Norblad, Walter, *Oreg*.....
Norrell, W. F., *Ark*.....2301 Conn. Ave.
O'Brien, Leo W., *N. Y*.....
O'Brien, Thomas J., *Ill*.....The Hamilton
O'Hara, Barratt, *Ill*.....The Congressional
O'Hara, Joseph P., *Minn*....2813 31st St.
O'Konski, Alvin E., *Wis*.....4000 Mass. Ave.
O'Neill, Thos. P., Jr., *Mass*..
Osmers, Frank C., Jr., *N. J*..
Ostertag, Harold C., *N. Y*....100 Maryland Ave. NE.
Passman, Otto E., *La*.....
Patman, Wright, *Tex*.....117 Carroll St. SE.
Patterson, James T., *Conn*..
Pelly, Thomas M., *Wash*....
Perkins, Carl D., *Ky*.....
Pfost, Gracie (Mrs.), *Idaho*..

Philbin, Philip J., *Mass*.....
Pilcher, J. L., *Ga*.....
Pillion, John R., *N. Y*.....
Poage, W. R., *Tex*.....2309 Skyland Pl. SE.
Poff, Richard H., *Va*.....
Polk, James G., *Ohio*.....
Porter, Charles O., *Oreg*....
Powell, Adam C., Jr., *N. Y*...
Preston, Prince H., *Ga*.....
Price, Melvin, *Ill*.....
Prouty, Winston L., *Vt*.....

Rabaut, Louis C., *Mich*.....
Radwan, Edmund P., *N. Y*....
Rains, Albert, *Ala*.....
Ray, John H., *N. Y*.....
Rayburn, Sam, *Tex*.....
Reece, B. Carroll, *Tenn*.....
Reed, Daniel A., *N. Y*.....The Woodner
Rees, Edward H., *Kans*.....1801 16th St.
Reuss, Henry S., *Wis*.....6448 Brooks Lane
Rhodes, George M., *Pa*.....5603 24th Ave., Hillcrest Hgts.
Rhodes, John J., *Ariz*.....
Riehlman, R. Walter, *N. Y*..3210 Wis. Ave.
Riley, John J., *S. C*.....
Rivers, L. Mendel, *S. C*.....
Roberts, Kenneth A., *Ala*...6102 Cromwell Dr.
Robeson, Edward J., Jr., *Va*..
Robison, Howard W., *N. Y*...
Robsion, John M., Jr., *Ky*...1500 Delafield Pl.
Rodino, Peter W., Jr., *N. J*...
Rogers, Byron G., *Colo*.....
Rogers, Edith Nourse (Mrs.), *Mass*.The Shoreham
Rogers, Paul G., *Fla*.....Sheraton-Park
Rogers, Walter, *Tex*.....
Rooney, John J., *N. Y*.....
Roosevelt, James, *Calif*.....
Rutherford, J. T., *Tex*.....

Sadlak, Antoni N., *Conn*....
Santangelo, Alfred E., *N. Y*..
St. George, Katharine (Mrs.), *N. Y*.
Saund, D. S. (Judge), *Calif*..
Saylor, John P., *Pa*.....
Schenck, Paul F., *Ohio*.....3801 Conn. Ave., Apt. 307
Scherer, Gordon H., *Ohio*...
Schwengel, Fred, *Iowa*.....
Scott, Hugh, *Pa*.....
Scott, Ralph J., *N. C*.....
Scrivner, Errett P., *Kans*...2331 Cathedral Ave.
Scudder, Hubert B., *Calif*...4545 Conn. Ave.
Seely-Brown, Horace, Jr., *Conn*.
Selden, Armistead I., Jr., *Ala*.433 Valley Lane, Falls Church, Va.
Sheehan, Timothy P., *Ill*....203 C St. SE.
Shelley, John F., *Calif*.....
Sheppard, Harry R., *Calif*...
Shuford, George A., *N. C*....Calvert-Woodley
Sieminski, Alfred D., *N. J*...
Sikes, Robert L. F., *Fla*.....
Siler, Eugene, *Ky*.....
Simpson, Richard M., *Pa*...5205 Lawn Way, Chevy Chase, Md.
Simpson, Sid, *Ill*.....2100 Mass. Ave.
Sisk, B. F., *Calif*.....
Smith, Frank E., *Miss*.....
Smith, H. Allen, *Calif*.....
Smith, Howard W., *Va*.....204 W. Walnut St., Alexandria, Va.
Smith, Wint, *Kans*.....
Spence, Brent, *Ky*.....Sheraton-Park
Springer, William L., *Ill*....
Staggers, Harley O., *W. Va*..
Stauffer, S. Walter, *Pa*.....
Steed, Tom, *Okla*.....
Sullivan, Leonor K. (Mrs. John B.), *Mo*.

Taber, John, *N. Y*.....
Talle, Henry O., *Iowa*.....4613 Harrison St.
Taylor, Dean P., *N. Y*.....
Teague, Charles M., *Calif*...
Teague, Olin E., *Tex*.....6015 Mass. Ave.
Teller, Ludwig, *N. Y*.....Mayflower Hotel
Tewes, Donald E., *Wis*.....
Thomas, Albert, *Tex*.....2901 34th St.
Thompson, Clark W., *Tex*...Sheraton-Park
Thompson, Frank, Jr., *N. J*..
Thompson, T. A., *La*.....1600 Kenwood Av., Alexandria, Va.

Thomson, E. Keith, *Wyo*....
Thornberry, Homer, *Tex*....
Tollefson, Thor C., *Wash*...
Trimble, James W., *Ark*.....
Tuck, William M., *Va*.....
Udall, Stewart L., *Ariz*.....
Ullman, Al, *Oreg*.....
Utt, James B., *Calif*.....
Vanik, Charles A., *Ohio*.....
Van Pelt, William K., *Wis*...
Van Zandt, James E., *Pa*....Arlington Towers, Arlington, Va.
Vinson, Carl, *Ga*.....4 Primrose St., Chevy Chase, Md.
Vorys, John M., *Ohio*.....2032 Belmont Rd.
Vursell, Charles W., *Ill*.....110 Maryland Ave NE.
Wainwright, Stuyvesant, *N. Y*.
Walter, Francis E., *Pa*.....
Watts, John C., *Ky*.....
Weaver, Phil, *Nebr*.....9408 Crosby Rd., Silver Spring, Md.
Westland, Jack, *Wash*.....
Wharton, J. Ernest, *N. Y*....
Whitener, Basil L., *N. C*.....
Whitten, Jamie L., *Miss*....5804 Nebraska Ave.
Widnall, William B., *N. J*...
Wier, Roy W., *Minn*.....
Wigglesworth, Richard B., *Mass*.3257 N St.
Williams, John Bell, *Miss*...1001 South Road S., Arlington, Va.
Williams, William R., *N. Y*..1241 Pa. Ave. SE.
Willis, Edwin E., *La*.....
Wilson, Earl, *Ind*.....
Wilson, Robert C. (Bob), *Calif*.
Winstead, Arthur, *Miss*.....
Withrow, Gardner R., *Wis*...
Wolverton, Charles A., *N. J*..1336 HOB
Wright, Jim, *Tex*.....
Yates, Sidney R., *Ill*.....
Young, John, *Tex*.....
Younger, J. Arthur, *Calif*...4545 Conn. Ave.
Zablocki, Clement J., *Wis*...
Zelenko, Herbert, *N. Y*.....

DELEGATES

Bartlett, E. L. (Bob), *Alaska*.1718 33d Pl. SE.
Burns, John A., *Hawaii*.....

RESIDENT COMMISSIONER

Fernós-Isern, A., *P. R*.....2210 R St.

OFFICERS OF THE HOUSE

Clerk—Ralph R. Roberts.
Sergeant at Arms—Zeake W. Johnson, Jr.
Doorkeeper—William M. Miller, 1732 S St. SE.
Chaplain—Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D. D., 1421 Montague St.
Postmaster—H. H. Morris.

OFFICIAL REPORTERS OF DEBATE

SENATE

James W. Murphy, 7 Primrose St., Chevy Chase, Md.
John D. Rhodes, 3535 Williamsburg Lane.
Gregor Macpherson, 3111 44th St.
Herbert N. Budiong, Kurtz Rd., McLean, Va.
Charles J. Drescher, 3738 North 4th St., Arlington, Va.
Francis J. Attig, 3919 Livingston St.
Nicholas J. Cinciotta, 400 Williamsburg Dr., Silver Spring, Md.
Julian R. Series, Jr., 4225 North 31st St., Arlington, Va.
Elmer L. Koons (assistant), 826 Aspen St.
Willard W. Pruett (clerk), 701 North Harrison St., Arlington, Va.
Placidino Zagami (clerk), 5805 10th Place, Chillum, Md.

HOUSE

W. L. Fenstermacher, 2929 Connecticut Ave.
Roy L. Whitman, 6101 16th St. NW.
F. S. Milberg, 3 Pooks Hill Rd., Bethesda, Md.
E. B. Clark, 604 Bennington Dr., Silver Spring, Md.
Frank E. Battaglia, 957 East-West Highway.
Claude S. Scheckel, 6 East Blackthorne St., Chevy Chase, Md.
Albert L. Schneider, 5420 Connecticut Ave.
Sidney W. Williston (clerk), 1830 Longford Dr., Hyattsville, Md.
Bjarne J. Sigurdsen (assistant clerk), 1921 U Pl., SE.
James W. Lea (assistant clerk), 5055 Dixon St., Oxon Run Hills, Md.

Appendix

History of Parliamentary Reporting in the United States, by Theodore F. Shuey

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. EDWARD MARTIN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 24, 1958

Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania. Mr. President, the older Members of the Senate will recall Mr. Theodore F. Shuey, who was Official Reporter of Debates of the Senate for 65 years, until his death in 1933.

Born in Virginia, he studied shorthand when he was 14 years of age, and went to college in Ohio. His college career was interrupted by his enlistment in the Pennsylvania reserves, and his service in the Union Army during the Civil War until the end of hostilities.

Sometime during his service in the Senate he wrote a brief history of parliamentary reporting in the United States, and it will be of interest to those interested in congressional proceedings, and to students generally. I therefore ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the history was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HISTORY OF PARLIAMENTARY REPORTING, BY THEODORE F. SHUEY, OFFICIAL REPORTER OF DEBATES, UNITED STATES SENATE, 1868–1933

Very few speeches made in the Continental Congress were reported. Rev. John Witherspoon reported a number of his own, made between 1776 and 1782, and these are of immense value because of his interest in finances and the public credit. Dr. Witherspoon had been called from Scotland to the presidency of Princeton College in 1768, and he was of great assistance to the Colonies.

Although merely a compilation, Elliot's debates merit first mention because of their supreme importance. Jonathan Elliot was born in England in 1784, and coming to New York at 18, he was employed in a printing office. In 1810, when the war for South American independence broke out, he joined the forces of General Miranda and fought for the liberation of New Granada (Colombia) from Spain. He was wounded and captured, but in 1813 got back to the United States. His great work, Debates, Resolutions, and Proceedings on the Adoption of the Federal Constitution, in Massachusetts, Connecticut, New Hampshire, Pennsylvania, Maryland, New York, Virginia, North Carolina, and South Carolina, with the Journal and Debates of the Federal Convention, held at Philadelphia from May 14 to September 17, 1787, was published at Washington in four volumes, 1827–30, to which he added in 1845 the Madison papers, being that statesman's report of the debates in the Federal Convention. It appears that Elliot and his son settled in Washington and became extensive printers of Government and other publications.

David Robertson, of Petersburg, Va., made a stenographic report of the proceedings of the Virginia convention on the adoption of the Constitution. There is no reason to believe that there was a scarcity of reporters in New York, Philadelphia, or elsewhere, and the quantity of verbatim and near-verbatim reporting they did in that early day is quite striking.

When we come to the congressional debates and proceedings, we have the following:

Annals of Congress, 1789 to 1824, 42 volumes, including Lloyd's Congressional Register;

Register of Debates by Gales and Seaton, 1824 to 1837, 32 volumes;

Congressional Globe, by Blair and Rives, established in 1830, began publishing the debates in 1833, continued until 1873, 113 volumes; and

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, by the Public Printer, from 1873 to the present.

Until the session of 1851–52, the Senate reports were published at the cost of the Globe proprietors. Before that date, the House had made a transfer of the per-column payment to that establishment. A daily Globe column was estimated at 1,600 words. The proprietors were paid $7.50 a column, of which the reporters received $4. The chief profit of the proprietors lay in the bound volumes furnished to Congress.

Until 1794, the Senate sat with closed doors and no report was made of its proceedings.

In the 2d session of the 1st Congress, January 15, 1790, a debate took place in the House on restoring the shorthand writers to the privileges of the floor, they having been relegated to the gallery at the preceding session. The sentiment in favor of the restoration appeared to be unanimous. Mr. Lloyd and Mr. Fenno were mentioned as the shorthand writers affected, but it was intimated that the privilege might be granted to others. In this debate, the shorthand writers, as they were uniformly styled, were commended for the accuracy of their reports.

Joseph Gales, Sr., was a Sheffield bookseller and printer. When a bookseller, he was attracted by a volume of Gurney's Stenography, and learned the art. Because of liberal sentiments, the publication of Thomas Paine's Tracts, etc., he fled to Germany in 1792 to escape prosecution. Three years later he arrived in Philadelphia, and was at first employed as a compositor by Dunlap & Claypoole, proprietors of the Daily Advertiser. Callender, the reporter of congressional proceedings for this paper, was dismissed, owing to blunders and other irregularities, and Gales was installed in the place vacant.

A recurrence of yellow fever, and the persuasion of influential politicians, led Gales to remove to Raleigh, N. C., in 1799, and become proprietor of the Register there. Here his son, Joseph Gales, Jr., perfected himself in his father's arts of printing and stenography, and attended the State university.

The first number of the National Intelligencer, established at Washington by Samuel Harrison Smith, was issued October 31, 1800. In 1807, Gales, senior, brought his son to Washington and offered his services to Smith. Two years later Smith took young Gales into joint proprietorship, and August 31, 1810, Joseph Gales, Jr., became sole proprietor.

Until he had the assistance of Mr. Gales, Mr. Smith was the only reporter on the Intelligencer. Gales, senior, returned to Raleigh and continued to publish the Register. In 1809 his daughter Sarah was married to William Winston Seaton, a young Scotchman who had made good on the paper owned by his wife's father. In 1812, Joseph Gales, Jr., made his brother-in-law a partner in the National Intelligencer. For 10 years after this association they reported the congressional debates without assistance, occupying seats beside the Vice President and Speaker, respectively. In 1822, Gales and Seaton employed an assistant reporter at $1,000 a session.

Gales reported Webster's reply to Hayne in 1830 and, that it might appear the following morning, dictated it to his wife, who wrote it in longhand. Gales had a beautiful home in a northeastern suburb of Washington, which he named Eckington, after the village of his ancestors near Sheffield. He was elected mayor of the city in 1827, as was Mr. Seaton in 1840, a position of great honor and dignity before the formation of the District Territorial Government in 1871.

Mr. Gales, the pioneer parliamentary reporter in Washington, died in 1860, having been connected with the National Intelligencer for more than 50 years.

We have now reached an important date in the political history of the country, the election of Andrew Jackson to the Presidency in 1828. The National Intelligencer was a Whig journal. When Jackson became President, he sought the establishment of a Democratic organ, and we pass from Gales and Seaton, shorthand writers, to Blair and Rives, employers of shorthand writers.

Francis Preston Blair was born in Virginia in 1791, and John Cook Rives was born in the same State in 1795. It chanced that both were taken to Kentucky at a very early age. Blair was a graduate of Transylvania University and became a journalist. He wrote for the Frankfort Argus a series of articles against nullification which attracted the attention of President Jackson, by whom he was invited to come to Washington. Rives had accepted a position under the Government in 1824 and was already there. The two founded the Globe in 1830, and in 1833 the Globe began publishing the congressional debates.

As time went on Blair severely criticized the southern Democratic leaders, charging them with designs to destroy the Union, etc., so that when Polk became President, in 1845, Blair's interest in the Globe terminated. The President offered him the mission to Spain, but he retired to his country estate at Silver Spring, near Washington, and became one of the founders of the Republican Party. Rives was sole owner of the Globe from 1845 until his death in 1864, when the Globe passed into the hands of his sons and a business manager as the firm of Rives & Bailey.

It was John C. Rives who erected the Globe Building, which stands on Pennsylvania Avenue between Third Street and John Marshall Place, and in which the debates of Congress were printed until the establishment of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD in 1873. On the top floor of this building there were rooms fitted up for the reporters of debates, to which they would repair after the close of the daily session. The Globe appeared at noon, and, being in the ordinary newspaper style, it was frequently encumbered with many supplements. At the end of a Congress it sometimes fell 2 weeks behind. In

those days the bound volumes far outranked the daily publication in importance.

Richard Sutton, an English parliamentary reporter, sat in the gallery of the House of Commons with Charles Dickens and, coming to New York in 1838, was associated with the elder Bennett in the establishment of the New York Herald. It was his great ambition to found a corps of shorthand reporters, and he saw this possibility brightened by Isaac Pitman's invention of phonography. He abandoned his Gurney system and took up the study of phonetic shorthand.

In the 1840's, Professor Hart began teaching Pitman's phonography in the Philadelphia High School. One of his pupils, Dennis F. Murphy, born in 1834, became an adept in the art. Oliver Dyer, teacher and lecturer, employed young Murphy as a demonstrator of the new shorthand on a blackboard. Mr. Sutton saw this prodigy and made of him the strongest link in the corps which he formed and which began reporting the proceedings of the Senate for the Globe the first Monday of December 1848. Young Murphy took notes of the entire proceedings and corrected the transcript of the other reporters. These either wrote out their own notes or employed longhand amanuenses. As the Washington dinner hour was then 3 p. m., and the Globe did not appear until noon the following day, a session of 3 hours being regarded as a long one, the task was not extremely difficult.

A few years later, James J., the second Murphy brother, graduated from the Philadelphia High School and, becoming an expert reporter, assumed a prominent place on the corps.

About this time the House created the position of stenographers to committees. Mr. Sutton is my authority for the statement that Mr. Rives had this done in order to get rid of an incompetent reporter, who had a pull with certain members, and that two committee stenographers were appointed that the incompetency might be in a measure concealed. At any rate, the competent stenographer wrote Gurney's shorthand, and the incompetent one Pitman's, which goes to prove, if proof were needed, that after all, mentality, or the lack of it, may outweigh the merits of the system.

In quoting Mr. Sutton, I should state that he was a man of strong likes and dislikes, particularly the latter. He had a quarrel with the proprietor of the Globe which resulted in the Senate reporters obtained protection under the wing of the Committee on Printing, a practice now firmly established.

John J. McIlhone was another Philadelphia High School boy, who continued to be a House reporter until his death in 1891, when he was succeeded by the late Fred Irland.

Edward Vincent Murphy, who completed the celebrated trio of brothers, was born in 1843, and fresh from the Philadelphia High School, joined the Senate corps in 1860.

Theodore F. Shuey, the son of a Virginia farmer, learned shorthand at 14 and 15 as taught in the textbooks of Benny Pitman and Andrew J. Graham. After a somewhat varied career as a college boy in Ohio, a soldier in the Union Army, and a newspaper reporter in his native State, he came to Washington in December 1868, and was employed by Mr. Sutton.

March 4, 1869, Mr. Sutton retired and a contract for the Senate reporting was given to his principal assistant, Dennis F. Murphy.

In 1873, when the publication of the debates was transferred to the Government Printing Office, the reporters of the two Houses were in a position to state just what they wanted, and to get it. The 5 independent House reporters decided that they would be appointed by the Speaker at a salary of $5,000, and be removable for cause. Dennis F. Murphy made a contract with the Committee on Printing to do the Senate reporting for $25,000 a year, and this was ratified by a resolution of the Senate passed unanimously.

In December 1874, James J. Murphy died and his place was filled by Mr. Shuey.

In March 1896, Dennis F. Murphy died, and the Senate, on the report of the Committee on Printing, unanimously gave the reporting to Theodore F. Shuey and Edward V. Murphy. The latter died in July 1919, and his son, James W. Murphy, was given his father's place on a like report unanimously ratified by the Senate.

The 6 House reporters now receive $6,000 yearly, and the lump sum, equivalent to that paid to the House, is given for the Senate reporting.

In Defense of States Rights

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HERMAN E. TALMADGE
OF GEORGIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, February 24, 1958

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, on February 18, 1958, members of the General Assembly of Georgia had the privilege of hearing an address before a joint session by Hon. Louis C. Wyman, attorney general of the State of New Hampshire, and former president of the National Association of Attorneys General. His address was one of the most forceful presentations on the destruction of States rights through the usurpation of legislative authority by the United States Supreme Court I have ever read. In order that every Member of the Senate might have the opportunity to get the benefit of the conclusions of this noted authority on constitutional law, I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, to have highlighting excerpts from his address printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the excerpts were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

No matter the precise phrase there is little doubt but what that great instrument through which Americans have devised perhaps the most satisfactory method of community living under a government of law and not of men, is being tortured out of all rational historical proportion by decision after decision of the United States Supreme Court which ascribe less and less meaning and importance to the 10th amendment and greater and greater scope to interpretation of the general powers delegated to the Federal Government. These decisions in their cumulative aspect seek by judicial fiat to encourage a philosophy of government patently contrary to that contemplated by George Washington and the great figures of our early constitutional period. Implicit in the rationale of recent decisions are certain basic assumptions concerning what is best for the American way of life, in reality judicial legislation which amends the Constitution to a point of usurping what has always heretofore been considered the proper function of the constitutional convention in our pattern of government. * * *

Much of what the United States Supreme Court has decided lately has been claimed to be in the protection of the individual. The Court has swung so far in this direction as to overly protect a motley collection of criminals, Communists, fellow-travelers, at the expense of an equally important obligation to protect some 170 million of law-abiding citizens and their local self-government. The principle of the rightful reserved powers of the States, properly preserved in a Federal-State partnership, has until now and will remain tomorrow the chief adhesive of our Union. This is not to say that there cannot be situations in which a State may by its actions deny the protection of the Federal Constitution to United States citizens within its borders. There have been instances of this since the commencement of our judicial system. * * * There will be instances in future days. For the determination of such controversies the Supreme Court is necessary and proper. Yet the delicate balance between the States and the Federal Government, and between individual citizens and both governments, depends for its preservation upon the reasonable application of the law by the executive branch and its reasonable interpretation by the judiciary.

Perhaps the most grievous invasion of States' rights in this decade has been the decision of the Supreme Court in *Commonwealth of Pennsylvania* v. *Steve Nelson*. Here a majority of the Court not only invoked the highly suspect doctrine of supersession by implication in holding that Congress intended to preempt State sedition laws, but interpreted the Constitution to permit to the Federal Government the authority to take away from the States their reserved right to make criminal acts within their borders seeking overthrow of the Government of the United States by force and violence.

I have always believed it to be elemental that an act of sedition against the United States Government is an act of sedition against Georgia or New Hampshire, or any other State in the Union.

Subversion designed to overthrow the Federal Government by force and violence is in itself an immediate threat to the safety and constitutional security of each of the States. * * *

The relationship between possible public disturbances and subversive advocacy among loyal citizenry is plain. That some States may see fit to be tougher on subversives than others is their own business. The Constitution does not authorize the Federal Government in, line, clause, or by indirection to take away from the States their fundamental reserved police power to so legislate in their own self-defense.

Since this decision in the field of national security, several other decisions of the Supreme Court have repeatedly disregarded the public record of Communist subversion both in this country and in many other countries around the world. * * *

In the teeth of all these distressing international developments, a majority of the Supreme Court of the United States has equated Communist activity in this country with lawful politics. It has strongly intimated if not held that at least as far as good moral character is concerned, membership in the Communist Party is apparently considered a mere matter of political association privileged under the first amendment. It has told the State bar association in California that in its view there is no reasonable doubt about the good moral character of an applicant for admission to the bar who refused to tell the bar examiners whether he was at that time a member of the Communist Party. It has told the bar examiners in New Mexico that contrary to their judgment and decision, it is denial of due process for them to refuse membership in the bar to an applicant who had a record of previous membership in the Communist Party and of several previous criminal arrests. It has rebuked Illinois in her internal rules of appellate procedure. It has denied to Nebraska the right to protect her citizens from the absolutism that is compulsory unionism.

It has prevented Michigan from ousting two local officials charged with crime. It has so restricted the period of detention

and circumstances attendant upon a confession as to make it infinitely more difficult to maintain effective law enforcement. It has so extended the concept of navigable waters as to invade what has always heretofore been considered the prerogative of the States in that field.

It has denied to the Legislature of the State of New Hampshire the power to investigate to determine whether the actual content of a compulsory lecture at a State-supported institution included subversive activity.

It has greatly interfered with the internal operations of the Federal Bureau of Investigation by requiring that FBI reports from a witness called in a criminal prosecution be made available carte blanche to defense counsel. And this last in a case in which even defense counsel only sought to have the reports screened by the Federal judge involved. In the light of the fact that the FBI does not have the subpena power, such a decision makes it most unlikely that informants of crime will be willing to expose alibis or make accusations of serious crime against gangsters and racketeers and dangerous criminals, for the simple reason that if Johnny Dio is going to see the reports made to the FBI, which include names, places, and other information, before Johnny is convicted and confined, the possibility of recrimination one would think too plain to miss.

In all of these ways the Supreme Court has not only deprecated the States interests in their own survival but has emasculated the 10th amendment. In practically none of these decisions was it necessary to go to the lengths to which the decisions have gone to reach the conclusions apparently desired. * * *

No matter the choice of words or the rationale of individual members of the majority, it is plain that the elements of partnership in State and Federal Government in the investigation of subversive activities and in many other fields ranging from North to South and from East to West, have by judicial decision been sharply limited if not destroyed. * * *

When we stop to realize that not only has the High Court emasculated our statutory law in the security field, but has also sanctioned protection of the dark corners of individual association with persons disloyal to America and made infinitely more difficult if not impossible the taking of sworn testimony relating to subversive activity in the United States, one wonders why? The Court appears to have suggested to America and to the world that in this land Communists and communism may not in fact be something which they have proven to be in every other place in the world. This is an amazing phenomenon that probably cannot be explained by a claim that the authors of such decisions are out of touch with reality. * * *

My friends, it is now State responsibility—in Georgia, in New Hampshire, in California, and in every State in the Union—to act together to stem this continued flow of power to Washington. I am not speaking of economic functions of government. In this field the President has appointed an important committee of governors to explore what the States can responsibly undertake in transfer from Washington. This committee, of which Governor Dwinell of New Hampshire is cochairman, has an authority that is primarily economic in scope yet it has a vital mission because unless the States are willing to undertake the responsibility of administering functions which are now administered by the Federal Government, there can be no restoration of such powers to the States. This important national committee is a sign of the good faith of the President in his promise to return to the States those functions they are willing and able to accept.

But committees and commissions, boards and agencies, are not the answer to repeated interpretations of the Supreme Court which by the process of judicial legislation ever narrows the influence and authority of the States.

While the process of constitutional amendment is available, it is also most unlikely, subjected to pragmatic test. Senator THURMOND of South Carolina has offered a resolution (S. J. Res. 145) to create a commission of Federal and State jurisdiction. This is a salutary move and it should be implemented at the earliest opportunity. By insuring fair representation on such a commission, if Congress pays serious attention to its recommendations when its work is done, there may result that recognition of an aroused public opinion that in some manner or other we must impress upon a majority of the Supreme Court.

If this is not done and if decisions such as these continue, I can see only tragedy ahead within these United States, because cooperation between the States and the Federal Government is a two-way street. If the Federal Government wants cooperation from the States, then the Federal judiciary should permit extension of real cooperation to the States, for the proof of any pudding is in its eating. If bar associations of the highest courts of the several States do not wish to qualify certain members as officers of their courts, the Supreme Court should not force them to do so. By assuming the ultimate question in review of such cases, the High Court has arrogated to itself the twin functions of judge and jury in passing upon the protestations of sunlit innocence from such applicants. Perhaps the local bar examiners did not believe them.

Finally, with your permission, I would like to address myself briefly to problems of public education. In spite of the militancy of the radical National Association for the Advancement of Colored People and the venomous bile of the Communist-dominated Civil Rights Congress, from both of which the South has suffered massive injunctions, many responsible citizens all over the country remain convinced that the normal function of control of public education is best preserved by the people of local action. This conviction has been the cornerstone of arguments of those who oppose Federal aid to education, in fear of ultimate Federal influence upon the texbook and the adolescent mind. The States, through their elected representatives in the Congress of the United States, have never legislated to require racially integrated schools.

Interpretation of the requirement of equal protection of the laws to force upon the people of a State a Federal social precept contrary to their settled social mores is a radical change from precedent and custom. Unanimity of decision makes it neither more convincing nor more acceptable to the South.

There is not time today to discuss the legal niceties of the use of paratroops and bayonets at Little Rock. As a matter of fact it is of no particular importance as to whether executive action at Little Rock was technically lawful or unlawful.

Hailed as a measure in protection of the rights of minorities, it in fact was probably the greatest insult to a State government that has ever transpired since our Constitution was adopted. * * *

It is reasonably certain that bayonets and force are not the answer to human problems of bigotry and racial tension. I find the incident at Little Rock especially unfortunate because conservatives were commencing to find bonds across party lines between North and South. This progress in gaining the support of people in the South, for governmental policies helping business and personal freedom, which are better for America than anything offered from other sources, has now been largely undone by what happened in Arkansas. It is also especially unfortunate because while intelligent Americans, even with stars in their eyes, are convinced that we cannot compromise our moral principles; being intelligent, they must recognize that neither can we be blind to commonsense application of personal values which are bound to encounter a great resistance to judicial or executive orders to jump into a melting pot—which has until now made America famous because of its free and voluntary qualities. This element of compulsion in haste has worsened race relations in the United States. It has worsened the reputation of the United States in those vast areas of the world where colored people constitute a substantial majority. This is a greater tragedy for its lack of necessity.

This Nation is composed of many languages, many races, many creeds living together under a document which permits a good deal of give and take. The very flexibility of the Federal Constitution has insured it continued strength against stresses and strains which in other lands have seen as many as 17 governments fall in 2 years. This document simply must not continue to be interpreted in such a manner as to throw out of kilter the great divider between the powers of the States and the Federal Government—the 10th amendment. The course of historical development of our United States must be turned from a direction of Federal paternalism to one of enlightened cooperation between sovereign States and the Federal Government—each working in its own sphere, with recognized division of authority and responsibility, in a spirit of partnership and not adversity.

Judge Matthes to Federal Appeals Bench

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 24, 1958

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am inserting in the RECORD an editorial which appeared in the St. Louis Globe-Democrat on Wednesday, February 19, 1958, Judge Matthes to Federal Appeals Bench:

JUDGE MATTHES TO FEDERAL APPEALS BENCH

President Eisenhower has made a commendable appointment in his nomination of Judge Marion C. Matthes of the St. Louis Court of Appeals to become a United States judge for the eighth circuit. The choice merits prompt ratification by the United States Senate.

The career of Judge Matthes shows a wide background in public service and a sound record on the St. Louis appeals bench. There is every reason he will prove an excellent selection to fill the vacancy on the eighth circuit court, created by elevation of Judge Charles E. Whittaker to the United States Supreme Bench.

This newspaper had urged the naming of United States District Judge Roy W. Harper to the Federal circuit post. Aside from individual bench records, which are good in both cases, the majority of reasons offered to support Judge Harper's candidacy are also realized in naming Judge Matthes. A Missourian of ability has been named so the State will have representation on this court. Judge Matthes is relatively young, respected in his profession, already proven a highly competent member of the judiciary.

All success to him in his new career.

Biography of James Harold Wallis

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOS. E. MARTIN
OF IOWA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, February 24, 1958

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. Mr. President, death came last month to one of the most eminent sons of the great State of Iowa, James Harold Wallis. During a lifetime extending over more than 70 years, he brought credit to the State and to himself as a journalist, a public servant and a writer. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a biography of James Harold Wallis written for the Yale Alumni magazine by his one-time roommate and lifelong friend, John Robert Waller.

There being no objection, the biography was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BIOGRAPHY OF JAMES HAROLD WALLIS

(Written for the Yale Alumni magazine by John Robert Waller, Yale, 1905, LAW)

(Born at Dubuque, Iowa, January 23, 1885. Died at Scarsdale, N. Y., January 13, 1958.)

The Wallis and Waller families of Iowa have been friends for more than a century. Our fathers were roommates at Epworth Seminary, near Dubuque, and it was my good fortune to room with Harold Wallis our first year at Yale in 1902. We attended high school together in Dubuque. He was class valedictorian and prominent in athletics and other school activities. At Yale, he was class poet, editor of the "Lit" and Courant, and a member of Phi Beta Kappa, Zeta Psi, and Elihu Club. After receiving his Yale degree, in 1906, he engaged in the study of law at the University of Chicago, but decided not to follow that profession.

James H. Wallis was active in the civic and business life of Dubuque, in which he served as alderman and mayor pro tempore, from 1912 to 1917, and worked diligently for the betterment of his native city. He was one of the organizers of the Allison-Henderson Memorial Association in memory of Senator Allison and Speaker Henderson, and assisted in the Taft Presidential campaigns. He also served on the Organizing Committee of the International Bank of Washington, D. C., now presided over by Maj. Gen. George Olmsted, of Des Moines and Washington.

J. H. Wallis served as editor of the Times-Journal until 1919, when he organized the Dubuque Daily News over which he presided until called to public service with the American Relief in Belgium, and later as Special Assistant to Herbert Hoover in Washington. Under date of February 4, 1958, ex-President Hoover writes: "I knew Mr. Wallis well. He was able, conscientious, and a very promising young man. I encouraged him to strike out on his own." In behalf of his Government, Harold Wallis prepared the first daily summary of world events with analyses of editorial opinions. His devotion to literary pursuits took him from Washington to New York in 1927, when he moved to Scarsdale where he resided until the time of his death. In addition to numerous magazine articles, he was the author of 3 volumes of verse and 14 widely read novels and mystery stories, some of which were adapted to motion pictures. He is survived by his widow, 2 children, and 4 grandchildren, as well as 2 brothers and their families in Dubuque.

Always considerate of others, J. H. Wallis had a friendly nature, with exemplary traits of modesty, kindliness, and generosity. Possessing leadership and seriousness of purpose, he was highly regarded for his unusual qualities of mind and heart. Among his distinctive characteristics were a keen sense of humor and quick wit. He joined heartily in mirth and laughter. A man of innate refinement, he was highly respected and added dignity to any gathering he attended. He was intensely loyal to his friends, but an uncompromising foe of greed and injustice. Measured by his years and many activities, he had reached full maturity; measured by accomplishments and duty done, he was ready for death's coming, but for those who knew him best, his passing could not have been too long delayed. He leaves a noble heritage to his family.

Grand Prairie Rotary Proposed Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RALPH W. YARBOROUGH
OF TEXAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, February 24, 1958

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, what this country needs is not a good 5-cent cigar. The Grand Prairie Rotary Club, of Grand Prairie, Tex., says what this country really needs is the following:

Six-lane highways across the Nation; rivers stocked with 4-pound bass; sewer systems that won't back up; a 20-percent cut in taxes; large pensions for mothers-in-law; and a law forcing backseat drivers to be licensed.

When I first heard of this legislative program, I was reluctant to introduce it because I felt it embodied the promises made by this administration prior to the last election. But I finally decided to go ahead and put it in the RECORD because time has shown that most of those promises have fallen by the wayside, anyhow.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have a portion of the January 17, 1958, edition of Rotary Breeze, the Grand Prairie, Tex., Rotary Club publication edited by Joe Grimland, printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the excerpts were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WELCOME TO ROTARY GRAND PRAIRIE, SENATOR YARBOROUGH

We are indeed happy to have the honor of a real live Senator in our midst. Since each State has only two and with one of them making the cover of Life this week and the other in Grand Prairie, we are sure they are appearing in the best places. Just to make you feel at home we would like for you to know the seating arrangement of our club. The conservative Democrats sit along the north wall, the liberals along the south wall, and the independents are at the back. There will be a few more noisy members at the back but please pay no attention to them—they are just Aggies looking for a coach. As for our needs you will find them very meager—a 6-lane highway and a couple of rivers dammed up and stocked with nothing but 4-pound bass; a sewer system that won't back up; a 20-percent cut in taxes; and a law forcing backseat drivers to be licensed; and a large pension for mothers-in-law so they can live by themselves. While you're at it you may as well investigate A. and M. and get them straightened out with a new warden—er-r-r; that is—coach. We're just kidding, Senator, we're real downright proud and happy you could come.

Misleading TV Advertising

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM E. PROXMIRE
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, February 24, 1958

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, all of us are aware of the tremendous influence television has on the minds of the American people today. It is extremely important that no unfair advantage be taken of the confidence many of our people put in what they see on TV.

The Madison Capital Times, a newspaper famous for its hard-hitting crusades in the public interest, has published a thoughtful editorial calling attention to the common practice of some TV advertisers of making use of the white-coat symbol of the medical man to sell patent medicines. The editorial suggests that some doctors themselves have been taken in by the advertisers.

I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, that this editorial be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MEDICAL JOURNAL HITS AT MEDICAL QUACKERY IN TV ADS

The New England Journal of Medicine, one of the most distinguished publications of its kind in the Nation, recently commented that doctors themselves are being sold on the medical quackery in TV commercials.

Surely, if there is anyone who needs to be convinced of the power of TV propaganda this should do it. When the members of the medical profession itself can be sold on a quack remedy by a smooth-voiced announcer dressed up in a doctor's white jacket, it demonstrates how dangerous TV can be when used irresponsibly.

The Journal made its comment in connection with a scientific experiment that proved that it is not true that a buffered aspirin can pound its way out of the stomach quicker than an un-buffered one. But, said the Journal, many members of the medical profession have been sold by high pressure advertising:

Protests are growing throughout the Nation at the quackery and deceit in many of the TV commercials. It is particularly offensive to have an expert only in voice control put on a white coat and advise people that if they don't take a certain pill they will become the victims of stomach acids strong enough to eat a hole in a handkerchief.

Recent events in Washington have demonstrated the tremendous influence TV interests have in Government today. It is precisely because of this influence that they have been able to get by with the kind of patent medicine advertising one sees on TV any day of the week.

It might not be a bad idea, if Congress ever does get around to a genuine investigation of the regulatory agencies, to inquire of the Federal Trade Commission why it allows this gigantic snake oil show to continue.

Surely, the public has a right to demand that in exchange for the legal monopoly of the public domain it has turned over to the TV interests we get something better than a return to the days of cowboys and Indians and the old medicine show.

The Cost of Operation Little Rock

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD B. RUSSELL
OF GEORGIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, February 24, 1958

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that an editorial entitled "Invasion's High Cost," which appeared in the issue of Thursday, February 13, of the Commercial Appeal, a newspaper published in Memphis, Tenn., be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

INVASION'S HIGH COST

As of January 31, Operation Little Rock had cost the taxpayers $4,237,996 according to Army Secretary Brucker. The operation began in September last and there is no indication when it will end—if ever.

Army costs at integrated Central High School through January 31, amounted to $3,802,282. The Air Force has estimated that its part in the invasion amounted to an additional $435,712.

Above and beyond normal unit maintenance costs, the Army paid out $177,823 for expenses incurred by the 101st Airborne Division in putting on an exhibition of unnecessary toughness.

According to Secretary Brucker's figures, federalization of the Arkansas National Guard cost $3,624,461, including $3,197,364 for pay and allowances, $186,678 for operation, maintenance and other expenses, $132,833 for clothing, and $107,586 for subsistence.

The $435,712 cost incurred by the Air Force was mostly pay and allowances for members of the federalized Arkansas Air National Guard. The purpose of mobilizing that branch baffles imagination.

The dollar cost is only part of the picture. Hardships have been imposed on families through the absence from home of the guardsman breadwinner, there have been dislocations in agriculture and industry because of the mobilization, civilian promotion systems have been upset and probably some of the guardsmen have lost their jobs. Time alone will tell the extent of that cost.

Without going into the merits of the integration controversy or the extent to which law and order had broken down in Little Rock—if at all—it can be said that the figures revealed by Secretary Brucker are those of the dollar cost of an outright Federal invasion of a State's sovereign rights.

As this invasion continues it has far reaching implications as well as known and hidden economic costs and exactly nothing is being accomplished. Persons in position to know regard the potentials of the existing situation as explosive with each new incident emphasizing the negative aspects of the whole sorry business.

Nothing better illustrates the ridiculousness of this experiment in Federal interference than the fact that 9 children have been kept in school for a little over 4 months in a hostile atmosphere inimical to academic progress at a cost of $4,237,996.

The total 1957–58 school budget for the city of Little Rock is only $5,222,297.

The continuance of the Central High situation on a cost basis alone is completely irrational, extravagant and unjustified. On the whole, it does the cause of sound education a gross disservice and serves only the purposes of agitators and extremists on both sides of the integration problem.

Responsibility for maintenance of order in Central High should have been restored to local authorities long ago.

Articles From Portland Oregonian on Fisheries Skimmer Device for Protection of Migratory Fish Runs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD L. NEUBERGER
OF OREGON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, February 24, 1958

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, one of the principal domestic issues confronting this session of Congress is how to provide for hydroelectric development on our great rivers of the Pacific Northwest without doing irreparable damage to migratory fish runs. This question has been brought to the Senate floor by the action of the Federal Power Commission in recommending construction of the Nez Perce Dam, which would would blockade the great Salmon River spawning grounds of Idaho.

One of the main hopes of those who believe that dams and fish can be reconciled is the so-called skimmer device, which is designed to prevent downstream bound fingerling fish from being pulverized by turbines or by the overflow of spillways.

Two informative and pertinent articles on the skimmer process appeared in the Portland Oregonian of February 17 and 18, 1958, under the byline of Herbert Lundy, editor of the editorial page of that daily newspaper in my home State. Mr. Lundy is known not only as an editorial writer, but also as a prominent sportsman and naturalist.

Because the Senate Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce will soon hold hearings on my bill, S. 3185, to give the United States Fish and Wildlife Service some jurisdiction over FPC licenses on rivers inhabited by fisheries, I I believe many Senators will be interested in reading the two articles by Mr. Lundy, and I ask unanimous consent that they be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MAJOR TESTS OF FISH SKIMMER DUE SOON
(By Herbert Lundy)

The skimmer you keep hearing about is not a hat but a complicated plan, with many variations, to get small migratory salmon and steelhead over high dams on their downstream progress to the sea. If they don't get to the ocean, they don't grow to be adults; they don't return to the graveled streambeds of their birth to produce more little fish, as is the habit of the Pacific Ocean's salmonoid species. The hope is that skimmer devices will prevent most of the downstream migrants from being chewed into fishburger pieces by turbines, deflated like broken balloons by pressure, or killed in the drop from spillways.

If it works, the skimmer will be a great help in the long fight to save salmon and steelhead runs for our own and future generations of commercial and sports fishermen. Fishery biologists generally think it will work—for some dams. But none knows how efficiently it will work. In other words, the fish losses could range from small to major.

The fishery agencies, State and Federal, with cooperation of dam builders, have learned how to get adult salmon upstream over dams in the Columbia system, with minimum losses. And steelhead can go anywhere salmon can go, and some places salmon can't.

Upstream passage by improved ladders or fishways—stairstep or vertical slot passageways through which water flows—is practical up to 100 feet in dam height. For higher dams, adult fish can be guided into traps, lifted into tank trucks and transported to the river above the dams to continue their spawning runs.

The downstream passage problem is another matter. And the heart of this problem is to find means to gather the tiny fish, to collect them from the breadth and depth of the river, so that they can be conveyed without harm to the water below the dam.

Because they have not solved this problem, those who believe it important to preserve the anadromous fishery resource have fought doggedly in recent years to buy time; to delay high dams in critical fish areas until it can be learned if high dams and fish ever can be compatible.

In the earlier years of settling the Northwest, salmon and trout migrations from the sea were blocked entirely out of scores of native streams by dams. These dams, plus mining pollution, destroyed about 75 percent of the fish producing waters of the Columbia River system. It is the remnant remaining which conservationists are fighting to save, and to increase if possible.

The prospects are brighter now than they ever have been that the salmon and steelhead can be saved and can be expanded in numbers, in spite of the increasing hazards inherent in dams, pollution, the explosion of predator fish population in impoundments and polluted waters, and the increased demands for food fish and sports fish. The skimmer is only a single phase of the campaign, but an important one.

The skimmer will be given a trial at two dams this year—at Portland General Electric Co.'s Pelton Dam on the Deschutes River in Oregon, and at Idaho Power Co.'s Brownlee Dam in the Middle Snake River which forms the Idaho-Oregon border. By counting devices—weight of fish and water, electronic checkers, or otherwise—some idea may be gained within a year about the probable success or failure of the skimmers. But the acid test, based on the return of adult salmon, will not be known for 4, 5 or more years. A minimum of 10 years will be necessary to be reasonably sure of the results. But this is a moratorium not likely to be achieved, in view of public demands for hydroelectric power and flood control.

It may be expected that shortly after the Pelton skimmer goes into service this spring, and the Brownlee skimmer this fall, the public will be fed a propaganda barrage (from waiting high-dam builders) about the millions of fingerlings being collected and transported safely over these structures.

Although conditions of dam heights, forebay drawdowns, and water temperatures, volumes and rates of flow may be vastly different than for Pelton and Brownlee, it

is as certain as night and day that the mere installation of skimmers there will be used for such immediate promotion of such gigantic dams as Nez Perce. In fact, the Federal Power Commission already has been misled on the subject.

But the possibility exists that the skimmer—which resulted from the desperation of fishery agencies and their decision to try by all means not to abandon any more spawning areas—may become a useful tool.

Instead of killing more fish with experiments, the United States Government could try out the skimmer on a major scale, first, at Grand Coulee Dam and Chief Joseph Dams. Grand Coulee, a total barrier to upstream and downstream migration, closed off thousands of miles of the upper Columbia system and destroyed all runs of chinook and blueback salmon and steelhead trout. It is not beyond hope that much of this natural fish production empire could be restored. No fish would be lost in the trial.

WILL SKIMMER WORK? NO ONE KNOWS

(By Herbert Lundy)

About 15,000 fall Chinook salmon and 1,200 steelhead were trapped and trucked around the Brownlee Dam construction job in the Snake River in September, October, and November. At least as many spring Chinook, probably more, went through uncounted while a coffer dam was washed out by floodwaters in the spring. The progeny of these 35,000 or more Chinook and steelhead will begin their migrations to the ocean next year. The spawn of the previous migrations will be starting out soooner.

The partial year of trucking adult fish around Brownlee disclosed to fishery men that there was an unexpectedly large and valuable spawning run of salmon up the Snake above the Salmon and Imnaha Rivers. The fish management people want to save and enhance this run. Their hopes will be pinned on the operation of a Rube Goldberg device for collecting and transporting fingerling migrants which has come to be known as a skimmer.

The name skimmer is roughly derived from the principle on which it is based. This is that many young salmon and steelhead working downstream for their youth-to-adult life in the sea follow the shorelines in big bodies of water; that most others, though traveling in midstream do not sound below about 100 feet. Hence the concept of a device to skim the small fish from near-surface areas of an impoundment, before they can be destroyed by blades of turbines or dashed to death over the spillways of a high dam.

The $3,500,000 skimmer layout will be approximately 1 mile above Brownlee Dam. It will be almost 2,000 feet long, extending from shore to shore. The fish barrier will be a steel wire-mesh net. The center and major portion will be of heavy material, 120 feet in vertical depth; the wings adjacent to the shorelines will be of a lighter material, adjustable so that they will continue to seal the underwater embankment as the reservoir fluctuates with its 101-foot drawdown.

The net barrier will be strung on cables, chief suspension being on the bottom cable anchored near the wings. The top cable will be floated on metal pontoons. The cables and the 120-foot deep net will go up and down as the surface of the impondment fluctuates. The theory is that most of the small migrants will not swim down deep enough to go under the net.

Built into the net will be three collector boxes, one at each side of the river in the wings, on the upstream side; one in the middle of the net. Pumps will draw water through these boxes at a volume of 100 second-feet each; the jets of water being directed upstream and to the side along the net, to form an additional attraction to the fingerlings.

In the boxes, the small salmon and steelhead will be automatically sorted for size by a grader system employing chutes and slots, similar to that in use in hatcheries. This system will direct the fish groups into holding boxes, live boxes, in angler's terminology.

At this point, if all goes well, the young fish will have been collected. From the holding compartments they will be directed through valves into an 8-inch pipe in which a current of water will convey them by tank trucks. The trucks would haul the small fish about 15 miles, for release into the Snake River below the Oxbow Dam site.

The skimmer complex of nets, locks, pumps, valves, and pipes designed to gather the small migrants and conduct them around the dam would be protected from drifting logs and ice floes by a trash boom 8-feet deep and spanning the river upstream.

Two principal hazards to this mechanical means of collecting small fish would be net failure and possibility that many fish will sound and go under the net.

A simpler skimmer device than that awaiting approval by the Federal Power Commission for Brownlee Dam is the one already approved and being installed in the Deschutes River for Pelton Dam. The penstocks at Pelton will be deeply submerged, at about 130 feet, and no net barrier will be tried there. The forebay is to have a maximum fluctuation of only 7 feet.

The fish ladder leading from below the reregulating dam to a natural bay above the concrete-arch Pelton Dam will provide upstream access to adult salmon and steelhead. On the theory that the small, downstream migrants will prefer not to sound below 100 feet, and that those coming down the western shore will make their way across the face of the dam to the artificial outlet on the eastern shore, a collection box there will be stationary.

The fish will be gathered in an outlet which will use 200 second-feet of water—but return 194 feet of it to the forebay—and conveyed in a pipe carrying 6 second-feet of water through the dam. This pipe will shoot the little fish into the fish ladder and they will go down that to the river below the reregulating dam.

The Skimmer device at Pelton is to go into service when the forebay is filled this spring, at Brownlee in the fall. These will be the first tests of a system worked out cooperatively by fishery and dam engineers in an effort to solve one of the major conflicts in the Northwest.

But a word of warning: If these skimmers work as well as they look on paper, they will not answer all the problems of dam passage. There is, for example, the timelag involved in salmon reaching their spawning beds. At Nez Perce site, there would be an adult-salmon problem, as well. Salmon trucked around the dam would have to be put back in the Snake River below the mouth of the Salmon River, since no one would know if they were bound for the upper Salmon, upper Snake, or Imnaha Rivers. But water impounded in the forebay would be a mixture of Salmon, Snake, and Imnaha waters. Could the fish find their way to their home streams? No one knows.

Why Postal Pay Must Be Raised

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM E. PROXMIRE

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 24, 1958

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, it is often easy, in talking about pay raises or anything else, to get involved in consideration of millions of dollars and lose sight of the individual human beings and their problems that really are the heart of the matter.

Recently I received a letter which brings sharply into focus what a pay raise for postal employees means to those individual human beings. This letter encloses a copy of the resignation of a rural mail carrier who quit to take a job which offered him "a substantial wage increase over what I am now earning." The job is washing rugs in a Madison business establishment.

I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, that these letters be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MIDDLETON, WIS., *January 27, 1958.*

Senator WILLIAM PROXMIRE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: I am enclosing a copy of a letter sent to our local postmaster within the last week. It bears out our often expressed contention that, unless the pay scale of postal employees is raised, there will be no employees. This man knows several routes, and is an asset to the service, yet he is leaving because he can do better elsewhere. The man of today wants money in his pocket now to meet expenses, not promises of a pension or other things in the future.

When S. 27 comes up on the Senate floor, I am sure you, as a member of the committee, will vote down any amendments that are not committee amendments, and will fight to keep the $240 cost-of-living bonus in the bill. Those of the classified employees who complain of this section would find that classifieds of skill comparable to clerk and carrier work would be in a higher classified grade, while postal employees are in level 4 by order of the Postmaster General.

It is very gratifying to have a Wisconsin Senator on the Post Office and Civil Service Committee.

I wish you the utmost success in all your efforts.

Sincerely,

CHARLES H. EASTON.

MADISON, WIS., *January 20, 1958.*

POSTMASTER,
Madison, Wis.

DEAR SIR: I wish to submit my resignation from the postal service, effective February 8, 1958.

The reason for my resignation is the job offer I recently received has a substantial wage increase over what I am now earning. And I feel I need this increase in order to live comfortably.

Respectfully,

KENNETH COX,
Regular Substitute Carrier, No. 188.

Poll on Pay Television

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STROM THURMOND

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 24, 1958

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, recently, Mr. Bob Brock, the television editor of the Dallas Times-Herald, of

Dallas, Tex., conducted a poll among readers of that newspaper on the subject of pay television.

Because the subject is one of particular interest to the Senate at this time, I wish to have the telegram from Mr. Brock to me, in reporting the results of his poll, printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

The telegram reads as follows:

DALLAS, TEX.

Senator J. STROM THURMOND,
The United States Senate.

HON. STROM THURMOND: As television editor of the Dallas Times-Herald, I have been conducting a poll among readers as to how they feel about the question of pay versus free television. The reactions of my readers have been unbelievable: 200 to 1 against any form of toll television. As the question of whether pay television should be given a trial nears a showdown, I would like to place at your disposal my entire mail on the subject. I believe the views of my readers mirror the sentiment of the Nation's televiewers as a whole.

BOB BROCK,
TV Editor, the Dallas Times-Herald.

Middle Eastern Economic Development

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, February 24, 1958

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, as a participant in the recent Middle East Institute held in Washington on January 31–February 1, 1958, I was particularly impressed with some of the proposals made for Middle Eastern regional economic development. My colleagues know that I have been publicly committed to this kind of approach for some time. In my report on the Middle East and Southern Europe filed with the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations in June 1957 I devoted some time to the proposal of the Middle East Development Agency.

In this connection, I was interested to note an editorial entitled "For Mideast Self-Help," published in the Christian Science Monitor for Saturday, February 8, 1958. I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FOR MIDEAST SELF-HELP

Much as the Arabic nations of the Middle East need American aid, they have resources with which to finance a great deal of their own development. It is encouraging, therefore, that Dr. Ali Amini, Ambassador from Iran to the United States, should have proposed at a recent conference in Washington some pooling of oil incomes by Middle Eastern states for that purpose.

This pooling is necessary because the petroleum deposits which comprise the chief material wealth of that region are not distributed through all the Arabic States. Most are concentrated in the tiny shiekdom of Kuwait, in Saudi Arabia, Iran, and to a less extent Iraq and Bahrein. This leaves Syria, Lebanon, Jordan, and Egypt as areas without substantial oil revenues unless from pipeline or canal transit fees.

At the Middle East Institute Conference Dr. A. J. Meyer of Harvard University remarked that Syria has negotiated a development loan from the Soviet Union at 2½ percent interest, while the Shiek of Kuwait has invested a roughly similar amount in the London money market at the same rate.

If there were simply the financial mechanisms for transferring investment capital from one Middle Eastern country to another many needs might be met. Since the recent Ankara Conference of the Baghdad Pact powers the United States is contributing to a telephonic network among Middle Eastern capital cities which will enable them to communicate directly with one another. For some time it has been proposed that the United Nations should sponsor a regional development organization which would make plans for water and land use, transportation, and new industries in the Mideast.

The United States could well request a place for such a project on the U. N. agenda. Its formation would assist the Arabic nations on a broader scale to do what Iraq has done to harness petroleum revenues to the upbuilding of the land. In that country 70 percent of the government's income is being spent on public works, including irrigation, agriculture, highways, industry, and housing.

Trip Around World by May Craig, Star Reporter, Portland Sunday Telegram

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FREDERICK G. PAYNE
OF MAINE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, February 24, 1958

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that an editorial from the Portland Sunday Telegram of February 16, entitled "A Reporter in Orbit" which discusses May Craig's current trip around the world, together with an excellent column by May Craig from the same paper on conditions in Iran, may be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial and article were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A REPORTER IN ORBIT

Star Reporter May Craig is flying around the world in somewhat less time than the 80 days it took the storied Phileas Fogg to traverse the circumference of the globe via balloon, boat, elephant, rickshaw, train, and assorted craft and vehicles. But she is witnessing more events, talking with more ambassadors and heads of state, and imparting more knowledge to the folks back home than Phileas and good friend Passepartout ever dreamed possible.

The column on this page finds her in Teheran, just emerged from the Middle East and heading into the subcontinent of India and Burma, thence to southeast Asia. We commend her daily columns to Telegram and Press Herald readers as a means toward greater understanding of the problems of the world.

IRANIANS EAGER FOR IMPROVEMENT
(By May Craig)

Iran is Moslem country but not Arabian and the people do not like to be lumped with Arabs. They belong to the Baghdad Pact, which has just been meeting in Ankara, Turkey. Iraq is the only Arab country in the pact and Egypt objects to Iraq being in, but people in Iraq say they will stay in the pact. The people in the pact want the United States to join but there is no indication we will, though we belong to many of the committees including the new military committee. The people of Iran, which is the ancient Persia, are Indo-European. Thirty years ago the Shah made Iran the official name of the country. The language is still properly called Persian.

The Iranians are against communism, but they do not want to provoke the the Soviet Union, with which they have a 1,000 miles of border.

This country is 2½ times as large as Texas. It has enormous resources of minerals, water, land. The leaders have an ambitious plan for development. They get lots of money for their oil, and can plan development, though their oil revenues went down to zero during the Suez oil crisis, when Syria cut the oil lines and the canal was blocked. Teheran lies on a flat plain, surrounded by mountains—beautiful, with the snow on them, with no snow in the city. It snowed in the city while we have been here, but it did not stay, though the mountains were newly white.

As in most of these old countries, there are open gutters and they overflowed with rain and melting snow, and flooded the streets so some were impassable.

To get from Europe to Asia, one must pass through Iran, and so there have been wars for thousands of years over this area. The people are proud of their ancient history, their culture. We went to the Palace of the Rose Garden, entirely lined with mirrors, cut into small shapes and made into patterns. There is the Peacock Throne, incredibly beautiful, with colored enamels and precious stones. If the Shah is crowned it will be here—but he told us that he will not have a formal, expensive coronation while many of his people are so poor. He has reigned for 16 years, often tempestuously—once he fled and came back after the rebellion was quelled.

He is a handsome, young man and loves his people. He gave all his own land to peasants, but the other big landlords do not. They squeeze the last penny out of the miserable villagers. Often they are absentee landlords and never visit the villages. This is the sort of thing that opens the door to communism. The Communists appeal to the poor people—in Russia they killed off the rich landlords and took the land for the state and the peasants didn't get any of it. But Communist promises appeal to helpless, hopeless people.

The Shah is for the people, but so far he has not dared to oppose the rich, entrenched interests which are only for themselves. The Shah and some of those around him want to spend the oil money to raise the standard of living for the people—who need it. Go into the streets of Teheran, away from the hotels and the palaces and the new government buildings and you see the most utter poverty and filth and hunger. To lift them will take a long time, much direction and money and a new psychology.

Most interesting official we met was Abol Hassan Ebtehaj, managing director of plan organization, who speaks excellent English, has tremendous energy, has been much in the United States and at the United Nations. He attended the International Conference on Private Enterprise in San Francisco, last October. He has here, helping him with his water power development, on their immense rivers, David Lilienthal and Gordon Clapp, who planned and helped to develop and administer our TVA.

Ebtehaj knows the waterpower of our country better than most of us do. He could cite by figure, the cost of water and thermal power production in the United States. Their plans were delayed by the oil crisis

when the revenue failed. They also plan roads, hospitals, schools, plants to produce paper, cement, and chemicals. They employ the best consultants of Europe. They want American know-how and want American technicians. They get some money from the World Bank, and point 4. They have a budget deficit at the moment, and want United States money. We don't want to provide it, for a budget deficit; we want to lend it for development. We think they make too big a budget, want to double salaries and take on more people—and that they should not expect to shift their budget deficit to the backs of the American taxpayer. But we have real friends here, mutual interests and defense problems. It is well that we hold them in the democratic alliances and raising the standard of living is one of the best ways to do it. They promise that private capital will be safe here from nationalization and expropriation. They tell us proudly they want loans—that gifts are humiliating.

Law of the Land

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STROM THURMOND
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, February 24, 1958

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, in the February 21, 1958, issue of the Nashville Banner of Nashville, Tenn., there appears an editorial entitled "Law of the Land?" in which a basic principle of constitutional government is pointed out in striking fashion. I ask unanimous consent that this editorial be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Nashville (Tenn.) Banner of February 21, 1958]

LAW OF THE LAND? WHO MAKES THE LAW OF THE LAND?

How is it made? By judicial interpretation, or by congressional enactment?

These are valid and challenging questions just now; and they need competent answer before recklessness under pressure's wild momentum—and without the brakes of sudy and reason—carries the country to the point of no return.

Actually, the Constitution is—originally—the law of the land. It hasn't been amended in any of the particulars today distorted into invasion of basic rights. Nor has Congress officially forfeited the rights of exclusive legislative powers. Where the Supreme Court encroaches upon that domain, Congress can act to redress the grievance of invasion.

For example: In June, 1950, the Supreme Court reversed the judicial rulings of a century—which under present theory had been the law of the land—to divest coastal States of their tidelands rights. It held on that date that the Federal Government has paramount rights to the tidelands.

Supposedly then that became the law of the land. And every subordinate court would be expected to deal accordingly with any case before it.

Congress did not accept that. Congress was of the opinion that the issue was one for legislative determination. A little under 3 years later, Congress did act on the question, and overwhelmingly. It enacted a law restoring tidelands title to the States, to the extent of their historic boundaries.

Only Congress can deal adequately and authoritatively with the present issues, insofar as Federal responsibility is concerned.

It has that obligation—primarily to assert just where the lines of authority fall; and they fall exactly where the Constitution drew them. Otherwise the "law of the land" is a nebulous instrument, subject to capricious change without benefit of legality—an item of confusion, abuse, and danger.

Leading Industries of Massachusetts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEVERETT SALTONSTALL
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, February 24, 1958

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD 3 articles which appeared recently in the Boston Daily Globe which describe 3 leading industries of Massachusetts—fishing, precision instruments, and textile machinery.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MASSACHUSETTS SETS THE PACE—PRECISION INSTRUMENTS REVEAL STATE'S SKILLS

(By Harry Stanton)

There are many first-class reasons for Massachusetts' high standing in the production of a wide range of precision instruments.

First is the fact that this State is rich in facilities for research and experimentation. Highly educated specialists with profound knowledge of the techniques of measuring, analyzing, and recording abound and are in frequent and easy contact with each other. Massachusetts has an unequaled supply of men with the know-how.

Precision instruments require close tolerance workmanship and Massachusetts also is plentifully supplied with highly skilled craftsmen and technicians. The labor force for this kind of work is exceptionally competent.

NEWTON FIRM'S SPECTROGRAPHS

Although this State's location at the far northeastern corner of the Nation is a handicap in establishment of industries requiring quantities of heavy raw materials the transportation problem is a minor one in the instrument field. Instruments usually are extremely compact, use up little material in proportion to their value, and can be shipped at low unit costs.

Most of the fine instruments for which Massachusetts is famous are made by comparatively small, highly specialized, companies.

For example, Newton's Jarrell-Ash Co. specializes in devices for analyzing materials by examination of the lines of the visible light spectrum emitted by the materials themselves. An astonishingly varied use of this method is being made throughout the world and JACO spectrographs are in use in many foreign countries as well as in most of the States.

Oil that has been used to lubricate moving parts can be analyzed by this instrument to determine its content of minute metallic particles—and thus to disclose the amount of wear on the bearings. A trace of paint sometimes can reveal the make, model and year of manufacture of a car involved in a hit-and-run accident. By burning in an electrical arc a piece of metallic alloy and photographing its emitted spectral lines the analyst can tell what metals are included and their relative quantities in the alloy.

Another interesting instrument made by JACO is the fluorometer, a device designed to measure the fluorescence of dense materials, either in solid or liquid form. It is particularly useful in detecting the presence of minute qualities of uranium and beryllium in biological fluids.

HEART INSTRUMENTS

One of the great makers of electrocardiographs in the Nation is Sanborn Co. of Waltham. Their production, together with that of one other producer in this State, places Massachusetts in the top bracket in this field.

The electrocardiograph is a device for making a permanent visible record of characteristics of the heartbeat permitting more detailed examination by the specialist than is possible by listening with a stethoscope.

Sanborn also turns out a metabulator, a valuable diagnostic instrument used to determine whether a patient is burning up his food too rapidly or too slowly; a visoscope, which shows heart action on a cathode ray tube, something like a television screen, a multichannel biophysical recording system capable of measuring and recording simultaneously as many as eight physical events, and a number of electronic instruments for industrial uses.

Baird-Atomic, Inc., of Cambridge builds and ships all over the world a broad line of analytical and control instruments for industry, medicine, and research. Stream analyzers, electronic counters, spectrophotometers, laboratory gas analyzers, pulse height analyzers, densitometer comparators, and radioactivity detectors are included among this company's products.

LARGEST IN ITS FIELD

The Foxboro Co., at Foxboro, believed to be the largest strictly industrial instrument maker in the world, is rounding out its first half century of production of units to control variables. The company's specialty is compact-sized instruments for continuous measurement of temperature, rate of flow, acidity, and other variables, particularly in moving fluids, petrochemicals, textile processing, the metals industries, water and sewage plants, and so on.

Although most of these instruments are mechanical and pneumatic, this company also is producing electronic and radionic devices, an example being a profiler for use in papermills. This sensitive instrument can measure the differences between the amount of energy emitted from a radioactive source and the amount received after passing through a sheet of paper and thus accurately determine the weight of the paper.

In addition to devices produced by companies specializing in the instrument field there also are, in Massachusetts, many companies that make instruments as a sideline to activities in other fields.

Included in this list are General Electric, Polaroid, Raytheon, Sylvania, Ultrasonic, Transonics, National Radio, and Avco Mfg. Co., among other. Although it is difficult to draw a line between what constitutes an instrument as opposed to a tool or a machine, a great many devices for precision measuring are made in Massachusetts. In fact, there is little doubt that this State sets the pace for the Nation in this respect.

NINETY-EIGHT BAY STATE COMPANIES MAKE TEXTILE MACHINERY

(By Frederick D. McCarthy)

One of the oldest industries in the United States, the manufacture of textile machinery had its birth in Waltham, and Massachusetts boasts of the greatest number of such manufacturing establishments in the Union today.

Despite its relative antiquity, the textile machinery industry is more advanced and aggressive today than at any time in its history. Due to numerous technological developments, the productivity rate per man-hour in the textile industry, it is estimated, has increased approximately 50 percent within the last 10 years, a rate far surpassing that of most other industries.

This has been made possible, points out James H. Hunter, president of James H. Hunter Machine Co., and president of the American Textile Machinery Association by extensive long-range research and development programs of American textile machinery builders.

PAYROLLS OF $43 MILLION

Some 98 textile machinery establishments are operating in Massachusetts, or more than 18 percent of the national total of 535 firms, according to the 1954 United States Census of Manufacturers. Pennsylvania is in second place, with 62 firms, or 11.5 percent of the total.

Payrolls of the Bay State companies aggregated more than $43 million and value of products shipped in 1954 was in excess of $101 million.

The famous Northrop automatic loom was first introduced by Draper Corp., of Hopedale, in 1894, allowing 1 weaver to operate 16 looms. That was a great accomplishment, the invention revolutionizing the textile industry and launching it on its great mass productive economy.

However, hopping ahead to the automatic single shuttle loom introduced by Draper Corp. largest manufacturer of cotton looms in the world, the progress since the first Northrop has been so rapid that the two pieces of equipment seem only remotely related.

Currently, the average weaver's productivity is more than 600 percent greater than that of the worker who operated the first automatic loom.

NEW SHUTTLELESS LOOM

Taking a peek at the last two decades, it is apparent that while the basic principle of textile weaving has changed no more than the use of wheels on an automobile, everything else has been altered on the loom just as it has been on a car: speed, efficiency, ease of operation, and maintenance, safety devices, use of automatic features, performance, and price.

Important changes in textile machinery have brought about increased versality, improved quality, increased automation, and lowered costs of maintenance.

One of the topflight, present-day research projects of Draper Corp. is the Draper shuttleless loom, which operates without shuttle, bobbin, or battery. Research has reached the point of actual mill test. Increased speed, reduced maintenance, and a high degree of automation are expected from this new loom.

FIRST TWO-SHUTTLE LOOM

Back in the depression days of the thirties, Crompton & Knowles Corp., of Worcester, perfected the first two-shuttle loom permitting the changing of shuttles without stopping the machine. Today this firm holds approximately 1,200 patents covering products relating to automatic bobbin-changing and automatic shuttle-changing features of its box looms.

Saco-Lowell Shops, another outstanding textile-machinery manufacturer, has its main plants in Biddeford and Saco, Maine, but its principal offices are located in Boston.

This company also had its origin in Massachusetts. Three principal companies came together to form the organization which since 1912, has been known as Saco-Lowell Shops.

The three original companies were formed in Waltham in 1813, in Newton in 1814, and in Saco, Maine, in 1825. The intital aim of each was to produce, not machines, but cloth. Each, nevertheless, created an independent textile-machine shop and eventually concentrated on the production of machinery.

COMPANIES DIVERSIFYING

In November 1956, Saco-Lowell acquired a 25-percent interest in Elliott Addressing Machine Co., of Cambridge, one of the Nation's leading factors in the office equipment field. Saco-Lowell also has a division which produces automotive parts.

A spokesman for this company said these outside activities are in line with a diversification policy initiated a few years ago to give greater stability to employment and operations.

Whitin Machine Works, of Whitinsville, is another prominent Bay State textile-machinery manufacturer which has been branching out into other lines.

STATE'S FISHERMEN REAP $35 MILLION HARVEST

(By Earl Banner)

The Bay State has held a preeminent position in the Nation's fisheries since colonial days and, chiefly by virtue of its position in close proximity to the greatest and most productive fishing banks in the world, couldn't very well lose its position as the Nation's top producer of ground fish without abandoning the business entirely.

And that isn't likely to happen. For, in spite of the sounds of distress emanating from the ports of Gloucester, Boston, New Bedford, Provincetown, from time to time, the Bay State's fisheries still provide employment for a lot of people and keep a lot of money in circulation.

Last year, for instance, Bay State fish packers and processors paid out more than $35 million to Massachusetts' 4,100 fishermen and vessel owners who, between them, man and operate some 540 vessels of all sizes. They paid out another $30 million to Canada, Iceland, Norway, and other fish-exporting nations for the fish they imported.

FISH SCARCE LATELY

There are about 80 vessels in the Boston fishing fleet now. They made only 2,457 trips last year, the lowest since 1944, when wartime operations hampered the local fishery. Their landings totaled only 135.6 million pounds, the lowest since 1924. But they got more money for their fish—$11.2 million, as compared with $10.5 million in 1956 and $9.2 million in 1955.

MILLION-POUND DAY

The Boston fish pier had its first million-pound day in nearly a year just last Monday when some 20 vessels landed a total of 1,381,000 pounds of fish. About half of these were haddock, the species that brings the highest price, and the price of 15.25 cents a pound was considered very good for that volume. The last previous million-pound day had been on March 18, 1956, when the price was pegged at only 7 or 8 cents a pound.

At this caplog price, the producers of haddock, fillets would have to get at least 40 cents a pound wholesale in order to stay in business, since the recovery in fillets from fish-in-the-round is only about 42 percent.

PAINFUL READJUSTMENTS

The New England fishing industry has been going through a period of painful readjustments throughout the past decade, an experience that it has successfully survived many times during the past 300 or more years of its history.

Outstanding examples of this were the now gone cod, mackerel, and menhaden fisheries of the 1880's. More recently, there was the rise and fall of the yellowtail flounder fishery in southern New England and its replacement on the same grounds by an even greater industrial fishery for the producers of fishmeal, animal food, and oils.

BIG NEW BEDFORD CATCHES

New Bedford, after a sorry start during the early months of 1957, wound up with a season to remember. Several new vessels were added to the scalloping fleet which brought in an alltime record catch of 16,458,000 pounds of scallop meats valued at $7,984,000.

The New Bedford fishermen did a bit better than just all right with yellowtail flounders, too. Their catch of this species totaled 14 million pounds, some 5 million more than in 1956. Total landings of all species of fish at New Bedford last year—103,270,000 pounds valued at $13.1 million.

The thing of it is, New Englanders are handier than anyone else in the United States to the richest fishing grounds in the world. They extend all the way from Nantucket Shoals to the Flemish Cap, some 1,300 sea miles. It is altogether likely that New Englanders will continue to send ships and men to harvest this wealth for a long time to come.

Texas Writer Sees Capital, Labor, and Management as Triumvirate

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LYNDON B. JOHNSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 24, 1958

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of an article under the title "Capital Is Labor," written by Mr. Charles A. Breitung, of Austin, Tex., be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CAPITAL IS LABOR

(By Charles A. Breitung)

The impression seems to be established that there is a vast chasm between capital and labor. As a matter of fact, capital is and always has been labor—the fruit of the labor of an individual or of a group of people. This seems to be fundamental. Certainly in a democracy such as we enjoy in the United States of America, capital has been created, with the help of Almighty God, by the works, inspiration, and labor of millions of men and women.

LINCOLN'S WORDS

The words of Abraham Lincoln can be aptly quoted:

"Labor is prior to, and independent of, capital. Capital is the fruit of labor, and could never have existed if labor had not first existed. Labor is the superior of capital, and deserves much the higher consideration. Capital has its rights, which are as worthy of protection as any other rights. Nor is it denied that there is, and probably always will be, a relation between labor and capital, producing mutual benefits."

The history of the Labor movement in the United States has been a slow assertion of the rights of the rank and file of men and women engaged largely in manual skills and trades.

MUCH MORE

But labor represents much more than that.

Management is labor, of the most intensive sort. Management requires a larger capacity of training, and frequently longer hours spent in close studies of the problems of operation and finance.

Meeting a weekly or monthly payroll is an experience which anyone must go through in order fully to appreciate what makes the

wheels go round. The money does not grow on trees.

A product, whatever it is, must be made and sold at a price sufficient to pay all costs and taxes plus a profit, or else the venture folds up.

CAUSE OF GROWTH

Our industries in the United States have grown to tremendous size because of the combination of the teamwork of people who were willing to advance funds, of the people who were competent to furnish the gift of management, and of the people who had the gifts and genius of cooperative skills and know-how. All of these are essential in the growth of a successful business.

Investment funds come from the savings of the many and the cumulative interests of the very few fortunate ones who have been able to conserve family wealth. From shirtsleeves to shirtsleeves in three generations is still largely true in this great country of ours. It is perhaps just as well that this is so, because it does give everyone a chance to achieve material prosperity, and do it by his own efforts, plus the will of God. The person who talks about his own bootstraps is an idiot or a fool.

LABOR'S PROGRESS

One cannot help but be impressed with the progress of organized labor during the past thirty-odd years. It is a story of teamwork and effort. Part of it is a story of misdirected idealism which sought objectives without knowing how to attain them. The right to quit work in a free democracy, is a God-given privilege. There are also duties and obligations implied with it. To say that babies must do without milk for days, or that the rank and file of our citizens must do without police or fire protection, or that we, the people, must do without anything, because the rights and privileges of a few are being violated, is not equity under God.

Labor does have intrinsic rights: It also has privileges and obligations. Likewise management, also mostly labor in another form, has basic rights, which it has earned; it too has privileges and responsibilities. Among responsibilities is the stern duty and trust to see to it that every man willing to work is employed. And if conditions do not warrant full employment, then that at least subsistence is provided during the periodic occurrences of readjustment.

A democracy cannot afford depressions when men and women through no fault of their own are unable to find gainful employment. The black side of a balance sheet may be black enough in the eternal scheme of things.

INVESTORS' RIGHTS

And the people who put up the funds, either directly through their personal savings, or indirectly through their life insurance equities or savings investment in bonds or stock or interests, have rights and responsibilities. They have the funds to invest. They have the right to expect a fair return on these funds commensurate with the risks involved. They also have the responsibility to the vast army of men and women employed to see to it that these workers receive a fair and just compensation for their labors.

In good times these people with funds enjoy profits by way of dividends and the increase in the property value. In bad times they receive no dividends and their property values shrink. And yet, they have an implied obligation to see to it that the men and women and their families, who work in the establishments in which they have financial interest, do not suffer unreasonably because of lack of the basic subsistence, of of food, water, and shelter.

The haunting fear of the rank and file is that they may not be able to even buy daily bread.

STATE SOCIALISM

State socialism, with its fantastic will-o'-the-wisp theory of equal rights for all, is fundamentally unsound. A man or a woman aspires, because he or she was a personal gain to achieve. The level of the mass average is the inevitable morass of the prehistoric quicksand which destroyed the monsters of that age. The Almighty made us as individuals; no two grains of sand are alike, let alone humans.

This brings up the point of ownership in these enterprises, large and small. Labor demands rights. Labor can have rights and ownership, which begets vested rights, by buying them with their own savings.

SIMPLE SOLUTION

As B. F. Fairless, recently chairman of the board of the United Steel Corp., has stated, labor can become the owners of these large corporations which employ them, by the normal process of stock purchase.

It is that simple.

Organized labor, with its millions of members in these multiple unions, can own sufficient interest in any and all of these companies, to exercise a voice in the management and policies of these projects. This involves responsibilities, and abilities. This is the challenge to organized labor. Organized and unorganized labor can either employ skilled, fairminded, professional and technical experts, or they can promote a program of training within their ranks so that this leadership is available to them in increasing numbers.

They want rights; they have the right to acquire ownership. Equity is fair play. It always has been, despite legal entanglements and obstacles.

FORMULA

With millions of men and women holding membership in these many unions, the will to ownership is governed by the willingness to save a few dollars each month collectively. Twenty million members in a union could invest $1 per member per month in the stocks of various enterprises. Within a few years the millions of members would play a very definite part in the management. The management is dedicated to the principle that the public must be given what they will buy, whether it is shoes or automobiles, houses or food and clothing. And $240 million per year invested in corporate securities would indeed play an important part in the relationship between invested capital, management, labor, and the consuming public, which likewise is largely labor.

WRONG DIRECTION

The discords caused by the temporary inability of the consuming public to obtain the services and goods desired, when the uneconomic strike periods occur, do not seem to be intelligent forward steps. Public opinion when properly informed with facts will certainly insist that all parties shall receive fair treatment. Little is gained by walkouts and strike protests, sometimes staged with elements of violence and disregard of property rights and public-service responsibilities, other than the loss of wages and salaries by labor and management, and the shortage of goods and services to which the general public have become accustomed.

No group in our democratic life has the right or privilege to hold the public welfare in contempt, or to overcharge the public for goods or services required in ordinary daily living.

The will of democratic government must be the voice of the majority of the people, and not the selfish wish of any organized minority, whether it be capital funds or labor, or management which is essentially a form of labor.

PUBLIC INTEREST

We can ardently hope for the day when these differences of opinion between deputized management representing ownership, and the groups of organized labor, can be disposed of in harmony and with mutual understanding without the interference of political influences whose main objective is often to gather votes for self-perpetuation in office. The public interest is paramount. The public is the Government.

In addition to the gigantic corporate structures, there are many hundreds of thousands of small enterprises, owned largely by the management, and operated with the help of men and women who are employed for stipulated salaries and wages. The relationship of management and labor, and capital and labor, is a personal one in these businesses. There is consequently more of a family atmosphere of harmony prevailing, with of course the personal factors of occasional discord.

When it is all summed up, the principles of the Golden Rule of doing unto others as you would have them do unto you, must be the basis of continued prosperity and peace in our national and international relationships.

Maine Cities Ask Jobs, Not Charity

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FREDERICK G. PAYNE
OF MAINE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 24, 1958

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a column from the February 17, 1958, Christian Science Monitor entitled "Maine Cities Ask Jobs, Not Charity" may be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MAINE CITIES ASK JOBS, NOT CHARITY

(By George H. Favre)

"What my people want is jobs, not charity."

In these words Mayor Clement F. Deschambeault of Biddeford sums up the hope and desire of his townspeople and the people of Biddeford's twin city, Saco. With a joint population of about 30,000, Biddeford and Saco have 3,302 unemployed, about 30 percent of the working population.

Of these, some 1,400 persons in Biddeford are on the relief rolls, with 140 families totally dependent on city welfare.

Mayor Peter A. Garland of Saco reported about 3,200 workers who have applied for unemployment benefits, out of a work force of 13,500. Of the unemployed, some 1,000 have applied for city aid, and about 100 families are presently wholly dependent on the city.

But while in no way minimizing the urgency of the problem, both mayors agreed yesterday that reports of economic distress in their twin cities have been blown up.

Radio and television reports of long breadlines and rumors that the economically vital Saco-Lowell shops, which produce textile machinery, were about to close down were categorically denied by the executive heads of both cities.

"I don't want to minimize the situation here," Mayor Garland said, "but things aren't quite as bad as some people would have you believe."

Mayor Deschambeault, who agreed with the Saco chief executive's evaluation, stated that the great need is not for food and clothing but for jobs. "The most important thing is to bring new industries to the areas," he affirmed.

City welfare agencies have been distributing surplus food for some time to families on assistance rolls in both cities.

Some 1,400 workers were thrown out of work last year with the closing down of the York division of the Bates Manufacturing Co., one of New England's largest textile firms.

Unemployment benefits for many of these workers are now running out, which will put an increasing burden on the relief rolls. Also contributing to the situation is a cut of 20 percent in the work force of the Saco-Lowell shops, which will affect 400 workers.

Mayor Deschambeault said that while the welfare case load has doubled in the last months, a $40,000 appropriation by the city is believed adequate to carry the load.

Meanwhile, over the weekend, in response to the sudden flare of publicity given the Biddeford-Saco unemployment situation, a spontaneous demonstration of neighborly concern brought donations of fresh foodstuffs to the area.

William V. Benson, a south Portland lobster dealer, together with other businessmen in the greater Portland area formed a good-neighbor committee to collect supplies for needy families in the Biddeford-Saco area.

The group is seeking contributions from businessmen, manufacturers, and producers through appeals made by radio station WLOB in Portland and seven affiliates on the lobster network.

Among the pledges of help received were 3,000 loaves of bread, 1,000 pounds of fresh fish, 520 quarts of canned sardines, 1,500 cans of corn, and milk, sugar, beans, fruits, and vegetables.

Mayor Garland this morning stated that the fresh foodstuffs will be moved as soon as possible with the most perishable commodities being distributed first so as to prevent any spoilage.

Triggering the generous action of the Portland merchants were news reports that tons of Federal surplus foodstuffs were being rushed to the area on an emergency basis.

Mayor Garland explained that Government surplus foods have been given out to the families of unemployed workers for months now, and that the latest 6-ton shipment was merely a temporary loan from Portland school-lunch program reserves to meet a momentary shortage.

"I don't want to leave the impression that the situation is not serious," Mayor Garland said. "Our unemployment problem, which had been a growing one over the past 6 years, is grave. But I do want to emphasize that the need is for more industry, more jobs."

He cited efforts on the part of Saco to help itself through an active program of industrial development, through which some $60,000 has been raised by public subscription. With the funds a 170-acre tract has been purchased for development, and the nonprofit development corporation is now tracking down several potential leads.

"We are definitely hopeful," the mayor said, "but of course industrial development is a highly competitive business these days."

Another possibility being explored is occupancy of the 800,000 square feet of factory floorspace abandoned by the York division of the Bates Manufacturing Co. last year.

Mayor Garland stated that a tannery has requested permission to move into the property. A hearing was held 2 weeks ago before the Maine Water Improvements Commission on the question of what effect the tannery might have on the already industrially polluted Saco River.

Meanwhile, Senator FREDERICK G. PAYNE, Republican, of Maine, has sought aid for the twin cities as has Representative ROBERT HALE, Republican, who said in a letter to the President that worsening unemployment made immediate aid necessary. Representative HALE urged that the President implement recommendations of the executive board of the Biddeford-Saco Textile Workers Union of America.

The union has asked the President for the channeling of defense contracts to the Saco-Lowell shops; support of all legislation designed to aid the textile industry; institution of an immediate public works program by construction of a sewage disposal plant on the Saco River; and extension of unemployment benefits to workers who have exhausted their benefits.

National Guard Men Deplore Proposed Reduction

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HERMAN E. TALMADGE
OF GEORGIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, February 24, 1958

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, I have received a telegram from 81 members of Headquarters Battery of the 250th AAA Battalion of the Georgia National Guard, deploring proposed reductions in National Guard strength. I agree fully with their expressed views and ask unanimous consent that their telegram be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the telegram was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AUGUSTA, GA., *February 19, 1958.*

Senator HERMAN TALMADGE,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:

The National Guard is the custodian of individual liberty of all Americans. The United States has never won a major war without the National Guard. As National Guard men we deplore attempts to reduce the National Guard. Request you use every means possible to prevent reduction of strength of National Guard.

Clarence Prather, George Toole, Calvin Broome, William Bush, Robert Gibbs, George Smith, Alfred Spires, William Haston, James Haupfear, Riley Jones, George Lawson, Cleonard Pittman, William Roberts, Carol Rhoden, Irvin Waters, Jerry Reese, Preston Sweeney, Carlton Whitaker, James Worrall, Eugene Adams, Frank Cheesborough, Jimmie Hale, Lincoln Hosner, Lester Jennings, Robert McKettrick, Ronald Pound, David Stringfield, Jack Anderson, Willard Baker, Thomas Burton, Doyle Brewer, Jack Chavous, Walter Chavous, Aubrey Crawford, Charles Harris, Carl Howard, Quitman Hughes, Rudolph Keen, Thomas King, Hugh Langston, William McDaniel, Franklin Otis, Claud McMullan, Robert Randall, Neal Riddle, David Sanders, Russell Smoldt, Frank Whitaker, Franklin Wood, Harry Cozart, James Davis, Jack Fountain, Roy Gay, Bobby Griffin, Foster Grimaud, William Herbert, Haskell Hughes, Jesse Kendrick, Willis Laird, Clifford Livingston, Walter Mays, Charles Moody, Anthony Powell, Joseph Stringfield, Bob Vintson, Wiley Andrews, Donald Akins, George Badger, Robert Dean, Robert Hardy, William Marks, Woodrow Newman, Charles James, Bobby Jones, Billie Otts, William Rowe, John Sheehan, Dean Smith, Donald Smith, Willie Williams, Keith Walls, Headquarters Battery, 250th AAA Battalion, Georgia National Guard.

Jurisdiction of the Supreme Court

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STROM THURMOND
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, February 24, 1958

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, in the February 21, 1958, issue of the Greenville News, of Greenville, S. C., there appears a column by one of the ablest of our Washington writers, Mr. Holmes Alexander.

It discusses the subject of special interest to all of us and I ask unanimous consent that the article entitled "Jenner's Bill Aimed at Checking Jurisdiction of Supreme Court" be inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JENNER'S BILL AIMED AT CHECKING JURISDICTION OF SUPREME COURT

(By Holmes Alexander)

WASHINGTON, February 20.—"A great cannon, loaded to the lips," was somebody's description of Daniel Webster in 1852 at his last momentous appearance in the United States Senate. Tone the description down a little; but not much, and you could use it to identify Senator WILLIAM JENNER, Republican of Indiana, who is in his last session and primed for a farewell salvo.

A gun in JENNER'S valedictorian salute is his bill (S. 2646), which would limit the Supreme Court's jurisdiction in considering certain appeals. Hearings have just begun, but the ideological lines were drawn behind closed doors in scrimmages with the Senate Judiciary Committee. It is the familiar battle, as old as the American Republic, between fundamentalists who believe that our freedoms are best protected by strict adherence to the Constitution and loose constructionists who believe in bending the law to fit the continuing crisis of emergency always. Personalities apart for the moment, this is how the argument on S. 2646 is shaping.

Fundamentalists: The Founding Fathers devised their incomparable system of checks-and-balances to make certain—among other things—that none of the three branches of Government should ever become too powerful. Thus the Congress, the Presidency and the Supreme Court—while all-powerful in unison—cannot separately infringe upon one another's duties and cannot threaten the people's numerous freedoms. In article III, section 2, there is a check by Congress upon the power of the Supreme Court. It reads:

"The Supreme Court shall have appellate jurisdiction both as to law and fact, with such exceptions and under such regulations as the Congress shall make."

This clause, according to constitutional fundamentalism, clearly means that Congress has the right and duty to check the Supreme Court from assuming run-away authority. Congress is under solemn instruction to check the Court's abuses by naming exceptions and regulations in the Court's right of hearing appeals from rulings of lower courts or from rulings of Congress.

Loose constructionism: The Jenner bill (S. 2646) is an attempt to discipline the Supreme Court for decisions which certain Members of Congress do not like. This would be an arbitrary and capricious act by Congress. The law is kept alive and up to date by these judicial decisions.

The fundamentalists do not deny the first part of this charge. Senator JENNER and his conservative colleagues fully admit that they do not like many Supreme Court decisions. They contend that, far from being arbitrary and capricious, they are following the instructions in the Constitution by attaching exceptions and regulations to the Court's appellate jurisdiction. The following are the five fields in which the Jenner bill would prevent the Court from upsetting decisions reached in lower courts and in Congress. Under S. 2646 the Supreme Court could not overrule:

1. Action against a witness for contempt of Congress.
2. Action of the Federal Government in firing a security risk, as long as it was done under an act of Congress.
3. Legislation in any State for the control of subversive activities within the State.
4. Action of any school or college to control subversive activities within its teaching body.
5. Regulation by any State concerning admissions of persons to practice law within the State.

Obviously, from this list, backers of the Jenner bill believe that the Supreme Court has abused its powers in recent decisions concerning: contempt of Congress, Federal internal security firings, State antisubversion laws, college antisubversive rules for faculty members, State laws to prevent Communists and their supporters from practicing in the local courts.

Does Congress have this right? The fundamentalist case, I am told, rests upon the reconstruction era decision in which a Mississippi newspaper editor named McCardle was arrested for some alleged infringement of reconstruction law. McCardle appealed to the Supreme Court. Congress, fearful of testing the dubious laws of that shameful era, quickly enacted a statute which withdrew (as the Jenner bill would do) the Supreme Court's appellate jurisdiction in the pertinent field of law. The case against McCardle was automatically dismissed. Chief Justice Chase acknowledged the right of Congress to act as it did. He declared:

"Without jurisdiction the Court cannot proceed at all in any case * * * the only function remaining to the Court is that of announcing the fact and dismissing the cause."

Thus if Congress should pass the Jenner bill, the Supreme Court would be bound by precedent to treat is as law of the land.

Statement by Hon. Homer E. Capehart, of Indiana, on 10th Anniversary of the Communization of Czechoslovakia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HOMER E. CAPEHART
OF INDIANA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, February 24, 1958

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement I have made on the 10th anniversary on the communization of Czechoslovakia.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR CAPEHART

Ten years ago, on February 25, 1948, the communization of Czechoslovakia was completed. This communization was effected, in the 3 years from 1945 to 1948. The nations of former Czechoslovakia, the Czechs, Slovaks, Sudeten Germans, Hungarians, Carpatho-Ukrainians, and Poles were subjected, enslaved or expropriated and expelled from their centuries-old homelands.

We Americans as well as the other free peoples of the world, remember on the occasion of February 25, the fate of the Slovaks, Czechs, Hungarians, Poles, Sudeten Germans, and Ukrainians, and give the expression of our deep sympathies toward these unhappy peoples and of our hope that they again will be free and independent in the future, enjoying the full freedom, private property, and free enterprise, democracy and self-determination which we Americans consider to be our own and for which these nations are longing.

I believe that we should give our encouragement to the exiled leaders of these nations to strive actively for the return of freedom to their peoples, for the realization of a policy of liberation by peaceful means. As Americans, we believe that this world cannot be forever half free and half slave, we wish it to be fully free and we believe that the slavery and injustice, afflicted on all the peoples of former Czechoslovakia, will be terminated in a not too distant future.

Juvenile Delinquency

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS C. HENNINGS, JR.
OF MISSOURI
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, February 24, 1958

Mr. HENNINGS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article on juvenile delinquency by Mr. Arley R. Woodrow, a well known St. Louis attorney. I believe that Mr. Woodrow's article contains a number of helpful suggestions and provocative ideas, and I am certain it will be of interest to Members of Congress and the people at large.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JUVENILE DELINQUENCY—SOMETHING CAN BE DONE ABOUT IT

In beginning this discussion, I will quote from a letter that was printed in the Mail Bag of the St. Louis Globe-Democrat, May 5, 1956:

"To the EDITOR:

"Recently the public was shocked to learn that some university students had formed a group that was planned to be the brains of a crime ring. The crimes of youth range from purse-snatching to burglary, robbery to rape and murder.

"These crimes are not committed alone on skid row, but in the city where people live, some of the boys and girls coming from better families.

"We are spending billions of dollars yearly to send boys and girls to prisons, reform schools, and in building more and better prisons. We try to lock the door after the horse is stolen.

"Little or no attention is given to the boy or girl until a crime is committed. That is to say, that there is no great organized effort to give help and guidance to American youth.

"The need for something to be done other than sending offenders to prison is well recognized. The circuit attorney of St. Louis has proposed that certain steps be taken, with State and city funds, to give assistance to chronic offenders on skid row.

"The need for recreational and training centers in every community is well recognized. Ministers, club leaders, progressive leaders of labor unions, all see the need for more and better community centers that can and will furnish activities for youth, and some have taken steps to correct the present deplorable situation.

"Churches have opened their basements for young people and some labor unions have recreational rooms. Boys' clubs are doing a fine job. All of these point the way but do not in themselves solve the ever-growing problem.

"There are thousands of young people in St. Louis and other cities with no place to go, no place for recreation and training. This can be said of older people, too.

"On my way home from my place of business, I frequently pass a delicatessan. Half a dozen boys and girls sit and stand around, some drinking soda water, others just looking bored. Then an old car comes along and all pile in and away they go in a cloud of smoke. There is nothing else for them to do.

"By boys and girls (in this letter) I mean all young people up to, say, 22 years.

"Every community should have its recreational and training center, where every opportunity should be provided for amusement, for wholesome entertainment. There should be ample opportunity for every boy and girl—youth—to pursue his or her desire for entertainment and training.

"The community should have its neighborhood theater, where youngsters could show off in their own shows, debates, etc.

"Opportunity should be given for training in art, music, drama, and there should be training in boxing, wrestling, jumping, swimming, play writing, acting, directing, jewelry making, fashion designing, tailoring, gardening, scientific research, marketing, as well as many other things that youth might want to do.

"The recreational centers should have their own newspapers, written, edited, and printed by the youngsters themselves.

"There should be frequent hunting and fishing trips, weekend excursions for all who want to go, and fun at State and National parks.

"A stipend should be provided for every participating boy and girl in all training activities.

"These activities should be, to a limited extent, self-governed. The boys and girls should make their own rules and enforce them in their own courts.

"In addition to furnishing the means for recreation and training, there should be an organized effort to draw every boy and girl into the program. This organized effort should be block by block, and in more crowded residential sections, every apartment house should have its own organization, and all should be supervised by competent, trained personnel.

"Such a program would keep our factories humming to turn out needed supplies, and would furnish employment for trained personnel.

"Such a program is a multibillion dollar program.

"It is correct that we have adequate defense forces, armed with the most modern equipment. American youth is our first line of defense."

In the few paragraphs which follow I shall attempt to show how the foregoing letter can be put into action, while at the same time help business and labor to prosper.

However at this time I should here quote some of the things I said before the Missouri State Legislative Committee on Juvenile Delinquency when it held a hearing in St. Louis.

"When the subject of juvenile delinquency is raised, some people lift their eyebrows and secretly think, 'It can't happen in my home.'

"Then the lightning strikes where it was never expected. The boy who wouldn't do a thing like that really does it. Sorrow is brought into the home of the innocent as well as into the home of the boy who committed the crime. I am thinking of 6 boys who kidnaped and raped a 13-year-old girl.

"Those who think in terms of the death penalty, the whipping post, and other forms of severe punishment should be given to youthful delinquents always think in terms of the 'other fellow's boy' and never of their own."

I also called attention to the fact that something should be done to prevent crime. In this connection, attention was called to the letter quoted above.

A conveniently located and properly conducted recreational and training center would give every young person an opportunity to be recognized. "The desire to be recognized causes many people to become great leaders, outstanding citizens in their community and nations," I told the committee, and also pointed out that the desire to be recognized often causes delinquency. Society must provide a way for young people to prove their ability to lead as well as a way to exhaust their energy.

"We have built skyscrapers on the old swimming hole," I told the committee, "and turned the brush thicket where junior used to hunt into flats and business houses.

"Older boys and girls find recreation in driving their cars on the streets and highways at breakneck speed. The only places they can find where there is music and fun is a tavern—when they get drunk they are no different than grownups, except that they have more energy and perhaps less good judgment. Society must furnish places for recreation in every neighborhood. This will be good for older people too.

"The program should be organized," the committee was told. "Every young person in the neighborhood should be contacted and urged to join a group of his choice.

"Such an organized effort would result in two lists: those who are active in youth activity and those who are not.

"The inactive list should be scrutinized by people trained in social work to the end that every boy and girl, every young person in the community would find a place in activity.

"This is a big program," I continued. "It is a nationwide program. It is a multi-billion dollar program. It is a program that requires Federal aid."

I also pointed out to the committee on juvenile delinquency that much frustration could be overcome by reducing the voting age.

Now, if a community center were built in every neighborhood and conducted as pointed out, what would happen to the economy of the country? What would happen to business, big and small? What would happen to employment, to labor?

Today we are spending increased appropriations to continue our crime program. Keeping and feeding and housing criminals is increasing daily. Building bigger and better prisons does not improve the community, does not improve the country. Every one cannot enjoy a prison. But every one can enjoy a community center where all may gather and enjoy themselves.

Today our Government is throwing money around like the proverbial drunken sailors. A little of this money could be tossed into a youth program that would give every American youth something to do, something to think about, a hope for the future.

The building industry, manufacturing plants and labor and farmers would find profit in such a program.

Many young lawyers and others who now find employment in our crime program would be able to take part in a much more enjoyable activity, which should be just as remunerative financially as well as provide much more fun.

Of course there are people who will say that such a youth program is creeping socialism, etc. But this is no more creeping socialism than is the United States postal system, the public school system, the fire department, the police department, etc.

The people have always turned to the Government for help in times of need. American youth today is in need of help.

We should ask our lawmakers to consider the needs of American youth. The youth program herein suggested will give the boys and girls of America a new lease on life and will give business increased activity.

Proposal To End Treatment Plant Construction Program Imperils Nation's Battle Against Water Pollution

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN A. BLATNIK
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 13, 1958

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Speaker, although we seldom think of it as such, one of the Nation's most precious natural resources is water. Once taken for granted—just as the air we breath—the importance of water has recently taken on greater and greater proportions. And for good reason, when you consider that safe water and enough of it are fundamental elements, inseparable and indispensable to the health and well-being of man.

The absolute necessity for an effective water conservation and utilization program becomes apparent when you take into consideration the fact that while the demand for water constantly increases, the supply of water remains constant. Mr. Speaker, there is as much water available to us today in this country as there was available to the Pilgrims when they landed in 1620. And yet the demand for it has increased to amazing proportions.

IMPORTANCE OF WATER

Water is the most used raw material in our factories. The fast growing synthetic and chemical industries require tremendous amounts of good water. The steel industry alone uses 13 billion gallons a day. It takes 365,000 gallons to produce a ton of rayon yarn; about one-half million gallons for 1,000 yards of woolen cloth; more than a million gallons for a thousand barrels of aviation gasoline.

Industry, it is apparent, requires water—tons of it. Of the total water use in the Nation in 1950, 35 percent was by industry. The forecast for 1975 is 62 percent or 215 billions gallons per day. With the growth of industrial production and population, a paradox will be presented to industry: How to use less water while needing more. The requirement for a lesser use is developing from the necessity to assure the municipalities, agriculture, and other users as well as industry obtain their needed share.

Take municipalities for instance. By 1975, our present population is expected to increase by 37 million people, 90 percent of whom will locate in communities or urban areas. Water supply consumption will increase from 15 to 25 billion gallons per day for domestic use.

Take the increased use of water for agriculture, especially irrigation. In 1900 we were irrigating 7.7 million acres which required 20 billion gallons of water each day. In 1955 we were irrigating almost 4 times as much land—29.5 million acres. Yet we used 6 times more water—120 billion gallons each day. By 1975 we will be irrigating 37.4 million acres requiring 170 billion gallons of water a day.

Add to all this the increased recreational use of water and the increase in waste transportation and you arrive at the startling conclusion that by 1975 this country will require an increase in the current water supply of 145 percent—equal to the additional supply of 145 New York Cities, requiring the flow of about 11 Colorado Rivers.

This spells nothing but trouble because of the simple fact that while the demand for water increases daily the supply remains constant. According to a recent study made by the Industrial College of the Armed Forces, there is little reason to expect any marked change in our gross resource of water by 1980. In other words, we'll have as much then as we have now—but with a demand increase equal to the flow of 11 Colorado Rivers.

This report goes on to say that:

Although there are now several promising techniques in the research and development stage, such as desalting of sea waters, reduction in evaporation losses, induced rainfall, and other reduction of water losses, none of these can be depended upon to change the overall supply of water in the near future.

Next to the very air we breathe, I would say water is most important to human life. It is also essential to economic and industrial progress. It is also essential to our entire defense structures.

As Secretary of Army Brucker recently said: "The United States can no longer treat water as an inexhaustible

resource and allow it to run a wayward and wasteful course to the sea." But that is exactly what we are doing today in our polluted rivers and streams.

Pollution is a waste of water and unless we tackle this water-pollution problem, and tackle it hard, we are going to be in very serious trouble in a few short years. Pollution is one of the largest contributors to our present and future water-resources problems and we must recognize that its control is one of the most effective and economical water conservation measures available to us.

POLLUTION PROBLEM SERIOUS

The pollution problem has gone from bad to worse in the past few years.

In 1920, 48 million people were served by sewers, and wastes had a population equivalent of 42 million persons. Today 95 million are served by sewers, and wastes have a population equivalent of 55 million persons. By 1975 an estimated 160 million persons will be served by sewers, with wastes having a population equivalent depending on what we do about pollution in the interim. And what has been our progress in supplying facilities for the treatment of these wastes? Right now, there is a need for 9,255 municipal treatment projects.

The picture is even darker regarding industrial waste. In 1920 organic wastes discharged by industry had a population equivalent of 50 million persons. Today that is more than doubled. Organic wastes discharged by industry has a population equivalent today of 110 million persons. By 1975 we know that our present industrial capacity will be doubled. The amount of pollution will again depend largely on what we do today and in the years to come in the field of pollution control. A 1955 survey by the Public Health Service shows a total of 5,700 treatment projects needed by industry.

And what about the future? In the Army college study I referred to before, the demand-supply situation was broken down region by region. Listen to some of the conclusions regarding the problem in 1980:

New England region. Pollution abatement is needed in certain areas, especially in southern New England.

Delaware-Hudson region. Serious water problems seem to be inevitable for area.

Chesapeake region. Pollution abatement is a growing problem in this area.

Eastern Great Lakes-St. Lawrence region. Pollution control is absolutely essential to protect the Great Lakes supply.

Upper Mississippi region. Pollution abatement is also a must for this area.

And the report goes on, covering each area of the country, each time with the same conclusion—pollution problems will become increasingly serious.

Fortunately for us, pollution can be controlled. Pollution is not something that must be endured as an inevitable consequence of our urban and industrial growth. Pollution abatement is possible, but it is an expensive process and it requires the cooperation of government, at every level, industry, and the public itself.

Responsibility for pollution abatement for the protection of water resources is shared today by local, State and Federal agencies. Under the American tradition of community responsibility, each city and industry has a clear obligation to construct, operate and maintain all the pollution abatement works necessary to assure that its wastes will not cause harm to others.

FEDERAL POLLUTION CONTROL RESPONSIBILITY AND ACTIVITY

The Federal responsibilities are primarily of a supporting nature, designed to assist and strengthen State programs. They include research, technical assistance on particularly difficult problems requiring highly specialized personnel or other resources not always available to individual State agencies, promotion of coordinated interstate action, and enforcement on interstate pollution problems. Since 1956 Federal responsibilities include Federal grants in aid, amounting to $50 million a year, to assist local communities in the construction of sewage treatment plants and facilities. I was the original sponsor and author of that program and am happy to report that it is working out splendidly.

As of January 31, 1958, Mr. Speaker, $72,543,846.36 in Federal grants have been approved for 875 projects representing a total cost of $367,064,915. In addition, Public Health Service regional offices are now processing 245 additional projects representing a total cost of $136,369,970 of which $23,939,912 would represent Federal grants. State agencies, at the same time, are processing 392 other projects which will cost $458,715,818, of which $42,808,783 would represent Federal grants.

This is a fine record for a program that supposedly did not have a chance. But we find, that despite the need for this program and despite its successful operation, it is being attacked from many sides.

Of course, this is nothing new. Every effort has been made since the enactment of Public Law 660 to block appropriations for the grant program. The first year the Bureau of the Budget froze the funds for 3 months. Last year an attempt was made to kill the appropriation on the floor of the House. We stopped that—but only by a narrow margin.

Now it looks like we have got a new gimmick to contend with—a completely new and cleverly appealing scheme for torpedoing this most vitally needed Federal function. This time, apparently, it is to be done under the alluring mantles of economy and States rights.

JOINT FEDERAL STATE ACTION COMMITTEE

Last August the President suggested the formation of a committee to study the question of Federal aid to the States with a view to determining which of the present grant programs could be properly turned over to the States and the Federal participation ended. This group, known as the Joint Federal-State Action Committee, issued its first progress report on December 5, 1957, and in it recommended that Federal grants for sewage treatment plant facilities be ended. This recommendation together with certain others will be considered by the governors' conference to be held next May. It has not yet been approved by that conference.

Apparently this does not make any difference to the President because in his fiscal 1959 budget we find the following language regarding the grant program under Public Law 660:

While this budget recommends continuation of this program at the 1958 level, it is expected that by the end of 1959 the Federal Government and the States will have had an opportunity to act on the recommendation of the Joint Federal-State Action Committee that the States assume this function entirely. Therefore, it is anticipated that no funds will be included in the 1960 budget for this purpose, should this recommendation be accepted as practicable by the Congress.

Mr. Speaker, in considering the practicability of this recommendation the Congress should pay close heed to the bases of the recommendation. Let us examine the Joint Committee's findings, the evidence presented, and see if the President's anticipation is justified.

The joint committee's first finding, found on page 35 of the report, was that municipalities and private industry, except in certain emergency periods, have borne virtually the full costs of waste-treatment construction projects, and outlays for such purposes have grown significantly.

The first part of this finding is so obvious it could have gone without saying. The second is misleading.

Naturally, prior to the time the Federal Government enters into a particular field or activity, local governments and interests have the entire responsibility. The important question is what has been the result of municipalities and private industry bearing virtually the full cost of waste-treatment construction projects? The result, simply, Mr. Speaker, has been the accumulation of a tremendous backlog of needs in sewage-treatment works construction.

As of January 1955, the Public Health Service estimated that the cost of municipal pollution-abatement needs for 1955–56 was $3.49 billion for sewage-treatment plants and $1.84 billion for interceptors. This makes a total of $5.33 billion for the next 10 years. These figures include the cost of building for the backlog, replacement for obsolescence, and construction for increased population. The table below shows these figures in greater detail:

Estimated cost of municipal pollution abatement needs (sewage treatment plants and interceptors), 1955–65

Item	Description	Cost for 10-year period 1955–65 (billions 1954 dollars)		
		Sewage treatment plants	Interceptors	Total
Backlog of needs as of Jan. 1, 1955.[1]	1. Communities needing treatment facilities including places with sewer systems requiring both sewers and treatment (22.7 million population).	1.03	0.60	1.63
	2. Communities served by facilities requiring replacement (2.1 million population).	.11	.03	.14
	3. Communities served by facilities requiring enlargement, addition, or improvement (13.7 million population).	.07	----------	.07
	4. Communities with needs, but type of improvement undetermined (1.6 million population).	.04	.02	.06
	Total backlog of needs	1.25	.65	1.90
Obsolescence, 1955–65.[2]		1.24	.48	1.72
New requirements, 1955–65.[3]	1. Increased needs in presently sewered areas (17.3 million population).	.89	.67	1.56
	2. Needs in communities having no sewers or treatment in 1955 but which will develop need in next 10 years (1.6 million population).	.11	.04	.15
	Total requirements	1.00	.71	1.71
	Total cost of municipal pollution abatement needs, 1955–65.	3.49	1.84	5.33

The chart shows that despite every effort made by local communities, who are generally genuinely sincere in their efforts to clean up their water supply, they have fallen further and further behind until today, according to latest available figures, the total backlog of sewage-treatment plant needs alone amounts to almost $2 billion. Add to that obsolescence and new requirements and you have a total 10-year need of $5,330,000,000.

To meet this need, therefore, the local communities will have to spend at the rate of $533 million a year for the next 10 years. They have never come close to spending this amount. The average yearly expenditure for treatment-plant construction, going back as far as 1913, has been $180 million. And that is in terms of 1955 dollars. Only once, and that was during the PWA–WPA days, did construction keep pace with need—and that only because Federal grants were available.

The claim of the joint committee, Mr. Speaker, that treatment-plant construction outlays have grown significantly in recent years also requires examination. According to the joint committee, the annual dollar volume of waste-treatment construction in recent years is as follows:

	Millions
1952	$176
1953	238
1954	282
1955	249
1956	393
1957 (estimated)	475

These amounts, Mr. Speaker, were arrived at by taking the total of sewage-treatment works contract awards and raising it by 25 percent. I was unable to find anywhere in the report why the total was raised 25 percent, but I am sure the joint committee had some reason to do it. For the record, however, I would like to show the actual total of sewage-treatment works contract awards for the same years as compiled by the Public Health Service, which administers this grant program. The actual totals are as follows:

	Millions
1952	$137
1953	190
1954	228
1955	201
1956	354
1957 (estimated)	329

An examination of either table, Mr. Speaker, shows that despite increases in plant construction outlay still enough is not being done and we are continually falling behind. It is the joint committee's contention, however, that the trend toward greater expenditures and stimulation in this field began before the enactment of the grant provision in Public Law 660 and, therefore, there is no real need for the program.

Mr. Speaker, the joint committee is either trying to deceive us or is just plain ignorant of certain facts. Included in the 1956 dollar volume of treatment-plant outlays, Mr. Speaker, is a $78-million project completed in that year, after being under study and development for the past 30 years, in the Pittsburgh metropolitan area. A project like the Pittsburgh plant comes along once every 10 to 20 years, but this joint committee includes it to show an increase in treatment-plant construction. If not for the Pittsburgh project expenditures during 1956 would have been below the $300 million mark by over $25 million.

So to begin with the joint committee is basing its trend on a project that comes along once every 10 to 20 years. Moreover, the committee fails to point out in its report that the rather substantial increase in treatment-plant construction for 1957 was the result of Federal stimulation under Public Law 660. Whichever table you follow, the joint committee's or the Public Health Service's, it is apparent that during 1957, the first year of operation under the Federal treatment-plant-construction program, more contract awards for treatment-plant construction were let than in any single year in our history. From the committee's own figures we actually have the best single argument for the continuation of Federal assistance that I have ever seen. Moreover, the increased activity for 1957 was a result of Federal stimulation amounting to less than $20 million. The entire $50 million appropriated was not spent that year. This tremendous jump in 1957 was the direct effect of the Federal program.

I think the question whether this Federal program is helpful was answered in the December 1957 issue of Minnesota Municipalities, as follows:

> The fact is that the existing grant-in-aid program has been a great success. Except during PWA days and the period during which the present aid program has been in effect, municipalities have never constructed enough sewage-treatment plans to adequately handle their increasing needs.
>
> Under the present program, while Federal grants accounted for only an estimated 10 to 12 percent of the total construction outlays in fiscal 1957, the Federal program has in effect generated the greatest sewage plant construction program in the history of the Nation.
>
> Although the aid offered by the Federal Government has been relatively small, the program has served to move many crucial local projects off dead center and has, as a result, broken the bottlenecks to a more widespread program by getting small upstream municipalities to initiate control programs.

Yes, Mr. Speaker, the trend is definitely toward greatly expanded treatment-plant construction activity, but only because the Federal Government finally assumed its share of the responsibility for cleaning up our rivers and streams. To reach any other conclusion would be inconsistent with the facts, including the very facts presented by the joint committee.

STATE PROGRAMS EXPAND UNDER FEDERAL AID

Now let us turn to the second finding, which is: State governments have been active in this field for many years, mainly to plan and coordinate statewide pollution control work. This, again, is a well-known fact and tribute should be paid to the Nation's public health officers and State pollution control activity officials who have devoted so much of their time and effort to what is more often than not a thankless task. I worked closely with these State people during the writing of what is now Public Law 660. I know how active they have been and I know the handicaps under which they have been forced to work in the past.

Originally, Mr. Speaker, the administration asked for $2 million yearly Federal grants over a 5-year period to assist the States in expanding and operating their water pollution control programs. A conference of State health officers held here in Washington agreed that $2 million was inadequate for Federal assistance to 53 State and Territorial water pollution control agencies plus several interstate agencies to carry out effectively the purposes of the bill. So the executive committee of the Association of State and Territorial Health Officers urged that the amount be increased to

$5 million, and that amount was approved by the House. In conference it was cut to $3 million which is now in the law.

These Federal grants are needed to stimulate State activity in the pollution-control field. Federal program grants under section 5 of Public Law 660 accelerate not only State programs but State financial support as well. Experience under the original Pollution Control Act, Public Law 845 of the 80th Congress, proves this point conclusively.

State water pollution control program expenditures (with breakdown as to source of funds)

Year	Total	State funds	Federal grant
1950	3,088,097	2,286,941	845,519
1951	3,799,805	2,983,322	815,313
1952	4,785,514	4,016,580	768,934
1953	3,912,404	3,912,404	0
1954	3,989,257	3,989,257	0
1955	[1] 4,000,000	[1] 4,000,000	0
1956	[1] 4,000,000	[1] 4,000,000	0

[1] Estimated.

It is obvious what happened under the old law. From 1950 to 1952, when Federal program grants, as distinguished from construction grants, were available, State expenditures showed a definite increase. Then, from 1953 on, when the Federal grants were discontinued, State activity remained static at the plateau reached in 1952, the last year of Federal grants. The Federal stimulant and incentive was taken away, and State activity, which had been on a steady rise, leveled off.

With the enactment of Public Law 660 in 1956 the increase in State activity began aagin. Although actual expenditures are not yet available, budgeted figures show that in 1957 the total spent on State pollution control programs was $6,926,739, of which the Federal Government contributed $1,937,107 and the States $4,989,632—almost $1 milion more than they are estimated to have spent the year before and for the 3 preceding years before that. In 1958 it is predicted that a total of $8,331,243 will be spent by State pollution control agencies. Of this amount $5,531,232 will be purely State funds, with the Federal Government contributing the balance of $2,709,-123. Again, over a million and a half dollars increase in State activity as a direct result of the Federal grant program which has served as a stimulant to the States to accelerate their own programs.

These State programs are the backbone of any really effective pollution control program. As former Assistant Secretary of Health, Education and Welfare Roswell Perkins said before our subcommittee:

> In the final analysis, pollution control is achieved through State action to bring about construction of needed treatment works. For this reason, it is essential that the States be adequately equipped to do the job. In recent years, the rapid increase and concentration of industry, and the continuing growth of urban areas, have thrust enormous pollution problems on many States. Some States have expanded their programs to meet the growing problem. On the other hand, many State water pollution control agencies are inadequately supported. For example, in 32 States annual appropriations for water pollution control in 1954–55 were less than $50,000; 23 of these States provided less than $30,000 a year.
>
> The inadequacy of the support of water pollution control activities is particularly significant in those States now experiencing large-scale industrial expansion, with the attendant urban development. The type of assistance provided for in these bills would be especially important to these States.
>
> Rounding out our assistance to State programs is the provision of expert consulting assistance on complex problems due to new types of pollution. The central staff of consultants at our Taft center is available to assist all the States on problems, which although they occur throughout the country, do not occur frequently in any one State.

Thus, the second finding of the joint committee, Mr. Speaker, told us notihng we did not already know, while leaving out the all important fact that Federal financial assistance has a definite and accelerating affect on State pollution-control activities.

STATE FINANCIAL AIDS INADEQUATE

The third finding of the committee is that some State governments provide financial incentives to municipalities and industry for waste treatement projects. It lists 11, all together: California, Maine, Maryland, New Hampshire, New Mexico, New York, Ohio, Oregon, Pennsylvania, and Vermont.

An examination of these State grant programs shows:

First. The programs in Maine and Maryland were directly stimulated by enactment of Public Law 660 and are predicated on the existence of that act.

Second. In addition to the programs in Maine and Maryland, the programs in New Hampshire, New Mexico, Ohio, and Vermont were all enacted after the passage of Public Law 660.

Third. Most of the programs provide exceedingly small amounts of money making their effectiveness questionable. The California program, for instance, providing a $1 million fund for loans pales to insignificance when you consider that last year total contract awards for treatment plants in the State amounted to close to $60 million. In New Mexico the legislature appropriated $150,000 for 2 years. Last year New Mexico was spending at the rate of over $1 million for treatment plant construction. While there are all worthy and commendable programs, and the States inaugurating them should be praised, they are not nearly enough to get the job done even in the State involved much less considering the fact that the great and overwhelming majority of States have no such program at all.

A few States, Mr. Speaker, New Hampshire, North Carolina, Virginia, and Wisconsin, have enacted legislation providing financial assistance to industries for waste treatment construction. These acts provide merely for accelerated amortization for tax purposes of industrial treatment facilities or they exempt industrial treatment facilities from local taxation. They are few in number and limited in scope.

It is perfectly obvious that while some States do provide financial assistance to their communities and industries, the overwhelming majority of the make no provision for such assistance and for all intents and purposes, the financial responsibility for constructing treatment plants, without Federal aid, rests squarely on the hard-pressed cities and towns throughout the country.

MEANINGLESS FINDINGS DO NOT JUSTIFY CONCLUSIONS

The joint committee's fourth finding is that the Public Health Service provides technical assistance to State and interstate agencies, and through them on request to communities and industries. To which I say only, "They had better be." That is what the law tells them to do, and if the Public Health Service were not doing what this joint committee found it was doing then an investigation of some sort would be in order. Mr. Speaker, of what significance is this fourth finding? How in the world can a finding that a Federal agency is doing what the law directs it to do lead to the conclusion and holding that Federal assistance to the communities for treatment plant construction should be discontinued?

The meaningless nature of the findings carry over to the fifth, as well. Almost as if they were making some sort of discovery, the joint committee finds that beginning in fiscal 1957, Federal grants were made to local governments to aid in municipal sewage treatment plant construction, a field previously reserved primarily to State and local government.

I wonder which definition of find fits this finding. According to Webster to find is defined, first, to meet with, or light upon, accidentally; hence to fall in with, as a person; or, second, to come upon by seeking or by effort. I do not know how much effort or seeking it took to find out that since fiscal 1957 there has been a Federal grant program to assist communities in the construction of municipal treatment plants. But I know for sure that the joint committee did not light upon that fact accidentally because that is the program they were after in the first place.

But to call this a finding does a disservice to the word itself. Upon finding it to exist, this joint committee recommends that the construction program under Public Law 660 be eliminated. That is about the extent of it. They had to find that it existed before they could recommend its discontinuance and that is the reason, it seems, for the fifth finding.

SIXTH FINDING GOOD ARGUMENT FOR CONTINUATION OF GRANTS

Going to the sixth finding, we find a further example of how the committee states a fact as a finding, trying to leave the implication, at least, that this is a reason for discontinuing the grant program. The sixth finding, however, might backfire on them. Actually, it is a good argument for the program—not against it. The finding is that Federal grants will account for an estimated 10 to 12 percent of total construction outlays in 1958; this percentage will decline as local governments increase their construction programs to meet growing

waste-treatment requirements in the years ahead.

To the committee this is a finding to justify the repeal of the program. To me it is an argument for its continuation.

It is true that Federal grants account for only about 10 to 12 percent of the total treatment-plant-construction outlay and that this percentage will decline as local governments increase their construction programs. This finding, that the Federal share is so small, leads to the seventh finding which is that the States can, therefore, absorb the cost. But we will get to that later. First, let us see why the Federal share is only 10 or 12 percent and why it will decline with increased local expenditures.

Under the existing program $50 million a year is made available to the local communities. The grants are limited to 30 percent of the cost of the project or $250,000, whichever is smaller. When a large and expensive project is approved for a $250,000 grant, the ratio of the Federal contribution to the local outlay is bound to be reduced. Many of these projects cost well over a million, and some much more.

As a result, Mr. Speaker, the percentage of Federal participation has been low. But, the important thing to remember is that this low percentage of Federal participation has stimulated tremendous local participation. When we build interstate highways at a 90–10 Federal-local ratio nobody complains. But when it comes to investing in clean water at a unbelievably favorable 10–90 Federal-local ratio, it is called an unwise program. Where else does the Federal Government get such a good return on its grant dollar? Considering only the projects constructed under the program itself the ratio is running about 5 to 1—local over Federal. And for the overall construction program containing projects both with and without Federal aid the ratio is 9 to 1—local over Federal. What better return for our investment could we ask?

The fact that the percentage of the Federal grant to the total national outlay will decline as local outlays increase is as obvious as the nose on a fourth-grade math student's face. With a constant Federal share, as dictated by law, and an ever-increasing local participation stimulated by that Federal share, the percentage of such Federal share must decrease. The fact, Mr. Speaker, that the Federal percentage will decrease is not a reason to scrap the program but to continue it on as a good investment. This rather interesting finding No. 6 is one of the best arguments I have seen in favor of the continuation of the Federal-grant program under Public Law 660.

FEDERAL PROGRAM SHOULD BE INCREASED, NOT CUT

Now we come to the seventh, and final, finding of the joint committee. This committee found that the Federal sewage-treatment plant construction grants are relatively small in terms of costs of needed projects and could easily be absorbed by the States. The first part of the sentence is exactly what I have been saying ever since we enacted Public Law 660. My original proposal called for twice what is now contained in the law, but we had to settle for the existing program due to incessant opposition from the administration and certain other forces. Time and time again I have said, "Fifty million is not enough. We need at least $100 million a year for 10 years to do the job right." I am happy the committee agrees that $50 million a year for 10 years is a relatively small amount. But we part company there. Because it is small, says the committee, we can get rid of it. That is a rather interesting way of looking at things. The way I see it, if the amount is small and the needs large the answer is to increase the amount. The logic of the committee's approach escapes me. It reminds me of a man with 6 children but money enough to feed only 3. Following the committee's logic, his solution is to let them all starve.

The second part of the finding does not seem to jibe with the facts. We are asked to believe that since the Federal grants are so small they could readily be absorbed by the States. Readily is an interesting word. Here it is 1958 already and only 11 States have grant programs of their own. Most of these are of rather recent origin and two of them are directly tied to the Federal grant program. I might say with the exception of Pennsylvania the only effective State financial aid programs are predicated on the Federal aid provided for in Public Law 660.

To say now, after less than 2 years of experience under the act, that the States will readily absorb the Federal contribution overlooks the fact that the reason we enacted section 6 in the first place is the fact that through the years the States have not assumed their responsibilities in this field and therefore the Congress was obliged to take action to preserve a vital and precious natural resource—water.

Wishing will not make it so. Nor will merely saying the States will do something result in their doing it. Past experience has proved the need for some form of Federal stimulation. Present experience is proving the rather limited Federal program is filling that need to a far greater extent than ever thought possible.

WATER A NATIONAL PROBLEM

From these seven findings, Mr. Speaker, the joint committee holds that local waste treatment facilities are primarily a local concern and their construction should be primarily a local or State financial responsibility. Now primarily under Public Law 660, the construction of waste treatment facilities is definitely a local financial responsibility. In the first section of the act itself Congress declares it "to be the policy of Congress to recognize, preserve, and protect the primary responsibilities and rights of the States in preventing and controlling water pollution, to support and aid technical research relating to the prevention and control of water pollution, and to provide Federal technical services and financial aid to State and interstate agencies and to municipalities in connection with the prevention and control of water pollution." So the committee is doing nothing more than restating the declared policy of Congress in this regard. And nothing in Public Law 660 detracts from that primary local responsibility in any way.

The construction phase of the Federal pollution program is dependent on local responsibility. The municipalities initiate action through their State pollution control agencies who must approve each and every application for a Federal grant. These State agencies are given the responsibility of establishing a priority list so that the most important projects in each State are sure to receive a Federal grant from the limited funds available. The local communities make all the arrangements, do all the work, and put up, as the committee itself points out, 90 percent of the money. If this is not primarily local responsibility, I cannot imagine what is.

By saying that the responsibility for the construction of waste-treatment facilities is primarily local, it does not follow ipso facto that the problem is exclusively a State and local problem. Far from it. It is also a national problem and therefore a national responsibility. The day is past when we can accept a purely local view on water-resources problem.

Neither stream pollution itself nor the construction of the treatment plants to clean it up can be considered purely local in character. The problem is a national problem. Its solution, while primarily the responsibility of State and local governments, requires Federal assistance. Under the construction grant section of Public Law 660, the Federal Government is doing nothing more than assuming its share of responsibility in solving a national problem.

Not only does the joint committee take the position, following its seven findings, that treatment plant construction financing is a local concern, but it says further that "should communities require additional financing, the funds should be forthcoming from the State governments on a loan or grant basis as the States may determine." There is no question Mr. Speaker, but that they require additional financing. The record is replete with the fact that they do require such financing and this is tacitly admitted by the committee itself in taking the position that the State governments should assist the communities in the financing of the necessary construction.

EXPERTS CITE NEED FOR FEDERAL AID

And finally, Mr. Speaker, the committee takes the position that there is no evidence to demonstrate the continuing need for the present Federal subsidy of an essentially local responsibility. It is simply amazing that this committee should take this position after a very short period of study during which it could not possibly become fully acquainted with the problem of water pollution and its control. This group, echoing the false charges of the NAM and the Chamber of Commerce, finds there is no need in an area where the recognized experts in that area find a very crucial and vital need. This com-

mittee flies in the face of all the evidence available and without citing one fact to sustain its position, maintains there is no need.

The committee is in disagreement with the Public Health Service which administers this program. Mr. Gordon E. McCallum, Chief of the water supply and water pollution program of the Division of Sanitary Engineering Service of the Public Health Service, in an article published in Water Engineering, pointed out that the Nation's pollution abatement needs will total $5.3 billion for the next 10 years. Earlier, Mr. Speaker, I discussed this same point and I refer you again to the table showing the backlog of needs, the obsolescence and new requirements. It is obvious that despite great local effort these needs were not being met prior to the enactment of Public Law 660.

We have seen that it is the committee's contention that the trend toward greatly accelerated local activity began before the enactment of Public Law 660 and therefore there is no need to continue the Federal grant program whose main purpose is to stimulate such local activity. I have already pointed out the fact that the evidence this committee uses to establish its trend are both false and misleading. As further proof of this we find that since the enactment of Public Law 660 an increasing number of States have registered record treatment-plant construction activity. In a survey recently completed it was shown that the number of States in which a record amount of treatment-plant construction was begun has greatly increased since the enactment of Public Law 660. In 1952, 4 States had a record construction year. They were Delaware, Massachusetts, Mississippi, and South Dakota. In 1953, 5 States had a record year—New Mexico, Oregon, Tennessee, Texas, and Wyoming. In 1954, only 3 States—Arkansas, New Jersey, and New York. In 1955, again 4 States—Michigan, New Hampshire, South Carolina, and West Virginia.

Then, suddenly, in 1956, following the enactment of Public Law 660, the number of States having a record treatment-plant construction year jumped to 13—Alabama, Colorado, District of Columbia, Idaho, Indiana, Kentucky, Louisiana, Nevada, North Carolina, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island, Vermont, and Virginia. Finally last year, as the impetus of the Federal program really began to be felt, 19 States had a record year—Arizona, California, Connecticut, Georgia, Illinois, Iowa, Kansas, Maine, Maryland, Minnesota, Missouri, Montana, Nebraska, North Dakota, Ohio, Oklahoma, Utah, Washington, and Wisconsin. An impressive record, Mr. Speaker, and every indication points to another record year for an ever-increasing number of States in 1958 and beyond. And if this keeps up for another 8 years under Public Law 660, and there is no reason to believe it will not, by 1966 we will have solved the municipal pollution problem in this country. That's what has happened with this small Federal program, which this committee recommends be scrapped.

Another group of experts, Mr. Speaker, disagrees with the committee on the question of need. We have already seen that the Public Health Service which administers the program on the Federal level disagrees. The men who administer it on the State level also disagree. The Association of State and Territorial Health Officers at its annual conference last November 3–8 adopted a resolution favoring a continuance of this program. This association is composed of the chief health officers in all the States and Territories—men devoted to the task of protecting the health of the Nation. These are the men who administer the program on the State level and their resolution citing the need for the continuation of the program is as follows:

RESOLUTION 4: FEDERAL GRANTS FOR WATER POLLUTION CONTROL

Whereas the Federal sewage treatment works construction program has been a highly satisfactory joint municipal, State, and Federal endeavor, achieving the goals set forth by the 84th Congress in Public Law 660 in abating water pollution; and

Whereas the increased activity in sewage treatment plant construction due to the program has materially aided in the abatement of pollution problems throughout the Nation; and

Whereas there still continues to be a serious water pollution problem amenable to relief by Federal grants, and

Whereas this program, while primarily designed to provide more adequate sewage treatment facilities has also exerted and continues to exert a significant influence upon the improvement of the quality of the Nation's water supply, and

Whereas this program is contributing significantly to the betterment of interstate relations, health and recreational facilities of the people of this country, and

Whereas continuation of this construction grant program will eventually eliminate the pollution problem in this country in the time specified by the 84th Congress: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Association of State and Territorial Health Officers at its annual meeting with the Surgeon General, assembled, November 3–8, 1957, That Federal grants for the water pollution control program be continued up to the total amount authorized under the terms of Public Law 660, 84th Congress; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be transmitted to the Surgeon General, to the Secretary of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare and to appropriate congressional committees concerned with such legislation.

This same group, by the way, during the hearings on the bill in 1956 opposed the grant section out of a fear that it would delay rather than stimulate construction. It is a tribute to the administration of the program by the Public Health Service that the State health officers now reverse their position and support the program.

Another group which most certainly qualifies as experts in this field because they deal daily with the problems of municipal pollution are the Nation's mayors. Through their organization, the American Municipal Association, they have come out in favor, not only of a continuation of the program, but its acceleration to 100 million a year.

Federal, State, and local officials, Mr. Speaker, who work daily with this pollution problem, who know first hand the needs and requirements, are practically unanimous in their disagreement with the committee's contention that there is no need for a continuation of this program.

Private interests, also, interested in the quality of the Nation's rivers and streams, also support the program and cite the need for its continuance.

The Nation's conservationists have been in the forefront of the fight for clean streams. Fifty million outdoor recreationists who look to water for relaxation believe there is a need for this program. The Izaak Walton League favors doubling Federal appropriations for treatment plant construction.

As League President William H. Pringle pointed out recently:

Operating as a strictly voluntary program and recognizing that the demand for pollution control and most of the financing must come from the grassroots, the Federal Aid to Water Pollution Control Act has proved so popular with local and State public health and pollution control experts that a great backlog of requests for cooperative local-State-Federal projects has piled up.

Sharply disagreeing with the conclusions of the joint committee, Mr. Pringle added:

No citizen organization has had a more constructive record of pollution control activity than the Izaak Walton League. We've worked since the early twenties to bring a stop to the pollution of the Nation's water resources. We've made good progress, but we all have been hampered by lack of a uniform national pollution control policy and program. We have that now, and we have no intention of seeing it abandoned in the misguided name of economy or of returning Federal powers to the States.

It has proved to be the most effective single piece of pollution control legislation ever passed by Congress and is a heartening example of voluntary cooperation by local, State and Federal Government to combat a broad, public evil. The Izaak Walton League will fight with vigor and unity at local, State and National level to assure continuation of the program and will seek increased appropriations in order that completion of the job can be assured within a reasonable period.

In short, Mr. Speaker, experts at all levels of Government and private interests disagree with the joint committee's position that there is no need to continue the program.

COMMITTEE'S RECOMMENDATIONS MISLEAD PUBLIC

From its findings and position the joint committee recommends the following action:

The Joint Federal-State Action Committee recommends that the President request Congress to take necessary action to discontinue construction grants for local waste-treatment facilities.

The committee recommends, therefore, that the governors request the State legislatures to—

(a) Provide such financial assistance for waste-treatment facilities as may be necessary;

(b) Strengthen, as needed, State water-pollution-control programs as they relate to both municipal and industrial wastes;

(c) Improve municipal capacity to raise funds to finance waste-treatment works.

The committee is asking the States to do that which the great majority of them have never done before. It recommends

the return to the day when Federal aid for treatment-plant construction was not available to the local governments, causing the great backlog of needs to build up to the danger point. We must face the fact that because of the tremendous demand on the local and State tax dollar treatment-plant construction finds it hard to compete with such more attractive activities and projects as roads, airports, hospitals, parks, and other municipal improvement projects. Let us face it. About the last thing people think about or spend money on is sewage. By the time the local tax dollar has gone around for the more attractive projects, many of which receive Federal aid, there is nothing left for a treatment plant. If we remove Federal aid now, we relegate the construction of these projects to the bottom of the financial totem pole once again, a position it has maintained for many years, considering the terrific backlog of needs which has built up.

As a substitute for the incentive provided by Federal grants under Public Law 660 the joint committee dangles before the governors of each State the prospects of a new-found source of State revenues—namely, 40 percent of the money collected by the Federal Government on local telephone-service taxes. The committee's recommendation for action regarding local telephone-service taxes is as follows:

The Joint Federal-State Action Committee believes that the local telephone-service tax is a logical revenue source for State and local governments. It recommends, therefore, that the Federal tax on local telephone service be changed so as to provide a 40-percent tax credit to those States enacting a 4-percent local telephone tax, not counting taxes already levied prior to the adoption of the credit device. This would mean that the Federal liability under the local telephone-service tax would be discharged to the extent of 40 percent for any taxpayer paying this amount of tax to his State government. At the end of 5 years the Federal levy should be reduced 4 percentage points automatically.

The Joint Federal-State Action Committee recommends that:

1. The President request Congress to take necessary action to provide up to a 40-percent Federal tax credit against the Federal local telephone-service tax for States enacting or increasing such taxes, the credit arrangement to last for 5 years, at which time the Federal tax will automatically be reduced by 4 percentage points.

2. The governors and the legislatures of the several States take necessary steps to avail themselves of this additional revenue source.

According to the committee, an estimated $370 million will be collected in fiscal year 1958 by the Federal Government from local telephone service taxes. Forty percent of that—or close to $150 million—will be made available to the States under the joint committee's plan. Superficially this may be a rather tempting offer. But, Mr. Speaker, nowhere in the report could I find the basis for an assurance that the return of such funds would guarantee their use for pollution control or treatment plant construction. Without such an assurance it seems strange that the joint committee would recommend the outright repeal of the Federal treatment plant grant program before it could be determined that the activity would actually be assumed by the States. And, stranger, indeed, that the President would include this recommendation in his budget even before the full governors' conference acted on it.

This idea of simultaneous reduction of grants and taxes has been considered before. One of the most blue ribbon of all the President's blue ribbon committees—the Commission on Intergovernmental Relations—considered this same proposition and reported the following:

The Commission has explored the suggestion that States would be assisted by a simultaneous reduction in Federal grants and certain Federal taxes. This approach would be inadequate in the current situation, since grants serve an essential purpose by assisting in the support of specific functional programs. Moreover, any general or selective reduction or repeal of Federal grants coupled with an equivalent reduction in Federal taxes would intensify the fiscal problems of the lower-income States, which would lose far more in grants than they would gain in taxes. On the other hand, a tax cut of sufficient magnitude to indemnify fully every State would result in a total loss of Federal revenue that would far exceed the grant reductions.

An alternative would be to reduce grants to the richer States and increase grants to the poorer. But since the purpose of grant programs is to stimulate and support particular activities in which there is deemed to be an important national interest, the question would arise as to whether the national interest would be fulfilled if changes of this kind were made.

Then, too, it cannot be assumed that taxes surrendered by the National Government would be fully utilized by either State or local governments. For example, recent experience with the Federal admissions tax (which was cut two-thirds in 1954) is inconclusive but not reassuring, despite the fact that its suitability for local use has often been stressed.

Moreover, Mr. Speaker, a close examination of this tax-rebate concept shows it is simply not designed to cope with the pollution-control problem—or any other, for that matter. The joint committee's implication that under their proposal such activities as pollution-facilities construction would be continued at its present level is a deliberate attempt to deceive and mislead the American people. The implication simply cannot be justified by the facts.

The Subcommittee on Intergovernmental Relations of the House Committee on Government Operations has prepared detailed tables showing the shortcomings of the joint committee's telephone tax-rebate proposal. The subcommittee has been studying this problem and under the chairmanship of the able gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. FOUNTAIN] has contributed greatly to the study of this serious problem. On February 18 the subcommittee heard testimony from the cochairmen of the joint committee and are currently closely studying the joint committee's report.

Table I below, prepared by the subcommittee, shows the distribution of telephones and local telephone-service revenues per capita in calendar year 1956, by State.

TABLE I.—*Telephone service in the United States, distribution of telephones and local service revenues per capita in calendar year 1956, by State*

State	Total telephones per 100 population [1]	Percent households with telephone service [1]	Local service revenues per capita [2]
Alabama	19.86	50	$12.71
Arizona	27.17	55	22.76
Arkansas	18.21	42	11.22
California	44.07	85	33.54
Colorado	37.56	77	24.90
Connecticut	48.01	98	25.51
Delaware	44.14	84	23.04
District of Columbia	64.78	87	41.40
Florida	34.34	66	19.79
Georgia	23.69	56	14.20
Idaho	29.43	69	19.13
Illinois	40.93	82	30.41
Indiana	34.88	78	20.38
Iowa	36.21	87	17.32
Kansas	35.69	79	19.59
Kentucky	21.19	53	12.82
Louisiana	26.69	65	16.79
Maine	29.33	70	19.08
Maryland	36.38	77	25.36
Massachusetts	41.14	91	28.69
Michigan	36.92	84	24.06
Minnesota	35.16	83	19.55
Mississippi	15.29	39	9.77
Missouri	33.99	73	21.83
Montana	32.36	71	16.36
Nebraska	34.32	79	19.27
Nevada	33.59	55	25.09
New Hampshire	32.64	75	20.06
New Jersey	44.06	91	26.28
New Mexico	25.17	53	16.64
New York	46.07	87	36.60
North Carolina	19.64	50	11.01
North Dakota	23.66	67	13.83
Ohio	37.98	83	22.86
Oklahoma	32.66	70	19.68
Oregon	34.97	74	22.91
Pennsylvania	38.68	85	20.97
Rhode Island	35.85	78	24.59
South Carolina	17.22	44	9.88
South Dakota	26.36	66	14.23
Tennessee	25.91	63	15.14
Texas	30.38	65	20.22
Utah	34.68	79	19.43
Vermont	30.00	73	18.11
Virginia	28.35	65	17.51
Washington	37.41	80	25.66
West Virginia	22.67	57	13.45
Wisconsin	34.02	80	18.91
Wyoming	33.07	69	17.74
United States	35.45	76	23.23

[1] Estimated by American Telephone & Telegraph Co., as of Jan. 1, 1957.
[2] Estimated by Federal Communications Commission.

You will note from the table that the total telephones per 100 population, the percent of households with telephone service, and the local service revenues per capita vary widely from State to State, contrary to the joint committee's finding that telephone service is uniformily distributed over the country.

Regarding total telephones per 100 population we find a high of 48.01 in Connecticut and a low of 15.29 in Mississippi. We find 98 percent of the households in Connecticut with phone service—the Nation's high—but only 39 precent in Mississippi—with the wide range between. And the same wide range holds for local service revenues per capita—the basis on which the tax is collected—from $36.60 in New York to $9.77 in Mississippi.

Yet the joint committee maintains the telephone tax is widely and unformily distributed over the country—not concentrated in a few States. What it fails to point out, however, is that the highest income level States will receive far more in tax rebates than they now receive in Federal grants for pollution control and

vocational rehabilitation, while the lowest income States will receive far less.

Table II shows exactly what will happen under the joint committee's plan.

TABLE II.—*Comparison of yield from 4 percent tax on local telephone service and Federal grants for vocational education and waste treatment facilities construction, for selected States*

States ranked by income level [1]	Yield from 4 percent tax on local telephone service (in thousands) [2]	Federal grants (in thousands)			
		Total	Vocational education		Waste treatment facilities construction [4]
			Older programs [3]	Practical nursing and fishery trades [4]	
10 highest:					
Delaware ($2,858)	$400	$539	$165	$24	$350
Connecticut ($2,673)	2,200	979	315	36	628
New Jersey ($2,443)	5,800	1,838	644	80	1,114
California ($2,419)	16,300	3,893	1,620	220	2,053
Nevada ($2,413)	200	495	151	18	326
New York ($2,395)	22,500	5,056	2,070	236	2,750
Illinois ($2,383)	11,000	3,383	1,461	169	1,753
Massachusetts ($2,206)	5,500	1,865	638	90	1,137
Michigan ($2,156)	6,800	2,712	1,182	140	1,390
Ohio ($2,154)	7,900	3,305	1,478	174	1,653
10 lowest:					
Mississippi ($964)	800	2,116	826	110	1,180
Arkansas ($1,088)	800	1,789	657	84	1,048
South Carolina ($1,133)	900	1,735	656	84	995
Alabama ($1,229)	1,500	2,162	898	114	1,150
North Carolina ($1,305)	1,900	2,727	1,288	168	1 271
Tennessee ($1,317)	2,000	2,214	958	120	1,136
Kentucky ($1,324)	1,600	2,089	908	114	1,067
South Dakota ($1,330)	400	944	253	30	661
North Dakota ($1,365)	300	991	257	31	703
Georgia ($1,400)	1,900	2,225	964	123	1,138
Total, all 48 States	148,000	84,468	33,179	4,228	47,061

[1] Based on per capita personal income, 1956, shown in parentheses.
[2] Estimated by joint Federal-State action committee, fiscal year 1958.
[3] Expenditures for fiscal year 1956. Older programs include agriculture, home economics, trades and industry, and distributive occupations.
[4] Allotments for fiscal year 1958.
[5] Allotments for fiscal year 1957.

Source: All expenditure figures from joint Federal-State action committee, progress report No. 1, December 1957. Income data from U. S. Department of Commerce. Prepared by Intergovernmental Relations Subcommittee, U. S. House of Representatives.

Note that all but 2 of the 10 highest income States (Delaware and Nevada) will receive far more in tax rebates than they now do in the form of Federal grants for pollution control and vocational rehabilitation; 2 of the programs the joint committee recommends be returned to the States.

By the same token, each of the 10 lowest income States will receive less in rebates than they now do in grants for these programs. It is just a case of the rich getting richer and the poor getting poorer. It is unfair and unjust to ask these lower income States to suffer even greater financial hardships while turning over to the wealthier States a windfall in tax rebates.

It would be different, Mr. Speaker, if these low income States were not putting forth adequate effort to meet their needs. The fact is, they are. The average fiscal effort of the States is 7.5 percent, which represents the ratio of State and local taxes to personal income with the State.

We find, from a table prepared by the Library of Congress and which appeared on page 9306 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of June 26, 1957, that only 4 of the 10 highest income States were above this average effort. At the same time, 7 of the 10 lowest income States were above the national average.

There is no question but that the Nation's lower income States are making a valiant effort to meet their responsibilities, but the lack of funds makes it impossible for them to do without Federal aid in certain fields. Yet these are the States which would suffer most under the joint committee's proposal.

Last October, Mr. Speaker, labor's Economic Review published by AFL-CIO saw the danger inherent in the joint committee's plan and pointed out:

In the first place, lower income States that now receive the largest proportionate share of the Federal grants cannot possibly recoup their losses by levying the taxes that Washington would relinquish. Only the wealthiest States—that need aid least—would benefit from this callous States' rights scheme.

This proposal would restore the uncivilized and outmoded concept that only those who can pay the price deserve decent public services. It would curtail or completely eliminate school lunches, vocational training, assistance for the aged, and many other important services in precisely those States in which family incomes are the lowest and, therefore, their needs are most acute. The slight progress already achieved toward raising minimum standards would be reversed.

Secondly, it cannot be taken for granted that these services would continue as in the past, even in the States that are better off. The absence of the stimulus of Federal matching grants would strengthen the powerful reactionary bloc in the State legislatures that always fights adequate appropriations to meet public needs. There can be little doubt that even in the more prosperous States many civilian service programs—now encouraged largely by the existence of Federal aids—would be watered down or ended.

The net effect of the joint committee's plan, Mr. Speaker, would result in the Federal Government giving up $148 million of revenue in exchange for an assumption by the States, however nebulous, of $85.5 million in grants—a net loss of $62.5 million to the Treasury. And without 1 cent of tax reduction for the people.

ACCELERATED CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM NEEDED TO HELP COMBAT RECESSION

Mr. Speaker, because of the great need for enough water of the right quality, pollution control is a vital and necessary function of government, at all levels. The Federal Government has a definite responsibility which it is now fulfilling under Public Law 660. The Federal Government could and should be doing even more, however, especially in light of the present unemployment situation. There is a need now to not only continue the construction-grant program but, because of the economic situation, actually accelerate it.

It is an interesting fact, Mr. Speaker, that the President has put forth a $2 billion post-office construction program. That amount represents exactly the amount of the backlog needs of treatment plant construction. Yet in this vital area of water conservation the President recommends that we eliminate certain Federal activity altogether. This administration's sense of values is amazing.

As the distinguished chairman of the Senate Public Works Committee pointed out just the other day, an accelerated treatment plant construction program, stimulated by increased Federal grants, would be an excellent recession antidote. Senator CHAVEZ placed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for February 17, on page 1927, tables showing the estimated impact an accelerated treatment plant construction program would have on our economy in terms of estimated payrolls and man-years of labor.

We have seen that under the existing $50 million a year program, $200 million of local participation is being stimulated for a total of $250 million worth of projects. The estimated payroll for this work is $75 million. The work requires 1,311.9 man-years of labor.

As Senator CHAVEZ has pointed out, doubling the Federal share would result in a comparable doubling of local activity with a corresponding double in payrolls and man-years of work. The projects are planned, Mr. Speaker. We could proceed with them now if sufficient Federal funds were available.

Here is a job crying for attention, Mr. Speaker. A task if left undone which would seriously curtail the Nation's future growth and expansion. A natural area of Federal activity which would add immeasurably to the future strength of the country. An activity if pursued diligently which would produce jobs, increase payrolls, and most important, protect our most precious natural resource—water. Mr. Speaker, I cannot urge this House too strongly to reject the President's proposal to discontinue Federal aid for treatment plant construction as recommended by our joint committee and at the same time let us move forward in the battle against pollution at an accelerated rate. For the present, this will be an excellent anti-

recession remedy. For the future, it will guarantee a supply of clear, fresh water to our children.

Norman Thomas, Victor Reuther, and Others Protest Torture of Spanish Students and Workers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WAYNE MORSE
OF OREGON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, February 24, 1958

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Norman Thomas, Victor Reuther, and Others Protest Torture of Spanish Students and Workers."

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NORMAN THOMAS, VICTOR REUTHER, AND OTHERS PROTEST TORTURE OF SPANISH STUDENTS AND WORKERS

Norman Thomas, Victor Reuther, and other sponsors of the magazine Iberica, which is dedicated to a free Spain, sent a telegram to President Eisenhower on Friday, February 7, urging that no further economic aid be granted the Franco Government in Spain from the President's emergency fund as long as Spanish students and workers are being beaten and tortured.

According to reports received by Iberica directly from Spain over 200 university students and workers have been arrested in Madrid alone during the past month as part of a stepped up campaign of terrorism. All are suspected of being opponents of the Franco regime and are indiscriminately labeled as Communists. In police attempts to force confessions many have been subjected to violent beatings and tortures such as being forced to hold their hands or feet on red-hot electric stoves. Several victims have gone insane as a result of the treatment received in the course of these interrogations while others have been hospitalized with broken bones.

Police sadism has reached such a point that even former Spanish Minister of Foreign Affairs, Alberto Martin Artajo, has written an indignant letter of protest to Gen. Camilo Alonso Vega, Minister of Internal Security.

In their telegram to President Eisenhower, Norman Thomas and the other sponsors of Iberica expressed concern lest United States aid to the Franco regime be injurious to our long term relations with Spain.

"In Spain we are rapidly losing the good will of the people," they warn the President, "by our active support of an oppressive and necessarily transitory dictatorship. If we wish to insure our accessibility to our costly Strategic Air Command bases on Spanish territory in the future, then we had better take another look at our relations with the Spanish people today."

The complete text of the telegram to President Eisenhower follows:

FEBRUARY 7, 1958.

President DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER,
The White House,
Washington, D. C.

MR. PRESIDENT: We are informed that the Franco Government in Spain has asked another $30 million from your emergency fund in addition to the $20 million already granted. We respectfully call your attention to the unpublicized fact that brutal repressions within Spain have been on the upgrade within the past few months. During the last few weeks over 200 university students and workers in Madrid alone, suspected of being opponents of the Franco regime and indiscriminately labeled as "Communists" have been arrested and many have been subject to cruel torture. By extending financial aid to the Franco dictatorship we are in a sense intervening in Spanish internal affairs and becoming accessories to these repressions. Therefore, we urge that you withhold further aid pending a termination of such uncalled for brutality.

In Spain we are rapidly losing the good will of the people by our active support of an oppressive and necessarily transitory dictatorship. If we wish to insure our accessibility to our costly Strategic Air Command bases on Spanish territory in the future, then we had better take another look at our relations with the Spanish people today.

Respectfully yours,

NORMAN THOMAS,
VICTOR REUTHER,
ROGER BALDWIN,
FRANCES R. GRANT,
ROBERT J. ALEXANDER,
LOUISE CRANE,
Sponsors of IBERICA Magazine.

Address care of Norman Thomas, 112 East 19 Street, New York, N. Y.

(NOTE.—Aside from the $41 million in foreign aid appropriated by Congress to Spain, for the fiscal year ending in June 1958, $20 million has been extended to the Franco Government from the President's emergency fund and another $30 million is being urgently requested. All of this is in addition to the hundreds of millions of dollars in economic aid already extended to Spain in connection with the United States base program.)

Identifications: Norman Thomas is chairman of the Post-War World Council; Victor Reuther is administrative assistant to the president, AFL-CIO; Frances R. Grant is secretary-general, Inter-American Association for Democracy and Freedom; Robert J. Alexander, specialist in Spanish and Latin-American affairs, is professor of economics at Rutgers University; Roger Baldwin is chairman, board of directors of International League for the Rights of Man; Louise Crane is publisher of Iberica magazine.

Attacks on the Supreme Court

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS C. HENNINGS, JR.
OF MISSOURI
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, February 24, 1958

Mr. HENNINGS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Attacks on the Supreme Court," by John E. Dunsford and Richard J. Childress, professors at St. Louis University Law School. These two scholarly gentlemen have written an excellent article in which they present many thought-provoking ideas. I believe they have done a splendid job in setting the Supreme Court in its proper perspective.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ATTACKS ON THE SUPREME COURT
(John E. Dunsford and Richard J. Childress)

According to an old dictum, it makes a difference whose ox is being gored. In the past few years the Supreme Court has gored some oxen (plus, now and then, a sacred cow), and the proof of the proverb lies in the sustained attack which has been mounted. The common judgment is that contemporary criticism of the Court has few parallels for scope and intensity in American history.

Disparagement of court decisions is not a new phenomenon, of course. Criticism of the High Court has flashed like summer lightning through the Nation's history, and one ordinarily need go no further than his favorite historical character to find some juicy tidbit of invective. Indeed, a case might be made against the present expressions of pique solely on the grounds of their pedestrian tenor.

Senator WILLIAM E. JENNER has characterized the Court's work as lacking solid foundation in either legal principles or commonsense. Prof. Edward S. Corwin has suggested that the justices bone up a little on the history of the Constitution before trying to remake it. Journalistic pundits have alternatively explained their disagreement with the Court's opinions by claiming that the justices are sadly deficient in scholarship, or haven't had sufficient lower court experience to function properly on the high bench.

The unique status of the Court makes it a scapegoat for any group in our society. Unlike politicians, the Supreme Court cannot be all things to all people. The nature of the institution impels judgment and decision—the deliberate choice between competing claims and theories. And what pleases the Civil Liberties Union is apt to wrap a fog of gloomy debate around the next American Legion convention.

A focal point of modern tensions, the Court is vulnerable to attack from all sides. In the important policy questions which the Court must decide substantial group interest can be identified with both sides—the losing as well as the winning side. The Constitution is very often invoked to protect the rights claimed by the minority or the unpopular side of public issues. It is, thus, inevitable that the Court will decide against some powerful and vocal groups. Just a glance at some of the recent decisions which feed the contemporary controversies is sufficient to show the type of problem with which the Court is confronted, and the variety of social groups which it has antagonized.

CASES REVIEWED

Segregationists and State rights groups are still smarting from the 1954 opinion of the Supreme Court in *Brown* v. *Board of Education of Topeka* (347 U. S. 483), which held the racial segregation of students in public school to be a violation of the equal protection clause of the 14th amendment. Some of the attacks were of the emotional sort including the perennial question, "Would you like your sister to marry a Negro?" Others reached for the cloak of constitutional respectability with claims that the 14th amendment had never been properly ratified, that the Court failed to follow its own prior decisions by rejecting the separate but equal doctrine, and that the Court had used sociological rather than legal criteria to determine the meaning of equal protection of the laws.

Perhaps the most publicized decision of the past term of the Court was the *Jencks* case (353 U. S. 657 (1957)). Both law-enforcement officers and other citizens, preoccupied with security against subversion, protested the High Court's ruling that in a Federal criminal trial, after a prosecution witness has testified, the defendant is entitled to inspect the witness' prior statements which

were made to Government agents and are in the Government files and which touch the events and activities on which he has testified. The purpose of this inspection is to give the defendant the benefit of information which might show that the witness has told inconsistent stories. It would seem only fair the accused be enabled to impeach the reliability of an inconsistent Government witness. Certainly, the defendant could not readily do so if the prior statements on the same subject matter are locked in the prosecution files. It is particularly worthy of note that the probity of the rule was demonstrated in the Jencks case itself where one of the witnesses, Harvey F. Matusow, subsequently recanted his testimony under oath. It should be noted too that the extent to which the Government files had to be exposed was limited to statements touching the subject matter on which testimony had already been given. The Federal Bureau of Investigation may like to protect its files, but a limited use of them is often proper if a person charged with crime is to be able to get information necessary for his defense. Some lower Federal courts had already required such a practice. A few months after the Jencks case Congress passed an act which left the decision substantially intact as a Federal procedural rule.

Some legislators and other citizens with a deep-seated conviction that the Court and the Nation are soft on communism were irate over the Court's holding in *Watkins* v. *United States* (354 U. S. 178 (1957)) which limited the investigative powers of congressional committees. The decision reversed a conviction for contempt of Congress based on the defendant's refusal to answer some of the questions posed by the House of Representatives' Committee on Un-American Activities. The Court traced the history of legislative investigations from the English Parliament through to recent congressional hearings and found a new tendency in the investigations which involve a broad-scale intrusion into the lives and affairs of private citizens. The constitutional infirmity in the conviction of Watkins, the Court found, was rooted in the vagueness and the sweeping character of the House resolution creating the committee; this made it impossible for the witness to know the extent of the committee's authority to command his cooperation in answering the questions propounded. The Court reasoned that Congress has no power to expose for the sake of exposure:

"The theory of a committee inquiry is that the committee members are serving as the representatives of the parent assembly in collecting information for legislative purpose. An essential premise in this situation is that the House or Senate shall instruct the committee members on what they are to do with the power delegated to them. Those instructions are embodied in the authorizing resolution."

The Court, after investigating the resolution creating the Committee on Un-American Activities, found: "No one could reasonably deduce from the charter the kind of investigation that the committee was directed to make." The Court concluded: "Petitioner was thus not accorded a fair opportunity to determine whether he was within his rights in refusing to answer, and his conviction is necessarily invalid under the due-process clause of the fifth amendment. The Court also stated that Congress in its investigations must not encroach unreasonably upon the individual's privacy or upon his liberty of speech, press, religion, or assembly.

Groups preoccupied with security against the menace of Communist subversion were once more disturbed at the Supreme Court's reversal of the convicition of 14 west coast Communists for conspiracy to violate the Smith Act. The decision in *Yates* v. *United States* (354 U. S. 298 (1957)) defined the statutory term "organize" to include only initial organizations. As a result parts of several indictments were declared invalid as covering acts beyond the 3-year statute of limitations. By this holding the Court rejected the Government's interpretation of the Smith Act and applied the familiar rule of law that criminal statutes are to be construed strictly. The Court also made a distinction between teaching the violent overthrow of the Government as an abstract doctrine in the academic sense and advocacy that incites to illegal action. This distinction was applied to the Smith Act which was interpreted to allow academic discussion of communism while prohibiting incitement to overthrow the Government. The distinction is not only a valid one but essential if the truth of a philosophical or theological position is not to be decided by legislative fiat. The government which is competent to declare Marxism false is able to say the same of Thomism. This does not, however, prevent the Government from prohibiting speech that incites illegal action, as the Court had earlier held in *Dennis* v. *United States* (341 U. S. 494 (1951)). This important distinction was forgotten by alarmist critics excited to discover that 14 Communists were not yet jailed.

Some of the groups which are concerned with civil liberties found cause for dissatisfaction in the Court's handling of obscenity in *Roth* v. *United States* (354 U. S. 476, (1957)). Occasional blasts from the other side of the fence came from those who agreed with the Court's opinion that obscenity is not within the area of constitutionally protected speech or press, but who disagree with the standard approved by the Court for defining obscenity. The standard applied by the lower court was whether to the average person, applying contemporary community standards, the dominant theme of the material taken as a whole appeals to prurient interest. While it is true that this might not be an ethician's definition of obscenity, ethicians do not make up the juries that have to rule on the charges. Some of the groups devoted to civil rights were also disturbed at *Kingsley Books* v. *Brown* (354 U. S. 436, 1957)) which allowed an injunction against the sale of obscene books. Here the objection was that prior restraint on the press violated freedom of press guaranteed by the first amendment. Justice Frankfurter's opinion attempted to meet the objections against prior restraint with this argument: "Instead of requiring the bookseller to dread that the offer for sale of a book may without prior warning subject him to a criminal prosecution with the hazard of imprisonment, the civil procedure assures him that such consequences cannot follow unless he ignores a court order specifically directed to him."

Veterans' organizations—as well as those who in general distrust foreign justice—were incensed at the action of the Court in denying relief to an American soldier whom the United States Army proposed to deliver to the Japanese Government to be tried for the killing of a Japanese woman in Japan. The issue was complicated by the 1951 Security Treaty and an administrative agreement with Japan. Under this agreement a joint committee of the two countries met but was unable to decide which nation should prosecute the soldier, Girard. The Secretary of Defense and the Secretary of State determined that the United States would waive jurisdiction. It was the waiver of jurisdiction which brought forth the cries. In the Court's opinion the United States could waive jurisdiction under an article of the agreement which provided: "The authorities of the state having the primary right shall give sympathetic consideration to a request from the authorities of the other state for a waiver of its rights in cases where the other state considers such a waiver to be of particular importance." The Court expressed its belief that the wisdom of the arrangement is exclusively for the determination of the executive and legislative branches. Here it is ironic that the Court is criticized for not interfering with the action of Congress and the Executive, whereas the usual complaint is that the Court is guilty of usurpation of the powers of the coordinate branches.

A section of the business and industrial community was dismayed at the Court's finding in *United States* v. *E. I. du Pont de Nemours and Company* (353 U. S. 586 (1957)) that section 7 of the Clayton Antitrust Act prohibited the lessening of competition through the holding of stock in a customer corporation (i. e., prohibited vertical stock acquisition). Section 7 of the act makes it unlawful "to acquire * * * the whole or any part of the stock or share capital of another corporation * * * where the effect of such acquisition may be * * * to restrain such commerce in any section or community, or tend to create a monopoly of any line of commerce." The act was adopted in 1914 and the earlier applications of the section had been made to prevent the lessening of competition through holding of stock in a competing corporation (i. e., to prohibit horizontal stock acquisitions). The Federal Trade Commission had not applied the section to vertical stock acquisitions, and it is safe to say that the section was generally thought not to apply to such acquisitions. The Court further held in the Du Pont case that the question of whether competition was lessened could be made at the time the Government filed the suit and did not have to be made at the time of original acquisition. The Court said the statute was applicable whenever the reasonable likelihood appears that the acquisition will result in a restraint of commerce or in the creation of a monopoly of any line of commerce." It is hard to deny that the Du Pont case expands the meaning of the Clayton Act, but it must not be overlooked that the case was brought at the instance of the executive branch of the Government and that the Congress can readily modify the act if it believes that the Court has erred.

Taking a broad view of the decisions here noted, one is struck by the kind of problem with which the Court is saddled. These cases called for judgments on core issues of our society: procedural rights of the individual faced with the massed power of the State; limits of free expression in a pluralistic society; irreducible minimums of minority interests; permissible affiliations of economic blocs; propriety of method in combatting subversion. These involuted questions underlie the facts of the cases. They call for specification and resolution, not in the sweet-sounding phrases of the speculative, but in the harsh irrevocable words of decision.

At any given time the diverse principles and overlapping assumptions which constitute a functioning government are in a precarious and shifting balance; this state of affairs is more, not less, true in a democracy. The task of the Supreme Court is nothing less than the articulation of this amorphous public philosophy and the application of it to the controversies which are properly brought before the bar.

Much of the present criticism can be traced, then, to an ignorance of what the judicial act entails, or to an unwillingness to accept the system of government which provides for a Supreme Court with power of review.

The popular notion of law demands a code of well-defined and finished rules under which all imagirable problems fit with snug exactness. Thus men who in their daily lives suffer agonies of indecision over what

suit to buy expect that a Justice can interpret the Clayton Act correctly. Those who conscientiously grapple with large but individual problems of moral conduct are chagrined when the Court cannot produce some slide rule to determine the meaning of obscene for 170 million of us.

The fact that lower courts are reversed in their decisons is a scandal of a sort. "Don't lower court judges know law, too? How, indeed, can there be disagreement over what the law is?" The supposition behind the objection is obviously that courts are invading the province of Congress, contrary to all the principles of government which are summarized in the textbooks: "the legislator makes the law, the executive enforces it, and the judiciary determines violations." Do we have a government of law or of men, runs the complaint.

This view—which, incidentally, is not necessarily restricted exclusively to those outside the legal fraternity—assigns to the judge merely the elementary task of applying law to facts and transcribing the results. Whatever validity such a philosophy has for the routine class of lawsuits, it fails miserably as an explanation of the operation of a Supreme Court. For the Supreme Court also has as a primary function the interpreting of a written Constitution, with the gloss that such interpretation is authoritative.

Constitutions are not the same type of animals as other laws. They are not designed to detail the solutions of every problem that can arise. Instead, they set down norms and guideposts within which particular decisions must be reached. All of this is elementary.

TASK OF COURT

Yet even when the Court is not exercising itself on a specific constitutional issue, it is normally concerned with problems that in their scope and complexity inevitably require a system of values and a list of priorities. Legal questions are in their essence manifestations of value clashes within our society itself. Only infrequently do legislators resolve these clashes comprehensively. The legislative process requires that the different interests be reconciled and that a law regulating an area of human conduct be expressed in terms which reflect a consensus required for its enactment. But the Court cannot stop when it has found the law's area of common agreement; it must judge the issue which has been presented to it. And the mere fact that the issue has reached the Supreme Court is some evidence that the statute gives only equivocal answers.

A failure to realize what the Court is called upon to do leads to frustration and annoyance. The innocent observer can only explain judicial disagreement, as Holmes put it, "as if it meant simply that one side or the other were not doing their sums right, and if they would take more trouble, agreement inevitably would come."

Depending on whether one agrees or disagrees with the decision, the Court is, in this simple view, either a society of god-like creatures, or a club of nodding mortals.

Yet even those who have a sophisticated understanding of the vital elements of judicial decision sometimes close their eyes to the structure of our American legal system. The Court is not merely a sounding board for debate on the burning questions of the day; it is a terminal point. The prevailing doctrine under which we live encompasses an independent and supreme judiciary which guards the sacred fires of the Constitution, and regulates and resolves the justiciable tensions. The alternatives to this system (and this fact bears periodic repetition) are anarchy or tyranny.

The Supreme Court is a consequence of the need for an impartial and a detached evaluation of governmental activity in the perspective of the Constitution. If the Nation acts in haste, it has a Court to prevent an extended repentance. But, additionally, the Court serves the real need of bringing issues to a conclusion. However it may gall us at the time, the buck stops here.

A distinguishing mark of our legal system is the precedence of process over power. The Court may make a decision but its enforcement lies basically in a willingness of the people to give that respect which is due the system itself. This respect does not hinge on agreement with any individual mandate of the Court, but on the knowledge that problems must be resolved by law.

The carping which overlooks the nature of the judicial process, or which balks at the meaning of the system, is dangerous precisely because it tends to destroy and not to improve law. No one would seriously preach the heresy that the Court is above criticism. The current problem is quite to the contrary. Mny of those who have attacked the Court in past months have actually forestalled effective criticism. As one lawyer put it, "I wish some of these people would shut up so that I could take issue with some of the Court's opinions. But I don't want people thinking that I'm in agreement with the rash charges that have been made."

The charge that the Court is playing a creative role, rather than a mechanical one, is noteworthy only for its naivete. Those who think that disagreements can be eliminated by requiring the Justices to have a given amount of lower court experience are only deceiving themselves. They canont see what Justice Frankfurter means when he writes: "One is entitled to say without qualification that the correlation between prior judicial experience and fitness for the functions of the Supreme Court is zero." And why is this true? Because, he tells us, "the Court's preoccupation today is with the application of rather fundamental aspirations and what Judge Learned Hand calls moods, embodied in provisions like the due process clauses, which are deliberately designed to supply only general norms of decision. The judicial process in applying them involves a judgment on the processes of government. The Court sits in judgment, that is, on the views of the direct representatives of the people in meeting the needs of society, on the views of Presidents and governors, and by their construction of the will of the legislatures the Court breathes life, feeble or strong, into the inert pages of the Constitution and the statute books."

Similarly naive is the mock horror with which other critics of the Court contemplate the immense power which the Justices wield. Among the crass remedies which some disgruntled critics would apply is a periodic reconfirmation of the Justices by the Senate. Thinking the bathwater foul, they are momentarily not concerned that the baby will be dumped out as well. At bottom their complaint is not that here is a Supreme Court but that the present Court does not reflect their views.

To be effective, the critic of the Court must appreciate the complex processes of human judgment; he must also concede the imperative need for finality in resolving vexatious problems.

There is no guaranty that the values which the judges apply are the proper ones. Every decision, then, should come under the closest scrutiny. Nor is there harm when decisions are taken to another (for example, the congressional) arena. But criticism must have direction, or it will be worse than futile. It will be simply destructive.

The Vital Work of the Asia Society

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 24, 1958

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, in recent years, Americans have fortunately become increasingly aware of the continent of Asia, its peoples, its cultures, its economic, political, social, and other problems.

One of the fine organizations which has been responsible for increasing the knowledge and understanding by our people of this vast continent, especially south and southeast Asia, has been the Asia Society.

Thanks to the Society's efforts, new bonds of friendship are constantly being created and developed the mutual good of ourselves and our friends in the East.

Volume 1, number 1, the January 1958 issue of the Asia Society Letter describes an interesting cross section of the work of this organization. It includes a prefatory note by Mr. John D. Rockefeller III, who has served in this worthy connection, as in so many other splendid connections, in the interest of our country and of international good will.

I ask unanimous consent that excerpts from the January bulletin be printed in the Appendix of the Record.

There being no objection, the excerpts were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NEW YORK CITY.

To Members and Friends of the Asia Society:

The interest and warm response that the founding of the Asia Society has engendered has been most gratifying. It is clear that there are many persons in this country, Asian and American, who share the conviction that fostering increased knowledge and understanding between the peoples of the United States and of the countries of Asia is an important and valid undertaking.

There are many ways in which international understanding can be advanced. None of us can predict with any degree of exactitude which elements in intercultural contracts are most important for fostering mutual understanding, but we can hazard some guesses on the basis of past experience. The schoolchild who learns about the daily life and interests of his contemporary in a foreign land, the university student who studies a foreign culture, the technician or businessman who deals with foreign firms or perhaps resides abroad to carry on his work, the reader of a novel depicting the emotions and feelings of people in a foreign culture, the government official who deals with international affairs, the museum-goer who sees exhibits of foreign paintings and sculpture—for all these people such experiences bring some degree of increased understanding. And increased knowledge in turn creates deeper insights, so that what may at one time have appeared a totally alien culture and an incomprehensible people gradually becomes familiar. One's own cultural horizons are thus expanded.

Our members come from many walks of life and are engaged in a wide variety of activities: businessmen, housewives, scholars,

students, Government officials, artists, engineers, writers, schoolteachers; our special interests in Asian affairs vary as widely. Through this newsletter we hope to inform readers of developments in Asian-American affairs that will be of interest to them. We will report on individuals identified with Asia and on institutions and groups working in this field. We will also inform readers about books, exhibits, films and other relevant items of interest.

The society's program is now getting underway. The appointment of committees to develop and carry out our program has begun and details of the committees formed thus far are noted in this first issue of the newsletter.

In welcoming members into the society may I, on behalf of the board of trustees, express our sincere appreciation for your interest and support and the hope that the efforts of the society will make a fruitful contribution to American-Asian understanding and friendship.

JOHN D. ROCKEFELLER 3D.

FOREIGN SERVICE FOR UNIVERSITIES

In Manila, a young American area specialist interviews a Filipino disk jockey whose program is rapidly establishing him as a powerful opinion molder over a wide area. In a midwestern college classroom, a former USIA official and onetime English instructor in China discusses a case history of a Japanese business enterprise with the members of an economics seminar.

Both of these men are engaged in different phases of the program of the American Universities field staff, a unique organization which is, in effect, a foreign service operated by and on behalf of American education. Established in 1951 by the heads of several American colleges and universities, the AUFS has developed a new approach to the study of foreign societies and has enabled its member organizations to maintain better communications with foreign areas than any of the institutions could accomplish alone. A professional organization of scholarly correspondents, the AUFS carries out a program of intensive field studies abroad combined with educational activities on American campuses. Major emphasis is on areas in respect to which university offerings have been relatively scanty. More than half of the program is currently devoted to countries of the Far East, south, and southeast Asia; other regions being studied are mainly in the Middle East, Africa, and Latin America.

Scholar-journalists

Blending the techniques of the scholar and the journalist, the AUFS staff member spends about 18 months at a time in his assigned area, sending back frequent reports which are published and distributed by the AUFS. He then returns to the United States and participates in a program of visits to member universities and colleges, spending 10 days on each campus lecturing, participating in discussion meetings and in a variety of other ways helping the institution fulfill its responsibility for bringing to faculty and students fresh and authoritative knowledge and judgments about foreign societies. The field staff's contribution is of special value because it supplies up-to-date facts and analyses of current developments. There are very few textbooks on the geographical areas reported on by AUFS men, and of the available books all but a handful are out of date.

Each of the 13 staff members has had years of study, residence, and work in a foreign area prior to joining the AUFS. He is as familiar with a foreign society as he is with his own and he has won recognition for his professional competence, although this is not always measured by the academic yardstick of advanced degrees. While a staff man usually has a primary interest related to one of the major academic fields of study, he is expected to be sensitive to the whole range of the society he observes and to include in his reports data that will be useful to a variety of disciplines.

Reports from the field

This joining of the roles of academician and journalist is reflected in the range of subjects covered by staff members' reports from the field. A random selection of titles from the cumulative index of reports issued to date covers such diverse topics as the Chinese motion picture industry as a tool for Communist propaganda, a report on the status of Japanese negotiations toward settling reparations accounts, case studies of the household budgets of three Indonesian families, an assessment of the position of the Chinese minority in Malaya, an analysis of the implications of shifting policies of American aid in the Philippines, observations on political forces and trends in an Indian state, and an account of nationalist sentiments in the 10th year of Pakistan's independence. Biographical sketches of well-known personalities and of obscure villagers, tabulations and analyses of election results, appraisals of the special problems faced by scholars and technical assistance personnel in the field are the subjects of some of the other reports. AUFS staff members writing from some 20 countries send in more than 90 reports in the course of a year.

The use made of the resources of the AUFS varies from campus to campus. Each member institution is free to adapt the program to fit its own educational methods. One university calls on AUFS men to contribute papers to an interdisciplinary faculty-student seminar and to lead the seminar discussions when they appear on the campus. At another school, a graduate seminar in international relations uses field staff reports as its sole source material. One college schedules the appearance of four AUFS men to do most of the teaching for eight weeks in a core course on international relations. A graduate school of business administration uses the program to help orient its students to the environment and problems a businessman encounters in foreign countries.

* * * * * *

Responding to the interest shown in the AUFS reports by educational institutions, government agencies and business organizations, the board of trustees in 1955 arranged to make multiple copies of these reports available to institutional subscribers. Inquiries about the reports should be directed to AUFS, 522 Fifth Avenue, New York, N. Y.

"IN STEP" AND INDIA

Business relationships have always been an important factor in the complex of communications between Asia and the United States. In the last decade, with the rapid acceleration of Asia's economic development, the scope of these business contacts has broadened correspondingly, branching out from rather small, self-contained circles to a network of relationships bringing together large numbers of administrators, engineers, and technicians with a mutual interest in commerce and industry.

One of the most dynamic examples of the expanding channels of communication provided by the business world is the program known as In Step, the Indian Steel Training and Educational Program in the United States. In Step is designed to train Indian engineers to take their place in their country's rapidly expanding steel industry. It is also providing 200 future leaders of Indian industry with a rare opportunity for first-hand knowledge of American economic life and the American people.

India's training needs

India graduates some 3,600 engineers from her technical schools each year. But technical training is not enough to equip a man with the skill and experience needed to supervise the operations of an expanding steel industry. For that, there is no substitute for on-the-job training. However, India's steel industry does not yet have the facilities to supply the necessary amount of in-service training. To help meet this need, the In Step program was developed through the cooperation of the Governments of India and the United States, the Ford Foundation, five American educational institutions, and the American steel industry.

PROGRAM COMMITTEES

The Asia Society is forming a series of country committees to give particular thought and attention to programs relating to individual Asian countries. The first of these, the India Committee, has been set up under the chairmanship of Norman Cousins, editor of the Saturday Review of Literature. Members of the committee are: Senator John Sherman Cooper, former American Ambassador to India; Dr. Leona Baumgartner, commissioner of health of the city of New York; Dr. Amiya Chakravarty, professor of philosophy at Boston University; Mrs. Julie d'Estournelles of the Woodrow Wilson Foundation; Mrs. F. F. Richardson, wife of an executive of the Standard-Vacuum Oil Co.; Mr. Phillips Talbot, executive director of the American Universities field staff; and Dr. Arthur T. Mosher, executive director of the Council on Economic and Cultural Affairs, Inc.

GALLERY COMMITTEE MEMBERS

A committee has also been formed to operate the art gallery which will be a part of Asia House. The chairman of the Gallery Committee is Mrs. James Laughlin, a member of the Junior Council of the Museum of Modern Art. The members of the Gallery Committee are: Mrs. Louis V. Ledoux, for many years a patron of Asian arts and chairman of the Arts and Exhibits Committee of the Japan Society; Dr. Aschwin Lippe, associate curator of the Far Eastern department of the Metropolitan Museum of Art; Mr. Porter McCray, director of circulating exhibitions of the Museum of Modern Art; Mrs. John A. Pope of the Circulating Exhibits Division of the Smithsonian Institute; and Mrs. John D. Rockefeller 3d, a trustee of the Museum of Modern Art and formerly president of the International Council at the museum.

A Cultural Exchange Committee has been set up under the chairmanship of Mrs. John D. Rockefeller 3d. The committee's members are: Miss Doris Duke, Mr. James Laughlin, Mr. Joshua Logan, Mr. Lincoln Kirstein, Mrs. Eero Saarinen, Mr. Carlton Sprague Smith; Mrs. James Laughlin is a member ex-officio. The Cultural Exchange Committee will be concerned with exhibits to be shown in this country both at the Asia Society and elsewhere and with small exhibits that will circulate in Asia. It will bring here from Asia a few persons working in the fine arts, including poets, novelists, and translators and some musicians and dancers.

ASIA IN THE SCHOOLS

For thousands of school children in the vicinity of New York City and for countless other viewers as well, the countries of Asia are no longer remote places inhabited by unfamiliar peoples. Each Tuesday morning for the past four months, in classrooms and school assembly halls the customs and traditions, the arts and folklore and many other aspects of life in different parts of Asia have been brought to the students through a series of half-hour television programs titled "Spotlight on Asia."

Presented by the New York City Board of Education in cooperation with the Metropolitan Education Television Association and WPIX, Spotlight on Asia reached schools in New York, New Jersey, and Connecticut and home viewers in those areas as well.

Each program in the series dealt with a different country or group of countries in Asia. The content varied from week to week but in general each half hour contained the following elements: Participation by nationals of the country being explored; some exhibition of the arts, crafts work, dances and music; a description of the national dress; models or pictures of typical dwellings; perhaps a filmstrip showing anything from rush hour on the Tokyo elevated train to a caravan crossing a pass in Nepal. Written, produced and moderated by Miss Jean Eicks of the New York City Board of Education. Spotlight on Asia offers a prime example of what can be done to give Americans a sense of genuine contact with Asia, using a minimum of resources close at hand and operating in effect without a budget.

Asian participants

Personnel of Asian Embassies and consulates in New York and Washington cooperated generously, lending slides, films, and art objects for display on the program. Even more important, many of these diplomats and sometimes their wives and children took part in the telecast, answering questions posed by Miss Eicks, explaining and describing the way of life in their own lands.

Presenting in 30 minutes a coherent picture of a land whose very name may be unfamiliar to the viewer is a knotty problem. Miss Eicks and her associate producer, James Morske, resolved it by keeping the script simple and relying primarily on cultural devices to give the audience a sense of identification with each Asian land and people.

* * * * *

KOREAN ART TREASURES

For the first time in history, a collection of Korea's national art treasures is being shown abroad. Almost 200 examples of Korean art through the centuries will be on display in a series of exhibitions in the continental United States and Hawaii. The exhibit is of great significance in the art world not only for the beauty and uniqueness of the individual pieces but also because no foreigners except for the very few who have visited Korea have even seen these works.

The Asia Society, Inc.—Officers: John D. Rockefeller 3d, president; Ernest A Gross, vice president; Phillips Talbot, vice president; Dr. Grayson L. Kirk, chairman; August Maffry, treasurer; Edgar B. Young, secretary; Paul G. Sherbert, executive director. Trustees: Chester Bowles, Arthur H. Dean, Lloyd W. Elliott, John Exter, Arthur B. Foye, Harry A. Gibbon, Ernest A. Gross, William R. Herod, Dr. Grayson L. Kirk, Mrs. James Laughlin, August Maffry, Dr. Edward S. Mason, W. E. Murray, John D. Rockefeller 3d, James J. Rorimer, Dr. Lauriston Sharp, Howard C. Sheperd, Edwin F. Stantan, Phillips Talbot, Juan T. Trippe, Mrs. Stanley P. Young.

Dwight Jones of the St. Paul Pioneer-Press

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EUGENE J. McCARTHY
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 24, 1958

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, last week a great newspaper editor died. He was Dwight Jones of the St. Paul Pioneer-Press. I wish to call to the attention of the House of Representatives this column in that paper by one of Dwight Jones' staff, Paul Light. The column details an aspect of Mr. Jones' character as it will long be remembered in the newsroom of the Pioneer-Press:

ONCE OVER LIGHTLY
(By Paul Light)

MEMOS WERE HIS DELIGHT

If Dwight Jones were to read these words I shudder at the memo he'd slide under my office door.

Memos to the staff were Dwight's delight, a verbal calisthentics of sorts. He was an inspired artist in their creation. His memos rose to the satirical heights of a Swift; the terse, descriptive powers of a Hemingway; the poetic flourish of a Shakespeare.

If you received one, you never forgot it.

You showed it proudly, as one does a red badge of courage, to fellow workers.

But now the memos and the writer are no more. Dwight Jones, managing editor of the Pioneer Press, died Sunday of a heart attack.

And we, his staff, are much the lesser.

One of the editorial crosses Dwight bore every night was reading the Paul Light column before it went downstairs and into type.

He bore it bravely as he did everything else in his life, from the bloody days of Belleau Woods to the envied scorn of his superior golf game.

As every proper managing editor should, he expressed definite opinions of what he read. These opinions were not wasted on idle air.

They were forged into imperishable memorandums which were more notorious for their verbal bark than their bite.

I'll never forget the memo I found under my door one fine spring morning:

"DEAR PAUL: A fascinating column this morning. I read it with interest. I read it again, and again, and again. What was it all about? Dwight."

He had right to wonder. I read it over again and darned if I could answer his question.

Dwight had a disturbing habit of being right.

Another of his triumphs I'll always treasure is the brief, and to the point memo:

"PAUL: Plaasa chack tha lattar "a" in your typawritar. And than claan it, dammit. I can't tall from your copy whathar you maan 'a' or 'a.' Sincaraly, your managing aditor, Dwight Jonas."

When I was a young reporter, Dwight quite frankly frightened me.

He was lean on both bylines and back slaps.

There was no story I wrote which would glean the barest of compliments from his lips. In fact anyone I considered a major journalistic triumph he would agree wasn't too bad but did I notice the sheriff's name was spelled with two "l's" instead of one?

The man obviously had not heard—I thought.

But that was until one confused night when a downtown building blossomed into flames.

Inexperienced, bewildered and frightened I took off on a dead run to cover the blaze. I arrived at the scene only to discover I'd left my camera back in the office.

When I dashed back in, Jones barked, "Why are you back so soon?"

I had to admit I'd forgotten my camera.

Grabbing it, I dashed out again.

At the fire I discovered now I'd forgotten the film.

The fire was waning. The flames were going and only threads of oily smoke remained. Oh, how I dreaded going back into that office and admitting the second boo-boo of the night.

But go back I did and admitted my foolishness.

The roof didn't fall. Instead Dwight grinned and took a young cub aside.

"It happens to the best," he said. "But it happens only once, remember that, from this you'll learn to stop and think before you run."

But in case I ever did forget, Dwight kept a blank sheet of photographic paper in his top drawer.

Whenever I got a bit too big for my editorial britches, he'd crook a come here finger.

He'd fish out that thumbworn picture of nothing and say, "Remember?"

Yes; I remembered.

And I'll never forget that I have worked for a newspaperman's newspaperman, Dwight B. Jones.

Montana: The Frontier Went Thataway

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES E. MURRAY
OF MONTANA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, February 24, 1958

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Montana: The Frontier Went Thataway," written by Mr. Herbert Howarth and appearing in the March issue of Harper's magazine.

Mr. Howarth is an Englishman who was privileged to spend a term at Montana State University in Missoula.

Mr. Howarth aptly observes that anyone in his senses would rather live there—in Montana—than anywhere else in the world.

He was particularly impressed with Missoula, situated on the western slope of the Rocky Mountains between Glacier and Yellowstone National Parks.

However, the author leaves one impression which needs correction. He refers to the seemingly great amount of leisure in Montana. I am afraid he confused leisure with unemployment.

Montana now stands, I regret to say, highest in the Nation in the percentage of unemployed workers who are covered by unemployment insurance. Thirteen percent of the insured workers in Montana are now jobless.

The picture of Montana which he paints so prettily is rapidly being darkened by the specter of unemployment—depression, if you please, on the farms, in the mines, in the forests, and along Main Street.

Mr. President, the rising unemployment in my State and in other States is further indication of the need for prompt executive decisions, legislation and appropriations to develop our great natural resources, to provide full employment, to make this Nation of ours truly great and to help our people achieve a full and better life.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MONTANA: THE FRONTIER WENT THATAWAY
(By Herbert Howarth)

We stopped one evening to buy cream at a farm where Missoula edges the mountains,

beyond which Montana becomes Idaho. It was a small farm, started a generation and a half ago by homesteaders from middle Europe. The strong-featured grandmother who poured cream for us in the kitchen, still talked with a Hungarian chime in her voice. The family was just sitting down to supper: to cottage cheese and chives, a bowl of steaming buttered corn, another of giant potatoes, a baked meat loaf in 2 inches of tomato sauce, coffee. The cutlery was sterling, heavy and good. Revere saucepans shone on the range. A small farm, but its prosperity made us, with European scenes still fairly fresh in our memory, reflect, "Who in Europe today has a farm like this?"

We were, as that comparative way of putting it shows, still fairly recent arrivals. My wife was born in Switzerland, I in Britain, and we were in Montana for the academic year—I was lecturing at Montana State University's Missoula campus. This was not our first sight of the United States; we had enjoyed previous stays at other American universities; but it was our first spell in the Rocky Mountains.

As we came out, I looked across the plantation of raspberry canes. The hills were pleasant in the sunset. A vacant lot beyond the farm was marked, "5 acres for sale."

"Why are we just visitors?" I asked my wife. At that moment it seemed near perfection to have the genial productive life of Missoula, to settle into the rhythm of its hard, clean winters and fruitful summers.

If we could have acted on that thought, would we really have liked it? Arrivals stream steadily into Missoula, but it doesn't keep a hold on all of them. It is growing, but it has a quick turnover of transients. Newcomers separate into two distinct groups: those who find the promise of a satisfying life in it and will stay; those who come hopefully, but now are restless and will move on.

For Missoula confronts you with this test: can you be content with what is good, relaxed, unconsciously kindly, but short of the stimuli of larger cities? Or must you have, to buoy you, that typical modern urban life where a complex, saturated law and culture flow above a lower level of complex, saturated antilaw and vice? There are no double levels in Missoula. A minimum of urbanity, maybe, but with it a minimum of trouble. Missoula, like all Montana, has its contradictions, some of which I will try to pin down, but they are innocent, transparent.

MONEY AND PASSION

The first thing about Missoula is its affluence. It insists on the newest in living styles. It puts more up-to-date cars on the street, per capita, than I have seen in a prosperous Michigan town of the same size near the automobile plants. It is building impressive and expensive houses up all the creeks and canyons and equipping them lavishly. Even in the older houses the interiors have comfort and charm.

Beyond the perimeter and into the hills obvious up-to-dateness diminishes, but spending power is abundant. The day before Christmas Missoula filled with families from outlying ranches. Leathery men, girls in rough cowboy trousers with yellow hair trailing to the base of their spines, piled out of cars and practically stripped the stores. The packed toy basement of Montgomery Ward had, at dusk on Christmas Eve, been emptied of all but 3 or 4 bicycles.

What is extraordinary is that collecting this spending power does not produce tensions or pressure. No one in Montana is in a hurry. If there were barometers of public anxiety, installed like the temperature clocks over the city banks, they would register low all the way from Glacier Park to Glendive. Men take their jobs, including the heavy and dangerous jobs in forest or mine, at a leisurely pace. The natural resources teeming on the flanks of the divide seem to turn to money easily enough to obviate competition. Where there's enough for everybody, there's no need to be acrimonious rivalries. In fact, the norm of Montana is mutual helpfulness. This sense of security in abundance actually seems to make for more efficiency rather than less, and it has one definite result: a margin of free time for everybody.

The usual problem of leisure is what to do with it. The old Puritans hated leisure because their experience was that very few people knew how to use it except badly. Missoula and its neighbors have, I think, only a modicum of the depleting kind of leisure routines. There is a modicum of drinking: cases of bourbon are wheeled in high pyramids out of the State liquor store into waiting cars. There is a modicum of gambling. But these international phenomena never go far in Missoula, never culminate in violence or public unpleasantness. The reason is that male energy is happily mated to a pleasure always available a mile or two from the doorstep. Western Montana is the country of sport: of the primitive, basic sports, hunting and fishing; and, after that, mountain climbing and skiing.

Missoula men invest their passions in these sports. A young student wrote to me: "In the month of September I feel the urge to go hunting. I just can't wait to get sighted in on a deer. I am hunting continually in my subconscious mind." On Sunday evenings in the fall the cars roll back townward with an elk or moose, clotted with blood, over roof or bonnet, and turn it in at their freezer locker. Occasionally a hunter doesn't come home, for they're a trigger happy and not too prudent crowd and have been known to pick each other off, or drill a station wagon, by mistake for a deer. In the skiing weeks—a lovely subzero season, when the morning sun comes up orange on the snow—there are new casualties daily swinging on crutches into office or classroom. But in nonchalant Montana nobody minds.

In fact, this sport on the hills and in the rivers is probably the source of the easy tempo and mental cleanness of Missoula. The folks who close their offices or clinics as early as they can on Friday afternoon; disappear up the creeks, and come back brown and smiling to the job on Monday, renew their energy while they use it. They remake themselves with age-old sports that play mind and muscle at the pace of nature.

HUGGING TOGETHER

The women, though they do ski and shoot (and once or twice a year fell the bear that intrudes in the backyard), are not focused on sport to the same extent. To handle their leisure—and no European woman would credit how much leisure they have—the follow the regular American trend and invent a round of group activities. They have created enough clubs in Missoula to program the week 2 or 3 times over: religious, charitable, astro-theosophical, literary, factfinding, fact-dispensing clubs; Friday Clubs that meet on Wednesday, As You Like It Clubs.

Every male is tempted to caricature club work, in Missoula or anywhere else. But it has a value. It involves at lease a minimal sense of social responsibility, produces heightened social consciousness; and some of the clubs require a program of reading, especially the network of book clubs that members of the university have set up (giving their own time) through the country districts over a hundred miles' radius. It is obvious that in isolated areas the book clubs may be the only—and certainly can be a significant—point of exchange of ideas. Still, within the area of Missoula itself there are too many clubs. What people are likely nowadays to need more in a town of 22,000 is a pause in the gregarious life. One or two nights a week might, as an experiment, be publicly declared private nights. Instead, the ladies contrive pretexts to get together 3 times every 24 hours.

This hugging together in the mountain communities is surely a folkway formed in pioneer days and out of pioneer conditions, where neighborliness was a necessity against loneliness, accident, and illness. The frontier customs are still alive in Missoula. New arrivals are hailed with a party and presents, and local businesses send round their version of the Welcome Wagon with vouchers and invitations. When there is sickness, every neighbor comes with help and food from her kitchen. When you are in difficulties on the road, every passer-by stops and helps.

Is it also a pioneer tradition that makes Rocky Mountain men prefer plain wives? I noticed that of 20 girls in a group I met, 2 had engagement rings—they were the pleasantly plain girls of the group. Most wives in the city look similar. Sometimes, thinking over this sociological phenomenon, I imagined that it conformed with the male experience in frontier conditions: the old experience that beauty causes trouble and that a fellow can be almost damned in a fair wife. Montana has left many of its pretty girls single, although there is reportedly a girl shortage in the State. The desirable girl is the straightforward girl, who will be master of the house, hold the bankbook, drive firmly to the chairmanship of a telephone committee (and so bolster her husband's standing), produce a litter of young, and insist annually on throwing out the old appliances and buying new models.

Incidentally, although they have the latest appliances and superb kitchens, and demonstrate recipes to each other in their clubs, only a few wives can cook (and even these seldom do). Rich Montana—which spends generously on appliances, fishing tackle, and guns—is frugal on food. The monthly food budget is modest and is the first to be cut in any domestic economizing, and there is a tendency to save by taking margarine instead of butter or extending fresh milk with powdered milk. To a Britisher this is an unexpected feature; my wife contrasted the way in which food is the first priority on a British family budget while the economies are on appliances and equipment. This is partly because Britain undervalues a wife's time and labor, my wife commented; but she also asked whether the steady eating that goes on in otherwise austere Britain is, by a parodox, actually a symptom of the austerity and the paucity of goods. The fact that a place of abundance like Montana rates eating low on a list of activities suggests that eating, in any quantities beyond a very low minimum, is only a psychological necessity, and that the people who are prosperous, both actually and psychologically, can grow and thrive without much eating. Certainly Montanans grow and thrive.

IS IT PROPER OR LEGAL?

It seems curious that Missoula has not attracted more women doctors. As far as I could check in conversation and from the telephone book, no woman physician was practicing there last year. A woman gynecologist could make a fortune, for the town is observant of the proprieties, reticent in personal relations.

Propriety, too, may be a carryover from frontier traditions, when anyone with sense would avoid provocativeness. I should say, however, that to a transatlantic visitor America as a whole seems formal, ceremonious, discreet, attentive to the proprieties. Lurid stories are sometimes told us regarding the big cities of the East or the Pacific, but in brief passage through these it has not been my luck to confirm them. J. D. Salinger's Catcher saw marvels through uncurtained hotel windows in New York, but I did not. Whereas from a 9 p. m. electric train threading the London suburbs.

But while Missoula completely respects an unwritten code of behavior between persons, it is superbly nonchalant in its relations with the officially written and impersonal law. The town treats its police with an indifference so unconscious and genuine that there isn't even humor in it. Half the drivers have no licenses. No one thinks of going in to pay a parking fine, or of answering a summons to court. Cars are to be registered by January 31, but no one hastens, and the law acquiesces by gently moving its deadline onward month by month.

This is a typical Main Street incident: A rancher is sitting at the wheel of his car, double parked, staring at a store. A highway patrolman passes in the opposite direction, stops level with him, hoots to call his notice. He stares at the store, doesn't move his head. Another hoot. When I next look round, the patrolman has moved on and the rancher is still double parked.

The attitude runs all through Montana and is significant—but not alarmingly significant. It means a simple dislike for regimentation. It is possible just because there is little lawlessness of the criminal degree; it is securely anchored in every man's certainty that he can rely on himself and his neighbors for sound behavior and honesty. A newcomer from the East will characterize Missoula as an extraordinarily honest town, and the absolute honesty and reliability contribute to the overall absence of tension. You can feel confident in every transaction.

Little crime in Montana, and little vice. A girl whose father owns a night club in another Montana city has assured me that the nocturnal offerings of the State are clean. She never saw vice in any tangled sense of the word till she saw California. I don't know whether she is right about California, but I find it easy to think her report on Montana is accurate.

Her remark about California arises, I fancy, from a widely prevalent Montanan conception of that State, which is just near enough to be the natural objective for the ambitious, just far enough to be the screen for strange and colorful projections. California is the Montanan's heaven and hell. It is heaven in its opportunities: once there, they tell each other, you never leave. It is hell in its supposed complications: you must keep an impassive face as you walk those west coast streets, or your glance will be taken as an invitation. Having met in Oakland and Los Angeles the same quiet correctness as elsewhere, I suppose that my friends who say this are only doing what is currently popular: localizing the mythical perversions of our time elsewhere.

A LEAP IN THE DARK

Quite independently of these fantasies, Montana feels a strong pull from the coast. Those transients who do not think they can adapt to Missoula's life will move on into Washington State, then perhaps work southward. For transients, that is all very well. It is not so obviously well if young men and women growing up in Montana homes come under the same magnetism, or, for that matter, if the somewhat fainter pull of the East draws them. There may be—and I believe that there already is—an outflow of the brightest minds, which the State cannot afford to lose.

The excellence of Montana's State University system actually sharpens this problem, though it also promises the best hope of a solution. The university has units in a number of centers. I saw only the Missoula unit, but if the others are as good, they are very good. A tiptop faculty teaches there. Many of the men have come from other States, deliberately choosing the mountains because, they say, the students bring unspoiled minds to their work, free from the sophisticated resistances that are sometimes a product of urban growing up.

It is remarkable to watch the interaction of faculty and students. When they arrive as freshmen, the boys and girls sometimes bring barely the first rudiments of academic habits of mind. They may have come from small, lonely, rural schools. Or, if they have had the fortune to grow up in a town (say, in Missoula itself with its splendid new million-dollar county school), they may have, offsetting their better academic preparation, a fear of privacy, like their elders'—in the dorms they shy away from the few single rooms and choose shared rooms, where they prevent each other from studying.

On the other hand, almost all young Montanans have an important asset: they have a knowledge of life that comes from spending vacations in responsible and tricky jobs: logging, trucking, tractor handling. Unlike the young in other places, where maturing still has to follow learning, they have begun to mature before they have begun to learn in the academic sense. They are all the readier to take in that kind of learning. They are gawky in their freshman year, but in the next two the interaction with the faculty begins to show, and in the fourth year they talk and write as men and women of high caliber.

Then comes the dilemma. The good student, in proportion to the extent he has been stimulated, wants urban pleasures that he has encountered in print in the process of learning. His town cannot supply enough of them, and his appetite is urgent. The pull from out of State becomes irresistible.

It is true that this exodus may be good for the rest of the Nation. But Montana needs its best products. Startling technical developments are imminent. New resources are being tapped, new industries settled. Over the next 10 years the face of the towns, even the skyline itself, may be transformed. These coming changes are necessary, and it would be as mad to resist them as it has always been mad and impossible to halt technical progress; and no one wants to. Almost no one is even thinking about the matter. Only a few thoughtful men are pointing out that the changes should be regulated, so that they shall not extinguish the graces and inner strength of present Montana: the ease, the sense of ample time and space, and the concomitant friendly honesty.

Montana is going to make its leap forward in any case, but at this moment it is shaping for a leap in the dark.

Just because Missoulans think individually, not in civic terms, they cannot easily plan for a problem like this. They feel that Missoula grew naturally across the lane that led from the mountains through the canyons to the eastern plains—the lane the Indians always used and the railway surveyors inevitably adopted—and that this process could not be bettered. Ever since the 1880's Missoula has been an active subcenter of the regional railway network; it has absorbed flour-milling and sugar-refining plants. So today when it is being offered its share in the new industries springing up all over the State, it is tempting for Missoulans to say: "Let them come. We have space for them all." But if they look about them they may see, even now, as a byproduct of the last 10 years' growth, warning signs that expansion can throw a spray of physical ugliness—like the straggling tin-can jungle along the main approaches.

As I said earlier, new arrivals face the problem of whether to stay in Missoula or push on to the coast. At present both alternatives are pleasant. The man lucky enough to have an equable Horatian temperament stays in Montana and enjoys his Sabine life at its kindest; the other man pushes to the Pacific and has his motley and culture. But in 10 years Missoula itself may be a motley, a scar on the hills.

What insurance can be taken up against this prospect? That depends on the extension and intensification of the university's work. Its teachers can communicate to students and parents their sense of the urgency of local needs. They can also work out and communicate a philosophy of public planning which will not damage the easy spirit that is part of the character of present Montana. What is needed among the students is a seeping awareness that, though it is good to go out of state for a taste of the world, it is even better to come back and play an influential role at home. The university already contains some striking instances of this process in action: its president, Carl McFarland, a brilliant man, formerly active in national affairs, came home to give his energies and considerable vision to strengthening the university that produced him; the faculty includes talented local men who went to Yale or Berkeley and came back to live and to help.

POSTSCRIPT

I add a line to these notes on the way east from Montana. The more miles fall behind, the more I realize the beauty of Missoula. To the newcomer the beauty is not promptly evident: the mountains may seem less erect and impressive, the life a fraction less robust, than he had supposed. But it will steal into him imperceptibly every day, lent by the changing lights on the hills, the resinous air, the pulsing rivers.

Anyone in his senses would rather live there than anywhere else in the world. Anyone who has been there would want to keep the beauty in Montana. It seems to me, at this moment of writing, that there is a broad national reason why America has a stake in keeping that beauty alive. As the Westerns on TV make clear, America loves her frontier tradition. The frontier has become an image of purity—of a moment when the mind was adventurous, courage high, and when the continent opened up at the thrust of these virtues. There is sentiment around the image, but it has a real center. Clear of sentiment, true and natural, a nuclear something of the frontier spirit is retained in Montana.

The Brussels Fair

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RAY J. MADDEN
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 24, 1958

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, the following editorial by H. B. Snyder, editor of the Gary Post-Tribune, should bring to the attention of Congress our responsibility before the world in participating in the Brussels Fair.

We spent billions on our mutual-security and defense programs but this expenditure will pay large dividends in the contest of winning good will and world opinion.

THE BRUSSELS FAIR

At the coming Brussels World's Fair, one of the biggest and most intelligently conceived in history, the United States will have a rare opportunity to portray for millions of visitors the exciting story of its achievements and its hopes for the future.

It is an opportunity we should grasp eagerly. American prestige is only just beginning to come back from the depths to which it sank after Russia's 1957 satellite launchings.

The Brussels exposition, to run 7 months from April 17, gives us a remarkable platform upon which to display the full range of

American life. Belgium is going to great lengths to provide the participating nations with an expansive physical and cultural setting.

But unless Congress changes its tune, the United States is likely to lose rather than gain in prestige at Brussels. Thus far Congress has voted only $12,345,000 for American participation. This is only about a fifth of the $60 million Russia will spend, not including $10 million in related propaganda activities.

The United States will have a beautiful pavilion, carrying out a challenging architectural concept. But unless Congress votes the additional $2 million President Eisenhower has requested, the American pavilion will operate on an 8-hour-day schedule.

Visitors passing our building will find the doors locked at 6 p. m. But they will be able to visit the large Soviet hall nearby, and the other major exhibits, for 4 more hours.

This is only a part of the story. The Soviet Union is planning to send its finest singers, actors, ballet dancers, and other performers. It will present impressive scientific and industrial exhibits. Even West Germany will be represented during the fair by its five major opera companies.

On the other hand, the United States has projected only modest displays and cultural programs. Our leading singers and others have protested over their inadequacy.

We are a nation of fine, vigorous musical and theatrical traditions. The reaction has been excellent when we have sent any of our stars on foreign tours. Our scientific stature is world legend. But evidently some in Congress do not see the point of proving it to a world that has begun to have doubt.

Even if our shaky prestige were not involved—and it very much is—one would think that national pride alone would prevent us from going to Brussels looking like the tag end of the parade.

Address of the Honorable Carmine G. DeSapio

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 18, 1958

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I commend to the attention of our colleagues an incisive and eloquent enunciation of the practices and policies of the big businessman's administration of President Eisenhower.

The Honorable Carmine DeSapio, in the following address delivered before the annual dinner of the New York State Democratic Committee, shows clearly how the administration has broken faith with the American people:

REMARKS OF THE HONORABLE CARMINE G. DESAPIO, DEMOCRATIC NATIONAL COMMITTEEMAN AND SECRETARY OF STATE OF THE STATE OF NEW YORK, AT THE ANNUAL DINNER OF THE NEW YORK STATE DEMOCRATIC COMMITTEE, NEW YORK CITY, SATURDAY, FEBRUARY 15, 1958.

Any gathering of Democratic leaders affords us opportunity to restate not only our party objectives but our party duties to the community and the Nation. To others this evening I leave the pleasant task of outlining new goals and programs. For myself, I should like to discuss an obligation—our party obligation to compel the national administration to deal frankly and truthfully with the people of our country. It is our unescapable duty to hold that administration to the highest standards of candor and accuracy in setting forth our exact position in a world of peril and a period of increasing distress at home.

We cannot excuse ourselves from this duty on the ground that it might seem like carping partisanship. If international tension is sharpening, if our posture of defense is weakening, if our prestige is waning, if our problems are growing, then it is imperative, in the public interest, to call the Eisenhower administration to account. We demand a frank and complete statement of our position as to our strength abroad and our economic plight at home.

Recently a distinguished churchman demanded that as a self-governing Nation, we be told the truth—the exact, unvarnished truth. In this demand, often stated by temporal leaders, he reminds us that we are not children. We are a politically adult people who can guide ourselves in wisdom if we know the nature and dimensions of the problem we must face.

For years, we were blandly assured that we were comfortably ahead of Soviet Russia in every department of defense.

That was not true.

For years, we were told that American science, education and technology enjoyed complete superiority over the Soviet.

That was not true.

For years, we were told that we had contained Russian power and even that Russia was on the point of internal collapse.

That was not true.

For years, we were disarmingly assured that Soviet progress in atomic power, thermonuclear weapons and the ballistics field was so slow that we could keep our lead by a minimum of national energy.

That was not true.

We suddenly find ourselves faced with crisis, but we still do not know the exact shape and size of that crisis!

Of only one point are we certain: that we are not even yet exerting an effort sufficiently arduous to guarantee our national survival. And had it not been for the dramatic demonstration of growing Soviet power in its strides towards control of outer space and in the perfection of a missile which soon will have the potential of destroying our country, we would to this day be lullabied into unfounded confidence in our security.

We are a free people capable of meeting any challenge, if we are but told the truth. Our party is a political instrument capable of demanding the truth.

For months, as signs of economic distress multiplied, we were told that our domestic economy would continue on a smooth plateau of prosperity.

That was not true.

We were told that the Government's fiscal and farm policies assured us a healthy business level.

That was not true.

We were told that unemployment would be spotty and insignificant.

That was not true.

From the sad disillusionment which followed, we must conclude that the business of government is too important a business to leave to amateurs. Perhaps they have not told us the truth because they did not know the truth themselves, but if this be so, then these short-term executives, borrowed from big business, should be replaced by men who know something of the science of government and the honored art of politics. We might note parenthetically that in the Eisenhower administration the turnover in tycoons has been terrific.

The other day, a distinguished Democratic governor upheld the importance of the politician as an expert in administering public affairs. He thought, as do we, that government should be run by men skilled in its methods and wise in the ways of men. Politics, which is the technique of government, is the only profession in which a man on loan from a corporation or a public-spirited amateur is often presumed to be more competent than the specialist. How big a mistake this is, the Nation is just beginning to perceive, for these so-called hardheaded men lack not only experience but faith. The truth is the Republican administration has been afraid of democracy and of the people and so, the people have been misjudged, misled and mismanaged.

It is our duty to demand an accounting—to demand a full disclosure of the balance sheet of American strength. Armed with the facts, the American people will evolve a wise and vigilant policy at home and abroad. To help shape, serve and implement this policy, the Democratic Party promises seasoned men, promises leaders who don't regard the jobless man as a statistic, promises technicians of government who understand it for what it is—a skilled exercise in human relations in the discharge of a wise and decent program. Upon the success of such free democratic government, the fate of all western society may fatefully depend.

Every man and woman in this great banquet hall tonight is a politician. Whether you be labor leaders, teachers, industrialists, bankers, farmers, workers, housewives, or students, the fact of your interest in politics, and your support of a political party, makes you a politician. And I submit that this is an honorable designation and one which evidences acceptance of your responsibility as American citizens, and your recognition of the truth that politics is everybody's business.

We must not wait until September or October to start our election campaign. We must proudly declare ourselves now—today—to be political leaders—politicians. We must bring to every man and woman of our State not only the message of the Democratic Party but the lesson of Republican inaction and indecision. We must, each of us, declare himself and herself to be a political teacher and we must undertake a full and comprehensive program of political education designed both to tear away the curtain of hypocrisy and to bring to light the great beauty that is truth.

This is a great night for our Democratic organization. Our party is on the march. We are moving forward to greater successes and greater responsibilities. In 1957 the people of the greatest of all cities reelected Bob Wagner as mayor by a plurality close to a million. In 1954 the people of the leading State in the Nation elected Averell Harriman as governor. And in 1958 they will reelect Governor Harriman and the entire State ticket by a minimum plurality of 375,000 because the people of New York State want to place their faith, their trust, their future in our party's program and philosophy.

And, certainly, with two such examples as our dynamic mayor and our great governor—two Democrats who typify the determination of our party to serve the people in the spirit of humanity and in dedication to integrity—certainly, with these great leaders, New York once again sets the standard for progress and achievement in government.

Again may I extend to you my personal thanks as well as the thanks of our party for all that you have done. With men and women such as you in our ranks, we cannot help but achieve ever greater success for our philosophy, for our program and, most of all, for the people whom we are mandated to represent and whose welfare we are pledged to protect.

Let's Avoid Newspaper Depression

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOSEPH P. O'HARA
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 24, 1958

Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the New Ulm (Minn.) Daily Journal of February 10, 1958, entitled "Let's Avoid Newspaper Depression," by Walter K. Mickelson.

LET'S AVOID NEWSPAPER DEPRESSION

Now that the Minneapolis Tribune has gone as far as they can go in their slumming reports from the canebrakes and bayous down in the segregated lands of the divided South, they have sent Carl Rowan out in southern and southwestern Minnesota to listen to the tales of troubles of busted farmers, overextended implement dealers, and overexpanded automobile dealers. The picture Rowan presents is a frightening and a maudlin one of small towns being forced to the wall—businessmen ready to close up—and southern Minnesota business in general going to balls of fire.

The reports of this able and brilliant writer would be interesting—and even at times highly entertaining—if they weren't so dangerous, and so extremely dangerous.

With the best intentions in the world, the Minneapolis Tribune writer has become an advance man for a depression.

He does not tell the whole story. He tells just a part of it, and it is a tragic part, for some of the areas in rural America which are making an adjustment from a war to a peace economy. There is no question that the rural sections are facing something of a recession right now. Except for the war years, they have faced it for nearly 40 years. Neither is there any doubt that many small villages have a tough struggle ahead. They have been facing and meeting these adjustments ever since the flivver took the place of the horse and buggy and paved roads replaced the mud roads years ago. Years ago the farmers and people in the small towns realized they faced problems but they never tried to solve them simply by wringing their hands and talking to sympathtic reporters. They solved them by thinking and hard work!

The Tribune series would not be so dangerous if they merely provided interesting reading—and, we presume, more circulation—but they are dangerous because they solve nothing and do make people afraid of the future. If you take a slight recession and throw upon it the gasoline of fear and doubt, then sooner than one thinks we can have a blazing depression. As the man, whom most of the Star-Tribune writers revered and supported, Franklin D. Roosevelt, said in 1933, "All we have to fear is fear itself."

Since these Tribune articles have appeared we have heard men say: "Well, I was thinking of buying a new car, but I guess I will have to make the old car do. If a depression is ahead for us, I don't want to spend the money."

We have heard a farmer say: "I had planned to buy a new tractor next spring, but if we are heading for a depression, I guess I better hold up."

We know of one man who was thinking of establishing a new business which would give employment to 30 people, but he now is thinking maybe he better forget it for a while "until I see how this depression I have been reading about develops."

Fear. Fear. Fear. Make people afraid of the future, afraid to move, and you can turn even a prosperity, to say nothing of a small recession, into a roaring depression. Unreasoning fear closes factories and makes the sheriff the chief salesman at foreclosure and farm sales.

What is behind all this talk of farm depression in southern Minnesota? There is no question but what there is some basis for fact plus a frozen corn and soybean crop last fall.

The farmers have been in something of a recession ever since World War I, except for war years, because we have lost much of our world markets, and our agriculture has been producing surpluses. We have never had a realistic farm program in the last 40 years and the present President, whom the Star Tribune has supported so enthusiastically, hasn't come any closer to a peacetime solution than the others. In order to adjust themselves to the present situation, farmers have had to mechanize, farm greater acreage, and reduce the number of people employed on our farms. This has reduced the number of farms and farmers.

The small villages and non-county-seat small towns have had their troubles from these and other conditions.

Our present cities and villages were laid out 50 to 100 years ago by the railroads. Because 8 miles was a long way to travel by team and wagon or horse and buggy, the railroads laid the villages out about 8 miles apart. These cities and villages grew and prospered after a fashion until about 1908 when Henry Ford began to sell his flivvers by the millions and people demanded paved roads instead of mud. As this movement accelerated, many of the smaller villages began to have their struggles and some of them have had to fight for their lives.

There is no doubt that rural areas over this Nation and probably the world are in an age of transition. They always have been. The livery barn had to give way to the garage and the blacksmith shop has been succeeded by the automobile mechanic. The small village has a different and perhaps a lesser role to play than before. Undoubtedly the farmer who is still a competitive force in an almost noncompetitive world needs a farm program which is more realistic, sympathetic, and understanding. There is no doubt that every village, small town, and city could be helped immeasurably if they could secure one more or just one factory.

The big question is how are we going to secure any or all of these things if we all go slumming, sit and wring our hands and weep over our troubles and misfortunes. How are we going to get people to buy and take chances if we convince them we are in the midst of a depression which none of them ever realized before? How are you going to get industries to locate in southern Minnesota if capitalists believe we are all busted anyway, and that they will have to carry the tax burdens of those who have failed in business?

No. Southern Minnesota isn't busted. It's good farmers are not quitting and its hard-working and enterprising merchants are not throwing in the towel.

The vast majority are working. Our farmers are producing and we are all paying out taxes and the overwhelming majority are going ahead and are making progress.

We have invited Mr. Rowan and the Tribune to interview both sides and present the whole story and not a one-sided, gone-bust, down-the-drain picture they have presented. It isn't true. It isn't fair. And it just isn't right to one of the best sections in Minnesota.

THE HUMAN SIDE

A man lived by the side of the road and sold hot dogs.

He was hard of hearing so he had no radio.

He had trouble with his eyes so he read no newspapers.

But he sold good hot dogs.

He put up a sign on the highway to tell how good they were.

He stood by the side of the road and cried: "Buy a hot dog, Mister."

And people bought.

He increased his meat and bun orders.

He bought a bigger stove to take care of his trade.

He got his son home from college to help him.

But then something happened.

His son said, "Father, haven't you been listening to the radio? There's a big depression on. The European situation is terrible. The domestic situation is worse."

Whereupon the father thought, "Well my son has been to college. He reads the papers and he listens to the radio and he ought to know."

So the father cut down on his meat and bun orders; took down his advertising signs, and he no longer bothered to stand on the highway to sell hot dogs.

And his hot-dog sales fell almost overnight.

"You're right, son," the father said to the boy. "We are certainly in the middle of a great depression."

Address of Congressman John E. Fogarty at the 50th Anniversary of Varnum Continentals, East Greenwich, R. I., September 21, 1957

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN E. FOGARTY
OF RHODE ISLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 24, 1958

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I would like to include a speech which I delivered on the occasion of the 50th Anniversary of the Varnum Continentals at the Varnum Memorial Armory, East Greenwich, R. I., on September 21, 1957.

ADDRESS OF CONGRESSMAN JOHN E. FOGARTY AT THE 50TH ANNIVERSARY OF VARNUM CONTINENTALS, EAST GREENWICH, R. I., SEPTEMBER 21, 1957

It is a distinct privilege to be invited to the hospitable town of East Greenwich and to share with Varnum Continentals and their friends in this golden anniversary of a proud military organization. I say proud, justly proud, because it preserves the distinguishing mark of the soldier—his uniform—in the fundamental glory of its colors and its trappings at that crucial time in our country's history when our colonies earned the right to be a nation. This organization preserved the uniform as we seek in this day to preserve the liberties and the opportunities that men who wore that uniform died to preserve for us. The courage and sacrifice of 180 years ago made possible this America of today.

In keeping with its patriotic principles and its basic obedience to the Commander in Chief of us all, it is a part of this celebration that we shall toast the President of the United States. That is the privilege entrusted to me and, conscious of all that it means in this troubled hour of world crises, I propose that toast—the President of the United States.

It is a happy coincidence that our President is our guest. He finds rest and respite from the cares of office in the city of Newport which is our common pride here in Rhode Island. There is nothing of party—there can be nothing of prejudice—as we all wish him a happy stay, and a refreshing return to the burdens of the White House to which the wishes of his fellow citizens, expressed in the democracy of the ballot, have called him.

The Newport upon which our President looks is a Newport of peace and plenty. He can hardly recognize in it the wartime Newport—the Newport of the Revolutionary War. Only from the history books will he know that it felt the hand of the oppressor—the British firebrand was applied to its homes—and men, women, and children were refugees from the cruelties of the invader.

But the East Greenwich of that time knew history at first hand. It was to this town, a seaport town, that the refugees of that winter came in their suffering. And it was here out of the scanty supplies that a wartime East Greenwich could gather, that the inhabitants shared the little they had with their fellow countrymen in need.

And it was from here, musket in hand, that citizen left his plow, his books, his leisure, and set out for Massachusetts when the neighboring colony was hard pressed by the same British redcoat.

It was in that goodly throng that Nathaniel Greene marched as a private, while James Mitchell Varnum was in command.

This is the name you would perpetuate. And you have chosen well. For in the short span of his life it may be said that he summed up the ideals of obligation to his country, and symbolized the opportunities of that country, as almost a complete volume of duty and destiny.

America means opportunity for education. James Mitchell Varnum symbolized that as a graduate with honors in the very first class of Rhode Island College, later to be known as Brown University, in the year 1769. He sought to repay this opportunity to learn by teaching others. He moved on to the study of law and the civil liberties that are dear to us. He defended them, that they might pass untarnished from colonial court to the justice of a sovereign state in a confederation of States.

He was a citizen-patriot in the best sense that has given us a citizen army throughout all our history on the premise that if we are to deserve freedom, it shall be the duty of each of us to defend that freedom. He was a colonel among his neighbors, he was a general by choice of our Government, he was a general by selection of the immortal George Washington.

It was no empty title he earned in a war that was long and cruel. The cause to which great men pledged their lives, their fortunes, and their sacred honor, was fought in agony and privation. The battle of Rhode Island was bitter personal adventure to the men like Varnum who bore the brunt of it. It is hard for us to believe that our gentle State was ever the battleground of men's hates. But the American will never forget the name Valley Forge. It was more than a name to James Mitchell Varnum. It was the Gethsemane of the colonial cause. Amid its stark tragedy, no heart was braver than that of General Varnum. We can imagine the pride and satisfaction of General Washington as he named this lad of East Greenwich, the light of the camp.

We have seen Varnum as student, lawyer, and soldier. His neighbors next chose the role of statesman for him and elected him to the Continental Congress in May 1780. To this day we are indebted to him for the boldness of his ideas, the courage of his convictions, and his outspoken advocacy of liberties to chart a new nation to its destiny. He gave an example of the private citizen with an awareness of public duty which has been the bulwark of our democracy, the strength of our political system, the source of our leadership as nation after nation has passed from the prime position they once held among world governments. It is startling to recall that there does not now exist in the world any nation in the same form it knew when James Mitchell Varnum raised his voice in that Continental Congress of 1780.

Next we see Varnum in the role of expanding America, when what is now Ohio was proclaimed as the Far West. We of New England may have forgotten that we then considered the great State of Ohio as part of our territory and staked our claims there.

This was then our Northwest Territory. General Varnum accepted appointment as Federal judge for the Territory. It was truly a frontier with Marietta set for its capital and the white dwellers living behind stockades to protect them from the Indians. I mention this to indicate the sacrifice that Varnum made, leaving the comfort and peace of the neighborhood where he was admired and respected, the home that was the loveliest in all this colony, and enduring the hardships of journey by horseback to the periols and privations which were finally to claim his life. As surely as the soldier on the battlefield, General Varnum died in what others might call exile from familiar scenes but what he deemed to be his duty and an honor conferred upon him by the Nation he loved and served.

I have probably been telling you a familiar story; but I feel that here in the name of Varnum you commemorate more than the military, you pay tribute to true Americanism, to the qualities that we must be able to command in this hour if our Nation is to survive.

America has come of age in the 50 years that you mark today. The 20th century has seen a world explode more than once and has seen our country break out of its isolation into world responsibility. The musket has given way to the missile, yet the atomic age brings no more peace than the colonies knew. The great ocean has narrowed and distance is no longer a defense. Mountains are leveled as jet planes break the sound barrier. Refugees come not from Newport but from far off Hungary. We declare that we have in the atom the greatest possibilities for peace and plenty. Yet a great part of the world hungers for food, and a greater part of the world hungers for security from war's alarms.

It is not my plan nor my privilege to settle here today all the problems of the world. But I submit that the security of America's future can lie in the pattern molded by the life of James Mitchell Varnum.

In a world where science challenges the secrets of nature we must have schools. We must have educated men and women, trained to meet the threats of any nation as Varnum's education prepared him for both Congress and military command.

We must have law and men to defend it, or life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness will be the possession only of the powerful.

We must have military strength, which must also be the pride and the possession of the citizen. We must be bold enough to mark time with no chip on the shoulder, but we must be strong enough to surpass so that we may survive when our freedoms are assailed.

We must have public service. The private life and public duty, of which I have spoken, must command the respect and the response of all of us.

We must have men prepared to sacrifice. This is a sacrifice of service. It can be by the man in uniform. It can be by the man in public office. It can be by neighbor working for love of neighbor, for pride of the community, and for love of country. It is reborn in us as we appreciate the blessings God has bestowed upon this land of ours.

This is the kind of patriotism, I believe, that inspires this day. It reaches deeper than the uniform—into the human heart. It reaches back farther than 50 years. It reaches farther back than the Revolution. Farther than the name of Varnum even. But it is the inspiration of this day. It reaches back to the time when men first learned that they should live as brothers under the fatherhood of God.

Benson Paints Partial Picture of Farm Plight

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLAIR ENGLE
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 24, 1958

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. Speaker, the Sacramento Bee has written an excellent editorial regarding Mr. Benson's recent proposals, pointing out that Mr. Benson has simply failed to recognize the fact that the farmer is getting less for what he produces and paying more for what he buys and that no amount of railing about the evils of high price supports will alter those two basic facts. Mr. Benson has the responsibility of coming up with a program that faces up to the facts and shows some imagination and ingenuity in solving the dilemma in which a poor farmer finds himself.

BENSON PAINTS PARTIAL PICTURE OF FARM PLIGHT

The Eisenhower administration's farm program has had no surplus in one area—that of candor. And Secretary of Agriculture Ezra Taft Benson's performance in Sacramento did nothing to pump candor back into that program.

In 1952 when President Dwight D. Eisenhower was campaigning for his first Presidential term he stated he favored support of the farm economy at not less than 90 percent of parity and that his administration would work toward 100 percent in the market place. His current program calls for giving Benson authority to set supports as low as 60 percent.

In Sacramento Benson said agricultural exports set a new high in fiscal 1956–57. He omitted to say his own department recently announced these exports in the last half of 1957 fell 10 percent below those of the same period in 1956. Of course it is the current picture which tells the facts about the state of agriculture.

Benson also emphasized that income per person on farms last year was up 4 percent over that in 1953. Naturally per capita income is likely to increase if the number of farmers diminishes and 2,800,000 farmers have left agriculture in the last 6 years. Under such conditions per capita income may rise even while total farm income sinks. The Agriculture Department's own figures show net farm income for 1957 at $11,900,000,000, down from the $12,100,000,000 of 1956.

Benson is undoubtedly correct in arguing that the surplus problem never will be licked and stability achieved so long as the farmers can depend upon high rigid supports. But he has not confronted with candor and courage the fact the farmer still has to buy his equipment and other commodities in a largely protected area where administered

high prices prevail. So long as this condition exists there is an injustice, especially to the sound family farmer, in forcing his sector of the economy into the free market.

To be sure Benson said there is no intention to withdraw supports entirely. But the weakness in his program lies in the fact he is plunging the farm economy into a highly competitive market without first coping with the inflexibilities of other factors which affect it, especially the farm middle man and food processor. The victim is likely to be the small family type farmer.

And a more candid analysis of the farm picture would enlist greater public confidence.

Stand Your Ground on American Resources

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE S. McGOVERN
OF SOUTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 24, 1958

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, when the National Rural Electric Cooperative Association held its annual convention in Dallas, Tex., early this month, it included as one of the main speakers on its program agenda, Mr. Kenneth Holum, of Groton, S. Dak.

I am proud to say that Mr. Holum has been a close acquaintance of mine for many years. All South Dakotans have come to know him as a keen student of soil and water conservation. Dedicated to the cause of wise resource development throughout the Nation, he has devoted a great deal of his time and energies to this important issue during the last two decades, even though he has been and still is, a busy farmer.

Known throughout the Nation for his work in this field as well as the REA cooperative movement, it was only fitting that President Truman appointed him to the Missouri Basin Commission some 10 years ago. Mr. Holum is presently executive secretary of the South Dakota Association of Cooperatives and chairman of the Western States Water and Power Consumers Conference, numbering some 17 States.

Speaking of the urgent need to fully develop our precious water resources for the production of more abundant electric power, flood control, water conservation, and recreational activities, Mr. Holum told NRECA convention delegates:

The President in presenting his budget for fiscal 1959 to the Congress, said with respect to water and resources, "The construction activities of the Corps of Engineers and the Bureau of Reclamation for flood control, navigation, irrigation, water supply and power projects will be limited in 1959 to ordinary continuation of the work started in prior years." No new starts of multiple water resource projects is provided for in the fiscal 1959 budget. Moreover, in a statement delivered before the House Committee on Ways and Means on January 17, the Director of the Budget said, "Another recommendation which will hold down budget totals is that no new projects be started in fiscal 1959 for construction of water resource projects by the Corps of Engineers and the Bureau of Reclamation."

With few exceptions the only new water resources development projects that have been started during the 5 years of the Eisenhower Administration have been those which have been initiated by the Congress exclusive of the administration's recommendations, and in some cases in the face of a refusal by the administration to invest the money for these projects even after it has once been appropriated.

Let us bear in mind that of the total budget of some $72.5 billion, only $900 million, or approximately 1.24 percent, is devoted to water resources development. These are not expenditures but rather investments in America's future. Were every Bureau of Reclamation and Corps of Engineers project deleted from the budget, the savings in terms of the total $72.5 billion would be almost imperceptible. Sixty-four percent of our total budget will go to the Department of Defense for design, development and production of weapons of destruction.

We all realize that our defense must be second to none, but it is my honest conviction that the future of our country, and the future of the world, lies in resource development for abundant production. We cannot win the battle for the minds of men with weapons of destruction. In the end we will win that battle because we produce abundantly the good things that a hungry world demands and craves.

Then Mr. Holum offered this striking contrast to United States plans and efforts in the field of water and resource development:

The Russians know that a nation's mechanical power determines its strength. They have 17 hydroelectric-power projects under construction on the Volga River alone. They are building 40 great dams. Three of the 40 are bigger than Grand Coulee. They are building 1 turbine 3 times as big as any in the United States.

Discussing concepts of electric power in this Nation, Mr. Holum said:

Just a few short years ago when we began the development of the Missouri River under the Flood Control Act of 1944, shortsighted private utility executives were telling our people that when Fort Randall, Gavins Point, Big Bend, and Oahe Dams were completed, the people of South Dakota would have power running out of their ears. They told us that we would have electric current to light up the tails of hundreds of thousands of jackrabbits that were infesting our fields at the time. Now, 12 years later, everybody recognizes that we are moving into a period of critical power shortage. We anticipate a critical power shortage in the State that lies at the heart of the Missouri Basin with four great main-stem dams within its borders. Cheap power quickly finds a useful market.

Last week our concern over power supply in the Missouri Basin became more acute when Gen. G. E. Galloway, Missouri division engineer, told us that, because of the proposed budget, power from Oahe would be delayed 18 months. It is reckless extravagance with an area's resources and the Nation's welfare.

We have tremendous water resources in this country. We have great undeveloped and underdeveloped water resources that must be developed to the maximum. This Nation cannot afford the luxury of an underdeveloped Snake River. Strategically located all over the United States we have great reserves of fossil fuel. In many areas we have tremendous reserves of lignite, subbituminous and bituminous coal that have never been developed. In my own State and in our sister State of North Dakota we have a practically unlimited supply of lignite coal. Using modern technology, that lignite can generate tremendous amounts of energy at low cost. Properly integrated with the hydroelectric system on the Missouri River so that available hydropower is used for peaking instead of base loading, savings can be vastly increased. The same situation applies all over the United States. We know the techniques for large-scale developments of these resources. Before Mike Strauss and Oscar Chapman left the Department of the Interior, they had developed plans for the transmission lines of tremendously high voltage needed to transport the power which can be moved so much more cheaply than fuel. Russia builds the high-voltage transmission lines; we do not.

Urging farmers of America to stand their ground and fight for a more enlightened resource program, Mr. Holum concluded:

We should ask Congress to declare it to be this Nation's policy to develop its power resources to the maximum. This declaration must be implemented with authorizations and adequate appropriations. Rural development must be expedited, not delayed. Our atomic-energy program must be accelerated for the good of the public.

George X. Sand—Conservationist of the Year

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL G. ROGERS
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 24, 1958

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, in Florida, because of the vast number of outdoor recreational attractions, we are very conscious of the need for conservation. One of the outstanding conservationists of our State and Nation is Mr. George X. Sand, of Deerfield Beach, Fla. George Sand is well known for his writings for national outdoor and general magazines. Knowing of Mr. Sand's great interest and activity on behalf of conservation programs, it was with a great deal of pleasure that I noted that he had been selected as the conservationist of the year by the Florida Sportsmen's Clubs awards program under the sponsorship of the Florida Wildlife Federation.

The following article from the Florida Wildlife Federation sets forth the basis and reason for this outstanding award to George X. Sand:

George X. Sand of Deerfield Beach, Fla., widely known and liked writer for the national outdoor and general magazines, after being sponsored by the Anglers Club of Broward County, has been named Conservationist of the Year by the Florida Sportmen's Clubs conservation awards program.

The awards program is under the auspices of the Florida Wildlife Federation and is sponsored by the Sears Roebuck Foundation. According to Florida Wildlife Federation president Dr. H. R. Wilber the high award given Sand represents the most significant recognition of individual conservation activity made in Florida during the past 25 years.

A gold medal, a governor's certificate, and a check for $100 were presented the 43-year-old writer by Florida's Gov. LeRoy Collins at an elaborate banquet held at Tallahassee, the State capitol, on February 8. The af-

fair was attended by hundreds of leading conservationists from throughout the southeastern United States.

In selecting Sand for the top honor over many other noteworthy Florida conservationists the following highlights of the veteran writer's 1957 conservation activities were taken into consideration:

1. During the year he fought repeatedly via newspaper and national magazine articles against various threatened public land grabs and other anticonservation activities, both in his own State and throughout the United States.

2. In the spring of the year he addressed the 22d North American Wildlife Conference at Washington, D. C., traveling several thousand miles at his own expense to do so. At that time he recommended that the Coordination Act of 1946 be revised (to give the United States Fish and Wildlife Service a leg to stand on for a change) and that the Congress also abolish future attempts of the Army to reconvey existing Federal reservoirs back to the original owners at a small fraction of the improved value, and at the expense of the public for fishing, hunting and other recreational use, and further, that public access be assured taxpayers to such reservoirs built in the future. Over 61 million Americans had been provided outdoor recreation at such Federal reservoirs the year before.

(Walter Gresh, the U. S. Fish and Wildlife Service regional director for the 12 Southeastern States, subsequently described this talk that was published verbatim in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, "The best paper, with punch and facts, that I have ever heard" and the Congress has since decided to act upon Sand's recommendations.)

3. One of the public land-grab exposés which Sand made at the national magazine level earned for him an 18 horsepower outboard motor and a gold trophy as second prize in a nationwide writing contest jointly sponsored by Johnson Motors and the Outdoor Writers Association of America to encourage broader public interest in conservation.

4. During 1957, at considerable personal travel expense and inconvenience, the writer addressed in person a number of large sportsmen's groups throughout Florida to bring them firsthand observations on such timely and important conservation problems as the dangerous waste of the State's fresh water supply, the fencing off of many Florida lakes against sportsmen, ill advised filling of waterfront lands by real estate developers, the urgent need for a salt water fishing license, and so on.

5. Also throughout the year 1957 he personally contacted by either telephone, telegraph, letter or in person every elected Florida Congressman in Washington at least once in connection with such Florida conservation problems, as well as many senators and representatives at the State capitol, including Governor Collins.

6. As president of the 180-member Florida Outdoor Writers Association Sand's first project was to eliminate the strained relationship that had existed through misunderstanding between this large statewide conservation group and an even larger and equally sincere one, the Florida Wildlife Federation. He also served as 1 of the 3 pioneer committee members (the other 2 being the presidents of the FWF and the Southeastern Fisheries Association, respectively), a determined committee which months later would see a genuine spirit of good will and mutual respect emerging for the first time between the sports fishing and commercial fishery interests in Florida. One outstanding result of this was the introducing into the Florida Legislature by the commercial fishermen (who had blocked all previous attempts) the bill which has since made the snook a game fish—something that had been the dream of Florida sportsmen for years.

It is now a matter of record, also, that Sand provided the large Florida writers' organization with the best conservation administration it had enjoyed since it was formed a decade before.

7. Recognizing the vital need for bringing strongly together for the first time Florida's many large and nonaffiliated sportsmen's groups (who had remained weak through their very insistence upon maintaining what they described as their individual identity) Sand in 1957 originated and followed successfully through with the idea of forming a much-needed Florida Conservation Council, a committee to be made up of delegates from each of these independent groups, so that for the first time a single committee could speak authoritatively for the majority of the State's sportsmen. Sand enlisted the aid of such influential groups as the Florida Wildlife Federation, the Florida Audubon Society, the FOWA to make this a reality.

Sand has been writing for the past 17 years. Hundreds of his fiction, articles, and picture features have appeared in such diversified top United States publications as the Saturday Evening Post, Life, Argosy, True, Field & Stream, Outdoor Life, Parade, Popular Mechanics, Farm Quarterly, many more. He lives with his wife, Phyllis (also a professional writer and photographer) and two daughters, Gail, 11, and Karen, 9, on the Florida lower east coast. His Conservationist of the Year award represents the first such honor to be bestowed by the recently created Sportsmen's Clubs Conservation Awards Program. Intent of the program in future years will be to further the proper utilization and conservation of resources of the State of Florida—soils, waters, minerals, forests, and wildlife, through an awards program designed to bring about the greatest interest in conservation projects and to give proper recognition to those persons and organizations who make outstanding contributions to the general resource and welfare of the community, region, and the State.

Water Pollution Control

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN A. BLATNIK
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 24, 1958

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Speaker, the Nation's conservationists and outdoor enthusiasts have been in the forefront in our battle to save the Nation's rivers and streams from the blight of pollution. One of the leaders in this fight has been Mr. Charles H. Callison, conservation director of the National Wildlife Federation.

Mr. Callison testified this morning before the House Subcommittee on Intergovernmental Relations in opposition to the recommendations of the Joint Federal-State Action Committee that the treatment plant construction grant program under Public Law 660 be returned to the States. Representing the Nation's conservationists, Mr. Callison gives a penetrating and excellent analysis of the pollution problem and the Joint Committee's recommendations.

His statement follows:

The National Wildlife Federation is a nonprofit, citizens' organization made up of State wildlife federations and sportsmen's leagues in the various States, Alaska, and the District of Columbia. The combined memberships of these State affiliates, adding up to more than 2 million persons, make the federation the largest conservation organization in America.

The hunters and anglers of this Nation, Mr. Chairman, and others interested in the out-of-doors and wildlife conservation, have long been aware of the creeping and cancerous growth of water pollution. They have long warned about, and fought against, this destructive menace that only recently, in years of growing water shortages, has burst shockingly upon the consciousness of most Americans.

The National Wildlife Federation was organized in 1937, a movement growing out of the first North American Wildlife Conference, which was called by President Franklin D. Roosevelt in 1936. Ever since that date the federation has been campaigning for effective water pollution control at both State and Federal levels.

Many of the State federations have been fighting the battle much longer. The League of Ohio Sportsmen, for example, will observe their 50th anniversary next month. Even the New Mexico Wildlife and Conservation Association, in the relatively youthful West, had its origin before the First World War. Others have acquired long records of service and respectable antiquity exceeding that of the National Federation.

The reason for doing this bit of bragging about our history, Mr. Chairman, is simply to emphasize the fact that the National Wildlife Federation, and its member groups, is no Johnnie-come-lately in the field. Our State federations have been campaigning, educating, pleading and fighting for effective State laws and adequate State programs in pollution control for decades. Indeed the organized sportsmen were the first sizable body of citizens to sound the alarm that this Nation could not go on dumping untreated sewage and industrial wastes into the public waters that are the very lifeblood of the economy.

This isn't surprising. Hunters and fishermen tend to become conservationists. This is because they get closer to nature than most other citizens, excepting perhaps farmers and many farmers are also sportsmen. They learn to appreciate natural resources, to understand ecological principles. They get out on the streams where they can smell the stench and see the destruction caused by pollution.

In 1954 we devoted National Wildlife Week to a nationwide campaign aimed at awakening the public to the menace of water pollution. During that campaign, and subsequently in an official statement of policy, the federation declaimed the following objectives:

"1. Sound and effective pollution control laws and programs in every State.

"2. Adequate Federal authority to clean up pollution in interstate waters in cases where the States, interstate or private agencies cannot or will not do the job.

"3. Adequate sewage treatment facilities in every community; adequate waste prevention or waste treatment by every industry.

"4. Adequate research by public and private agencies aimed at improving the efficiency of sewage treatment and at solving difficult problems of industrial waste control."

Mr. Chairman, the contamination of the public waters of America by dumping untreated sewage and industrial wastes into them is nothing more than the literal, physical destruction of natural resources. What happens when a stream is befouled and poisoned by pollution?

Its waters cannot be used for household purposes except after costly treatment.

Industries requiring clean water for their processes have to seek plant sites elsewhere.

This adds to the cost of commodity production, depresses the polluted community.

The waters cannot be safely used for swimming, boating, water skiing, or other forms of aquatic recreation. Parks and playgrounds along the shorelines must be posted with warning signs.

Farmers cannot use the stream to irrigate their fields or water their livestock.

Fish die in these waters. Waterfowl and other wildlife shun them.

Real estate values decline along the polluted river, because no one wants to live above the stench of an open sewer.

All this, gentlemen, is sheer waste. It is worse than waste, it is needless destruction of natural resources that this Nation can no longer afford.

Since the industrial and urban growth of this Nation began, we have fallen steadily behind in our puny efforts to check and abate water pollution. Except for one short period of years in the 1930's when Federal public-works money was available for sewage-plant construction, the volume of untreated wastes poured into our streams has steadily increased. Each year we lost more new miles of stream and shoreline to pollution than we were able to rescue from pollution.

By 1956 the situation had passed the point of national toleration. In that year a conservation-minded Congress passed Public Law 660. It is a moderate law that emphasizes, and encourages, State and local responsibility for pollution abatement. Its enforcement provisions are benign but it is, nevertheless, somewhat stronger than the toothless Taft-Barkley Act of 1948 that it amended and replaced.

Public Law 660 has one provision that does give this Nation its first real chance to get abreast of the sewage problem. This is the construction-grants program. This is the program that was opposed at the time and has been under fire ever since by certain trade associations representing industries that have a vested interest in water pollution.

Mr. Chairman, the National Wildlife Federation, together with all its State and local affiliates, worked hard for Public Law 660. To my certain knowledge, because I personally attended all the committee hearings and took part in many of the conferences leading to its enactment, it was supported also by every other national conservation organization. It had the endorsement and active support of the Garden Clubs of America, the National Council of State Garden Clubs, the General Federation of Women's Clubs, and of other similar organizations.

When it was passed, Public Law 660 was hailed as a great victory by conservationists up and down this land. Indeed, we called it the greatest single accomplishment of the 84th Congress in the field of natural-resources management.

These same organizations, to a man and woman, have supported appropriations for the programs authorized in Public Law 660, including the construction-grants program. We shall continue to support them.

Although the construction-grants program has only fairly gotten off the ground, the record to date proves our faith and our hard work were not misplaced. Sewage-treatment plants are now being built by American towns and cities at a faster rate than ever before in American history. The polluted streams and beaches are becoming clean.

Even the so-called Joint Federal-State Action Committee, whose recommendation we are here opposing, estimates the dollar volume of waste-treatment construction in 1957 would total $475 million, nearly 25 percent more than in 1956 and about double the annual average from 1952 to 1955.

The stimulation provided by Public Law 660 has been all the more remarkable, and encouraging, in view of the fact that the municipal bond market in 1957 was the worst since 1935. It is quite evident that hundreds of the smaller cities could not have financed new sewage-treatment facilities, and would not have started them, without the aid and incentive of the Federal grants.

In the 14 months since the grants program actually got started in December 1956, until the end of January 1958, a total of $72,543,844 was approved in grants for 875 projects, total construction cost of which is figured at $367,064,915. But, as of January 31, 1958, there were applications on local drawing boards or being processed in State and regional offices for other grants totaling $87,710,668, to assist in the construction of some 922 installations estimated to cost a total of about $700 million. This clearly shows, Mr. Chairman, that the stimulation brought about by Public Law 660 is only now beginning to make itself felt.

It also indicates that an annual program of $100 million in Federal grants would be more realistic, and more in line with national pollution-control needs, than the $50 million authorized in Public Law 660. You will recall that, as originally introduced by Congressman BLATNIK, this legislation proposed $100 million in Federal incentive grants annually up to a total of $1 billion over a period of years.

It is an interesting theory, Mr. Chairman, that if the Federal Government discontinues this program the States will step in and provide financial aids to take up the slack. It is an interesting theory, but we know from bitter experience it will not work. A few State legislatures might act promptly to carry on the program without interruption, but delays up to 10 years and longer would inevitably occur in most States. Meantime, we would once again be falling further and further behind in the pollution-control problem.

For one thing, we know from long and recent experience that the same groups that are now doing their best to kill the Federal grants program, would be on hand in the lobbies of the State legislatures to oppose stronger State laws, and to block adequate appropriations. These are the groups that have a vested interest in polluted streams. They are the same groups that sparked the unsuccessful attempt on the floor of the House last year to knock out 1958 appropriations for the construction-grants program.

The theory that the Federal Government has no responsibility for water-pollution control also is utterly without validity. So many major streams and watersheds, so many metropolitan areas, are interstate in character. It is only through Federal action, in cooperation with State and local agencies, that the toughest pollution problems can be overcome. The knotty problem of the Potomac, right here on the doorstep of the Federal Government, is a case in point.

If it is valid to argue that spending Federal funds to help clean up municipal sewage is a misuse of Federal tax dollars, it is equally valid to argue that all flood-control works should be paid for by the local beneficiaries and by the landowners on whose lands the floodwaters originate. It is possible to calculate with reasonable accuracy the proportion of overflow waters that are contributed to a stream system as a result of land misuse by farmers and ranchers in a watershed. Do we try to argue that the farmers who own and operate the watershed lands should pay for flood-control works downstream? As a matter of fact, the Federal Government contributes from its general revenues through several programs to help the farmers install soil conservation and water-control measures and to protect the watersheds from excessive runoff. All the taxpayers of the Nation contribute to the cost of mainstream flood control.

There is just as much reason, based on broad public benefits and the interlocking community of national interest, behind Federal grants to stimulate the construction of sewage-treatment works for pollution abatement.

In conclusion, Mr. Chairman, we wish to reemphasize that the problem of water pollution in this Nation demands action, not theory.

We are getting action at last under Public Law 660. The conservationists of this country will oppose, and will fight with all the resources at their command, any attempt to scuttle, or to weaken, any part of the Federal program.

At the same time, they will continue to work, with all the resources at their command, for stronger State laws and more adequate State appropriations for pollution control and abatement. They will throw their organized strength behind municipal bonding issues and other local actions to clean up the polluted waters.

I make the above predictions, Mr. Chairman, as statements of fact. This is one issue on which conservationists have no doubts. On this issue we know how we stand. For the immediate economy and public welfare, and for the long-range security of America, water pollution must be cleaned up.

Statement by the Honorable John Foster Dulles, Secretary of State, Before the House Committee on Ways and Means in Support of the President's Proposals for an Extension of the Trade Agreements Act, February 24, 1958

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 24, 1958

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, the Secretary of State, Hon. John Foster Dulles, made an excellent statement in behalf of the President's proposals for an extension of the Trade Agreements Act before the Ways and Means Committee today. Although this statement will be contained in the printed hearings of the Ways and Means Committee, I believe it will be beneficial if the House membership had this statement available for consideration at this time. Accordingly, I am having it inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD.

The statement follows:

STATEMENT BY THE HONORABLE JOHN FOSTER DULLES, SECRETARY OF STATE, BEFORE THE HOUSE COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS IN SUPPORT OF THE PRESIDENT'S PROPOSALS FOR AN EXTENSION OF THE TRADE AGREEMENTS ACT, FEBRUARY 24, 1958

I

I am here to support the President's proposal to extend and strengthen the now-expiring Trade Agreements Act.

That proposal has two main aspects:

1. It is designed to benefit our national economy by enabling us to share more of the world's trade and commerce.

The Secretary of Commerce and the Secretary of Agriculture have convincingly shown the importance of the President's proposal from this domestic standpoint.

2. The President's proposal is also designed to help make the United States secure against external danger.

It is that aspect of the President's program that I today ask you to consider.

II

The reciprocal trade agreements legislation of the United States, enacted in 1934 and extended and strengthened since then on 10 different occasions, has by now become symbolic, the world over, of economic cooperation as a substitute for economic warfare. It stands for the proposition that everyone is better off by exchanging goods rather than by trying to be self-sufficient.

Following the depression of 1929, many nations sought to revive their economies by building up trade barriers in terms of tariffs, quotas, and currency barriers. The consequent decline in world trade brought about, by 1934, extreme nationalism in several countries and that was a major cause of World War II.

Since World War II, the trend has happily been in the other direction, at least so far as the free world is concerned. The United States, by far the greatest single economic unit, has been an indispensable leader in this respect. Our Trade Agreements Act, as renewed and strengthened from time to time, has reflected a purpose to build up, and not pull down, international trade.

Today this is more than ever important. That increased importance results from the grave dangers that we face from Communist imperialism.

III

I shall speak first of the physical danger that we face.

Since 1955 when the Trade Agreements Act was last extended, there have been revolutionary developments in the instrumentalities of war. Hydrogen bombs have been developed in quantity, with explosive power measured in terms of megatons, and not mere kilotons. The means of their delivery have been vastly increased, not merely by supersonic planes but by missiles hurled through outer space and traversing distances running into the thousands of miles.

For the first time in history, the United States is subject to major devastation from weapons launched from foreign soil.

That danger is met, and our peace is preserved, by one fact and one fact alone—that is that the free world is not disunited, but works together and provides dispersed power to retaliate against armed aggression. That dispersal is a vital element. If our retaliatory power were located only in the United States, it would not be a dependable deterrent for it might be largely obliterated by a sudden blow. It takes cooperation all around the world to assure that Soviet armed aggression will be deterred.

This cooperation cannot be sustained on a purely military basis, with disregard of economic factors. The United States is the economic heart of the free world. The economies of other free nations depend, in large part, on the flow of trade—their economic life blood—to and from the United States.

The dependable and effective use of joint military facilities in other lands faces inevitable collapse unless the governments and people associated with us feel that their relationship with the United States contributes not merely to military security but also to indispensable economic security.

Does this mean that our friends and allies may try to coerce us into trade arrangements which, from our standpoint are improvident? It does not mean that. Never has any foreign government attempted to negotiate in those terms.

But there are certain facts of life that we must recognise. One is that representative governments cannot ignore the sentiments of their people. And other peoples will scarcely believe that we regard security as a two-way proposition, or that we take the Soviet Communist danger seriously, if we seem to be unconcerned about their economic welfare and force them to economic dependence on the potential enemy.

The peace of the United States, now more than ever, depends upon maintaining with other free peoples a sense of fraternity and of community. This implies willingness to cooperate with them in the field of trade and commerce.

IV

It would, however, be a great mistake to assume that the only danger our Nation faces is that from open armed attack. The greater danger comes from the political-economic warfare of international communism.

Its strategy involves subverting one country after another until finally the United States is isolated and its economy so depressed that, to use Mr. Stalin's words of 1924, the United States will consider it expedient voluntarily to make substantial concessions to the proletariat. That strategy was recently restated by Mr. Khrushchev in these words:

"We declare war upon you—excuse me for using such an expression—in the peaceful field of trade. We declare a war we will win over the United States. The threat to the United States is not the ICBM, but in the field of peaceful production. We are relentless in this and it will prove the superiority of our system."

It would be reckless to treat that threat as negligible. Soviet rulers have been rapidly developing their means of waging economic warfare against the United States and have now achieved an industrial level that enables them to export manufactured goods in increasing quantity and variety, and to take in exchange large amounts of natural products—agricultural and mineral—either for their own use or to dump on free-world markets. They hope thus to gain economic dominance, and subsequent political dominance, in many countries that seek an assured foreign market whereby to earn the means to pay for essential imports.

Already the Soviet bloc has initiated this technique in relation to Egyptian cotton and Syrian cotton and wheat. The Communist rulers no doubt hope thereby to gain a controlling influence over the Suez Canal and the Syrian pipelines, with which they could dominate the economy of Western Europe.

Similar Soviet-bloc efforts are manifest in relation to other areas.

If other free-world nations think that the United States market will be increasingly closed to them, that will immeasurably help the Soviet Communist bloc to prosecute their plan of economic encirclement and ultimate strangulation of the United States.

V

Some elements of United States industry seek to improve their competitive position by implying that any competition from abroad, merely because it is foreign, should on that account be debarred.

The United States cannot accept that viewpoint without endangering our whole Nation. There is, of course, a wide range of cases where foreign competition should be restrained, and is restrained, by protective action. But a general disposition to exclude foreign goods whenever they are competitive, would gravely disrupt economic, political and spiritual relationships which are required for our own welfare and for the defense of our peace and freedom.

It is neither un-American nor unpatriotic to have national policies designed to assure a congenial and friendly world environment. Since our earliest days it has been, and now is, accepted United States doctine that our own peace and security interlock with conditions elsewhere. We have, when needed, paid a great price in blood and treasure to prevent other lands from falling under the control of hostile despotisms.

The first great foreign policy of the United States was the Monroe Doctrine. It declared that the peace and security of the United States would be endangered if hostile despotisms were to extend their political systems into any portion of this hemisphere. By the Caracas Declaration of March 1954, the American Republics declared that the domination or control of the political institutions of any American state by the international Communist movement would endanger the peace of America. The Congress of the United States in June 1954, with only one negative vote, endorsed that Caracas resolution.

If, indeed, the spread of international communism to this hemisphere endangers our peace, shall we seek by sound economic measures to prevent that? Or shall we adopt trade polices that will create the very danger we signaled?

Our second great foreign policy evolved in relation to Europe. In World War I and World War II, the United States incurred casualties of the order of 1 million and spent hundreds of billions of dollars rather than see the other side of the Atlantic fall under the domination of a hostile despotism. Now this threatens for the third time. Shall we have trade policies that will unite Western Europe with us in vigorous freedom? Or shall we renounce this waging of peace?

Our third great foreign policy evolved in relation to the western Pacific. We were unwilling that the Far East and the Pacific Ocean should fall under the domination of hostile war lords. In order to prevent that, we fought a long and hard Pacific war. Unless we have enlightened trade policies, we shall risk losing all that we thought we had won at so grievous a price.

Since the close of World War II, the United States has, by treaties or joint congressional resolutions, proclaimed, as regards nearly 50 nations, that the peace and security of the United States would be endangered if these other nations were to fall into the clutches of Communist imperialism. But the Communists are not going to keep hands off merely because of bold treaty words or resounding congressional proclamations. The Russian and Chinese Communists are tough. Our words will command respect only if we are seen to be ready to back them up.

If we are to avoid the grim alternatives of war or surrender, we must have the national policies and actions represented by our mutual-security program and by the Trade Agreements Act.

With these measures, the United States and its allies can peacefully win the cold war. President Eisenhower said last December in Paris: "There is a noble strategy of victory—not victory over any peoples, but victory for all peoples." The policies of the free world over recent years have been winning policies, and clearly so.

Armed aggression has been deterred, and the free world has cooperated successfully to resist Communist subversion.

In Eastern Europe, outbreaks in East Germany, Poland, and Hungary have shown the discontent of the captive peoples and their longing to become again free and self-respecting nations.

Within the Soviet Union itself there have been sensational political changes over the past 5 years which represent not merely personal struggles for power but a conflict of policies related to the growing desire of the people for more intellectual freedom, more personal security, and better living conditions.

It is by no means visionary to foresee the time when nations and peoples now being exploited by international communism for external adventures and world conquest, will have governments genuinely dedicated to promoting the welfare of their own people.

Then indeed the international scene will be transformed.

However, this result will not be achieved unless the free-world nations stand firm on the policies that create a unity which nullifies both the military and the political-economic threats which now stem from Communist imperialism.

The imperialist leaders have, or believe they have, one asset on their side—that is the tendency of the democracies to get tired and not to be willing to persist in the efforts that are required to sustain free world unity and strength. If that unity ever collapses, then the Communists could feel that victory was within their grasp.

The essential is that we hold fast to policies which have demonstrated their worth and which if persisted in will assure that the ultimate victory will be that of the people, not of the despots.

VI

Let me take, by way of illustration, four key positions—north, south, east, and west.

To the North there is Canada. The United States and Canada are inescapably interdependent from the standpoint of continental defense. In 1957 Canada bought from us about $3.9 billion of goods and sold to us about $2.9 billion of goods. Canada has expressed its concern at the size of this adverse trade balance. If the Canadian Government and people were to assume that it is our purpose to make that trade balance still more adverse, there would inescapably be adverse repercussions on our joint North American defenses.

I turn to the south, to Venezuela. It supplies petroleum products which were vital to us and our allies during World War II and the Korean War. Later, Venezuelan petroleum prevented a major catastrophe when, in 1956, the Suez Canal was closed and the Iraqi-Syrian pipeline blown up. Venezuela bought from us, in 1957, about $1 billion and sold to us about $900 million of goods. If the Government of Venezuela considers that we intend to put up serious barriers to imports from Venezuela the consequences will not be in the interest of our national security.

I turn eastward to Europe, taking the United Kingdom as an example. The British people are authors and stanch defenders of free institutions. We have a varied and vital military cooperation with the United Kingdom. We have just concluded with it our first IRBM agreement. The United Kingdom lives by participation in world trade. In 1957 it bought about $1.1 billion of United States goods and sold to us about $775 million of goods.

If the United States were to adopt policies that would set in motion a series of worldwide trade restrictions and high tariff policies, the effect upon the United Kingdom would be grievous.

If we turn now to the Far East, we have the case of Japan. Japan is our second largest market for American goods generally and our best market for agricultural products. Japan has a population of some 90 million. They live in an area about the size of California, but with no comparable natural resources. The Japanese must manufacture and trade to live. They are, indeed, the only important industrial nation in the Far East. They bought from the United States in 1957 about $1.250 billion of goods, and sold to us about $600 million of goods.

In the period of the early thirties, when world markets were closing and international trade declining, the leadership of Japan passed to those who believed that Japan, in order to earn a decent livelihood, would have to impose its rule over China and Southeast Asia to insure adequate markets and sources of raw material. That led to war. Today the Soviet Union and Communist China eagerly covet the use of the industrial power of Japan for their military and economic warfare purposes. The Japanese resist that unholy alliance. But surely our trade policies ought to help to make it possible for Japan to gain a livelihood within the free world.

There is no suggestion that the United States should eliminate all restrictions on all imports from these four countries, or from any other countries. Actually, special measures have recently been taken to limit imports from each of the four countries I have specifically mentioned. For example, there is a Government-sponsored voluntary restriction which limits oil imports including those from Venezuela and from Canada. There is an increased duty on bicycles from the United Kingdom, as a result of escape clause action. There are Japanese imposed restrictions on textiles, flatware, and other goods sold to the United States.

Surely a system that contributes so much to our political and military security, which takes account of the needs of our domestic industry and which provides our farmers and industrial workers with vast markets, should be effectively continued.

As other witnesses have testified, there is developing a new situation in Europe as a result of the common market treaty which will create a common market without trade barriers as between six countries of Western Europe. It remains to be seen whether those responsible for the common market will adopt liberal trade policies or protectionist policies as regards others. The decisive period in this respect is from now through 1962. Much will depend upon the example of the United States and the bargaining power of the United States. This is a particular reason for extending the act for 5 years and strengthening it as requested by the President.

George Washington gives pertinent advice in his Farewell Address. He counsels that our national policies should be formulated, not on a basis of sectionalism, but on the basis of overall national interest. "Every portion of our country," he says, "finds the most commanding motives for carefully guarding and preserving the union of the whole." And that union, he adds, should be "directed by an indissoluble community of interest, as one nation."

Almost every national policy hurts some and benefits others. The form of our taxation; the nature of our defense purchases; the location of Government operations—all of these and other national policies inevitably tip the scales of competition. Often, and certainly in the field of trade, those few who may be hurt are more vocal than the many who may gain. I do not complain that those who may be hurt are vocal. That is their right. But the Congress has a duty. The determining factor should, as George Washington said, be the "guarding and preserving of the union of the whole."

The Trade Agreements Act stands as a worldwide symbol of enlightened statesmanship. Failure to renew and strengthen that act as the President has requested would set back the clock and endanger our Republic and each and every person in it. That is the paramount consideration.

Law of the Land?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. CARLTON LOSER

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 24, 1958

Mr. LOSER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call the attention of my colleagues to an editorial which appeared in the Nashville Banner on February 21, 1958, entitled "Law of the Land?"

Is the law of the land made by judicial interpretation or by congressional enactment? This question is one which must be decided and it would be well for all of us to give it the study needed in order that we may act and once again know that the law of the land is based on the Constitution of the United States.

The editorial follows:

LAW OF THE LAND?

Who makes the law of the land?

How is it made? By judicial interpretation or by congressional enactment?

These are valid and challenging questions just now; and they need competent answer before recklessness under pressure's wild momentum—and without the brakes of study and reason—carries the country to the point of no return.

Actually the Constitution is—originally—the law of the land. It hasn't been amended in any of the particulars today distorted into invasion of basic rights. Nor has Congress officially forfeited the rights of exclusive legislative powers. Where the Supreme Court encroaches upon that domain, Congress can act to redress the grievance of invasion.

For example: In June 1950, the Supreme Court reversed the judicial rulings of a century—which under present theory had been the law of the land—to divest coastal States of their tidelands rights. It held on that date that the Federal Government has paramount rights to the tidelands.

Supposedly then that became the law of the land. And every subordinate court would be expected to deal accordingly with any case before it.

Congress did not accept that. Congress was of the opinion that the issue was one for legislative determination. A little under 3 years later, Congress did act on the question, and overwhelmingly. It enacted a law restoring tidelands title to the States to the extent of their historic boundaries.

Only Congress can deal adequately and authoritatively with the present issues, insofar as Federal responsibility is concerned.

It has that obligation—primarily to assert just where the lines of authority fall; and they fall exactly where the Constitution drew them. Otherwise the law of the land is a nebulous instrument, subject to capricious change without benefit of legality—an item of confusion, abuse, and danger.

Local Government and Problems of Water Pollution Control

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN A. BLATNIK

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 24, 1958

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Speaker, last week the Honorable R. P. Weatherford, Jr., mayor of Independence, Mo., addressed the Surgeon General's Conference with State and interstate water pollution control administrators. Mayor Weatherford represented the American Municipal Association and its 13,000 member cities on the subject of municipal sewage-treatment problems.

Mayor Weatherford's remarks should be studied by all those who believe that the construction-grant program under

Public Law 660 should be returned to the States.

Similar to the style of another man from Independence, Mo., Mayor Weatherford lays it right on the line and pulls no punches. No one knows the problems of municipalities better than the men who represent them and they, through their spokesman Mayor Weatherford, are opposed to repealing the treatment plant construction program under Public Law 660. In fact they advocate an expanded program of Federal aid in order to effectively deal with the problem of stream pollution.

Mayor Weatherford's statement follows:

Gentlemen, my humble honor indeed it is to address you on behalf of the 13,000 member cities of the American Municipal Association on the subject of Municipal Sewage-Treatment Problems. As many of you know, this is a subject on which I have spoken with considerable feeling on previous occasions and on which I shall probably speak many times again.

The national policy on water pollution of the American Municipal Association was first clearly enunciated at its 31st annual congress in Philadelphia on December 1, 1954. This policy has been reaffirmed each year. At our last American municipal congress in San Francisco in December 1957, the following recommendations concerning the Federal water-pollution control program were unanimously adopted:

The Congress is urged to continue and expand the 1956 Water Pollution Control Act by:

1. Providing for an expanded program of research and technical assistance;

2. Liberalizing the financial provisions of the act by increasing the total loan and grant authorization and by raising the percentage of Federal contribution available for each project to cover at least 50 percent of the cost of the project, with no ceiling limitation as to the maximum amount;

3. Increase the annual authorization from $50 million to $100 million; and

4. Establish separate incentive aid program designed to promote the construction of waste treatment facilities on a metropolitan area basis.

You are all aware, I am sure, of the recent recommendation of the joint Federal-State action committee relating to termination of the Federal grant-in-aid program to cities for the construction of sewage treatment plants. Again on this occasion the American Municipal Association strongly supported the grants feature of the Federal act. The official policy of the association was expressed to President Eisenhower by AMA President Ben West of Nashville, Tenn. Mayor West said in part:

"In view of all the evidence concerning the impact of this program to America's cities and to the Nation as a whole, we feel compelled to register with you our strong conviction that termination of Federal assistance for the construction of sewage waste treatment plants will seriously jeopardize the possibility of ever developing an adequate water conservation program for the Nation.

"All the evidence points to the continuing need for Federal financial assistance in the field of water-pollution control and on an expanded basis. We urge you to press for continuance of this program, at least until the prospect for its solution by all States is entirely assured and until Federal withdrawal from the field will in no way jeopardize the formulation of an effective national water-conservation program."

We have some idea as to the rough dimensions of the total public-facility problem faced by urban areas. By 1975, for example, our population will have increased from approximately 175 million to something close to 225 million. Households will increase from approximately 45 million to close to 65 million. It has been estimated that raw land for urban use will be taken over at a rate of 1 million acres annually.

There are more than 15,000 local governments in the 174 metropolitan areas that include and center about cities having 50,000 or more inhabitants. About three-fifths of the entire population of continental United States resides within these areas. Most of the Nation's increase in population since 1950 has occurred in metropolitan areas, chiefly in the suburban portions surrounding the central cities. With this suburban growth have come urgent problems of making adequate provision for local schools, police and fire protection, transportation facilities, water and sanitary services, and other community needs. The framework within which these needs must be accommodated is, in most cases, a complex structure of numerous autonomous local governments of many different types.

Under the present law, communities within metropolitan areas cannot pool Federal grants for the construction of joint treatment facilities. This negative approach to what could be a most effective means of handling large area disposal problems should be corrected and made positive by rewarding growing local governments who band together either by cooperative agreement or otherwise in the handling of a common problem by making stimulating Federal grants available to assist them in constructing a common treatment plant to serve all their needs.

A 1955 survey by the Public Health Service of municipal pollution-abatement needs estimated that their cost for the period 1955–65 would be $5.33 billion. Of this total, sewage-treatment plants would cost $3.49 billion and interceptors would cost $1.84 billion. These estimates covered and then-existing backlog of needed construction, obsolescence of older treatment facilities, and new sewage-treatment needs that would develop from population growth and new needs in previously unsewered places.

This represents a staggering financial load for the cities of the Nation. To meet these needs we will have to construct sewage-treatment works at the rate of more than $500 million per year. The magnitude of this task is shown somewhat by the fact that since World War II we have not been able to average half that amount. There is at present a backlog of needed municipal pollution-abatement projects of well over $1 billion. You are probably well aware that it was this backlog that led in large measure to the construction grant-in-aid provision in the new Federal legislation.

In solving its pollution-abatement problems, the municipality faces both fiscal and technical problems, not to mention administrative and organizational problems in the metropolitan areas. In all of these areas the community requires assistance. Since the problems of finance are most difficult from the viewpoint of municipal government, let me address myself to this point first.

Compared to the Federal and State governments, the municipality is near the bottom of the tax revenue source totem pole. Tax dollars are in short supply in municipalities. Nevertheless, city officials must find the money to build, improve, and maintain streets, schools, libraries, airports, water systems, parks, and all the other public projects needed in a modern municipality. The needs for all these projects is constantly increasing and city officials are finding it more and more difficult to divert their already limited funds into sewage-treatment construction.

We all recognize, I am sure, that the sewage plant just doesn't compete in the same voter's league with schools, libraries, parks, etc. This is especially true, since the average voter sees the sewage plant as a primary benefit to those who live downstream if he ever sees it at all. Perhaps a part of the problem lies in the failure of the Water Pollution Control Agency in selling its product and its benefits. Another part is again the obstacles in organizing adequate pollution controls on a metropolitan, regional, and interstate basis.

The final problem is very real to the municipal official. Many municipal bond issues for sewage treatment needs have been defeated by the voters in recent years. Many communities find they have no current funds and are already at their statutory limit for bonded indebtedness. The market for sewage revenue bonds is generally uncertain. In 1957 the municipal bond was at its lowest in many years, particularly for sewerage, and many issues went unsold. We believe that if it had not been for the stimulating effect of the Federal grant program, 1957 would have had one of the lowest construction contract award levels since World War II. Instead, the grant program helped generate the most widespread sewage plant construction year on record.

The AMA believes that most municipalities are unable financially to deal effectively with the water-pollution program. For the most part, State governments are unable to give financial assitance or show little or no inclination to do so. Only the Federal Government has the resources to provide the financial assistance needed to meet the problem. We believe that sewage pollution involves health and water resource problems of national significance and that the Federal Government has a definite responsibility to render financial aid to municipalities in meeting these problems.

The American Municipal Association fully subscribes to the principle of Federal grants for the construction of municipal sewage-treatment works. We favor section 6 of Public Law 660 except that we believe its financial provisions are too limited and should be revised sharply upward. We also believe, as I have already noted, that stimulatory Federal assistance should be brought to bear on the problem of developing adequate metropolitan treatment programs.

The municipality also faces serious technical problems in dealing with water-pollution situations. I will not dwell at any length on these since this is an area entirely familiar to you gentlemen.

The first problem of this nature that comes to mind is this business of selling the need for costly sewage treatment to the general public. The already overburdened taxpayer can see the benefit to some other fellow downstream but can't see any benefit to himself. Consequently he often votes "No" on a bond issue and our problems of financing are again multiplied. We just haven't done a good job of relating pollution to overall water use or to the municipal taxpayer how pollution prevention and abatement benefits him by benefiting the health and welfare and economic potential of the States and the Nation as a whole.

Municipalities, metropolitan areas, and geographic regions need better planning for their sewage-treatment plants. All too often such plants are constructed with State approval and within 10 years become inadequate for the problem that has developed. It is a hundred times more difficult to refinance improvements to a relatively new sewage-treatment works than it is to finance the original construction. We believe there should be a close working relationship between the State water-pollution-control agencies and State planning commissioners and State municipal leagues. These State agencies, working in concert with municipalities and their consulting engineers, could do much to assure adequate planning for municipal sewage treatment. Among them they certainly have the financial, engineering, administrative, and planning experts to do the job.

The high cost of sewage-treatment construction is a serious problem to municipalities. The city must buy what is on the market since it has no other source. The market price has gone up steadily without any apparent increase in many years in the efficiency and economy of the product. The city is certainly in no position to develop new and better methods for treating its own sewage. Nor does it appear to us that anyone else is doing much about this increasingly serious problem of high costs for sewage treatment. Much more research and development must be undertaken by the regulatory agencies, both State and Federal.

Let me mention one more problem and this relates to the operation and maintenance of treatment works after construction and to the training of personnel. We recognize without question the primary responsibility of the city in operating and maintaining its own sewage plant or contributing its share in handling larger area problems. But, at the same time, we recognize that there is an overall responsibility on the part of the State pollution control agency in the municipal sewage treatment plant and its operating personnel. It is very important to those responsible for municipal sewage treatment to know that there is an overall importance and interest attached to pollution control at community level.

This can be done effectively by State supervision, inspections, training courses, professional associations and all the other means so familiar to you all. We wouldn't dream of building a school, staffing it with teachers, sending our children to it and then never pay attention to the school again. The State wouldn't allow it if we tried.

Where does the municipality look for leadership in solving its sewage treatment problems? To themselves alone? To the Federal Government? Or to the States? Everyone recognizes that only the local government itself can initiate the necessary remedial programs of prevention and abatement.

The broad concern for the quantity and quality of the Nation's water resources is properly that of the Federal Government. That proper concern includes a positive effort to see to it that State and local governments can and will assume their responsibilities in meeting their share of the problem.

We believe that communities should be able to look to the State for some of the answers to their pollution problems. In seeking these answers from State water pollution control agencies, we wonder if it is not reasonable to ask them:

1. What are you doing to keep your governors and State legislators informed of the water-pollution problem and its needs?

2. Are you working closely with your State municipal leagues and State planning commissioners to promote better understanding of pollution problems and to reach better solutions of them?

3. What are you doing to sell the values of municipal sewage treatment to the tax-paying public?

4. What are you doing to help solve financing problems in the light of the peculiar needs for pollution abatement?

5. What are you doing to reduce the cost of municipal sewage treatment?

6. What are you doing to promote efficient and economical operation and maintenance of municipal sewage treatment plants once they have been constructed?

Finally, I believe a word about industrial pollution, which is a very formidable part of the total pollution problem now confronting us, is appropriate.

I believe it goes without saying that a large part of industrial pollution exists to a degree unrecognized for the real problem it poses, simply because it hides behind the torrent of untreated domestic sewerage.

We must not defer coordinated action on the part of all levels of government to eliminate the ever-increasing flow of untreated industrial wastes in our Nation's waterways. The States and the State legislatures in particular must recognize the need and take action to accomplish an effective program to control industrial pollution. Without such control domestic programs, no matter how successful, cannot do a complete and lasting job.

The Federal Scholarship Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 18, 1958

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, on February 17, 1958, I appeared before a subcommittee of the House Committee on Education and Labor in support of my bill, H. R. 821, to provide loans to needy, qualified students. My testimony before that committee follows:

STATEMENT OF REPRESENTATIVE ABRAHAM J. MULTER (DEMOCRAT, OF NEW YORK), BEFORE THE HOUSE COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR, FEBRUARY 17, 1958

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Chairman and members of the distinguished House Education and Labor Committee, many words have been written on this subject in the past few months. I will limit my remarks in the hope that this committee and the Congress will soon substitute action for words. To my mind there is no more important action that this Congress can take than to enact a Federal-aid-to-education measure. This would go to the heart of the problem pointed up by sputnik and in the long run contribute more to the strength of our country than having any number of spheres circling the earth. We will miss the boat and perhaps even the spaceship if we are satisfied with crash programs in weapons and satellites which will provide only temporary strength. Gentlemen, you are now considering the very future of this country. I hope only that my bill and my testimony this morning will be of some assistance to you in successfully discharging this task.

The purpose of H. R. 821 is to furnish loans to the country's needy and scholastically qualified students so that they may continue their education beyond the high school. State agencies will select the students to receive these loans.

The amount of money available to a State would be determined by the ratio which the number of its Members in the House of Representatives bears to the total number of Members from all the States which have accepted the provisions of this act. My proposal, if enacted, would authorize for the Federal scholarship fund the sum of $5 million for fiscal year 1958 and $10 million for fiscal year 1959 and such sums as are necessary for succeeding years. For a student to be eligible for a loan, his State must designate a State agency and establish certain methods and standards of selection. Moreover, the Commissioner of Education may suspend loans to students if he determines that the State agency is discriminating against individuals on the basis of race, creed, color, or national origin. The State will only be required to make certain deposits into the Federal scholarship fund if the fund is not self-sustaining, but in no event can this State payment exceed 10 percent of the amount of advances made to students from that State during the preceding year.

The Federal Scholarship Act would loan to an eligible student an amount not in excess of $1,000 a year for the first 4 years of study in any educational institution of college-grade studies. In addition, the bill would provide $1,500 a year for 4 years to students in graduate schools.

Repayment of the loan by the student will be over a 10-year period with interest at 1 percent per year.

Let me review briefly the reasons such a program is needed. As you know, I have supported such a program for years and first introduced this legislation in 1955. Recent events have dramatized the urgency for such a program, which is long overdue. The reasons we must now enact a Federal-education program fall into four categories, viz: security and defense, rising costs of a college education, the requirements of a free democratic society and the moral obligation of the Government to the youth of the country. I shall discuss each of these briefly.

1. Security and defense needs: There is no reason for one to discuss this in detail. In recent months the facts and arguments have been well publicized. We are not developing to their fullest (neither quantitatively nor qualitatively) our most valuable natural resources—human talent, ingenuity, and skill. And this is true in all fields, not just physics and mathematics. The Commission on Human Resources and Advanced Training concluded in 1954 that the Nation is producing enough persons competent for higher education to meet the demands for specialization in all fields. In other words, we need not emphasize 1 or 2 fields of study if we do something about the fact that fewer than half of the upper 25 percent, and only 6 out of 10 of the top 5 percent of high-school graduates are obtaining the higher education which would enable them to develop their full potential. Other studies indicate that with aid available for study in any field, more than half of the students would pursue careers in teaching, engineering, and scientific research.

Congressmen should be well aware, as are most scientists and educators, that successful solutions to our national problems are equally dependent upon the contribution of biologists, medical doctors, lawyers, economists, social scientists, and so forth. If we overemphasize a single branch of learning we will probably create as many problems as we solve.

2. The rising cost of higher education: If we review briefly the yearly income of the great majority of American families as compared to the present average costs of attending college, there can be no doubt that a financial barrier exists for many bright young students.

In its current population reports, the Bureau of the Census estimated that in 1956 there were 23 million families that received a yearly income of $5,000 and less, 7 million families had incomes of $2,000 and less. Now, a recent report of the United States Office of Education states that the cost of attending undergraduate college in 1956–57 averaged $1,500 a year at public institutions and $2,000 a year at private institutions. I will not belabor the point. The facts speak for themselves. Most of the children of these families cannot financially afford to attend college. The Congress of the United States cannot afford to allow America to draw her future brain power only from the economically favored few. As we all know there is no correlation between a family's income and the capabilities of its children. Tens of thousands of capable high-school students fail to enroll in colleges each year for financial reasons. We must rectify this situation.

3. The point clearly emerges from this, gentlemen, that our ideal of equality of opportunity conflicts with the situation which we are allowing to persist. Let us recall that education is essentially the communication of a society's culture or way of life. As our Western culture becomes more complex, higher education becomes more important. We have progressed from a system of education solely within the family to one where it requires 16 to 20 years of formal education to acquire specialized knowledge. Therefore, to deny financial assistance to capable, needy students is to deny them their equal opportunity to acquire knowledge of, and participate fully in the cultural heritage and way of life of the United States.

In addition we endanger our democratic institutions if we do not meet the increasing demand for broadly educated scientists, lawyers, educators, yes, even legislators, to deal with the increasingly complex problems of the social and physical world.

4. The moral responsibility of the Government grows out of all of the above. It is our duty to see to it that the country is now secure and remains so and it is our duty to see to it that all talent is given the opportunity to develop through its own efforts in order that the country remains morally and physically strong and that our ideals do not become empty words.

I will now deal with the special value of the loan program provided for in my bill. It alone will not do the job. However, not only will a greater number of students receive specialized training if this Federal Scholarship Fund is created, the better, more serious students will be attracted by such a program. If we provide this opportunity for loans, the industrious, serious, and highly motivated students will respond. Slackers and those not serious about the importance of an education will not undertake the obligations of repayment. In this way we are assured that those mentally gifted students who are willing to exercise initiative and to work hard will have the opportunity to develop themselves and thereby make a high level contribution to society. A loan program is therefore an important complement to any scholarship grant program which you gentlemen may consider.

Let me now briefly deal with arguments which have been advanced in opposition to such a program. First of all there are those who contend that the loans will not be repaid. This cynical argument displaying an amazingly profound lack of faith in the youth of our country is not borne out by the facts. The record is as follows:

During World War II we had a temporary measure, the student war loan program, which lent three and one-third million dollars in its 2 years of existence. As of December 31, 1957, approximately 90 percent of this sum has been repaid in addition to $375,695 in interest. Only 1.4 percent or $46,403.81 has been charged off and referred to the General Accounting Office. An undetermined amount of this has even been collected. The Department of Health, Education, and Welfare anticipates that the major portion of the small outstanding balance will be collected.

The experience of private institutions is likewise very successful. The following is from an article which appeared in the New York World Telegram and Sun, May 5, 1956. "According to the director of admissions at Rensselear Polytechnic Institute, 'The experience of almost every college is that there is virtually no loss by default.'" Thus, the record supports those who have faith in the integrity of the Nation's students.

The most foolish argument is that no one would take advantage of a loan program. I suppose I find this point peculiar because I just don't know anyone who withholds help from those who need it for fear it will not be accepted. This is too easy an escape from fulfilling an important responsibility. In addition, I am convinced from my mail and the facts that a publicized Federal loan program would not go begging because it would be meeting a real need and one that will increase in the future.

Let me point out in conclusion that this bill will not place a burden on the Federal Treasury since it provides for a revolving loan fund. Furthermore, the issue of Federal control is not involved as the aid is to students with the administration of the program placed in the hands of State agencies.

Please understand that I do not say this bill is the panacea for education. It will not cure all problems. It will not give us all the specialists we need—not even those in any single field. But it is one instrumentality that will help the overall program.

Gentlemen, we can and must at this juncture in our Nation's history provide for the future, demonstrate an abiding faith in our youth and discharge our moral and legislative responsibilities. I submit that the one thing we cannot afford at the present time is further postponement of enactment of this program.

Mr. Chairman, I appreciate this opportunity of appearing before your commitee to present my views. Thank you.

Mr. ELLIOTT. Thank you, Mr. MULTER. I have one comment with respect to your statement, and that is in the nature of a question. Do you think that the $5 million which you propose for the first year, and $10 million for the second year, and such sums as may be necessary for the years thereafter, are sufficient to get the program underway?

I am thinking of this against the backlog of something over 200,000 of the brightest students who do not go on to college each year.

Mr. MULTER. I am sure it will not solve the full problem, nor will it do as much as it should. Let us start it gradually. Let us see if it does have the popular acceptance that I think it will have.

Secondly, we can start off the first year with 5,000 students. If we double that the second year we can take care of 10,000. Let us see how many will avail themselves of the privilege. If the demand is far in excess of the amounts provided for, we can then in 1960 or even in 1959 as we see what the demand is for the program and how many students are availing themselves, then reassess the program. We may in 1960 say there is not enough demand for it. Let us abandon it. I doubt it. I think the demand is going to increase for the program.

This is not an expenditure. It is not going to cost us any money. From the experience we have had, every dollar of this money will come back. With the 1 percent interest it will pay all the administration costs and return the money and cover any possible losses.

Let us try it as a test program. We tested it, as I indicated, during World War II on a temporary basis. Let us try it again. After we have had a year or two of experience let us reassess the program.

Mr. ELLIOTT. The gentleman from New York.

Mr. WAINWRIGHT. I would like to congratulate my friend, Mr. MULTER, on the program, and point out several things in his statement. First of all, he was a presputnik on education, which I think is quite relevant these days because so many of us, to a certain extent, myself, have only been fairly recently enlightened. I think that your program, which as you point out, you put in in 1955, was a proper start.

I am inclined to agree with you in your monetary value. On the other hand, there is another school of thought which must be given careful consideration.

The chairman has a comprehensive bill in. Title III of the chairman's bill provides a $40 million amount generally along these same lines as your bill. However, I am not clear on this. Does your bill specifically tie it into a scholastic qualification? In other words, is there eligibility, as there is in the chairman's bill, only to those who fit into certain requirements?

Mr. MULTER. Oh, yes. I leave it to the States to pick the students, but the States will have to set standards. It will not be merely applying for a loan because the boy or girl wants a loan to pay tuition. The boy or girl will have to show aptitude.

Mr. WAINWRIGHT. How about economic requirements? Will the applicant have to show that he is a needy case?

Mr. MULTER. Yes; the applicant should show that he is a needy case. He should not be required to show financial responsibility.

Mr. WAINWRIGHT. He would show that he did not have sufficient funds?

Mr. MULTER. Yes; he should show that if he did not get the loan, he could not carry on.

Mr. WAINWRIGHT. You were in Congress then. I did not know about this program that you referred to. Was it called the student war-loan program?

Mr. MULTER. That was the title of it, yes, sir.

Mr. WAINWRIGHT. As of December 31, of this past year, there were 80 percent paid up?

Mr. MULTER. Yes.

Mr. WAINWRIGHT. Was this a 10-year program, do you know?

Mr. MULTER. Yes; I believe the program permitted a student to repay his loans over a period of 10 years. It did call for a higher interest. I think it calls for 4 percent interest.

If you noticed the figures, I pointed out with a $46,000 chargeoff of loans as against $375,000 of interest, if we would divide that by 4 so as to reduce the interest rate, instead of 4 percent to 1 percent, you would still have $90,000 of interest collected in this period, and you have only had $46,000 in losses. It did cost more than $46,000 to administer the program.

Mr. WAINWRIGHT. Many of the proposals that have been presented to us tie in a loan program to the qualification of the student. That will mean that it will be necessary for this committee and for Congress to have some kind of legislation similar to that recommended by the administration where we can find out who are the bright ones and who are the dumb ones and separate the wheat from the chaff. Would you be inclined to support such a program?

Mr. MULTER. I would support the all-inclusive bill that the chairman has introduced. I have no pride of authorship. I am not asking this committee to report my bill. I am asking the committee to report a bill which will include this program. The grant program is important. All the items in the chairman's bill are important. All, together, will go a long way toward solving the whole problem. The loan program is only going to solve one part of it, a small part of it.

Mr. WAINWRIGHT. I have no further questions.

Mr. ELLIOTT. The gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. WIER. I only have one curiosity to throw out. If this program was in effect during World War II, and I have no knowledge of it, as a matter of fact, of course, I was not here during those days, who sponsored this legislation, why was it sponsored, and why was it discontinued?

Mr. MULTER. I was not here in Congress when the bill was originally enacted. I came down in 1947 in a special election. This was already on the statute books at that time.

I believe the reason for initiating the program was because there was a tremendous need to channel more students into the colleges.

Mr. WIER. Was it initiated by the Department or by the committee or how did it come into being?

Mr. MULTER. I know that it had the administration's support, but whether the original idea came from the administration or from some Member of Congress or from outside educational forces, I do not remember. I know it did have the administration's support.

The surprising thing is that after it proved so successful on a temporary basis, we let it die.

It just so happened that nobody showed enough interest to revive the program or extend it.

Mr. WIER. I assumed from the résumé that you made that you had made a pretty close check on the legislation and that you had gotten in touch with the HEW for a history of the bill.

Mr. MULTER. I did not check on who sponsored it.

Mr. WIER. I mean the history of it.

Mr. MULTER. I did check and study the operation of the program to determine whether or not it was a successful program. It was successful. Students did apply for and get the aid and then kept their obligation and repaid.

I think you will find that most of the debts that were written off were because the student died rather than because he wanted to default.

Mr. WIER. Where did you get the information you have today?

Mr. MULTER. From the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

Mr. WIER. You did not ask them anything about the history of the bill?

Mr. MULTER. Nothing about the original sponsorship; no, sir.

Mr. WEIR. Let me ask the Chairman a question. You have had the department here?

Mr. ELLIOTT. Yes, sir.

Mr. WIER. Has there been anything approached on a question of a trial run on this type of legislation by the administration, or do they not know anything about it?

Mr. ELLIOTT. They have referred to it, I will say to the gentleman, just in passing, to the effect that this program was in existence during World War II. I believe, to be specific, that the witness Doctor Flint referred to it. I think in the testimony that he gave originally here last August or thereabout, that you will find something about it in the printed volume of hearings.

Mr. WIER. I know where to look now.

Mr. ELLIOTT. The gentleman from New York, Mr. Gwinn.

Mr. GWINN. Mr. Multer, I was reading last night a little Greek history and you reminded me of the statement of Socrates which was to the effect that statesmen or politicians who concerned themselves only with the immediate demands of organized groups, used the power of government for temporary purposes, were only contributing to the destruction of the nation, whereas those who took a long look into the future and thought in terms of the future welfare were indeed great statesmen.

So you qualify as a great statesman if you had lived in Socrates' time.

Mr. MULTER. Thank you, sir.

Mr. GWINN. I wonder if you have got enough evidence to support the idea that the student today needs loan funds. I had a letter from the University of Virginia last week saying that they have in that single university $300,000 unused for lending to students.

Mr. MULTER. I am surprised to hear that, Mr. Gwinn. I think there has been a poll made of educators on the subject. I think they divide about equally between those who would favor grants and those who would favor loans.

I will say that if you take the total number that would favor both grants and loans, you find that a very large percentage of them favor the principle.

I assume that that takes in men who have had experience in colleges that is quite different from the one you referred to.

Mr. GWINN. There is another feature. I think we lack specific information about what the need is. The fact that only $3¾ million was applied for in World War II would indicate that the demand was not very great at any time, and the fact that it was discontinued after two years was further evidence that the demand for loans was not very great.

Mr. MULTER. Except, Mr. GWINN, we must have in mind the war years and the temperament of the boys during the war years. There was much uncertainty of what their future was. Their desire was to get into the service and get the job done. I had that with my own boys. The older boy was then in an engineering school at Cornell, and his desire was to get in and get his service behind him and get the war behind him. Parents who had boys in colleges those days did not know whether those boys would go back or not when the war was over. Most of them when they returned went right on and did finish.

The temperament of the boys was very much different.

I think the encouraging thing is that they did use as much as they did during the war years for a loan program.

Having in mind that this is really going to cost us nothing except possibly the cost of administration of the program, and that will be very small, let us try it and see what happens.

Mr. GWINN. It gets the Federal Government into the business again that belongs to the individuals and to the local community. It seems to me you get to the point where it will raise the constitutional question once more. Is this a proper function of the Federal Government? It cannot be really called a defense measure or a military measure.

Mr. MULTER. It is a welfare measure. I think I know your philosophy on the matter. Let me put it this way, sir: Why should we not take this position? As long as we are going to continue to make loans, Federal loans to business, why should we not also make it to the youth of our Nation?

Mr. GWINN. Why you can justify most anything on the loans that we are making which is about one-fifth of all the lending that is done in the Nation today. That is the trouble. Most of those loans are partially bad. Many of them are wholly bad. We have the Government in business on a big scale. Of course that to me is the reason why we should not certainly expand further this incredible Government that we have, and I am speaking of it under Republican auspices, because I think we are making respectable everything that Roosevelt and Truman did, eminently respectable.

Why should we not, while we are trying to revamp our notions about what the functions of government are, try to stop this sort of business? Why do we not take a look at what it is that we have already bought with Federal dollars?

Mr. MULTER. I am the wrong one to ask that, Mr. GWINN, because as you probably know I thought those were good programs under Roosevelt and Truman and espoused them. I think they are good programs under Eisenhower. I think they are good programs no matter what party is in control. That is why I think we ought to expand them.

If you disband our Small Business Administration, where are these small-business men going to get the loans? If you take away the Federal Reserve Board and its Federal Reserve banks where will the big banks get their money? I say that is good business. It is not only good business, it is good for our country, it is good for our economy, and we could not get along without it.

If we agree with the material viewpoint, that it is proper for government to help business then it is proper for government to help these youngsters get an education. Maybe some of them will later come to this body as Congressmen and espouse your viewpoint rather than mine, but I am willing to run that risk.

Mr. GWINN. If they are beholden of the Government they will begin to worship the Government like they did in olden times.

Mr. MULTER. There also I do not agree. When you get to worshipping a government in a democracy, in a republican form of government like ours, it is self-worship, and we are not going to get to the point of worshipping ourselves. We are too individualistic for that.

Mr. GWINN. I wish I were as hopeful as you.

Mr. ELLIOTT. Thank you, very much, Mr. MULTER. Your statement has been most helpful, and we appreciate your time and consideration.

Mr. MULTER. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

We'd Better Start Selling America to the World

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. CARLTON LOSER

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 24, 1958

Mr. LOSER. Mr. Speaker, I was greatly impressed by a recent story appearing in the Nashville Tennessean some days ago written by the Honorable Coleman A. Harwell, vice president and editor of this great southern newspaper.

Mr. Harwell has just returned from a European trip and he suggests a number of things that can be done by America to strengthen western unity and the cause of freedom.

He calls to the attention of the readers of this newspaper that we have expended nearly $18 billion in foreign aid during the last 12 years. He suggests that our vast surpluses of food should be put into channels that will take it to hungry people and relieve the agriculture distress.

This article is most thought provoking. It is a new approach to foreign aid, and one that should be read by every Member of the Congress.

It follows:

WE'D BETTER START SELLING AMERICA TO THE WORLD—RED SALESMEN OFFER TOUGH COMPETITION

(This is the final article in a series by the editor of the Nashville Tennessean, who has just returned from a trip to France and England. Other articles, one on the London theater and the other dealing with some travel pointers, will appear in subsequent Sunday editions.)

(By Coleman A. Harwell)

There is great need for dramatic leadership to break the grip of the cold war.

America alone can provide this leadership.

If she does not, she is in danger of tipping more of the world toward Russia's influence.

These are some of the things that America can do to strengthen western unity and the cause of freedom:

1. Launch a crash program of atoms for peace.

2. Sponsor through Unesco or elsewhere, a great unified scientific plan for world betterment, including a drive on cancer, malaria and other dread diseases.

3. Develop a new approach to world economic needs, including a lending program that will increase productivity and buying power. At the same time, work to reduce world tariffs and thus stimulate trade.

4. Put our vast surpluses of food into channels that will take it to hungry people and relieve the agriculture distress which is a major factor in our present economic difficulty.

Easier said than done? True.

Far fetched? Possibly, but consider the alternatives.

In the 12 years since World War II we have spent nearly $18 billion in foreign aid. Most of it has been for military purposes. People in the lands affected are still about as hungry and ill clothed and ill housed as they were.

The hope of winning the cold war seems dim. The probability of a crackup in Russia or an upheaval among its satellites appears slight. For one thing, the scientific achievements of Russia and the surprising extent of Russian economic penetration into uncommitted nations, stretching from the Pacific to the Mediterranean, suggests increasing strength.

So, do we continue to stockpile more bombs and perfect our missiles, while Russia does the same? Do we have a summit conference and agree to curtail military competition? In either case, it seems the best to be hoped for is a stalemate.

So much attention has been focused on a summit meeting—plans and arguments concerning one—that less dramatic aspects of the East-West situation have almost been lost sight of. One might even suspect the summit matter is being emphasized to distract attention from Russia's vast economic drive.

MILITARY AFFAIRS ONLY

We should bear in mind that a summit meeting concerns military affairs only. Of course, they must be dealt with, but we must realize that the game may be won elsewhere while we are concentrating on these worrisome and dangerous, though possibly unrewarding matters.

Meanwhile, if we are not active in other ways, we can be certain that Russia will be. She already is. And we can be certain that the uncommitted regions of the world, and even our friends, are not going to sit around and twiddle their thumbs.

They are not particularly afraid of meeting Russia in the market places, or elsewhere for that matter. While we hold Russia at bay militarily, now with our Strategic Air Command and later with missile bases, we may find she has won vast areas and populations with her economic offensive.

It is not the writer's intention to intimate that our military program, including NATO, is useless. Quite the contrary. We need stronger forces in our joint defense program, for both psychological and physical reasons. We cannot leave Russia's military might unchallenged.

But we cannot continue to suffer such setbacks as have occurred in the last 2 years without suffering permanent damage. The three big ones were:

1. Hungary.
2. Suez.
3. Sputnik.

Paul-Henri Spaak, secretary general of NATO, who says we are losing the psychological cold war to Russia, places considerable blame on the western press, charging we have ballyhooed sputnik and given too much play to Bulganin's letters.

The answer to that, we believe, is that the press on the whole did no more or less than to report the facts. If it erred at times, it usually put things straight speedily. If Bulganin got more space and bigger headlines than Spaak, or we, wanted him to get, it was because he made news. The same space was available to our leaders.

The damage to western prestige and unity, we submit, was done largely by the three things listed above.

HARD LESSONS

Hungary showed that no satellite nation can look to us for rescue; Suez showed that western nations could be drawn off balance by their anxiety and frustrations; sputnik showed that American doesn't always have the most and the best and the biggest of everything, including initiative and imagination. (These two qualities, incidentally, are the essentials of good salesmanship. Khrushchev obviously is using them in his economic campaign.)

What a young Englishman said to me about another aspect of Suez was shocking to me. He is a conservative, thoughful young man who lived several years in America after World War II.

He said that many Britons, possibly a majority, were opposed to the Suez venture. But, he said, they were outraged when we denounced the British and French.

"After that," he said, "many of us felt that America was not to be relied on as a friend. In fact, some said America was no more to be trusted than Russia."

A scathing comment, extremely difficult to take quietly. But there came to mind what an old friend, a veteran American news correspondent, had said to me the day before:

"These people make you mad. But you can always tell just where they stand. And, another thing, no matter how mad they make you, you know when the showdown comes, when you need them, you can count on them."

He's lived in England most of 17 years, covered the blitz in London and the war on the continent, has been in every country of Europe and the Mideast, has sized up peoples in all of them in a particularly incisive way. His judgment seemed to me worth respect.

HE WAS A FRIEND

So when the young Englishman delivered himself of the scathing comment on America, I reminded myself it was a friend talking. And the thought occurred that if we do not want more friends, and others, talking the same way or worse we'd better get busy with some leadership.

President Eisenhower's open skies and space-for-peace proposals do not seem to serve the purpose. What we need is a practical program to compete with Khrushchev's salesmanship.

Eisenhower seems definitely on the right track with his recommendation for increased loan funds and is assured of support in Congress.

This is what we need more of in place of Mr. Dulles' continuous travelogues.

It is to be hoped that President Eisenhower and the Democratic Congress will work together to provide a practical program and dynamic leadership which the free world direly needs.

McSchwartzism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. TIMOTHY P. SHEEHAN

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 24, 1958

Mr. SHEEHAN. Mr. Speaker, the Chicago Tribune properly calls attention to the conduct of Dr. Bernard Schwartz and some of the members of the House Subcommittee on Legislative Oversight.

The many unproven charges and accusations against public officials and Government agencies without having given the accused an immediate opportunity to tell their side of the story, and having these people tried in the court of public opinion by having leaked information to certain newspapers is not good ethics.

Certain liberals in this country continuously alledged unfairness on the part of the McCarthy Senate committee proceedings attributing these irregular methods to the late Senator's committee. Where are all these self-righteous liberals and liberal organizations today? Why are they not vehemently protesting the methods used by Bernard Schwartz?

The lack of action by the liberals only helps to confirm my long-held opinion that the great majority of them are fakers and will justify any action or program which carries out their ends and only have a passing and superficial interest in justice and ethics as real principles of everyday conduct.

The Chicago Tribune editorial is as follows:

[From the Chicago Sunday Tribune of February 16, 1958]

MCSCHWARTZISM

Dr. Bernard Schwartz has been testifying before the House subcommittee that fired him as its chief counsel. Dr. Schwartz said that he and his staff had found evidence indicating that Richard A. Mack, a member of the Federal Communications Commission, had received $3,650 in checks from an attorney who, in Dr. Schwartz' opinion, acted for the successful applicant for a TV license in Miami, Fla.

These and many other charges regarding Government officials of high rank, eminent members of the bar, and other citizens have been heard, and the persons concerned were not given an immediate opportunity to tell their side. Without the knowledge of the committee members, Dr. Schwartz' investigators secreted a wire recorder when they interviewed Commissioner Mack. Instead of turning over the recorded interview to the committee after he was fired, Dr. Schwartz had his wife hand it to Senator MORSE for safekeeping.

Isn't it odd, then, that those who screamed loudest in protest against the alleged irregularities of the McCarthy inquiry are not up in arms over the arbitrary or unfair conduct of the investigators and some of the committee members in this inquiry into the Government's regulatory commissions? Part of the evidence and many of the charges of misconduct have been leaked to favored newspapermen, but not even this highly irregular method of conducting the com-

mittee's business has been condemned as McCarthy was condemned.

The conclusion to be drawn from this difference in the attitude toward the two investigations is not that Dr. Schwartz' methods are unspeakably wicked but that Mr. McCarthy's weren't unspeakably wicked, either. Surely no one can pretend that corruption in public office is a trivial matter, but neither is the progress of the Communist conspiracy in this country a trivial matter. Both are extremely serious subjects, requiring the attention of Congress.

Dr. Schwartz was determined to expose weaknesses in the organization of the regulatory commissions because if they are left uncorrected our Government itself will be undermined. Mr. McCarthy was equally zealous to keep Communists from undermining the military and moral strength of our people.

Of the two dangers, that of communism is the greater and more immediate, for it is no secret that the Reds are determined to destroy freedom in the United States if they can, by any means that comes to their hand. They may have the means at this moment.

Public opinion today is on the side of Dr. Schwartz. The people want to know, and believe they have a right to know, whether the officials in the regulatory agencies are honest; whether Sherman Adams, the President's chief assistant, has intervened in behalf of any litigant before these agencies; whether Thomas E. Dewey, as a lawyer, has taken any advantage of the fact that the administration is heavily indebted to him for Mr. Eisenhower's elevation to the Presidency.

Similarly, we have always believed the people for the most part were with Senator McCarthy. They thought they had a right to know whether the cause of communism was being advanced in this country and abroad as a result of carelessness in guarding our military secrets or the infiltration of American installations by Communist spies.

The people were right both times. Those of us who refused to join the clamor against McCarthy are consistent in upholding Dr. Schwartz. It is those who were anti-McCarthy but are now pro-Schwartz who need to explain an inconsistency.

Dewey at Manila

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEO W. O'BRIEN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 24, 1958

Mr. O'BRIEN of New York. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following news release:

The missile which the United States Navy Department fired 60 years ago, on February 25, 1898, directed to Adm. George Dewey, at Hong Kong, hit solidly on its impact area, 10,000 miles away, and started a chain reaction that established United States supremacy in the Pacific Ocean and had far-reaching effects upon our history. The war-headed message was dispatched by Assistant Secretary of the Navy Theodore Roosevelt, the centennial anniversary of whose birth on October 27, 1858, is now being observed. It compelled worldwide recognition of the United States as a power with which all nations must reckon in their immediate or long-distance planning.

War with Spain was imminent. Theodore Roosevelt realized the vital importance of preventing action by the Spanish Fleet at Manila. His message to Admiral Dewey said: "Order the squadron except *Monocacy* to Hong Kong. Keep full of coal. In the event of declaration of war (with) Spain, your duty will be to see that Spanish squadron does not leave the Asiatic coast, and then (conduct) offensive operations in Philippine Islands. Keep *Olympia* (flagship) until further orders."

As a result of this order, Admiral Dewey concentrated and prepared his fleet at Hong Kong, which he left on April 27, under further instructions from Secretary of the Navy John D. Long, "to commence operations at once, particularly against Spanish fleet. You must capture vessels or destroy."

Dewey arrived off Manila late April 30 and commenced his bombardment early May 1, with 6 warships and a revenue cutter against the Spanish fleet of 10 ships aided by the shore batteries. All Spanish ships were sunk or put out of action and Dewey commenced and successfully maintained his blockade of Manila the same day.

On August 13, Manila surrendered to Admiral Dewey. Thus the Philippines were lost by Spain. Their acquisition, and that of Hawaii, contributed greatly to our dominance in the Pacific Ocean. Historians credit these results to the foresight and courage of Theodore Roosevelt, and the effective execution of his order to Admiral Dewey on February 25, 1898.

Of Admiral Dewey's accomplishment, Theodore Roosevelt later wrote:

"Admiral Dewey has done more than add a glorious page to our history; more even than do a deed the memory of which will always be an inspiration to his countrymen, and especially his countrymen of his own profession. He has also taught us a lesson which should have profound practical effects, if only we are willing to learn it aright.

"In the first place, he partly grasped and partly made his opportunity. Of course, in a certain sense, no man can absolutely make an opportunity. * * * Nevertheless when the chance does come, only the great man can see it instantly and use it aright. In the second place, it must always be remembered that the power of using the chance aright comes only to the man who has faithfully and for long years made ready himself and his weapons for the possible need."

Radio Free Europe

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GORDON H. SCHERER
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 24, 1958

Mr. SCHERER. Mr. Speaker, many of my colleagues of the House may not have heard the broadcast of Fulton Lewis, Jr., on February 19, in which he interviewed Mr. George Brada, a native of Czechoslovakia who lives in Munich, and who is the administrative assistant to Dr. Walter Becher, a leading member of the Bavarian Parliament.

The interviews deals with the type of job Radio Free Europe is doing. Since all of us in the Congress are vitally interested in the reactions of Europeans to this activity, it is my feeling that my colleagues and others who read the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD should have the benefit of Mr. Lewis' broadcast, which follows:

FULTON LEWIS, JR., BROADCAST OF FEBRUARY 19, 1958

Mr. LEWIS. Tonight, ladies and gentlemen, I have for you what I consider a very important witness in the Radio Free Europe story. All through this thing, the Free Europe sponsors have been begging the most important question involved; they say it is all a noble enterprise because it is sending the message of truth and freedom to the captive people behind the Iron Curtain. Granted this is an admirable enterprise, the question is whether this is actually what they're doing. A lot of important people are taken to Munich every year on plush junkets to see the machinery in operation and get a stopoff in Paris on the way back, and they say what a wonderful thing it is. The catch is that none of them really knows, because none of them is ever able to find out what these broadcasts are really saying, what line they're taking—they are all in foreign languages—they could be saying anything and not even the American officials would know because they can't understand the language either.

Tonight I have with me Mr. George Brada, a native of Czechoslovakia, who lives in Munich, who is administrative assistant to Dr. Walter Becher who, in turn, is one of the leading members of the Bavarian Parliament, both of whom are in this country as visitors. He is in a position to tell us, firsthand, what the truth is and what these broadcasts really do say.

Mr. Brada, you have seen the stacks of photostats which I have been presenting to my listeners, as evidence of what is really going on in Radio Free Europe and what is being said in their broadcasts—are you able to tell us whether or not these photostats are authentic? Do you have any way of knowing?

Mr. BRADA. Oh, yes. I have seen thousands of Radio Free Europe documents, and these that you have are absolutely authentic. You see, Mr. Lewis, the great majority of people working for Radio Free Europe in Munich are entirely out of sympathy with what they are doing. Most of them, if they were able to earn the same living in some other way, would not be working there at all. In other words, there is an anti-Communist underground in the operation.

Mr. LEWIS. And the employees have access to the files?

Mr. BRADA. They have constant access to the files, and they can very easily remove documents which they consider important or which show how the broadcasting is protecting communism. They bring them out to show to friends, or they will bring them out for anybody they think can be helpful in exposing what is going on. They have no sense of loyalty to the organization. They are merely earning a living.

Mr. LEWIS. Now, Mr. Brada, you have heard many Radio Free Europe broadcasts, I assume.

Mr. BRADA. I have made it my business since early 1952 to monitor the broadcasts, either by listening to them or recording them or by reading the scripts.

Mr. LEWIS. The Crusade for Freedom advertises these broadcasts as being a great fight against communism and a message of truth and freedom to the people behind the Iron Curtain. What is your opinion of them?

Mr. BRADA. Oh, they sometimes use the word freedom, but they never use it in the sense of giving back to the people the freedom that the people once knew. They never use it in the sense of freedom as the Western World knows freedom. This is just an empty word with them. They talk of freedom in terms that amount to a return to the national front governments which were led by Communists. At that time, they also talked about freedom, but the people knew very well there was no freedom.

Mr. LEWIS. Do the broadcasts denounce communism, as we are led to believe?

Mr. BRADA. They denounce Communist Russia * * * they denounce Stalinist communism * * * but they praise and promote the development of National communism. They never recognize the internal danger of communism to these countries as you recognize it to your country here in the United States.

Mr. LEWIS. Now, could you enlarge on that a little?

Mr. BRADA. Well, yes, in this way: they never make any mention of your congressional investigations into communism or subversive activities. I have never heard the first word about the Alger Hiss case, or about how China was lost to the Communists or the Harry Dexter White case, or any of the others. These things are carefully concealed in the same way that the true story of the communization of these Iron Curtain countries through the national front governments are concealed. They never mention the truth about the working methods and tactics of the state security police, and its agents-provocateurs in the East at the present time.

Mr. LEWIS. What is their attitude toward the Gomulka government of Poland?

Mr. BRADA. They picture Gomulka as a great national hero in whom they place all their hopes for the future. The proof of the fact that they are very friendly to Gomulka lies in the fact that Gomulka's government no longer makes any attempt to jam their broadcasts.

Mr. LEWIS. What about Tito?

Mr. BRADA. It is the same with Tito. They spend many hours every day in favorable propaganda about Tito and Titoism, but they constantly soft-pedal or eliminate any criticism of what is wrong in Titoism. You see, Mr. Lewis, much of the evil that is done by the Radio Free Press propanganda is done by emphasizing the things that are favorable to national communism, and never mentioning the things that are unfavorable to it.

Mr. LEWIS. Would you say that the broadcasts are soft toward communism?

Mr. BRADA. I would say very definitely, yes. They take the line that no real effort toward liberation of the people in the East is necessary or even desirable, and that if everybody simply has faith, the evolution of Titoism or Gomulkaism will follow in the other countries as a natural course of events. They preach the idea that communism eventually will just fade away of itself.

Mr. LEWIS. Mr. Brada, do you think that communism has faded away in Poland or in Yugoslavia?

Mr. BRADA. You are asking the wrong person, Mr. Lewis. Ask the tens of thousands of Polish and Yugoslav refugees who are constantly escaping from both countries. Or, if you can, ask some of the hundreds of thousands in both countries who are starving under the Communist system.

Mr. LEWIS. Radio Free Europe talks about "truth dollars" and the "message of truth" being sent behind the Iron Curtain. Is it the truth, Mr. Brada?

Mr. BRADA. Yes, in a sense, they tell the truth. Most of the broadcasting time is allocated to a never-ending repetition of banalities. It is a sort of special little game of truth that Radio Free Europe plays for itself. It goes something like this: The Communists call the Americans imperialists. Americans are not imperialists. The Communists claim they want peace. The Communists do not want peace. This endless repetition of trivialities only spreads boredom and turns listeners away. The question is not whether they are telling the truth but whether they are telling any truths that amount to anything or accomplish anything. The fact is you can impart many lies and make much evil propaganda by telling the truth.

Mr. LEWIS. Now, just what is the real purpose behind the Radio Free Europe propaganda, Mr. Brada?

Mr. BRADA. The real purpose, Mr. Lewis, is very simple. Radio Free Europe is being operated by the discredited politicians of the old national front governments, who collaborated with the Communists and finally sold their countries out to communism. They fled to the West, and merely continue their political activities, using the radio transmitters of Radio Free Europe to try to continue the political propaganda which they no longer could deliver in person. Their purpose is the same purpose they had before they fled into exile—the communization of their nations. These people are not any high-minded idealists who are interested in fredom and liberty and justice and a restoration of all those things to their home countries. These people are politicians—discredited politicians, at that—and their purpose and hope is somehow to get themselves back into control, so they can impose their own private brand of communism on their countries in place of the present brand. That's the reason they are soft on Tito and soft on Gomulka. They want to be Titos and Gomulkas themselves.

Mr. LEWIS. And you don't approve of that?

Mr. BRADA. It is unimportant, Mr. Lewis, whether I approve or not. If the American people want ot pay the bill for any such operation, that is their privilege. But if they are paying the bill, it seems to me that they should know what they are paying for, and not be asked to support it under false pretenses.

Mr. LEWIS. Thank you, Mr. George Brada, we appreciate your taking the time to tell us the facts about the Free Europe broadcasts.

A Bill To Facilitate Construction of a Superliner Passenger Vessel

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS M. PELLY
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 24, 1958

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a bill to authorize the payment of construction differential and cost of national defense features of a superliner passenger vessel for operation in the North Atlantic to replace the Steamship *America* which is about to become obsolete.

This bill carries the language recommended by the Department of Commerce in its report on H. R. 9342, which is the original bill of the distinguished chairman of the House Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee, Mr. BONNER.

In addition to the wording suggested by the administration amending Mr. BONNER's measure to authorize building of a sister ship to the steamship *United States*, I have added a provision so that for purposes of determining the fair cost of national defense features to be paid by the Government the normal commercial speed for the superliner shall be considered as 28.5 knots without a penalty if the ship averages a running speed up to but not exceeding 30.7 knots.

The impasse in negotiations between the United States Lines and the Federal Maritime Board has been over the factor of what should be considered the normal commercial speed.

My bill would have Congress set the new vessel's normal speed as 28.5 knots which is the average running speed of England's *Queen Mary* and *Queen Elizabeth*.

Testimony of Clarence Morse, Maritime Administrator, backed by the General Accounting Office was to the effect that he had construed 30.7 knots to be the normal commercial speed because this has been the average speed of the steamship *United States*.

Mr. Morse has stated an agreement could be reached between the United States Lines and the Maritime Board within the framework of the Merchant Marine Act of 1936 if 28.5 knots was established by Congress as the basic peacetime speed of the ship.

Mr. Speaker, in introducing this legislation I have sought to break the roadblock to an agreement under present policy and law without having the Government build the ship and sell it at a fixed price as provided by the chairman's bill. Certain strong objections raised by the administration would be eliminated by this new bill and I think it might encounter less obstacles before and after final passage.

I wish to emphasize, Mr. Speaker, the importance of an agreement between the proposed operator and the Government. The Navy says there is a vital need of the new ship as an auxiliary troop transport in the event of war, and that speed is the best safeguard against the submarine menace.

Likewise let me point out the economy of a privately built ship ready for use if necessary, as against Navy vessels with 100 percent Government cost of construction and maintenance.

The distinguished chairman of the House Maritime Committee has made valiant efforts to work out a means of arranging for construction of the new superliner. My purpose is to assist the chairman to harmonize the differences between the various parties of interest.

Tom Little's Finest Hour

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. CARLTON LOSER
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 24, 1958

Mr. LOSER. Mr. Speaker, one of the greatest political cartoonists of our generation, Tom Little, was signally honored by Silliman Evans, Jr., and his newspaper, the Nashville Tennessean, the other evening at a giant dinner in his honor. Friends and cartoonists from over the Nation gathered in Nashville to do honor to this Pulitzer prize-winning cartoonist of 1956, who for 43 years has worked on this great newspaper. He was again given National recognition by Freedom's Foundation at Valley Forge, Pennsylvania, a few days ago, receiving

two George Washington honor medals for oustanding works in his chosen field. These honors were conferred on him "for valuable contributions in furthering democracy and religious understanding."

Since this distinguished newspaper man is known across the Nation as the outstanding political cartoonist of his generation, I thought the editorial appearing in the Nashville Tennessean, entitled "Tom Little's Finest Hour," would be of interest to Little's friends in the Congress and throughout the country.

Unanimous consent having been obtained to insert the editorial in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the same follows:

TOM LITTLE'S FINEST HOUR

This was Tom Little's finest hour. His position as one of the country's foremost cartoonists had been long established. His fighting qualities in behalf of good causes was known throughout the land and across the seas. His deep human qualities were a familiar story.

But here were his friends, or part of them, gathered from far and near to pay tribute to his accomplishments in long service with the Nashville Tennessean. All of his well-wishers and admirers, of course, could not have been gathered under one roof, but these were a representative group, including famous members of his specialized profession who found gratification in hailing the Pulitzer prize winner and holder of many other significant awards.

Success rarely comes easily for any man, and Tom Little has been no exception. But in his case, a talent for hard work and a remarkable flair for arresting ideas has been unbeatable. By the broad strokes of his crayon he pleads a cause more effectively than can be done with words, and by the same means he can assail those who nave been unfaithful to the public trust.

That he has used his gifts aggressively is accepted, but at the same time he has more than his share of humility and understanding.

At last night's gathering his heart must have been warmed, and beyond that there was the knowledge that the sincere tributes were indorsed by countless others who hold him in such high regard. More than a Nashville institution, he influences the thought of America; and it is in this broader role that he has been toasted.

Nowhere is pride in his accomplishments greater than among his associates on this newspaper and we stand in the forefront of those who salute him for high achievement.

Schwartzism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. TIMOTHY P. SHEEHAN
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 24, 1958

Mr. SHEEHAN. Mr. Speaker, in its editorial of February 19, the Washington Star brings into proper focus the conduct of Bernard Schwartz, ousted chief counsel of the House Subcommittee on Legislative Oversight, who has made wild accusations against certain people without promptly giving them the proper opportunity to defend themselves.

The Star editorial states that Dr. Schwartz seems to have a talent for overstatement. In making these wild-swinging generalized accusations, Mr. Schwartz seems to have the support of the liberal elements in the country. These liberals have taken practically no action, but instead appear to support Swartzism, which apparently consists of gross overstatements, wild accusations, and personal use of congressional committee material and committee files without regard for the rights of the persons involved.

The Star editorial follows:

VERY THIN STUFF

The "case" against Sherman Adams in the matter of North American Airlines, as it has been developed by Dr. Bernard Schwartz, strikes us as being about as thin as thin can be.

Dr. Schwartz, who seems to have a talent for overstatement, referred to the North American case last week when he accused the House Subcommittee on Legislative Oversight of trying to frustrate his plans to "bring to light the machinations of the White House clique in controlling decisions of these (regulatory) agencies." He has also imputed "grossly improper" activity to Mr. Adams in connection with this matter.

Well, let's take a look at what Mr. Adams, assistant to the President, actually did.

On June 26, 1953, he wrote a letter to Murray Chotiner, one of Vice President NIXON'S campaign managers. This letter evidently was in response to a request for help in the North American matter from Chotiner, who is a lawyer. Mr. Adams wrote that he had gone over the matter carefully with the then Acting Chairman of the Civil Aeronautics Board. (The CAB had started proceedings to revoke North American's operating authority for violating regulations.) Mr. Adams also said that North American, if dissatisfied with the CAB ruling, could appeal to the courts, and that this might delay final action for as much as 2 years. The CAB ruled against North American, the case was taken to the courts, and the courts upheld the CAB.

Just where is the gross impropriety? The Adams letter seems to us to be a polite brushoff. Certainly he did not influence the CAB, and he did not tell Mr. Chotiner anything that the latter, as a lawyer, did not already know.

Dr. Schwartz argues that what North American wanted was delay, and he complains because the CAB agreed to stay, or hold up, its order pending the court appeal. But what else could the CAB have done? North American unquestionably had the right to appeal to the courts. Does Dr. Schwartz think that the CAB, by enforcing its order immediately, should have put North American out of business before it had its day in court? If so, this surely is a strange concept of justice.

What all of this adds up to, in our opinion, is another example of the smear at work. The Vice President's campaign manager and the assistant to the President are linked to "the machinations of the White House clique." The headlines proclaim that Mr. Adams has done something grossly improper. But when one wades through the transcript of the testimony it is clear that Mr. Adams did nothing to control the CAB decision, and did nothing to rescue either Mr. Chotiner or his airline client. Following are two significant questions and answers, as reported in the transcript:

"Question. Doctor, do you know how many other people, Senators, Congressmen, had written to the CAB with reference to this case?

"Answer. Yes; there was tremendous pressure from all sides, both from the Congress, from the Executive, and also outside, generated, primarily by North American.

"Question. Sure, and notwithstanding that, the CAB went ahead and put him (North American) out of business?

"Answer. Yes; eventually."

All of which leads us to the obvious conclusion that neither the alleged machinations of the White House clique, nor those of any other clique, were controlling the decisions of the CAB.

Hair of the Dog

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALVIN M. BENTLEY
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 24, 1958

Mr. BENTLEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend and revise my remarks, I wish to include the text of a column by Henry Hazlitt from the February 24 issue of Newsweek magazine entitled "Hair of the Dog." The article in question is a strong denunciation of deficit spending as a possible cure for the economic difficulties in which we find ourselves today.

The article follows:

HAIR OF THE DOG

(By Henry Hazlitt)

It is only a few weeks since the President reported that the Nation's output of goods and services in 1957 totaled $434 billion, the highest figure on record. In December 1957, moreover, the average hourly earnings of manufacturing workers, at $2.11, were also the highest on record. But suddenly, overnight (if you believe the Democratic speeches in Congress), we are in a cataclysmic depression. Mass unemployment and starvation stalk the land, forcing soup kitchens and breadlines. (It is true that official estimates of unemployment rose to 5.8 percent of the labor force in January as compared with 5.2 percent in December.)

The Democratic politicians are almost praying for a depression so they can have the privilege of saving us from it this November, and again in 1960. And they have not the slightest doubt about the remedy. It is, as you might have guessed, for the Government to spend more money. Especially we must start more public works. The question is not whether they are needed, but how much employment they will provide, and how much they will add to purchasing power. It is assumed that every dollar spent by Government somehow magically multiplies itself in increasing national income. Given this theory, economy in government is not only unnecessary but antisocial and wicked; and squandering and waste are the height of economic wisdom.

NO MAGIC IN DEFICITS

It seems necessary to point out all over again that the Government-spending theory has been repeatedly disproved in practice. In the fiscal year 1944, the Federal Government spent $95 billion; in the fiscal year 1947, it spent only $39 billion. Here was a drop in the annual spending in this 3-year period of $56 billion. A budget deficit of $51 billion in 1944 was also turned into a budget surplus of $754 million in 1947. Yet instead of a recession in this period there was a substantial increase in employment, wages, and

prices. Again, in the fiscal year 1953, the Federal Government spent $74 billion; and in the fiscal year 1955 only $64 billion. The budget deficit also dropped from $9.4 billion in 1953 to $4.2 billion in 1955. Yet in the calendar year 1955 the gross national product increased $25 billion above that of 1953.

I have repeatedly tried to explain in this column not only that the Government-spending nostrum or Government-deficit nostrum does not work in practice but that it is theoretical nonsense as well. This leads us to the depression remedy that the conservatives and Republicans are now suggesting, which is a cut in taxes. President Eisenhower has said that he would favor a tax cut to brake the recession unless the economy turns up by midyear. Now a tax cut would at least have several advantages as compared with an increase in expenditures. It is a smaller invitation to reckless Government spending. A wisely made tax cut, moreover, could increase incentives. But this is not what anybody is suggesting. What is being mainly suggested is an increase of $100 or more in the personal income-tax exemptions which would take millions of people off the income tax entirely, leaving the confiscatory rates on higher incomes and the excessive rates on job-giving corporations.

WAGE RATES AND JOBS

The President wisely pointed to the danger of "going too far with trying to fool with our economy," and implied that he would want such a tax cut only if it would not be inflationary. But the very purpose of such a tax cut would be to resume inflation. What is proposed, in short, is a cut in taxes without a cut in expenditures, to increase the size of the deficit, and to get recovery by deficit.

The worst of all remedies for the recession is that proposed by Walter Reuther and the AFL–CIO. It is a further increase in wage rates so increase purchasing power. As I pointed out here last week, a further increase above present peak wage rates would simply increase cost of production, squeeze out more profit margins, price more goods and more labor out of the market, increase unemployment still more, reduce payrolls, reduce labor's total income, and turn recession into real depression.

The country may well pray to be saved from its saviors.

Education for Freedom and Security

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT L. F. SIKES

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 13, 1958

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, I wish to have inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the speech made by Mr. M. D. Mobley, executive secretary of the American Vocational Association, Inc., before the Alumni Chapter of Alpha Gamma Rho Fraternity of Washington, D. C., on Saturday, February 15, 1958, on Education for Freedom and Security.

Mr. Mobley is one of America's best known experts in the field of agricultural legislation. I have personally observed his work for many years and I know that his statements deserve serious consideration.

The speech follows:

EDUCATION FOR FREEDOM AND SECURITY

My subject for tonight is Education for Freedom and Security. I shall attempt to bring to you the facts relating to the major problems with which the free nations of the world are concerned at this point. For several years I have given much thought to some of these problems. During the past 6 months, as a result of a foreign assignment that took me around the world, I have had reason to give these matters concentrated thought.

Today the free world is confronted with serious problems that have direct bearing on the security and freedom of people everywhere. They involve the battle for the minds of men, the armament race with Soviet-dominated countries, the economic war that is beginning to take form, the world population explosion and the yearning of people in underdeveloped countries for a better way of life.

In our efforts to maintain a just and lasting peace, we must never lose sight of the fact that security and freedom are concepts which dominate the desires of men of all races and nationalities throughout the world. The yearning for freedom is perhaps stronger with those like us who were born and bred in its tradition. But the two ideals are essentially inseparable. Man cannot enjoy one without the other. Freedom means little to the man who is starving through no fault of his own. Security means little to a man who cannot also exercise his freedom of thought and his God-given individuality.

In recent months we have heard much about America's education system—its faults and shortcomings. It seems that everyone has suddenly become an expert on education—even those who have not been in a school of any sort for years. Some of the information, or maybe I should say misinformation, that is being blandly presented in speeches in the press and over the radio and television would lead one to believe that educators should try to make scientists and engineers out of all the people. Our Nation has no need for millions of people with a smattering of science and mathematics which would occur if we should make advanced courses in these fields compulsory for all secondary school pupils. Instead we need a few hundred thousand able, talented, outstanding scientists and mathematicians. No one would question the importance of scientists and engineers to our Nation's security and well-being, but we should not become so hysterical and warped in our thinking that we would try to force every child regardless of his talents or lack of talents to study advanced science and higher mathematics. We must continue our efforts to develop an adequate and comprehensive program of education for all the people—a program that recognizes individual differences of people. We must continue to maintain school offerings that deal with human values, good citizenship and skills and knowledge essential to production know-how. We should not allow a couple of Soviet sputniks to cause us to become hysterical and launch forth on a program of revamping America's education system that may do more harm than good.

On the other hand, we should constantly study critically our schools and ever strive to improve them. I would be the last to claim they are satisfactory and that they cannot be improved, but let's not become hysterical. Nor should our studies be launched on a basis of witch hunting.

There is much talk about poorly trained teachers. We all know there are far too many such teachers in our public schools today. I have reached the conclusion that there is not too much wrong with our school system that adequate salaries for teachers would not in time correct. Too many of the people are shedding crocodile tears and are releasing half-truths about the weaknesses of our education system. They might accomplish more if they would think up and support ways and means of providing adequate funds to employ and hold fully qualified and competent teachers.

In years ahead, education—especially those phases which increase the efficiency of workers—will be of increasing importance. We are entering what appears to be the first stages of an all-out economic war with Russia. This is no secret.

Russia's Khrushchev has already made known, in no uncertain terms, the Soviet plans in this field of activity. Only a few months ago he said to an American newspaper publisher, and I quote:

"We declare war upon you * * * in the peaceful field of trade. We declare a war we will win over the United States. The threat to the United States is not the intercontinental ballistic missile, but in the field of peaceful production. We are relentless in this, and it will prove the superiority of our system."

Last fall, while in Karāchi, Pakistan, I saw positive evidence of Russia's attempt to battle us and other free nations for the markets of the world. While there I visited the exhibit of Soviet manufactured goods being offered for sale in this foreign country. The exhibit included tractors, grain drills, pumps for irrigation, automobiles, motorcycles, machine tools, sewing machines, bicycles, scales, meat grinders, microscopes, electric percolators, cameras, watches, porcelain and many other items. Placed on each exhibit was the name of the local concern where it could be purchased, and in some cases the price was displayed.

The products I saw were well made. In fact many of them appeared to be carbon copies of American manufactured products and of goods produced in other countries.

For example, the cameras were almost identical with the German Leica camera. The tractor for sale looked very much like the John Deere.

The thing that alarmed me was the fact that the prices were much lower than the prices of similar goods manufactured in this country. For example, the tractor on display was being offered, so I was told, for 5,000 rupees which at the rate of exchange is a little more than $1,000. The same tractor in the United States sells for well over $2,000.

Along with the battle of economy which may last for centuries, if we are able to maintain peace, is the battle for the minds of men. With the Soviet goods shipped to foreign countries, go Soviet technicians who are trained propagandists as well as technicians.

Not long ago William Benton, publisher of the Encyclopedia Brittanica, who spent several months in Russia, wrote a story that appeared in the December 1956 issue of Coronet magazine, under the title "The Soviet Technician: Ominous Threat to the West," and with the subtitle "We have Nothing To Match These Unique Technological Schools That Turn Out Supertechnicians Without a College Degree."

According to an article that appeared in Life magazine there are 3,796 of these "tekhnikums" in Russia that graduate 70,000 technicians per year. They serve in positions between professional workers and skilled or semiskilled workers.

Mr. Benton stated in his Coronet article the following, and I quote:

"Many of these tekhnikums turn out what might be called junior engineers. Actually these juniors are supertechnicians and specialists who fill vitally important secondary jobs, leaving graduate engineers free for more highly skilled work, and creating a surplus. And, this surplus is what is helping defeat us in the cold war in Asia and Africa.

"Trained in propaganda as well as science, the Soviet engineers and tekhnikum graduates are exported by the hundreds to underdeveloped nations thirsting for guidance and leadership in all fields of technology.

"The United States, lacking this 'middleman' technician category, is wasting thou-

sands of its well-trained engineers in comparatively second-rate jobs—as sales engineers, manual writers, glorified draftsmen, and troubleshooters. Not only are we graduating little more than half the engineers that the Soviet is, but we are wasting their talents for lack of tekhnikum counterpart."

At the present time the United States is providing technical assistance to about 50 underdeveloped nations throughout the world. This program is designed primarily to help the people of these nations to acquire skills and knowledge that will make it possible for them to produce more and have more.

Some of these underdeveloped nations pose a serious and threatening problem. They are ripe for communism.

If we were to classify the countries of the world into 3 groups, we would find that the total population in the group of the highly developed nations, such as the United States, Canada, Australia, and New Zealand, is only 400 million. In the intermediate group, such as the countries of southern and eastern Europe, the Soviet Union, Japan, and the more prosperous countries in Latin America, the population is about 500 million. In the underdeveloped group, including all of the countries of Asia and Africa, most of those in Latin America, and a few in southeastern Europe, the population is about 1,800 million.

This means that approximately two-thirds or 66 percent of the people of the world live in underdeveloped countries, about one-sixth or 16 percent in the intermediate group, and less than one-sixth or 16 percent in the highly developed countries.

The low level of production per person is the cause of the stark poverty of most of the people in underdeveloped nations.

Though tremendous progress in productivity has been made in the highly developed countries, there are today more poverty stricken people in the world than there were 50 or 100 years ago. The population in underdeveloped countries has continued to grow at an accelerated rate, but the production of goods has not increased accordingly.

In recent years—since 1930—the rate of increase in population in undeveloped countries has been almost twice that of the highly developed countries.

If the present rate of increase should continue, the earth's population will double every 42 years. This would mean about 6 billion people in the world by the year 2000.

This tremendous increase in population—should it occur—will place an ever greater strain on the earth's resources and will intensify the struggle for food and raw materials. In addition to the great increase in population the demand per person is also rising.

All this means that we must increase research not only in the missile and other armament fields but in the field of agriculture and nutrition in order to find ways to produce more per unit, more per man and to create new and cheaper foods.

The primary reason for the unprecedented growth in the world's population has not been due to the increased birthrate, though the birthrate has increased. The main factor has been the decline in mortality.

The cheap method of control of malaria and other diseases through the use of miracle drugs has played an important role in lowering the mortality rate, especially among infants. For example, a year's protection from malaria can, in some countries, be made available at less cost than one haircut in Washington.

It seems ironic that as we reduce mortality from dread diseases in the underdeveloped countries, we have not been able to get the people to produce sufficient food to prevent malnutrition. As we improve health conditions and prevent death from diseases, which result in extending the average life span, we must help the people of these underdeveloped countries find ways through research and efficient production to produce more. Proper education is one of the important tools for accomplishing this.

In Pakistan, where I spent 7 weeks last year, I was told that 8 workers out of 10 live on the land and are engaged in farming. Yet they do not produce enough to feed themselves, although a very large percent of their agriculture is devoted to the production of food. I could not help but compare this with the situation in the United States where only about 1 out of every 10 workers are engaged in farming. Yet we produce more farm products than can be consumed domestically and marketed profitably in the foreign markets.

Thomas Jefferson once said, "If a nation expects to be ignorant and free in a state of civilization, it expects what never was and never will be."

Freedom and security in the struggling underdeveloped countries of the world—where two-thirds of the world's population live—depend largely on education, an important part of which must be training that will help them acquire skills and knowledge so they can produce more and have more.

In my estimation, this is a phase of our foreign-aid program that must be expanded. Not only because it is the humanitarian thing to do, but because it is vital to our own security and well-being, and to the freedom and security of people everywhere.

Social Security in 1958

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL A. REED
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 21, 1958

Mr. REED. Mr. Speaker, three present Members of the House—Mr. JOHN W. McCORMACK, Mr. THOMAS A. JENKINS, and I were members of the Ways and Means Committee in 1935 when it reported out the Social Security Act. The report accompanying this legislation included minority views which Mr. JENKINS and I signed. These views concluded with the statement that:

The minority membership of the Ways and Means Committee have at no time offered any political or partisan opposition to the progress of this measure, but on the contrary, have labored faithfully in an effort to produce a measure which would be constitutional and that would inure to the general welfare of all the people.

That nonpartisan spirit has prevailed throughout the intervening 23 years, both during the periods when my good friends, Mr. Robert L. Doughon and Mr. Jere Cooper, were chairmen of the committee and our party was in the minority, and during the periods my good friend, Harold Knutson, and I were chairmen and ours was the majority party.

All of us on both sides of the House have a right to be proud that in social-security legislation over the years we have followed the letter and spirit of this initial statement and "have labored faithfully in an effort to produce a measure that would inure to the general welfare of all the people." That this tradition of statesmanship shall continue to govern our actions is currently of highest importance in view of recent social-security developments to which I shall shortly refer.

The 23 years since the enactment of social security have witnessed profound changes. We have had not only the greatest war in history but the greatest economic expansion in any two decades of our national life—and our social-security system has reflected this fact. Between January 1, 1937, when social-security taxes first became payable, and 1950 when its coverage was first substantially amended, our economic expansion was reflected by the constant increase in social-seclurity revenues. Earning subject to social-security taxes and accordingly social-security-tax receipts, doubled between 1938 and 1942, and in 1950 were nearly three and a half times what they were in 1938.

Besides increases due to our economic growth, revenues have been further increased by the 1950 and subsequent amendments. These have increased coverage from about 3 jobs out of 5 to the presently nearly universal coverage, and have increased the maximum employer-employee taxes on an individual from $60 per year to a present $168 plus $21 for disability. This has meant a nearly fourfold increase in revenue—from less than $1.7 billion in fiscal 1948–49 to over $6.5 billion in fiscal 1956–57—plus a third of a billion from 6 months' taxes for disability.

As rapid as these increases in contributions have been, they have not kept pace with the increase in benefit disbursements. The natural increases in numbers eligible for benefits and in benefit levels would have been great. But these increases were greatly augmented by the 1950, 1952, 1954, and 1956 amendments which liberalized benefit formulas, provided for new starts, disability freezes and dropouts for computing benefits, reduced eligibility requirements, increased permissible earnings of beneficiaries, reduced the retirement age for women, and otherwise increased benefit payments. In combination, benefit expenditures have increased some tenfold, from less than $0.7 billion in 1948–49 to nearly $6.7 billion in 1956–57—while supporting contributions increased less than fourfold—from some $1.7 billion in 1948—1949 to some $6.5 billion in 1956–57.

Let me repeat these critical figures for the fiscal year ending last June, giving the exact amounts to the nearest $1,000: contributions $6,539,837,000, and expenditures $6,664,638,000. For the first time in its history the system's disbursements exceeded its contributions. It lacked $124,751,000 of being pay as you go. This crossing point, where expenditures exceeded contributions was estimated in 1956 to occur just before 1960. On the basis of those estimates, we provided in 1956 for a combined employer-employee tax increase of 1 percent, effective January 1, 1960, and for similar increases in 1965, 1970, and 1975.

At the time of the 1956 amendments your committee secured the best estimates then possible. When the conference agreement of July 16 settled the minor Senate-House differences, esti-

mates were again made, this time on the agreed bill, and were printed on July 23, 1956. Table 7 of those estimates showed for 1957 and 1958 that contributions would exceed benefit expenditures, that in 1959 the contributions plus interest would exceed benefit expenditures, and that in 1960 with the scheduled social-security tax increase, contributions would again substantially exceed expenditures. In each of these years the trust fund would increase. The balance of $21.8 billion at the beginning of 1956, was estimated to increase to $24.5 billion by the end of 1959, and to nearly $26 billion by the end of 1960.

These estimates were based on high employment assumptions and were so labeled. High employment means not only high-payroll tax receipts, but also importantly affects the number who decide to retire and hence the size of benefit disbursements. Intermediate assumptions were made for other factors such as mortality.

I mention these assumptions because, as is illustrated by what has actually happened since the estimates, it is utterly impossible to make any social security estimates not subject to very substantial variations. Perhaps we should have warned the House as to these implications of high employment assumptions, but I question whether it would have made any difference had we done so. I feel that we have had as good actuarial advice as is possible, and that the actual situation which has developed is not to be considered a reflection on Mr. Robert J. Myers, who has been the social-security actuary and our committee's actuarial adviser for many years. Mr. Myers has rendered to the social-security program and to the Congress very distinguished service as the chief actuary and as the congressional adviser on actuarial matters. Mr. Myers has brought to his duties great professional competence and abundant integrity that have given to those relying on his ability deserved confidence in his well-considered views. Instead, it is due to economic and other uncertainties inherent in old-age and survivors' insurance, which cannot be resolved into dependable estimates by any actuary. We find this inherent uncertainty reflected in the latest Trustees' Report on the Social Security Trust Fund, filed last April 30. This report contains estimates which have two assumptions as to future employment levels. Under one of these, the trust fund is estimated to increase by June 30, 1961, more than $2 billion over the estimated balance of June 30, 1957. Under the other assumption, the trust fund is estimated to decrease some $1.8 billion. Both estimates include contributions plus interest on the trust fund, in receipts. Both estimates show that expenditures will exceed contributions—under one assumption, this deficit is over a quarter of a billion dollars, under the other it is over $4 billion.

Recent experience indicates that even this disturbing report may prove optimistic.

Estimated contributions for fiscal 1956–57 were more than a quarter of a billion dollars above the amount actually realized and estimated expenditures nearly a quarter of a billion dollars less than were actually spent. The estimated surplus of contributions over expenditures turned out to be nearly a half billion dollars wrong. It turned out that we had nearly a quarter of a million dollar deficit.

The estimates for the current year may prove to be overoptimistic by a much greater margin than were last year's estimates.

It is questionable whether the revenues for the current year will actually exceed last year's revenues, but the estimates call for about a billion dollars more. It is practically certain that expenditures for the current year will be far more than three times the expenditures which we have figures on for the first third of the year—so we can feel almost certain that these are again very greatly underestimated.

I look forward to the next trustees' report, which we should receive by next April, as I feel certain that its new estimates will take account of the actual experience occurring since the last report. It should prove most helpful in deciding on appropriate action.

The last few months have demonstrated that social security's basic variables so affect its income and outgo that even with the finest actuarial advice there is a tremendous uncertainty as to what costs are going to be and what social security tax rates will be needed to meet these costs. We have had brought home the fact that in contrast with ordinary insurance and annuities where the annual premium is fixed within narrow limits and actuaries deal principally with mortality, social security requires also the best guess possible of future economic conditions. For these future conditions largely determine the total earnings which will be taxed and hence the system's future contributions, and also greatly affect the size of the rolls and, in the long range, the benefit levels, and hence the expenditures. We need more experience in the actual operations of the 1956 amendments.

The situation I have outlined calls for statesmanship of a high order. As is always the case, there are numerous social-security bills pending before the Ways and Means Committee for liberalizing the system. These were introduced in good faith and possibly may be construed as commitments of their authors. I am deeply appreciative of this situation. I feel that the author's constituents will appreciate that these bills were introduced on the assumption that the 1956 estimates of receipts over expenditures were correct and that the surplus of receipts over disbursements would make the proposed liberalizations feasible. I cannot believe that public opinion would favor enacting these bills under the present circumstances. I should like to stress this point because the American people are vitally concerned in the soundness of our social-security system. Would it not be considered a betrayal of our trust if we, at this time of a mounting social-security deficit, recklessly deplete the trust fund by further liberalizing amendments?

The fundamental principle, adopted at the outset of the old-age and survivors insurance system, was that the system should be actuarially sound. The original act established what was termed the "old-age reserve account" and which, since the 1939 amendments, has been called the Federal old-age and survivors insurance trust fund. The principles leading to its establishment and purpose were reaffirmed by the 1956 amendments. In establishing disability insurance at that time we likewise established a separate trust fund, the Federal disability trust fund, separately financed by the additional social-security tax which was imposed and earmarked solely for disability benefits.

There have been, particularly in the early days of social security, divergent views as to the appropriate size of the trust fund, but since 1939 the present general yardstick has been in the law. It contemplates that Congress shall act when the trust fund is unduly small or unduly large. This general yardstick is referred to as the "3-times rule"—the relation of the trust-fund balance to 3 times the estimated expenditures during any of the ensuing 5 years. There is also the unwritten rule that the system should not operate in the red—the pay-as-you-go rule. I do not believe that this House will ever knowingly act in violation of these rules.

Members of this House are keenly aware that they are, in reality, social-security trustees who represent, on the average, some 400,000 citizens of their respective district, practically all of whom are concerned with this great system as present or prospective, direct or indirect contributors and beneficiaries.

I have included in this 400,000 not only those presently employed and directly contributing toward benefits and those actually receiving benefits, but all, including wives and children whose breadwinners' take-home pay is affected by social-security deductions and whose every purchase is affected by social-security taxes passed on to them by way of higher prices, and who are in turn given a floor of protection by the system.

Each of us is pressed to make changes in the system and each recognizes that many of these changes may be desirable. Each of us appreciates that these proposals must be evaluated in terms of immediate and long-run costs, as such costs must, at least ultimately, be reflected in the social-security taxes. In thus weighing benefits and burdens we exercise a necessary trusteeship.

The Congress has been subjected increasingly to articles in the press which point out that social security has been liberalized every election year since World War II and cynically forecast that this year will be no exception. We properly resent this inference that social security is considered a political handout, irresponsibly provided by the Congress. Every student of the system knows the care and consideration which have been given each change. We have at times differed among ourselves on some details, but we have likewise recognized the integrity of those with whom we differ. Amendments have been

adopted only after a careful appraisal of their results, and we have been zealous above all else to preserve the financial integrity of the system.

The fact should be published that each 2 years there is a new House of Representatives, and that social-security proposals introduced the first year are in general the bills whose necessary study and consideration precedes our action in the second year—which is inevitably also an election year. The public should be fully appraised of the careful and considered actions which precede social-security changes.

I particularly stress the importance of a broad understanding of the reasons why the present social-security situation has developed. Members who may be disappointed in not getting action on social-security proposals which they prize, should take satisfaction that inaction demonstrates the falsity of charges that we are playing politics with social security. Much more important, it gives our people concrete evidence that their deep faith in the integrity and security of our contributory insurance system is not misplaced.

I cannot think of anything more tragic, both to the present and future beneficiaries of the system, than our knowingly enacting any proposal that would scrap the principle of pay-as-you-go and operate the system in the red, or which would increase expenditures at a time when the system already is so operating. Such action would undermine public confidence both in the system and in the Congress which controls the system. It is essential that the solvency of the old-age and survivors trust fund be preserved so as to safeguard the benefit rights of the millions of Americans who look to the OASI program for their retirement security. It is particularly essential that such benefit rights be protected with respect to our Nation's low- and middle-income families.

Walter Reuther Has It Coming

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
CLARE E. HOFFMAN
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 18, 1958

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, the much publicized controversy between the Kohler Co. of Kohler, Wis., and the UAW-CIO, headed by Mr. Walter Reuther, is nearing a public hearing.

In view of the widespread interest in this particular strike, I ask that the following editorial from the Arizona Republic dated January 12, 1958, be inserted in the RECORD:

WALTER REUTHER HAS IT COMING

Walter Reuther is fighting viciously to prevent the Senate Rackets Committee from investigating United Auto Workers. Reuther's objective is to make it seem that the committee's investigation of the Teamsters' Union was a public service, but that any probe of the UAW would be just low-down politics.

Reuther does not like Dave Beck, and his rivalry with Jimmy Hoffa has been bitter and often violent. It served his purposes to have both of them cut down to size, but now that the finger points toward the UAW, Reuther is screaming about antilabor bias.

Now that Hoffa and his friends have offered to give even more damaging evidence against Reuther than Reuther is alleged to have turned up on Hoffa, it is unquestionably the duty of the rackets committee to check into every aspect of Reuther's dictatorship. Dave Beck is a petty chiseler compared to Reuther, when you realize what a threat to American liberty Reuther's plans and performance present.

It is clearer now than ever before that the refusal of the committee to consider the operations of the Auto Workers would be the worst kind of politics. Under the chairmanship of the Democrats, the committee vigorously investigated the one big union which supported the Republican administration in the last election. If the committee now, as a result of Reuther's threats, shies away from studying the affairs of another union which supported Democrats, it can be nothing else but a brazen whitewash of political favors.

Reuther's union is the Nation's prime example of political power bought with dues and assessments against members. He excels in applying his doubtfully achieved political power in economic warfare. In the hate-strewn, violence-ridden Kohler strike, where Reuther's avowed purpose has become to break a great company unless it bends to his will, the UAW political arm reaches across the whole continent—city councils, county commissioners, State and Federal authorities have been pressured to boycott Kohler products. Some weaklings succumed. Congress should be interested in learning what methods were used thus to influence government.

Reuther cannot possibly disclaim responsibility for the death-dealing violence at Kohler. Surely the Senate Rackets Committee in all conscience must find out if he is responsible for what happened at Kohler and why he has been able to stay out of prison.

Just like last week, John L. Lewis, one of the great leaders of labor in America, referred to Reuther as "an earnest Marxist inebriated by the impetuosity of his own verbosity."

No fair person wants an investigation solely for the purpose of discrediting any branch of organized labor. No investigation should be undertaken for partisan political reasons. But neither should any investigation be avoided for such reasons. If Reuther is clean, an investigation won't hurt him. If the methods he uses are fair, he need not fear the results. But in any event, the public should know what goes on, and the Senate Rackets Committee is the only means it has of finding out. The committee cannot succumb to Reuther's present violent attack if it wants to retain the respect it has won from the American people.

V. Y. Dallman Conducts Campaign To Develop Public Interest in Elections

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PETER F. MACK, JR.
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 24, 1958

Mr. MACK of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I wish to include the sixth of a series of editorials by V. Y. Dallman editor of the Illinois State Register, on problems and responsibilities of party organizations.

The article follows:

DEMOCRATIC FEDERATION SEEKS TO AROUSE VOTERS TO ACTION

The Democratic Federation of Illinois offers some real hope that at least a part of the ills of the Democratic Party will be cured in time. This group has, as its sole aim, the building up of the party and its improvement to that stage where there will be real statewide competition in all counties, and where the party will be victorious in State contests.

There is certainly nothing wrong with that.

The organizers of the federation are all dedicated citizens. Some of them began their active support of Senator PAUL H. DOUGLAS in his 1948 campaign for the nomination. Some were members of the administration of Governor Stevenson. Many others are outstanding workers and fund raisers for the Democratic organization. Some of them are progressive ward or precinct officials, and a few are like-minded county chairmen.

They went about the formation of the federation in a straightforward, honest way. They consulted Senator Douglas, Governor Stevenson, Mayor Daley, former National Chairman Steve Mitchell, and State Chairman Jim Ronan. They explained their program fully. They gave their aims and policies wide publicity. Their program went through many refinements.

Can anyone in his right mind imagine that organizers of the federation would have carried on if they had faced disapproval on the part of those men named above? They would not.

It is amazing that a number of county chairmen are covertly opposing the organization of Democratic clubs in their counties. It is amazing that some misguided political figures have attacked the federation as a rump organization. It is tragic that some have adopted a purely negative attitude toward the club idea.

Don't they want to see the Democratic Party grow stronger? Don't they want to mobilize the whole Democratic strength which is presently not half mobilized? Don't they want to win State offices? Don't they want to carry Illinois for the national Democratic ticket? Don't they want to see the party alive with new ideas, new idealism, new and vigorous workers, young people and housewives all helping build up the Democratic Party?

The election returns, particularly of 1956, prove beyond any dispute that the job is not now being done. If the Democratic Party is going to win control of the House in 1958 and control of Illinois in 1960, it is not going to do so by remaining divided, half mobilized, full of suspicions and mutual animosities, and dragged down by do-nothingism in the ranks of too many of its local branches.

Cook County Chairman Mayor Daley, Senator DOUGLAS, and others named above cannot spend their time wholly in examining, recruiting, mobilizing, and training prospective party workers. Some who should be doing this are not doing the job.

True, the federation has been tagged in one or two newspapers as anti-Daley, because at its original Springfield organization meeting two or three individuals were critical of political tactics of the Chicago mayor. Five hundred people attended that meeting and participated in its democratic processes. It was inevitable that, with everyone having his say, some critical views would be expressed. That is democracy in action, for democracy in essence means that all views will be expressed and receive consideration.

The federation has been called a Steve Mitchell organization because he supports its aims. It is neither anti-Daley nor pro-Mitchell.

It is our opinion that the federation has demonstrated its faithful democracy, that it has pursued a calm and statesmanlike course even under provocation, and that it offers the best means yet devised to cure weaknesses in the Democratic organization. County chairmen and State Democratic officials should welcome the federation, not shy away from it.

As we said in an earlier article, the cure for the ills of the Democratic Party is more democracy, not less of it. This the federation seeks to provide.

Testimony of Lamar Fleming, Jr., in Support of H. R. 10368

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HALE BOGGS
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 24, 1958

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following testimony of Lamar Fleming, Jr., of Houston, Tex., before the House Committee on Ways and Means, in support of H. R. 10368, renewal of Trade Agreements Act:

National attitudes that fitted past circumstances may cease to fit changing circumstances, as old suits cease to fit our changing bodies.

Among the circumstances which shaped our early national attitudes were the following. The early settlers were few in number. Their tremendous task was the development of a vast country and its resources, from the raw state. They depended for supplies and capital upon the European communities from which they had come, until arduously they could convert the wild resources of the new country to usable forms and achieve an excess of production so that they could have capital of their own. Their isolation was extreme, separated from their European sources of supplies and capital by months of ocean travel and transport and slow overland routes.

Besides these economic circumstances, an important political circumstance accompanied the severance of political ties with England. This was the policy of aloofness from the alinements and controversies of the Old World, which was pursued from the inception of the Republic until World War I.

The dependence on European capital, through investments and loans, lasted a long time. With the exception of a few years, it was 1876 before our exports caught up with and exceeded imports, evidencing a surplus of production sufficient to service Europe's investments in and loans to our economy.

The factory system of manufacture began to supersede handicraft and cottage industry in Europe during the early years of our Republic. The tremendous demands upon our limited labor force and capital for development of our country and its vast resources limited the availability of them to build and operate factories. We had to give priority to developing more immediate production from our fields, forests, and mines, for our sustenance and to pay for indispensable imports and service investments and debt.

On the other hand, we had experienced intermittent interruptions of supplies from Europe as a result of the series of European wars culminating in the Napoleonic Wars and our War of 1812, and this planted a desire to develop industry here. From it sprang customs duties to protect American industry in the American market.

Naturally this proposal met opposition on the grounds that it would tend to raise prices of the protected manufactures to consumers, including producers in the export surplus lines and persons in service occupations, which were categories not susceptible of customs protection. That this opposition did not prevail and that the protective system gradually was expanded probably was due to something more than the desire for self-sufficiency. In a nation chronically dependent on foreign investments and loans, straining to overcome a foreign-trade deficit and meet its international obligations, it may be presumed that whatever tended to reduce imports had an aura of desirability.

In 1820, 65 percent of our exports were crude foodstuffs and materials and less than 6 percent were finished manufactures, compared with 16 and 57 percent, respectively, of our inports. During the 1870's, crude foodstuffs and materials were 58 percent of our exports and finished manufactures were 15 percent, compared with 33 percent of each of these categories for the imports. In the years just preceding World War I, crude foodstuffs and materials were 40 percent of the exports and finished manufactures 31 percent, compared with 48 and 22 percent, respectively, for imports. In finished manufactures, imports still were double exports in the 1870's, but at the turn of the century the exports of them climbed above the imports and have remained above them ever since. The changes between 1876 and World War I occurred in a time of excess of general exports over imports, when domestic savings and capital were growing and immigration was supplementing the labor force, both facilitating the growth of industry.

World War I sharply changed the development of our economy and our world relations.

The needs of the belligerent nations, and our needs when we became one of them, called for a tremendous increase in our productive capacities, industrial, mineral, and agricultural, during World War I and an even greater increase during World War II. Both wars left the principal nations of Europe impoverished, particularly World War II, and left the United States the creditor nation and world money center. We were removed from the status of economic immaturity and dependence on investments and loans from abroad, into the position of leading nation in international investments and loans.

Our industrial expansion in World War I hastened a technological revolution and the organization of much of our industry on a mass production basis, in which plant investment back of the worker made efficiency in cost compatible with high wage scales. Adaptation of production to the technological revolution and mass production methods spread during the interval between the wars and was spurred further by World War II. Ours was the ideal economy for these changes, with our advantages in capital, popular buying power, and mass domestic market within a single customs system. American industry became the greatest and most efficient source of the kinds of products in which plant investment can do most to reduce man-hour requirements.

Technological progress and mechanization greatly increased the capacity and efficiency of our agriculture.

By 1956 the excess of exports over imports was $6,400 million, equal to more than half the value of the imports. Imports of crude foodstuffs and materials were double the exports of them; and exports of finished manufactures were more than three times the imports of them. Twenty percent of the exports were crude foodstuffs and materials, and 58 percent were finished manufactures, compared with 41 percent and 26 percent respectively for imports. Six thousand seven hundred million dollars of the exports, constituting more than the export surplus, was machinery and vehicles, products particularly susceptible to the advantages of technological progress and mass production. Imports of machinery and vehicles were $631 million.

Of course, we cannot long maintain export surpluses at the 1956 level. That is not even to be desired, for it would mean exporting a great deal of wealth for which we could not possibly collect.

The 1956 exports were swollen by subsidized agricultural exports in amounts which probably will not be recurring. For exports to continue at that level would require foreign grants at higher levels or increased imports or both. The cost to us as taxpayers and consumers will be less if the slack is taken up by increased imports rather than grants. I think our expanding industry offers us good reason to expect constantly increasing imports of raw materials for manufacture, especially minerals. I do not believe, however, that we can expect enough increase in imports to forestall partial choking off of exports unless our attitude becomes one of willingness to receive in substantial measure imports that are competitive with domestic materials and domestic manufactures.

The change in our circumstances from struggling debtor to opulent creditor, from purveyor of debt-paying cash crops and other raw materials to the world's principal supplier of manufactured goods, has brought us to this situation. We must give away part of our production, or cut production far below capacity, or buy more from the other fellow.

Changes have occurred elsewhere. The European nations and Japan were impoverished immediately after the war; but they have come back a long way, thanks greatly to our assistance. Their present productions surpass the prewar levels, although they have not achieved anything like a per capita parity with ours. Further development of it will add to world buying power and increase their value to us as customers, provided their and our developments are conceived in cooperative friendliness, in which event the expansive emphasis of each side will be in the productions for which it has comparative advantage. But expansion of European productivity could become more a competitive threat than a promise of added markets if the attitudes between us should become the dog-eat-dog kind, without recognition of the principle of comparative advantage.

Our economy has benefited tremendously from the mass production methods that were practicable here because of our mass market within a single customs system. Except beyond the Iron Curtain, there has been no European market within one customs system with as much as a third of our population. We now face the European common market with a population about equal to ours and resources at least challenging ours, to which Britain and other countries seem destined to affiliate themselves, with some reservations, adding fifty-odd million more population. The substance of this arrangement is that the member countries within a short span of years will eliminate duties between themselves and become a single mass market within one customs system. For imports from other countries, they agree to make their duties substantially the average of their present duties, but within and reconciled to their obligations under the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade (GATT).

I believe this is one of history's masterpieces in statesmanlike accomplishment. Nations that were lagging as separate units will become potent through combination of

their resources and customs-free markets and exploitation of the efficiencies of mass production.

As a contracting party of the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade, we are entitled to sit in with the members of the common market, to forestall establishment of duties that would impair our status quo under the GATT conventions, and generally to influence the conclusions in a cooperative direction.

Western Europe will not be the only common market. The Russian bloc already is one. This common market may be extended to include China and other countries; it may include China already. Regional common markets are being discussed in other parts of the world.

I do not think it is to be doubted that the interests of the Russian bloc will direct it toward cooperation with the European common market. While there is no vested interest except the state's, man-hours of labor will be directed to the lines where they can produce the most value. So it is reasonable to expect that Russia will direct her labor principally toward the productions for which she has comparative advantages, such as abundance of the raw materials, and will exchange the surplus of this production freely for the products of Western Europe in which the latter has comparative advantage, in order to get the most value, quality, and variety for the man-hours expended.

This will benefit both Russia and Western Europe. Talleyrand said there are no friendships between nations, only communities of interest. Trade is the base of normal international communities of interest. The growth of trade between these two mass markets will draw them closer together. The growth of trade between each of them and other countries will draw them and the other countries closer together. The growth of our trade with Western Europe and all other countries, including Russia, will draw us all closer together. And the reverse is equally true: significant refusal of trade with any country, creating conflict instead of community of interest, will deepen the gulf and misunderstandings and weaken the ties between us, which among nations is the counterpart of friendship between individuals.

The shaping of these developments may be very rapid. I referred earlier to the remoteness of our forefathers from the rest of the world. Advances in transportation and communications have annihilated remoteness between nations in the old sense. Communications now reach everywhere within seconds and fast transportation now can reach almost anywhere within a couple of days. All the world is becoming an instantaneous part of all the rest of it.

I also mentioned earlier our traditional policy of aloofness from alinements and controversies of other nations. This ended when we entered World War I and World War II. We have become the creditor of nearly all nations. We have become protector of nations against subjection to totalitarian rule. We are looking to all nations who resist this subjection for cooperation, political and, if necessary, military; and we ask many of them to furnish bases for our military forces. We are in active alliance with other nations for joint defense. We no longer are aloof; we seek the partnership of all nations for the common security.

In these circumstances, an attitude of detachment from the outside world would be blind anachronism. What we need in these circumstances is close attachment to the world.

Our tariff policy through 1930 was one of resistance to foreign trade—resistance to imports, which of itself restricted exports. The step toward encouragement of foreign trade was taken when the Trade Agreements Act was enacted in 1934, authorizing administrative negotiation of reciprocal tariff concessions. The step was implemented after the war by the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade between thirty-odd nations, providing rules and a forum for negotiation of tariff concessions and of mitigations of the obstructive practices which many nations had adopted under the strains resulting from the war, as these strains relaxed, to prevent perpetuation of them as instruments of protection.

The Trade Agreements Act was adopted in times of depression. During its lifetime, our economy has achieved new heights of productivity and prosperity, our foreign trade has flourished, and our Nation has earned significant recognition for devotion to world-wide expansion of trade for the benefit of all concerned, including ourselves. Congress has been relieved of the burden, impossible of proper achievement by a legislative body, of working out every minute customs schedule—a burden which I am told consumed 18 months of logrolling in the case of the Tariff Act of 1930.

The matter before you now is the extension of the Trade Agreements Act, in a form which does not render it ineffective, for 5 years. I wish the proposal were to extend it indefinitely.

I am deeply convinced that the 5-year extension of the act and continuation of the policies involved in it will best serve the immediate and long-range dollars-and-cents interests of the American people. I am convinced it will accomplish more for our national security than many of the billions which will be appropriated for military purposes. I am equally convinced that denial of the extension or amendments that nullify the effectiveness of the act would have disastrous effects on our foreign relations and would aggravate sorely the responsibilities and difficulties of the diplomatic and military sides of our Government. We would be drawing back into isolationism at a time when discovery and evolution are shortening distances, drawing people and places closer together, and making more of the fruits of the earth available to those who do not hide behind walls of their own building. We would be abdicating a great destiny which lies before us to others less blind to the changes that are going on—to the nations in and to be affiliated with the European common market, to the great Eastern common market, and to other groups of nations which follow suit to secure the benefits of mass production and mass markets within single-customs area. We must not let this occur.

The Economy Without Politics

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. NOAH M. MASON
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 24, 1958

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, on Tuesday, February 18, the New York Times editorial page gave us a sane and sensible interpretation of the present business situation without what the Times called the smog that has enveloped the economic picture since it fell into the hands of the politicians—meaning, no doubt, the apostles of gloom and doom who are so assiduously trying to convince the voters that we are rapidly going into another real depression.

If this clear-thinking editorial covering the present condition of our economy could be printed widely, there would be no question of a Republican victory in November and business would take on the courage that is needed very quickly—and nothing else is needed—for recovery from the present slump.

Mr. Speaker, under permission already granted, I include the editorial from the New York Times entitled "The Economy in Perspective" as a part of my remarks:

THE ECONOMY IN PERSPECTIVE

Dr. Arthur F. Burns, first Chairman of the Council of Economic Advisers under the Eisenhower administration, has contributed greatly toward dispelling the smog that has enveloped the economic picture since it fell into the hands of the politicians. He did this in the course of a talk at the end of last week at Columbia University.

Political spokesmen, declared Dr. Burns, who played a major role in steering us out of the recession that followed the tapering off of the rearmament program in 1953–54, have exaggerated the extent of the present decline. They quote statistics showing that steel output has fallen 45 percent and the Federal Reserve index of industrial production 9½ percent. But this ignores the fact that steel, like the railroads, has been historically a prince and pauper industry, the fluctuations in which are far wider than the fluctuations in the economy as a whole. Neither do they mention that the decline in both these instances started from the highest level in history.

As to the industrial production index, this is an excellent index when it is employed by economists or others who understand its limitations, but it does not purport to be a complete measure of economic activity. No index could be that omits such important segments of the latter as the service industries, far and away the most stable area of the economy. Professor Burns estimates that the decline in overall output to date would be nearer to 2 to 2½ percent. than 9½ percent. This would leave the (price deflated) measure of economic activity on a par with 1955, the first full year of the 1955–57 boom.

Unemployment figures have been similarly misrepresented. Currently, the jobless figure is between 4,500,000 and 5 million. But, as Dr. Burns pointed out, this is a meaningless figure in the absence of allowance for seasonal considerations because December, January, and February are the 3 months of the year having the highest rate of unemployment. After seasonal allowances have been made, Dr. Burns indicated that not more than 1,250,000 to 1,500,000 can be attributed to the current business contraction.

According to Dr. Burns: "A study of slumps going back to World War I showed that the current decline was rather mild or moderate." He explained that it resembled far more closely the recession of 1953–54 and 1948–49, which were very mild, than those of 1920–21 and 1937–38, "to say nothing of that of 1929–33."

Science Education Not Enough

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE S. McGOVERN
OF SOUTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 24, 1958

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, the American people have always believed that education is an essential foundation for democracy. No less a political

thinker than Thomas Jefferson stated emphatically that self-government is not possible except with an educated electorate.

I think by far the most important bill in our whole code, is that for the diffusion of knowledge among the people—

Jefferson wrote his friend Wythe in 1786. Writing in 1916 to another colleague, he warned:

If a nation expects to be ignorant and free, in a state of civilization, it expects what never was and never will be.

Jefferson, who designed both the physical plant and the curriculum of the University of Virginia, believed in a broadly based liberal education that gave due emphasis to the humanities as well as the science courses.

Recently, there has been a growing demand for more emphasis upon physical science in American schools. This demand is doubtless justified considering the neglect of science and mathematics in many of our schools. It would be a serious mistake, however, for us to become so concerned about the physical sciences that we neglect equally needed improvements in other aspects of the curriculum. What is needed now is a general improvement in the quality of our entire educational program. Anyone who doubts the crying need for better educational standards in the social science disciplines, as well as the physical science courses, would do well to read the following editorial from the Huron (S. Dak.) Daily Plainsman of February 10, 1958, which I include as follows:

THEY DON'T EVEN KNOW WHAT IT IS

Education for democracy is one of the claims which Americans make for their schools.

However, the Chicago Daily News cites evidence that our schools are turning out high school graduates who don't know the difference between Communist dictatorship and democratic capitalism.

The News points out that of 80 college freshmen asked to define "capitalism," most called capitalism a form of government—an evil and dangerous form of government.

Here are some of the definitions:

"Capitalism is more on the dictator type of government."

"Capitalism is the extreme measures taken by a group, country, or even a single person."

"I am sure there are many places where capitalism is going on at the present time, and if this practice should ever become nationwide, the country is in for a lot of trouble."

"Capitalism * * * is on the order of communism."

Compare those definitions with that given by Webster:

"Capitalism: An economic system in which * * * the ownership of land and natural wealth, the production, distribution and exchange of goods and the operation of the system itself are affected by private enterprise and control under competitive conditions."

The most unfortunate aspect of this deplorable ignorance was that these 80 freshmen wanted to become teachers. And it isn't likely they will turn out youngsters who know any more than they do about capitalism and how it functions in a democracy.

Is it any wonder that our economic and political picture is confused?

The Natural Gas Bill Controversy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. NOAH M. MASON
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 24, 1958

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, on January 30, 1956, a little more than 2 years ago, before a foolish attempt was made by an oil company's attorney to influence a Senator to vote for the natural-gas bill by offering a sizable donation to his campaign fund—and long before the recent unfounded deliberate distortion of facts that occurred in connection with a Republican political campaign fund-raising dinner in Houston, Tex.—I issued a statement covering the natural-gas-bill controversy. What was true then is just as true today. If the principle of the gas bill was right then, it is just as right today. Even President Eisenhower in his veto message endorsed and approved the objective of the Harris natural-gas bill, although he felt obligated to veto the bill because of the unfortunate incident that occurred in the Senate in connection with its passage.

In his veto message President Eisenhower himself said:

Legislation conforming to the basic objectives of H. R. 6645—the Harris natural-gas bill—is needed. It is needed because the regulation of producers of natural gas will discourage individual initiative and incentive to explore for and develop new sources of supply.

That quote from the President's veto message is an outright endorsement of the principles of the bill.

Mr. Speaker, the statement I issued on January 30, 1956, was as follows:

Should the Federal Government regulate and control the price of natural gas at the wellhead? The House said "No" when it passed the Harris bill last summer. Briefly, the controversy came about as follows:

In 1938 Congress passed the Natural Gas Act regulating the rates charged by the interstate pipelines for transporting gas. Since these carriers enjoy a monopoly in the field of transportation, it is only proper that their transportation rates—like all other interstate transportation agencies—should be regulated and controlled. However, in the Natural Gas Act of 1938 Congress said "the provisions of this act shall not apply to the production or gathering of natural gas," leaving the price charged for the production of gas to be determined by the operation of a free market.

In 1954 the Supreme Court by a 5-to-3 split decision—in spite of the clear prohibition contained in the act—ruled that the Federal Government had the power to regulate and control the price of gas at the wellhead. Since this decision was contrary to the express provisions of the Natural Gas Act of 1938 and violates the specific provision of that act, bills were introduced by Congressman HARRIS and Senator FULBRIGHT to nullify the Court decision and to place the production of natural gas where it had always been—the price at the wellhead subject only to the control of a free market.

The price of natural gas for heating homes is made up of three factors; namely: (1) The price to the producers at the wellhead; (2) the price charged by the pipelines for transportation; and (3) the price received by the local public utility for distribution.

The last two factors are regulated and controlled as public monopolies, yet they get 90 percent of the price charged the consumer. The producer of the gas gets only 10 percent of the price charged.

In other words, if the average Illinois consumer pays $70 per year for heating his home with gas, the producer gets only $7 of that total and the transportation and distributing agencies get $63. This figures out about 60 cents per month or 2 cents per day the consumer pays to the producer for the gas he uses. The balance of his bill goes to the pipeline owner and to the local distributing utility—each one of which has been and now is regulated and controlled by Government.

Mr. Speaker, I supported the Harris bill (H. R. 6645) in the House 2 years ago, and I expect to support H. R. 8525 whenever it comes before the House for action, because the principle of the bill and the objective of the bill are proper and desirable.

As a part of these remarks I include an editorial from the Houston Post pertaining to the dinner held in that city recently:

OPPONENTS OF GAS BILL DISTORT LETTER BY PORTER FOR OWN ENDS

The furor which has risen in Washington over a charge by a Washington newspaper that Monday night's dinner here for Representative JOSEPH W. MARTIN, Republican, of Massachusetts, House minority leader, was a gas lobby affair apparently intended in some way to influence the forthcoming vote in the House on the Harris-O'Hara natural gas bill is more than absurd. It is shocking. It indicates the extent to which opponents of the legislation will go to distort simple, honest actions and words.

The charge stems from an unfortunate letter which Republican National Committeeman H. J. (Jack) Porter sent out to TEXAS Republicans, asking their support for the dinner, which had the dual purpose of honoring Representative MARTIN as a friend of Texas in Congress and raising funds for the Republican National Committee. In it Porter referred to the well-known fact that MARTIN had supported the natural gas bill during the previous times it was before the House.

Holding dinners at which congressional leaders are speakers for the purpose of raising funds is a standard practice of both parties. There is no taint attached to them. As a matter of fact, because the money raised goes to the national committees, it is probably far less subject to criticism than direct campaign donations to candidates.

Why, then, should evil motives be attributed to such a dinner held here? Not by any stretch of a warped imagination could the affair be regarded as an attempt to influence Representative MARTIN, who knew nothing about the Porter letter and who already was on record as an advocate of the gas bill.

Representative MARTIN, a former House Speaker, is too fine a man to be placed in such a position by such distortion of fact. When the Republican Party was at its lowest ebb of influence some years back, he was one of those largely responsible for keeping it going and staging a comeback.

Why should it be deemed proper for dinners to be held in other States to raise money for the party while at the same time ascribing evil and chicanery to one held in Texas?

Policies Made for Wrong Reasons

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDITH GREEN
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 24, 1958

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, when Brig. Gen. Hugh B. Hester retired in 1951, it was after more than 34 years of military service and many varied military assignments. General Hester, who is a native of North Carolina and a graduate of the University of North Carolina, has, since his retirement, undertaken graduate work in international relations at the University of Pennsylvania. General Hester has spoken out on East-West relations with great courage and understanding on several occasions. In the January 1958 issue of the Churchman he writes a very thought-provoking article on Policies Made for Wrong Reasons. Under unanimous consent, I include this article in the Appendix of the RECORD:

POLICIES MADE FOR WRONG REASONS—BROTHERHOOD: THE CENTURY'S ONLY HOPE FOR SURVIVAL

(By Brig. Gen. Hugh B. Hester)

Any search for the reasons for America's loss or decline of prestige in the power struggle for world leadership must extend much deeper than the present temporary setback in the missile-launching race. In fact, it must be sought outside the framework of power politics altogether, for mere physical power has now lost all meaning in a world both needing and demanding leadership of the mind and spirit over the barbarous brutality of military might.

The real reason for the decline, or rather decay, in our leadership lies in the abandonment of our great liberal traditions: Free search and inquiry, tolerance of heresy and nonconformity, and the superiority of the mind and spirit concept over brawn and matter. These we surrendered to McCarthyism under the false slogan of security but actually paid for in the coin of submission to the current fashion of conformity.

Surreptitiously and imperceptibly to most, an authoritarian orthodoxy has been cleverly subverting our social and political institutions. Under the smokescreen of Communist danger and, wrapped in the flag of patriotism, this poisonous virus continues to be adroitly injected into the American system. While the Melish and Oppenheimer cases are probably the most celebrated, they are by no means isolated instances of this. Daily we are becoming more and more what we purportedly fight: A garrison state of authoritarianism.

Even before Mr. Truman bought George F. Kennan's Communist containment policy—later expanded into the 20th century edition of the 19th century holy alliance by Mr. Dulles as the Eisenhower doctrine—and succeeded in selling it as a peace panacea package to the Congress, the United States was making policies for wrong reasons. Lend-lease and UNRRA, our greatest ventures in international cooperation, were sabotaged under the supposedly smart slogan: "Uncle Sam must not become Uncle Sap" and the completely isolationist policies of unilateral aid and military alliances, outside the United Nations, were substituted for these two great experiments in a global assault upon man's greatest enemy: Poverty.

Foreign aid is openly justified as a means of, or device for, having others fight our battles. Integration of the races at home is defended as necessary in the struggle for the minds of men. Federal aid for schools is advanced as necessary for training more students for the development of better and more effective weapons for the mass murder of other human beings.

Rarely is aid supported for the purpose of feeding the hungry, clothing the naked, and housing the homeless. Instead most boast that we are doing this only for our own self-protection. No official voice is lifted any more in support of honest, sincere negotiations at the highest responsible level: Summit meeting, for reducing military, political and economic tensions which might render unnecessary the attempted bribery of others to fight for our own skins. Few indeed, that is officially, oppose segregation as unchristian, or as a gross insult to the human spirit and a criminal assault upon the brotherhood of man. And fewer still propose Federal aid for the schools for the purpose of developing the whole man instead of scientific robots for his further debasement.

Here in Washington, where this is being written, the President is being abused, accused, denounced and even villified by much of the press, the radio and television commentators, the military and many others—much of it, of course, subrosa. This is done, not because he failed to fire his "brink of war" Secretary, Mr. Dulles, for sabotaging the 1955 summit conference, by demanding, subsequent thereto, of the Soviet Union terms which if they had been accepted, would have meant her unconditional surrender; not because he failed to resume, after his long illness, negotiations with the enemy for attainable and reasonable terms of coexistence; but rather because he now refuses to abjectly and immediately surrender to the hysterical demand for pulling out all stops for a crash program in an unparalled arms race which can only lead to world disaster and civilization's end. Unhappily his mose recent illness will reduce still further his already very limited influence in the mad race to war; now as irrational as the force directing the moth to the flame.

Only a few, led by such distinguished citizens as Norman Cousins, Walter Lippmann, James Reston, Thomas L. Stokes, Dorothy Thompson, and James P. Warburg, and an occasional editorial in the few remaining liberal papers, have the intelligence and courage to raise a voice in warning against all this madness. Most of the others continue to beat the war drums in an ever-rising crescendo of fear and hate, apparently believing that in this way they may finally provoke the "war to end all wars" they have been advocating for years. And all this allegedly because the Soviet Union recently launched two earth satellites: An achievement all mature men should approve and applaud as a contribution to man's knowledge of the universe in which he now resides and which he hopes later to inherit.

The hysterical nature and extreme violence of much of this obvious propaganda would seemingly suggest that some, if not most of it, may be motivated by what the psychologists term impulse projecton: that is, attributing to others one's own desires, or looking into the mirror without recognizing the familiar face reflected therein. This possibility gains further support from the earlier claims for the American century and our manifest destiny as well as from the current plaint about the necessity for bearing the burdens of our unsought leadership of the free world.

So long as our national policies are motivated by wrong reasons and our peace offensive permeated with false propaganda, just so long must both fail. A nation's security cannot be bought of other nations; integration of the races is a matter of right and justice, not of political expediency in an ideological struggle for whatever purpose; and education to be real must be for the whole man, not just scientific man. And, furthermore, 20th century man's loyalty now belongs to the family of man, not to the archaic anarchistic nation-state system.

Once the leaders of this Nation, or any other nation for that matter, recognize these truths and earnestly undertake the building of a cooperative world society for a meaningful future through honest and serious negotiations at the very top level with their opponents, this or that nation need no longer fear the future. This is so because human brotherhood is now the only reliable and helpful force in the 20th century struggle for survival.

Who Are the Unemployed?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALVIN M. BENTLEY
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 24, 1958

Mr. BENTLEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the text of an editorial by John R. Stewart from the February 24 issue of the Detroiter, the weekly publication of the Detroit Board of Commerce. The article in question shows that unemployment figures are not the most reliable factor in determining the economic conditions in this country at any given time.

The article follows:

WHO ARE THE UNEMPLOYED?

(By John R. Stewart)

Who are the unemployed? Today's count includes teen-agers who quit high school to get a job, oldsters who want to supplement their social security payments, marginal workers primarily interested in soft jobs at good pay, and women who enter the labor market only during periods of tight labor conditions, plus all others who would be willing to take a job if conditions suited them. They do not even have to be actively looking for a job; maybe the job they prefer does not exist in their area. In addition, the count includes all those millions of workers who, at any given date, are in the process of changing jobs.

To what extent, if at all, should the above be counted as unemployed? Obviously, coverage should be restricted if the term is to mean anything. Instead, under labor union pressure, coverage is progressively being increased. Latest change was made last year when another quarter million were arbitrarily added by a change in definition. Previously, in 1954, and again in 1956, the sample was enlarged by including more areas. Was it just a coincidence that each change resulted in an addition to the unemployment count? The January 1954 change was especially interesting. In that month, the sample was enlarged to cover 230 areas as compared with only 68 in the old sample but the number of households remained the same—25,000. This change in coverage raised the unemployment guesstimate to 3,087,000 for the month against only 2,359,000 as based on the old sample. A jump of 31 percent.

Estimates of both employment and unemployment, by the United States Department of Commerce, are based on personal interviews each month involving 35,000 households (sample increased in 1956). The unemployment count includes all idle persons of Commerce, are based on personal interwork.

The amount of unemployment at a given time depends not only on the number employed on that date, it depends also on employment levels of preceding months.

Thus, much of today's unemployment was created by the boom conditions of 1955 and 1956 which brought into the labor force many persons not normally a part thereof. This influx of temporary female help and marginal male workers brought the Nation's 1956 labor force up to 59.3 percent of the noninstitutional population, 14 years of age or older, an alltime high proportion.

A breakdown of the labor-force figures shows that a sharp increase in the proportion of women workers has been the cause of the steady rise in the labor force. In 1940, only 28.1 percent of working-age women were in the labor force; by 1950 this had risen to 33.1 percent. The latest month reported, November 1957, reveals 36.4 percent. In contrast, the proportion of working-age men in the labor force had dropped from 83.9 percent in 1940 to 80.8 percent today.

Admittedly, today's unemployment rolls are not made up exclusively of marginal workers or persons not normally part of the labor force. Many persons of this type are still gainfully employed while some persons who are part of the regular labor force are out of work. Nothing in this article should be construed as belittling the hardship of those families whose breadwinner is out of work through no fault of his own.

This article does wish to point out that (1) the unemployment count is inflated to the point where it has little meaning, and (2) that in any case, unemployment should not be used, as it is now being widely used, as the chief measure of economic conditions.

Employment, not unemployment, measures a nation's prosperity. When current employment data are available, they will show an economic condition much more favorable than indicated by the widely publicized unemployment figures.

Time for a Refresher Course

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JACKSON E. BETTS
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 24, 1958

Mr. BETTS. Mr. Speaker, the following editorial from the January 18 issue of the Marion Star offers the basis for some sober thinking in the matter of science education. In the face of great pressure to spend vast sums in this field, it might be well also to give some serious consideration to such fundamental ideas as are pointed out in this editorial:

TIME FOR A REFRESHER COURSE

It is seldom that any Federal budget allotment wholly satisfies those most directly concerned. The administration's billion-dollar educational program, which calls for $600 million from the States, is no exception.

Although the program, pared to a minimum, would cost the Federal Government about $224 million for the first year and an estimated billion dollars by the time of its expiration date 4 years hence, advocates of a more lavish outlay accuse the planners of being more concerned with a balanced budget than with the school crisis.

The exact size of the best program is always debatable, so it would be well to analyze the entire educational system in the United States and redesign the program to fit the nuclear age.

The current educational trend of substituting sugar-coated subjects and courses that provide only a smattering of information has unfitted the mind of many American students for hard work and clear thinking.

Statistics show how far we have wandered from the field of fundamentals in education.

Nearly one-fourth of all high schools in the United States now offer no courses in chemistry, physics or plane geometry. One-third offer no trigonometry, solid geometry or advanced algebra. Many of these schools, of course, are small.

But during 1956 only 34.4 percent of all high-school students took chemistry; 24.5 percent physics; 9.2 percent trigonometry; 7.6 percent solid geometry.

These subjects are fundamental for careers in science.

What is the solution?

Kevin McCann, president of Ohio's Defiance College, has come up with one suggestion that makes sense. Though admittedly not the cure-all, Mr. McCann says: "The solution may lie in the great pool of potential high school and college level science and math teachers in the small colleges which are devoted mainly to training teachers."

Mr. McCann suggests that the important thing is greater use of equipment and supplies that are too expensive for schools to buy and of teaching aid packages—films not now in existence but in preparation under National Science Foundation grants * * * the cost of these packages would be relatively small compared with a giant scholarship program."

In a Nation where the free-spending school of thought has predominated for so long, the logical place to begin revamping our education could well be with each of us, individually. A refresher course in practical economics would be a good starter course.

Resolution by the Oregon State Bar

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDITH GREEN
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 24, 1958

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, many of us have, for years now, been concerned with the lack of effective utilization by the armed services of the skills and training of many of the persons under their jurisdiction. Corrective legislation has been enacted to prevent such waste with respect to some of the professions—but not with respect to all.

Depletion of our limited reservoir of skilled manpower through wanton waste should not be permitted to continue. This is particularly true in the case of attorneys, who are not now receiving compensation commensurate with that paid to members of the medical and other learned professions.

The need for remedial legislation is ably pointed out in a resolution adopted by the board of governors of the Oregon State bar. In order that the seriousness of the current situation may be brought to the attention of my colleagues, I have asked unanimous consent that the resolution adopted by the board of governors be printed in full in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

Whereas there has been introduced in the Congress of the United States Senate bill 1165, which provides for additional pay and promotion for members of the legal profession serving with the armed services in a legal capacity, bringing the pay and promotion status of military lawyers to a level commensurate with the special professional pay and promotion schedule now available to members of the medical and other learned professions serving with the military; and

Whereas it is the sense of the board of governors of the Oregon State Bar that lawyers should receive such commensurate compensation and rank, for their professional training and skill are certainly as valuable to the Armed Forces as those of the other learned professions; that the armed services are having great difficulty in procuring and retaining even a minimum of military lawyers, and that if they are unable to do so, it will be impossible to administer properly the present Uniform Code of Military Justice; that said Code was made the basis of military justice largely through the efforts of civilian lawyers, and that we therefore have a responsibility to insure its successful operation; and that, finally, the Oregon State Bar has a peculiar interest in and knowledge of the needs and problems of the armed services: therefore be it

Resolved, That the board of governors of the Oregon State Bar indorses Senate bill 1165, and urges upon the Congress of the United States its passage, and the secretary be and he is directed to send copies of this resolution to the Members of the United States House of Representatives and the United States Senate from this State, and to the American Bar Association.

BOARD OF GOVERNORS OF THE
OREGON STATE BAR,
By GEORGE W. NEUNER,
President.

Attest by:

JOHN H. HOLLOWAY,
Secretary.

JANUARY 25, 1958.

The Late Hyman Landau of Wilkes-Barre

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 24, 1958

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Wilkes-Barre Times-Leader of February 17, 1958, which comments on the passing of Mr. Hyman Landau, leading businessman and civic leader of Wilkes-Barre:

HYMAN LANDAU

Active on the local scene for more than a half century, Hyman Landau, Wilkes-Barre businessman, civic leader, and prominent figure in the Jewish community, was a self-made man. His was the familiar success story of the poor immigrant boy who made good in his adopted country and city.

No newcomer to these shores was more grateful to America than Hyman Landau for the way the doors of opportunity were opened to him after his arrival in Wilkes-Barre from his native Austria-Hungary. A watchmaker by trade, he became associated with the Landau firm, then owned by his uncle, the late Samuel Landau. From this modest beginning stemmed a career that easily qualified him for a place among the city's leading businessmen.

The three famous words, "God Bless America," immortalized in verse by Irving Berlin and sung by Kate Smith, were more closely identified with Mr. Landau locally than they

were with Mr. Berlin and Miss Smith nationally. He uttered them on countless occasions with a mingled sense of pride, humility, and appreciation, furnishing an index to his character and an explanation of his extracurricular activities.

Hyman Landau was regarded in business circles as a resourceful and courageous executive. Trained in the exacting school of experience, he learned to think things through before embarking on an enterprise, weighing the possibilities carefully. He acquired a well-deserved reputation as a keen observer, capable of anticipating trends. As a merchant, financier, and real-estate operator, he played a leading role in northeastern Pennsylvania.

In the spheres of religion, philanthropy, and civic affairs, he carved a second career that duplicated his worldly success. Here again astuteness and qualities of leadership asserted themselves with beneficial results. His charity crossed the boundaries of creed and nationality, his only concern being the worthiness of a cause or individual.

Wilkes-Barre is going to miss this enterprising citizen who contributed so substantially to its progress since the turn of the century.

The New Look of the Constitution

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. W. J. BRYAN DORN
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 24, 1958

Mr. DORN of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I respectfully call to the attention of the House this splendid speech delivered by Donald R. Richberg almost 9 years ago. He accurately predicted the continuing attack on the Constitution of our country and its dire consequences to our people. Mr. Richberg's speech was foresight and I recommend it to the Congress as still being timely and worthy of the attention of each of us:

THE NEW LOOK AT THE CONSTITUTION, AN ADDRESS BY DONALD R. RICHBERG AT THE ANNUAL MEETING OF THE VIRGINIA STATE BAR ASSOCIATION, WHITE SULPHUR SPRINGS, W. VA., JULY 29, 1949

Long, long ago, when the sages of today were sweet 16, there was a Constitution of the United States which looked like the spirit of 1776. Today that Constitution has a new look. In fact, to many it has the look of the beckoning spirit of national socialism.

What has happened to the dear, old Constitution? Have the gland treatments, the face lifting and face saving of big and little politicians actually endowed it with new vigor, or have they merely sapped its mature vitality in trying to make it over in the image of headstrong youth?

For the moment it appears that even Communists are impressed by this appearance of rejuvenation. They may be half-sincere in asserting that it is no longer necessary to overthrow our Government in order to establish their slave Utopia. All they need to do, apparently, is to take over the Government, whose stumbling advances into socialism, are, step by step, being sanctified by Congress and courts as within the constitutional objectives of the National Government.

The impediments to tyrannical authority, created by a division of powers between the executive, legislative, and judicial branches, have been gradually destroyed by creating commissions in which laws are made, interpreted, and executed by one body of men. It will soon be only a short step to the designation to the President as lord high commissioner of the general welfare, invested with authority to regulate the business, the agriculture, and the labor of the Nation, and to establish economic security and slavery, from the cradle to the grave.

We made a tentative step in this direction in the late, never-to-be-forgotten NRA with which I had some experience. But neither the Congress nor the Supreme Court had been sufficiently liberalized in 1935 to approve this noble experiment. The Congress knocked it down; and the Supreme Court sat upon it so heavily that it suddenly expired. Nevertheless the subsequent validation of the agricultural acts, the Wagner Act, the Wage-Hour Act, the price control acts, the social security acts, and other socializing laws, indicates that the destruction of the NRA was only a stumble in the onward march of paternalism.

With constitutional barriers laid low we may now go forward to establish enough national commissions to regulate all our economic and social activities. Eventually, with farmers, businessmen, and workers, and their political leaders, all completely dependent upon the Federal Government for a livelihood, the President and his Cabinet, as a politburo, should be able to lay down the party line and have it followed by all who prefer economic security to liberty—which is currently assumed to be a vast majority of the people. But, what of the guaranties of individual liberty which are written in the National Constitution? Will they not stop the march of regimentation and prevent the enforcement of laws that compel individuals to live and work under the direction of an all powerful National Government? Many years ago the Supreme Court laid down the law in this clear language:

"The liberty mentioned in that amendment [14th] means not only the right of the citizen to be free from the mere physical restraint of his person, as by incarceration, but the term is deemed to embrace the right of the citizen to be free in the enjoyment of all his faculties; to be free to use them in all lawful ways; to live and work where he will; to earn his livelihood by any lawful calling; to pursue any livelihood or avocation, and for that purpose to enter into all contracts which may be proper, necessary, and essential to his carrying out to a successful conclusion the purposes above mentioned" (*Allegeyer* v. *Louisiana*, 165 U. S. 578).

Is that the law today? Ask the farmers, the business men, the workers, unionized or independent. Do they enjoy such liberty, or are they working under a multitude of restrictions enforced directly or indirectly by the National Government? Ask them what percentage of their earnings are taken by the National Government, and spent for them as a father might take and spend the earnings of his immature children.

It is true that the Supreme Court has recently reasserted in strong language the rights of free speech, freedom of the press, freedom of assembly, freedom from police oppression, and unfair trials for crime. The constitutional liberties of the actual, or probable, or prospective enemies of society, criminals, revolutionaries, and fanatics, are still jealously, even tenderly, protected. No one but a Communist—with his tongue in his cheek—could deny that our Constitution still provides a stout shield for every wrongdoer.

Every criminal can have his day in court; and if he engages in profitable crime it is a long, long day. Gangsters may slay and torture; but even the most notorious must be handled with kid gloves by a policeman. Thieves and spies and crooked gamblers may misuse the telephone; but policemen may not intrude on the privacy of their conversations. Communists may picket courts and seek to intimidate juries; but policemen must not interfere with their free speech. Massed armies of pickets may terrorize workers, destroy business and beat up men who want to work; but the National Government must not interfere, unless citizens outraged by lawlessness take the law into their own hands. Then there is a great clamor for the National Government to move in to make sure that the constitutional rights of the original lawbreakers are protected.

Please do not misunderstand me. I believe that the constitutional rights of every man accused of crime should be protected. I believe that officers of the law first of all should be compelled to obey the law. But, I do detest the political hypocrisy that proclaims that murders and organized crime by gangsters and labor gorillas in northern cities must be dealt with by the local police, because a Federal law would be unconstitutional; and in the next breath demands the passage of a Federal law to curb the comparatively rare outbreaks of lawlessness in the South.

There is another new look of the Constitution affecting civil liberties which I deplore; and that is the tendancy to subordinate the civil liberties of a majority of the people to special privileges which are granted to a politically strong minority. Every lawyer knows that the Constitution does not grant a single right to any minority of persons. It only grants rights to individuals; and every liberty guaranteed is the liberty of an individual. And so it follows that your right and mine must be exactly the same. Yet, we hear solemnly proposed, and endorsed by political party platforms, a Federal law to compel businessmen to employ workers whom they do not want to employ and to compel workers to work with men with whom they do not want to work. This is called in unconscious irony a fair employment practice act.

The announced purpose of such a law is to protect the alleged civil right of persons to employment which might be denied to them because of race, color, or religion. There is not one word in the Constitution establishing any such right. And so the drafters of the Federal bill thoughtfully wrote in a provision by which Congress would undertake to establish this nondiscrimination in private employment as a civil right. However, there is not one word in the Constitution giving the Congress power to create such a new civil right. On the contrary the 10th amendment provides that:

"The powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution are reserved to the States respectively, or to the people."

And, most decisively, the ninth amendment privides that:

"The enumeration in the Constitution of certain rights shall not be construed to deny or disparage others retained by the people."

There is no more elementary right of any free people than freedom of association. There is a fragment of this right specifically preserved in the right of the people peaceably to assemble, which is protected by the first amendment. But the overall freedom of association in work or play is clearly a right retained by the people of the United States. This is an individual right which not only protects voluntary association but also must forbid any compulsion to associate. Otherwise it would be meaningless. If I could force my companionship on you, then I could destroy your freedom. You and I must have equal rights to accept or to refuse association with each other.

FEPC legislation, which would compel one man to employ another whom he does not wish to employ, also violates the constitutional liberty of contract to a degree never before attempted. Laws have been enacted making certain contracts illegal, or controlling the form or substance of contracts. But, so far as I am aware, this is

the first instance of an attempt to compel a man by law to make a contract with a person with whom he does not wish to make a contract.

Indeed, a contract under which an employer would be forced to serve an unwanted employee so closely resembles a contract under which an employee would be forced to serve an unwanted employer, that involuntary servitude appears to be the result in both cases. Even labor laws, which require bargaining and affect the scope of contracts, do not compel a man to make a contract. But FEPC laws, making it an offense to refuse to hire an applicant because you don't like him, would cut the heart out of liberty of contract. If such a law be held constitutional then where is the constitutional barrier to complete political control of labor?

Organized labor may in time learn this lesson, as it learns so many lessons—too late. Labor fought successfully for years to stop discrimination by employers against union members. But, when recently laws were passed to forbid a closed shop discrimination in favor of union members, the unions appealed in vain to the Supreme Court to declare such laws unconstitutional. So, if tomorrow it should be held that an employer has no right to exercise his free will in selecting his employees, then day after tomorrow it may be held that the employee has no free will to select his employer. Would this be involuntary servitude? Apparently not, if the Supreme Court should approve the present arguments of the FEPC advocates, because in a law forbidding discrimination against an employer the employee would have the same right that an employer now has under FEPC. He would not be actually compelled to make a contract of employment, because he would be free to stop earning a livelihood.

Perhaps I have said too much about FEPC, but since this horrible prospect is riding high on the tidal wave of the future, it seems well to point out how rapidly our ancient landmarks will be washed away whenever this wave breaks over the few constitutional barriers that still remain between us and the deluge.

The greatest constitutional barrier against the tyranny of national socialism has been so battered by storms of reform in the last 50 years that when its broken reef occasionally appears even scholarly critics refer to it as the anachronism of States rights. The new look of the Constitution has been fashioned in the image of headstrong youth. The young man in a hurry commonly assumes that the 14th amendment, plus the national money power granted in the 16th amendment, plus the judicial enlargement of the national commerce power, have made the States hopelessly subordinate to, and dependent upon, national lawmaking. In youthful ears any assertion of States rights sounds like a voice from the tomb wherein John C. Calhoun, Henry Clay, Jefferson Davis, and all their ideas of State sovereignty are supposed to be forever and completely buried.

Strange to say, the political principles of Thomas Jefferson are still regarded as so vital and enduring that political partisans of every stripe from conservative to radical acclaim his wisdom. Yet no man exceeded Jefferson in hatred and fear of the inevitable tyranny of centralized government. It was Jefferson who wrote that "A single consolidated government would become the most corrupt government on earth," and who prophesied that the road to destruction of the United States would be "by a consolidation first, and then corruption as its necessary consequence."

Also he wrote, "It is not by the consolidation or concentration of powers, but by their distribution, that good government is effected. Were not this country already divided into States, that division must be made that each might do for itself what concerns itself directly, and what it can so much better do than a distinct authority." (Writings of Thomas Jefferson; H. A. Washington edition, VI–543; VII–216, 223.)

In his first inaugural Jefferson called for the support of the State governments in all their rights as the most competent administrations for our domestic concerns and the surest bulwarks against antirepublican tendencies.

The principle of local self-government was written into the Constitution, not merely to induce the separate colonies to agree to the creation of a Federal union, but primarily to maintain the democratic responsibility of a government which resides close to the people who are governed and which is immediately subject to their scrutiny and their control. Let me quote the penetrating wisdom of Charles Warren, a profound student of our Constitution:

"The framers knew from experience, and they intended to preserve the principle, that a local government is a responsible government—a government which can never long be conducted in defiance of the opinions, the desires, or the prejudices of the governed; they knew that a distant and centralized government had been and could be conducted otherwise; and they were not inclined to authorize such a central government to interfere with or administer their local affairs, unless absolutely necessary for the safety, welfare, and permanence of the Nation as a nation."

How has it come about that today this profound principle is ignored and we have national laws regulating such matters of intimate and local concern as labor relations, wages and hours of work, agriculture, the growing and marketing of crops, manufacturing, merchandising, mining, and housing, with national tenacles stretching out to control education, the practice of medicine, and the unknown, glimmering, beckoning objectives of social and economic security.

No one can doubt that such an extensive field of operations for the national Government was never contemplated by the authors of the Constitution. No one can doubt that they deliberately denied any general police power to the national government which might authorize the extension of its authority into such realms. It was James Madison who wrote in the Federalist (January 29, 1788): "The powers reserved to the States will extend to all the objects which, in the ordinary course of affairs, concern the lives, liberties, and properties of the people and the internal order, improvement, and prosperity of the State."

But, we are told that the social and economic conditions of 1787 have disappeared. We live in an industrialized civilization, with the lives and industries of 150 million people woven into one national enterprise by transportation and communication facilities unknown to our forefathers. We have become so interdependent upon one another that, it is argued, only national laws can insure that cooperation and harmony which are essential to our safety, health, and welfare. In a word, we are told that the National Government must exercise a police power superior to the police power of the States; and by legalistic magic such a power is being transmuted out of the national power to regulate commerce among the several States, or out of the national power of taxation, or—with the ghost of Madison violently protesting—out of the general welfare clause.

If, however, we should recur to fundamental principles, we would see that, while these social and economic changes may seem to call for more national lawmaking in order that the American people may be efficiently governed, they more insistently demand more local lawmaking if the American people are to continue to govern themselves.

A central Government of 150 million people has already become, and will remain, a Government of pressure groups and political traders. A central Government, gathering and spending billions of dollars for national defense has a clear objective and unquestioned responsibility. But, a central Government, gathering and spending billions of dollars to advance the general welfare, has the dubious objective and the questionable responsibility of taking from one man to give to another, of robbing Peter to pay Paul, of satisfying those pressure groups that may deliver more votes than the pressure groups unsatisfied, of feeding citizens who are vocal and organized at the expense of citizens who are dumb and unorganized, of paying for the votes of classes and communities that will support the party in power, out of the pockets of the opposition. This is, bluntly, that present corruption of Government which Jefferson warned was inevitable after centralization.

Isn't this also a defect of all local governments? Certainly it is a defect of all popular governments. But there are many redeeming virtues in misgovernment by cities, or counties or States. First, they provide the kind of misgovernment which the people who are governed want, or deserve. Second, they are so close to the people that their misdeeds are easily seen and exposed. Third, the responsibility of their public officials is direct and obvious. Fourth, a bad local government can be changed as soon as a majority of the people are informed and anxious to have a change.

On the other hand, national misgovernment, entrenched in one part of the country, spreads its evil authority over another part where the people neither want nor deserve such government. For a pertinent example, Virginia is a State whose citizens as a whole believe in economical government. But, its Senators and Representatives in Congress are powerless to save citizens of Virginia from taking and spending of their incomes by the National Government in a spendthrift paternalism that would not be tolerated within their own State.

Consider for a moment the regulation of labor relations by the Federal Government. The pressures of organized labor come from the industrial centers of the Nation, and largely from a few great industrialized States. The people who inhabit the vastly larger area of the United States are economically and socially antagonistic to the monopolistic demands and oppressive practices of labor unions. As freemen they should be permitted to live and work free from the remote controls of remote labor organizations which are endowed with special privileges and protected in evil practices by special immunities granted by a remote National Government.

It is a bitter complaint of organized labor that 16 States have made the closed shop unlawful. It was argued to the Supreme Court that these were States where organized labor was not strong enough to defeat such laws; so the Supreme Court was asked to hold them unconstitutional. The Supreme Court happily declined, being fortified by the provision of the Taft-Hartley Act which graciously permitted the States to enact such laws. Now in the battle against the Taft-Hartley Act we have seen the full power of the President and a national party machine exerted to impose upon the States a renewed tyranny of national labor law enacted to advance the special interests of organizations of a minority of the people, living and working in a small fraction of the total area of the United States.

This discussion could go on indefinitely. Let me terminate it abruptly with a few general observations. As an active practitioner, and a prospective teacher, of con-

stitutional law I must make a clear distinction between what the law is and what the law ought to be. The Supreme Court is the final arbiter of what the law is. But the people are the final arbiter of what the law ought to be and eventually shall be. If they believe that the National Government should have and exercise greater powers to promote the general welfare they will find the way to enlarge its authority. If they believe that more local self-government is essential to their liberties and their pursuit of happiness, they will find the way to enlarge the authority of the States and the municipalities.

It was Herbert Spencer who said that, "No philosopher's stone of a constitution can produce golden conduct out of leaden instincts." If the leaden instinct for economic security so dominates the common thought that men and women are willing to accept the paternalism of a national welfare state, then the golden dream of individual liberty and genuine self-government will fade out of the Constitution and out of the lives of the American people. But, if that golden dream, which inspired the writing of the Constitution, and inspired the American people to lead the advance of civilization for more than 160 years—if that dream still inspires them, they will reestablish home rule as the only trustworthy guardian of their liberties; and they will never cease to fight against that centralization of power which, as Jefferson said, "has destroyed the liberty of man in every government which has ever existed under the sun."

Tycoon's Success Formula

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDITH GREEN
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 24, 1958

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, recently the Interstate Commerce Commission, utilizing procedures designed to weaken greatly public trust and confidence in the work of that Commission, granted a general freight increase to the Nation's railroads. These rates will operate so as to discriminate unfairly and unjustly against the West.

Many persons—including myself—protested the unseemly haste with which these rate raises were "railroaded through" the Commission.

I ask unanimous consent that there be printed at this point in my remarks the letter I addressed to the Honorable Howard G. Freas, Chairman of the Interstate Commerce Commission, protesting against these unseemly procedures.

But there is a further episode in connection with this rate increase which falls clearly within the jurisdiction of the Subcommittee on Government Oversight. I refer to the activities of Mr. Owen Clarke, who, just before he stepped out as Chairman of the Commission, issued the order setting in motion these hasty procedures. Having done so, he left the Commission and took a position with the Chesapeake & Ohio Railroad.

Mr. Clarke's hasty departure leaves many unanswered questions relative to the judicial type of conduct expected of one occupying a position such as did Mr. Clarke.

I have already addressed a letter to the Subcommittee on Government Oversight asking that this matter be investigated.

I desire also to call the attention of my colleagues to a pointed editorial appearing in the International Woodworker for February 12, 1958 in which the many unanswered questions concerning Mr. Clarke's appointment are raised. Under unanimous consent, I include the editorial in full in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

JANUARY 21, 1958.

Hon. HOWARD G. FREAS,
Chairman, Interstate Commerce Commission, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: This is in reference to *Ex parte 212* relating to the requested general railroad freight increase.

I wish to protest most strongly, in the first place, the procedures adopted by the Commission in this case. As categorized in a communication received from the Governor of Oregon, "the Commission handling of the present railroad freight-rate increase procedure (*Ex parte 212*) * * * has been extremely damaging to the public welfare including that of the State of Oregon."

The Governor, in his communication, went on to say:

"On December 27, while Clarke was still chairman, the Commission issued an order scheduling hearings concerning *Ex parte 212* under the so-called short-form procedure. This order generally provided that all statements, all evidence, all exhibits, all showings of any description made or submitted by the public in defense of the public interest must be prepared and on file with the Commission at Washington, D. C., on or before January 20, 1958."

"This order and the supporting statements of the railroads which, of necessity, have to be answered by the public by January 20, were not received by this office or any Pacific coast commission prior to January 6 or 7, 1958. This left exactly 6 working days in which to review voluminous statements of railroad officials and thereafter prepare evidence and exhibits in opposition to the proposed rail increases. It is utterly impossible for the Oregon Public Utility Commissioner's staff properly to prepare any type of responsible exhibits or evidence in this short space of time."

I cannot agree too strongly with these statements by the Governor. To give opponents such an extremely short time to review the voluminous, 174 page, complicated and complex tariff proposed by the railroads is preposterous.

I urge the Commission, therefore, to extend the date for the filing of replies and to extend the time permitted for oral arguments. The possible serious economic consequences to the economy of Oregon warrant, in my opinion, the Commission's giving all parties a full and fair opportunity to present to it all the facts.

It should be borne in mind that if the Commission should permit these new tariffs to go into effect subject to refund provisions upon subsequent investigation, it will not be of assistance to those many shippers in my State who will have no refund coming because the increased rates priced them out of the market. Equity demands, therefore, that the Commission have before it all possible relevant facts before it arrives at any decision permitting the proposed increased rates to go into effect even on a temporary basis subject to later scrutiny.

This is a matter of such grave importance that I am calling it specifically to the attention of Congressman MOULDER, chairman, Subcommittee on Government Oversight, with the request that during the course of his current investigation, he make certain that this matter is thoroughly studied and legislative safeguards be proposed to prevent a repetition of such an incident.

I wish to protest, in the second place, the proposed tariff because of its discriminatory features against shipments from the West. I protest specifically as discriminatory the 2 percent increase proposed in line haul transportation because its being put into effect would have such a disasterous effect upon the shipment of lumber products. I protest, also, the extraordinary high increases on accessorial or special service charges, some representing an increase of as much as 82 percent. I do hope that the Commission will go into each and every one of these proposed increases thoroughly and painstakingly before permitting them to become effective.

I urge the Commission, in its review of this matter, to give the utmost consideration to this question of discrimination against Western shippers. The transportation tax already works unfairly against this group. We should be careful not to compound this unfairness.

During the last weeks, I have received a surprisingly large number of letters from individuals and concerns in my district who would be seriously injured by the allowance of these increases, and who have felt so strongly about it that they have taken the time and the trouble to write. These letters are on file in my office and are available for your inspection.

Sincerely yours,

EDITH GREEN.

[From the Portland (Oreg.) International Woodworker of February 12, 1958]

TYCOON'S SUCCESS FORMULA

The American people must look like a flock of lambs to the gluttons of industry.

That's the only reason we can figure for their calloused disregard of principle, not to mention the already low standards of business ethics currently in vogue, as they fleece the public at every opportunity.

The case we have in mind involves the curious ethics of one Owen Clarke, until recently Chairman of the Interstate Commerce Commission, the so-called public agency charged with regulating interstate transportation in the people's interest.

Mr. Clarke is now a vice president of the Chesapeake & Ohio Railroad.

He was hurriedly appointed following the scheduling of a shotgun hearing on railroad requests for a rate increase in the western area of the United States.

The railroads decided that they needed a 2-percent increase in rates on lumber and lumber products shipped from the Western United States and a flat 10-percent increase in loghauling rates in the same area.

Mathematical genius is no requirement to see that this will raise havoc with the competitive position of the West in relation to the South, where freight rates already bestow sizable advantages.

This did not, however, stop Mr. Clarke from deciding, on the 27th of December, that a hearing was necessary. He proceeded to notify interested western public utility commissions and generously gave them until January 20 to answer the voluminous briefs prepared over the past several months by the railroads.

Irate westerners had no more than screamed with their first pains of anguish when Mr. Clarke forthwith resigned from the ICC and became, overnight, a vice president of the C. & O.

Meanwhile, in the words of Howard Morgan, public utilities commissioner for Oregon, there has been a noticeable lack of publicity on the salary to be paid Mr. Clarke, or the duties of his office, by either him or the C. & O.

We can't help but wonder at this reticence. Mr. Clarke has climbed rapidly up the ladder of success, but unlike Horatio

Alger, seems bashful about giving out the formula.

He ought to be bashful. Nothing more shameful in the history of public regulatory bodies has happened in recent years.

It is a commonly accepted standard among public utility economists that you don't go from a public body like the ICC directly to the payroll of those you are supposedly regulating without the elapse of a couple of years or more.

The fact that he went directly to the C. & O. shows better than anything else he could have done that he did sell out to the railroads.

Another serious factor in this case is the effort of Mr. Clarke's action on the public reputation of the ICC. No one can now assume that any decision rendered by that body during Clarke's tenure of office was honestly and impartially arrived at.

It's a fair conclusion, in our opinion, that Clarke's every act as Chairman of the ICC was taken with a view to increasing his value to the railroads. Apparently the C. & O. put up the highest ante.

We recommend to the Congress that they give Mr. Clarke's promotion the benefit of a thorough public investigation, so that others may learn this tycoon's success formula.

A Mother Asks Some Pertinent Questions Which Can Be Answered Only by Action of the Committee on Ways and Means

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL C. JONES
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 24, 1958

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, it is not often that I avail myself of the opportunity to extend my remarks in the Appendix, and I have attempted to reduce the amount of extraneous matter that clutters up the Appendix much too frequently.

But I received a letter this past week that is out of the ordinary, in that it gives a presentation of a condition far more eloquently than I could express myself on the subject of the need for more liberal exemptions in our income-tax structure.

This letter is written by a mother. It is written from the heart. It is, to me, one of the most forceful presentations that I have read on this subject, and it makes sense. I especially hope that it will be read by the members of our great Committee on Ways and Means which has the responsibility of adjusting our tax laws to bring about greater equity in the payment of taxes.

I have omitted the names from this letter, for after all the names are immaterial and this letter could have been written by any one of many hundreds of women who live in the 10th Congressional District of Missouri. It expresses, I believe, the views of many thousands more in similar situations all over this country.

This mother does not have all of the answers to one of the greatest problems with which we are faced, but she does have some suggestions, which, if translated into law, would go a long way towards correcting some of the inequities which exist.

To my colleagues, I say, read this letter and see if you are not impressed just as I have been. To the members of the Committee on Ways and Means, I say, how can we justify further delay in doing something to help families like the one described in this letter?

Here is the letter. Read it, please:

Congressman PAUL C. JONES,
Tenth District, Kennett, Mo.

DEAR SIR: I would like to introduce myself to you.

I am ——— ———, 41 years of age, the wife of ——— — ———, and the proud mother of 5 fine children; 4 boys and 1 girl, ages, ranging from 18 years to 2 years old.

My husband is a railroad brakeman earning a so-called decent wage; and as he is the sole bread winner in our family, it is certainly a problem planning a budget in raising a family of this size and giving them not the luxuries of life but the necessities they need. With the rising cost of living since the Republicans are in office, I do well to provide them with food and clothing—a place to sleep and keep warm. It certainly doesn't pay to raise a family these days. I would be so grateful if it were possible some time to shop for myself for a new dress, hat, and shoes, all at the same time; but what with? Wouldn't I love to have a dinner out and see a movie with my husband if we could afford a baby sitter and the price of a dinner and a movie.

My beef is this—Mr. Jones, I can't understand why? When a person reaches the age of 65 years and is still working—he gets twice the amount of exemption given him—$1,200 for himself, and his wife also if she is 65 years or over. I get $600 exemption for each child, and who can raise a child reasonably on a $600 exemption? Why can't the Government give the mother and housewife the benefit of the tax exemption, instead of a person 65 years of age and over? A person of that age doesn't eat as much as a growing child; neither does he buy the clothes that a child needs to go to our schools or to keep warm in winter; and to help combat bad colds and other diseases he may contact.

The Government hasn't, as far as I am concerned, given much thought to the common laboring man with large families. Oh, sure, it has been said that if a person wants security let him go to prison; there he can eat and have a bed to sleep in. I, for myself and my family, would like to have more than that. I want a decent living for my family and security for them in the future years to come. How can one send their children to college on a $600 exemption—deny the smaller children in the family of food and clothing they need, in order to send the older ones to college.

Maybe it would be a good solution to suggest that the Government send the children to colleges—they seem to be so eager to help with foreign aid to other countries and to help with their problems (that I don't think is necessary). Of course it is not for me to think about any such plan for I am just a small cog in this great democracy that we live in. Uncle Sam doesn't hesitate one moment when he needs fine, strong, alert, mentally fit, and well fed boys, when we or some foreign country go to war to take our boys. Has he stopped to think that it is the mothers who have raised them, sacrificing everything (and proud of it) to make them into the fine strong boys that they are?

What about this new deal about the doctors and medicines for a person 65 years or over; the Government again allows them the full deductions on this issue; but I have to have a certain percentage of the wage my husband earns before I can deduct the doctor bills and medicines from his income tax. Is this fair? Does a doctor charge me less when I go to his office than he does a 65-year-old person? He does not. Most all people that age have false teeth, eyeglasses, and about everything else they need in this line. But in order to raise my children sensibly, I am supposed to take my five children, my husband, and myself to the dentist and doctor for regular check-ups and it isn't free.

It is plenty damn disgusting to we mothers who are really interested in having large families to have to pay these high costs of living and taxes. I don't have the ambition to be wealthy, but I would like to see our great leaders give some thought to the poor laboring people who have given so much to have such a fine country. We have always had a great country built on the belief of equality for all; but in the past years we have failed to live up to this great issue. Now it is seemingly so, that all big corporations are thinking about is to fight the common laboring man; and speaking of the Government giving breaks to some one or body—it is for the wealthy man. If the Government would see fit to allow us more exemptions for our children, then we, as parents, would be able to pass more bond issues for better schools to send our children to; more money to be paid for the best teachers available to teach them, and send them to colleges to further their educations. We certainly can't do this on the $600 exemption we are getting now.

Mr. JONES, I do hope and pray that our Congressmen and Senators we voted for, and have faith in, will give more consideration and thought to we poor people with large families; in asking the Government to allow us more exemptions in order for us to be able to provide a better living and education for our children in the near future. I, as one mother, would be ever so grateful.

Yours very truly,

Mrs. ——— ———.

New Tune for Tariff League

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM A. DAWSON
OF UTAH
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 24, 1958

Mr. DAWSON of Utah. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include in the RECORD the following article from the Salt Lake Tribune, of February 9, 1958, which contains some provocative observations on the timely subject of tariffs and foreign trade:

NEW TUNE FOR TARIFF LEAGUE
(By Robert W. Bernick)

Perhaps the American Tariff League should change its name.

Not only is tariff a bad word in some quarters of this country but admittedly the first impressions of such an organization on minds of a generation educated on free trade is that of a gray-bearded, outmoded, reactionary, narrow-minded, isolationist conspiracy to somehow turn the clock back.

ATL, of course, is a lobby agency, just as is the opposing Committee for National Trade Policy.

But it is a pleasure to report that reading of the Tariff League's recent 117-page analysis of the United States world trade policy does not disclose any sentimental longing for the old days of high tariffs.

In fact, the ATL's program and its sponsors, in the eyes of future historians, might well make more sense than some of the suggestions of those in Government and business who very sincerely believe that trade in a competitive world can be planned.

The ATL survey discloses that:

1. A goodly number of important people both in business and labor are behind the league. They don't appear to be the type who fit the rusty image of the professional tariff advocate.

2. The league isn't just agin' things. It has a program it proposes as an alternative to mere extensions of the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Acts of 1934 and some of the abuses apparent in this legislation.

3. There is a good deal more to issues of trade and tariffs than most people, including this writer, have been aware. In short, everything isn't black or white on this issue.

Protection always has been of great moment to residents of this area as foreign competition is an important and frequently controlling element in wages, profit, and employment in the sugar-beet industry, mining (whether steel or nonferrous metals), chemicals (potash, phosphates, etc.), coal and petroleum.

Of course, the reciprocal trades agreement program is up for renewal in Congress this year and much effort is being made to stir up support. A 5-year extension is sought along with another 25-percent cut in import duties of goods and raw materials shipped into the United States.

The proponents, all doubtlessly as sincere as the opponents, are convinced that this extension and further cut in duties is necessary to save the present economic situation, if not the free world.

But the American Tariff League in its conclusions to its study, feels quite differently.

"Today's world," says the organization, "is at comparative peace after 11 of the last 18 years have been consumed with war or reconstruction from war.

"The world is, today, only beginning to adjust to the new economic dynamics which face it. As we arrive at this turning point in our Nation's foreign economic policy, let us review the experience of over 20 years' operation under present foreign trade policy of the United States.

"The evidence demonstrates that:

"1. The trade agreements program (of 1934) has not played any substantial part in economic recovery from the depression or in subsequent economic developments. These have, instead, come from basic dynamics stemming from other elements such as peace, new markets for new products, upsurge of population, and increases in personal purchasing power.

TRADE POLICY LESS RESTRICTIVE

"2. Our own tariffs have been reduced by as much as two-thirds and the United States at this moment has the least restrictive trade policy of any major trading nation.

"3. The program of multi-lateral agreements which the United States State Department has erected over the years on basis of the 1934 act and which finds expression in GATT (the international General Agreement on Trade and Tariffs) is rapidly becoming outmoded by trends in the world toward economic nationalism, preferential trading areas and commonpool markets.

"4. Harm has been wrought upon many American industries in placing foreign policy considerations ahead of domestic well-being.

"5. Some industries have been selected as 'expendable' in this battle of world power dynamics.

"6. Over the years, the tariff structure has become a complete hodgepodge and an entirely fresh appraisal is necessary.

"7. Industries essential to the defense mobilization base of the American people in case of war have been seriously weakened.

"8. The basic wage gap between American and foreign workers remains substantial and in general has not been offset in American industry by higher productivity in this country.

"9. Reciprocity, the basis of the original Cordell Hull policy, has not been achieved. Instead, foreign markets for American goods have been artificially expanded by military and economic aid.

"10. Present uncertainties in United States business conditions and some deterioration of industries affected by foreign imports, are cause for grave national concern."

These are the findings.

Among them are many specific items.

One-third of our entire imports are of items produced in foreign countries by low wage employees in plants, mines, etc., owned or controlled by American firms.

As has been remarked, generalized, broad-scale tariff reductions have made it possible for some firms to escape the burdens of unionism, lowering productivity, high taxation, social legislation, and other factors in the United States, all of which in one form or another are said to be contributors to the American standard of living.

Or take the theory that we have to import in order to export. How important are exports to the United States as a whole?

The research staff preparing this ATL report shows statistically that exports now make up 4.6 percent of the total United States gross national product. In the 1920's, before the passage of reciprocal-trade acts, they accounted for 5.4 percent of the GNP. Before World War I, in the era of alleged high tariffs, exports measured more than 7 percent.

WAGE DIFFERENTIAL A FACTOR

Take the wage differential, a very real factor.

The average weekly wage in United States manufacturing on basis of a 40-hour week in 1956 was $80.19 cents. Of the United Kingdom on basis of a 46-hour week, it was $34.64. In Japan, the work week is 50 hours and the wage $11.86. In Mexico, weekly wages in manufacturing are $11.10.

In India, workmen labor 46 hours a week for $4.74.

Or take the proposal that some sacrifices must be made by selected industries (lead and zinc?) to accommodate the United States trade policy.

The United States Chamber of Commerce estimates that for every 100 jobs permanently lost, a community is deprived of $360,000 in annual retail sales; $270,000 in bank deposits; 107 automobile registrations; 112 households; 40 jobs in other enterprises and 4 retail establishments.

And so it goes.

New Foreign Service Legislation Needed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALVIN M. BENTLEY

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 24, 1958

Mr. BENTLEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to revise and extend my remarks, I would like to include the text of an editorial from the February 1958 issue of the Foreign Service Journal. The editorial in question calls attention to the need for a pay raise for Foreign Service employees, as well as a liberalization of the provisions of the Foreign Service Act relating to survivorship annuities for widows and children of deceased Foreign Service officers. Both of these subjects demand legislative action by the Congress during its present session.

The editorial follows:

NEW FOREIGN SERVICE LEGISLATION NEEDED

As of this writing (early January) and with the 2d session of the 85th Congress just opened, we can think of a number of measures designed to benefit employees of the Foreign Service which we would like to see presented to Congress and which we believe would receive its favorable consideration. We would put high on a list of these measures (1) a pay raise for Foreign Service employees and (2) a liberalization of the provisions of the Foreign Service Act relating to survivorship annuities for widows and children of deceased Foreign Service officers.

A general pay raise for employees of the Foreign Service is, we believe, clearly and urgently needed in order to enable Foreign Service personnel to meet the demands of the rising cost of living. The last pay raise was granted by Congress in 1955, since which time the cost of living has risen sharply, as we are intimately and somewhat painfully aware. A pay raise for Foreign Service employees and a general pay raise for all Federal Government employees are inextricably entwined, we realize, but we hope the Department will be ready with its own proposals as regards the Foreign Service when the attitude of the administration and the Congress on this subject is known.

As regards survivorship benefits for widows and children, we believe it is important that the current provisions of the Foreign Service Act in this respect be liberalized to bring them at least roughly into line with the benefits presently accorded the widows and children of civil-service employees. Under current provisions of the act, a retiring Foreign Service officer is hard put to provide adequate survivorship benefits to his widow and children, a matter which is of immediate concern to those officers faced with retirement in the near future but which should be of concern to younger officers as well.

To illustrate in a general way what is involved in this matter for Foreign Service officers, let us take the hypothetical case of Mr. Jones, a Foreign Service officer who is retiring this month from the Service with an annuity of $6,000. Under current law, Mr. Jones may elect, upon retirement, to receive the full $6,000 for the duration of his life, with no provision for annuity for his wife if he should predecease her, or he may elect to take a reduced annuity for his lifetime, in which case his wife would receive an annuity after his death. The maximum survivorship annuity he could provide under present law would be $2,500.

Mr. Jones, as in the case of any Foreign Service officer, wants to provide for maximum survivorship for his wife, but the choice is not easy, for he learns that the cost to him is a reduction in his full annuity equal to one-half of the sum he wishes to provide for his widow, in this case $1,250, leaving him an annual retirement annuity of only $4,750. This is a steep price for Mr. Jones to pay, but in all probability he reluctantly elects to accept the reduction so that, should he die first, his wife will have support for the remainder of her life.

A civil-service employee retiring on the same $6,000 annuity, on the other hand, would be able to provide a higher maximum survivorship annuity for his wife ($3,000) for a reduction in his own lifetime annuity of only $420. He could, therefore, retire on an annuity of $5,580 as opposed to Mr. Jones' $4,750 and at the same time provide more generously for his wife's support if she should survive him.

In addition to this more favorable circumstance, the civil-service retirement provisions allow for a payment to the widow of up to $600 per surviving child under the age of 18. There is no provision for such payments under the present Foreign Service Act.

All this adds up, in our mind, to the need for legislation which will liberalize the provisions of the Foreign Service Act pertaining to survivorship benefits. We urge the Department to seek the enactment of such legislation from this session of Congress.

The Late Honorable Dwight H. Green, Former Governor of Illinois

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROLAND V. LIBONATI
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 24, 1958

Mr. LIBONATI. Mr. Speaker, the citizens of Illinois heard with the deepest regret that the Honorable Dwight H. Green, 61, died Thursday evening in the Presbyterian-St. Luke's Hospital, where he had been a patient since November 21 in a fight against lung cancer.

This regret was shared by thousands of his fellow citizens throughout the United States, as stated in the words of Democratic Mayor Richard J. Daley, of Chicago, who credited Mr. Green with sponsoring creation of the State housing board and pioneering legislation in neighborhood redevelopment acts, which established principles of sound government in future legislation affecting great cities in this field. Also, his labor legislation, dealing with workmen's and unemployment compensation, were strengthened under Governor Green's leadership. Again, legislation affecting mine safety laws were tightened under his administration. His programing of consolidated school districts and improvement of the eduactional system of Illinois pointed the way to educational advancement.

His appreciation of the members of the general assembly and their problems can best be understood by the passage of laws, during his two administrations, increasing salaries and the establishment of an adequate general assembly retirement system, providing pensions for legislators as a token of appreciation by an appreciative electorate for good public service.

Governor Green was a man of high principles, great ability, and strong personal integrity. He waged a constant fight, down through the years, to keep the Republican Party of Illinois faithful to the principles of conservatism. He was of unswerving loyalty in his political and personal friendships and retired his own importance to his party in the national picture, to advance the political aspirations of candidates for the presidential preferment of his party.

Dwight H. Green was Governor of Illinois during the war years, from 1941 through 1948, and because of his fiscal soundness of policy and regulated economy, he accumulated in the general revenue fund the enormous sum of in excess of $150 million.

A number of the present Members of the House of Representatives in Congress from Illinois served in the general assembly while the Honorable Dwight H. Green was Governor of the State, and knew him intimately, and personally express their true feelings of admiration, respect, and sadness at the death of this distinguished, loyal, and patriotic American. He served his Nation in war, his State in high public office, and his community in civic and public movements as chairman for the raising of moneys in the cancer drive fund, arthritis and rheumatism funds. There was no cause too great or too small to interest this busy man. He was loved by everyone because he had a genuine love for human beings and was of such a sensitive nature that no person left his presence without feeling that he had met a man who wanted so much to be a friend.

It is a law of man that seldom does a man die with as long a list of friendships as he enjoyed in his years of affluence and influence; but it is true of Governor Green that, what friends he did make, they will never diminish in number. His life of sacrifice to public service was without financial remuneration, but his badge of honor, carried through life, marked him as an honest man. No one can ask for more.

It is with deepest sympathy that we extend to his family, his widow, Mrs. Mabel Green, his daughters, Gloria and Nancy, and his sister, Mrs. Mary Shearer, our heartfelt condolences and the blessings and protection of God in his memory.

Benson Must Go

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PHIL WEAVER
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, January 29, 1958

Mr. WEAVER. Mr. Speaker, I want to call to the attention of my colleagues in the House a recent editorial from one of America's well-known farm publications, the Nebraska Farmer. It is entitled "Benson Must Go." I assure you that the sentiments herein expressed by this farm publication reflect the voice and the thinking of the bulk of our farm citizens and small-business people and particularly the average American citizen at the grass-roots level.

Lower prices and rising costs for the farmer will only push agriculture into further economic oblivion and this condition is already spelling trouble in certain parts of our business and industrial economy today. The prosperity of every community throughout this great land of ours is dependent upon the well-being of those engaged in agriculture. A program of reducing acreage and of reducing prices along with rising costs to the farmer means just one thing—less farm income. The theories of Mr. Benson are contrary to the laws of good commonsense because the farmer, like any other businessman, must maintain a level of income to meet his fixed expenses. If the price is low, he expands his production facilities to increase production, thereby adding to the total overall production of farm commodities.

Both the farmer and the consumer have been penalized by the Benson approach—because neither has benefited. The prices that the farmer receives for his products have gone down and the costs for food to the consumer have gone up.

Whether we like it or not, our whole economy is built around subsidies. Practically every segment of our economy has some protection. Labor has the minimum wage, industry has tariffs, and business has fair trade laws. Agriculture should therefore, too, be entitled to a fair degree of economic protection. It cannot survive on a competitive free enterprise basis in a subsidized and supported business and industrial economy. Our objective should be to restore a fair level of buying power to the American farmer.

Let us not put the farmers of America in an even tighter economic straitjacket. We need a Secretary of Agriculture who will be realistic and practical and face the facts to get results, not a Secretary who is stubborn and knows all the answers. As the author of this article comments, much more than political considerations are involved, "Benson has sold agriculture short."

This is food for thought.

The editorial follows:

BENSON MUST GO

For the good of agriculture, as well as the Republican Party, Secretary Benson has got to go.

Many Republican politicians, with their eyes on seats in Congress next year and on the Presidency in 1960, have been convinced for some time that Benson is a millstone around Republican necks.

If political considerations were all that were involved, we could see our way clear to letting the politicians stew. But this is not the case. Much more is involved. Benson has sold agriculture short.

Ever since he became Secretary, Benson has been spanking agriculture, urging farmers to stand on their own two feet, be rugged individuals and throw off the yoke of Government management—even if they went broke doing it. He has done this spanking publicly, thereby scuttling the efforts of any agricultural group trying to build its public relations and tell its true story to consumers.

Can you imagine Benson saying anything like the following:

"If, for the protection or convenience of consumers, it appears desirable to have ample supplies of farm products at all times to avoid the risk of shortages * * * consumers should share the cost for such protection and convenience.

"We are out of patience with the persistent cliché that farmers must 'learn to live with abundance' when such abundance results in cut price markets."

That is the type of thing you might well expect a Secretary of Agriculture to say. But it hardly needs to be said that it didn't come from Benson. It came from the National Grange in annual convention at Colorado Springs last month.

The guaranties and aids afforded to labor and industry by Government have escaped Benson's attention at the same time he has been abhoring such in agriculture. As a

Secretary of Agriculture, he has been spanking the wrong baby.

What agriculture needs in a Secretary is a man who will supply leadership to bring together warring factions within agriculture itself. No workable program for agriculture can be organized until this job is done. And it needs a man who will stand up as a champion for agriculture to fight for a feasible program once it is organized.

Unfair Treatment of Kings Point Academy in Military Pay Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. VICTOR L. ANFUSO
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 24, 1958

Mr. ANFUSO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am inserting into the RECORD the text of a statement which I am submitting to the Senate Armed Services Committee on the military pay increase bill, S. 3081, as it affects the United States Merchant Marine Academy at Kings Point, N. Y. I have also submitted a similar statement to the House Armed Services Committee on the companion bill, H. R. 9979.

My statement is as follows:

STATEMENT BY CONGRESSMAN VICTOR L. ANFUSO, SENATE ARMED SERVICES COMMITTEE, ON S. 3081

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, I appreciate this opportunity to present my views before your esteemed committee on the bill S. 3081, to revise the method of computing the basic pay for members of the uniformed services.

Actually, I have no quarrel with this bill. I consider it a very meritorious and praiseworthy piece of legislation. All of us are extremely interested in improving the quality and the management of our military personnel, which this bill seeks to achieve. I am wholeheartedly in accord with the objectives of the bill, and most especially with the provision to increase the military pay. I feel we must do everything possible to retain the skilled officers and technicians in the Armed Forces, particularly at a time like this when skill is at a premium and is so necessary for the safety and the security of our Nation.

I want to direct your attention merely to one section in the bill which I consider detrimental and discriminatory. That is section 14 which seeks to deprive the uniformed officers and enlisted men of the United States Merchant Marine Academy at Kings Point from the proposed military pay increases and status benefits. Under this section, the Secretary of Commerce is given the authority to prescribe the pay and allowances for the officers and enlisted men at Kings Point, which may actually turn out to be pay cuts instead of increases as are to be granted to all other military personnel.

Adoption of this section would not only be discriminatory against the personnel at Kings Point, but will most certainly jeopardize the academic standing of a vital military educational institution by removing its excellent staff and faculty from their present protection within the framework of existing legislation governing the pay of these people. May I remind the members of this committee that in the Merchant Marine Act of 1936 it is specifically stated:

"The ranks, grades, and ratings for the personnel of the said Service (i. e., United States Maritime Service) shall be the same as are now or shall hereafter be prescribed for the personnel of the Coast Guard."

The Kings Point Academy was subsequently given the same pay status for its faculty and staff as was accorded the Coast Guard. Now an attempt is being made to deprive them of this legislative entitlement which goes back some two decades.

Aside from the fact that this constitutes a gross injustice, such action would most certainly result in demoralization at the Kings Point Academy and its future as an accredited educational institution would be seriously undermined. Approval of this section would undoubtedly encourage many of these people to leave Kings Point. In this way, the bill which is aimed to improve the quality of military personnel and keep them in the service, will achieve the exact opposite.

And one other point. We have been talking a great deal these past few months, ever since Russia launched her sputniks, about the vital role of education to our national security. All of us are keenly aware of the need for trained teachers on the college level and the urgency for training suitable personnel for our nation's security needs. But what are we doing? We are putting a provision into a bill for military pay increases which will only serve to withhold such increases from a group of government college teachers who are giving training of a special sort to our youth.

It is difficult for me to understand the logic behind this kind of action. On the one hand, we are breaking our heads to think of ways to assure victory in the struggle for our national survival; on the other hand, we are doing everything to discourage those who are in the front-lines of the struggle.

Mr. Chairman, I urge you and the members of your committee to delete this section from the bill so as to enable the personel at Kings Point to receive the same fair treatment as is given to other military personnel.

Fortieth Anniversary of Estonian Independence

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALVIN M. BENTLEY
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 24, 1958

Mr. BENTLEY. Mr. Speaker, February 24, 1958 marks the Fortieth anniversary of the Proclamation of Independence of the Republic of Estonia and today event is being commemorated all over the world by people of Estonian descent and those Estonian citizens who live in a free land.

Estonia has been incorporated into the Soviet union by brute force and her people have now been Communist slaves for more than 10 years. However, they still long for the day of their deliverance from Soviet tyranny and their moral insistence against their totalitarian rulers remains unabated. They can preserve this spirit of resistance as long as they remain convinced that the United States will never abandon its own efforts on behalf of all the captive peoples and will continue to work for their freedom and right of self-determination.

It is therefore important that we take every opportunity to reassure the people of Estonia that our policy of liberation does continue. It is equally important to give encouragement to the anti-Communist spirit and activities of free Estonians throughout the world. There are many of them in my own State of Michigan to whom I would like to pay tribute on this occasion.

Mr. Speaker, it is my conviction that, just as the free flag of Estonia still flies in our own country, that this date will one day again see that flag flying in Estonia itself. The spirit of the brave people of Estonia will continue to resist communism until victory is theirs and until freedom returns to their country.

Andrew Jacobs, Our Former Colleague

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RAY J. MADDEN
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 24, 1958

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, the following article from our former colleague, Andrew Jacobs, of Indianapolis, Ind., is interesting in that Andy has not forgotten the fact that he is a perfectionist in politics and keeps an extensive file on governmental and political facts extending back through the years.

WHAT I THINK
(By Andrew Jacobs)
NEWS ITEMS

December 12, 1949: Senator HOMER E. CAPEHART, Republican, senior United States Senator from Indiana, charged at Butler Field House last night that Federal aid was a hoax. The Senator pointed out that the money the Government doled out came from the pockets of the voters in the first place and that the Government returned only about 8 percent of it in Federal aid.

February 8, 1958: Senator HOMER E. CAPEHART, Republican, senior United States Senator from Indiana, speaking from Elkhart last night, pointed out that during the last 5 years Indiana had received $2 in Federal aid for every $1 she had paid in Federal taxes.

THE FISHES AND THE LOAVES

And after these things Ike went over the budget and a great multitude followed him for they had learned of his miracles from the press.

And Ike went up to the summit and there he sat with his diplomats and the flyover was earnestly discussed with the sadducees.

And when Ike was airlifted home he lifted up his eyes and saw great unemployment, and he sayeth unto Sherm, "Whence shall we buy bread that these may eat?"

And Sherm knowing what Ike would do, but to prove him, answered, "A bit of Federal bread is not sufficient for them, even that every one of them might take a little."

And one of his disciples, Allan, a brother of John Foster sayeth unto him, "There is a lad here, Ezra Taft, who hath 5 barley loaves and 2 scrawny fishes, but what are they among so many?"

And Ike said, "Bid the men relax." And now there was much grass in the place, but none in the streets, as yet, mind you. And so the men relaxed in the grass, in number, many millions.

And Ike took the scant vittles; and when he had given private thanks over TV, he distributed unto the disciples and the disciples unto those as were relaxed and as much as they would.

And when they were filled Ike said, "Gather up the fragments that remain, that nothing be lost, and that we show great economy."

Therefore, they gathered together and filled twice as many warehouses as the Government had before, which remained over and above unto them that had eaten.

Then these men, when they saw what Ike did, said, "This is of a truth the most peerless leader that should ever come into the world."

When Ike therefore perceived that they would come and take him by force, to make him break the third-term rule, he departed unto the Burning Tree Golf Club to be all alone.

Thus far, according to Senator HOMER.

Fortieth Anniversary of Lithuanian Independence

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 24, 1958

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Wilkes-Barre Times-Leader of February 15, 1958, on the occasion of the observance of the 40th anniversary of Lithuanian independence:

LITHUANIAN INDEPENDENCE

It must be irksome to the Soviet Union to have Lithuanian Independence Day celebrated every February 16. This is a grim reminder to the gang in the Kremlin that a day of reckoning is coming because freedom does not die in men's hearts. It lives on in successive generations—forever. Despite the stranglehold it has on Lithuania now, Moscow cannot win; eventually, it must lose. That is the lesson of history.

For 123 years, Lithuania was held in bondage by czarist Russia. Then came the First World War and opportunity knocked for Lithuania. It threw off the yoke and on February 16, 1918, just 40 years ago tomorrow, the independence of Lithuania was proclaimed. The hopes of successive generations were realized and their perseverance in this holy crusade rewarded.

But 22 years later, there was another upheaval with a second world conflagration. Tyranny went on a rampage again and Lithuania was one of the early casualties. It was incorporated into the Soviet Union, ostensibly through a plebicite, but actually by force. With a gun pointed at its head, Lithuania was left without a choice.

To this day, the United States has not recognized the legality of this move. To do so would be to condone an injustice and to be an accomplice in a crime.

So the struggle goes on. Eighteen years have come and gone since the Communist coup. They have been years of terrible hardship for these unfortunate people and of anguish for Americans of Lithuanian extraction and for others who love freedom and detest dictatorship.

But there is a measure of consolation in the knowledge things might have been worse. So long as men and women with Lithuanian blood in their veins carry on, so long as other friends of Lithuania stand by its side, all is not lost.

Today, there is added reason for faith in the future. The entire world is alerted to the menace of communism. Lithuania does not lack for sympathy and understanding. It is not alone in the struggle for liberation.

Good Cause for Bragging

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN E. HENDERSON
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 24, 1958

Mr. HENDERSON. Newspapers of the Nation's smaller communities perform a vital function of informing the people of events which have a direct bearing on the conduct of their local, State, and national affairs. In these days of mass news reporting media, the place which our smaller newspapers hold is often overlooked and unappreciated.

In southeastern Ohio, there are a number of weekly newspapers which are active in the effective reporting of the events in their communities and whose editorial comments reflect a vitality and intelligence that would do credit to some of the great metropolitan daily newspapers. It gives me great pleasure to call the attention of the Congress to the Journal of Caldwell, Ohio, one such newspaper in the 15th Congressional District which will shortly mark its first century of service to its community. It has recently been accorded the deserved recognition of being selected by the Ohio Newspaper Association as first in general excellence among publications servicing communities of less than 2,500.

I am commending to the Congress an editorial from the Marietta Daily Times, of Marietta, which makes comments with which I associate myself. The editorial is as follows:

GOOD CAUSE FOR BRAGGING

"We're not bragging. We're just proud." With these words The Journal, a weekly newspaper published at Caldwell, introduces some editorial comment on the honors it won at a recent meeting of the Ohio Newspaper Association. Not only was it judged the best paper in its class in the State, but it just about cleaned the platter of other awards, receiving five besides the first prize.

In addition to the top award, The Journal was cited for general excellence among newspapers in the under 2,500 population category, taking four honors for news coverage, makeup, advertising, and women's news.

A community service award also was received for its promotion of the John Gray Memorial, the ensuing campaign and the final erection of this memorial at the roadside park north of Caldwell. It was for this service in bringing recognition to Ohio's last surviving soldier of the Revolutionary War that the Caldwell newspaper won Statewide plaudits. In this connection The Journal says:

"In a matter of only a few months, The Journal will be observing the 100th anniversary of its founding and the recognition which was received this year at the annual convention was especially fitting in connection with the founding of this weekly newspaper."

Publishers of the Caldwell newspaper are Clarence J. Estadt and John D. Wheeler and they deserve the recognition that their publication was given because of its general excellence. It is one of the few weeklies that come regularly to our desk, and we have long considered it one of the best of which we have any knowledge. They have every reason to be proud, and we doubt that they will ever have greater cause for bragging.

For those interested in seeing how a good small town newspaper is put together, copies of The Journal are available in my office.

H. R. 8525

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN D. DINGELL
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 24, 1958

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to permission granted I am inserting into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a copy of a letter sent to me by the Honorable G. Mennen Williams, Governor of the State of Michigan, enclosing a copy of a letter that Governor Williams and Lt. Gov. Philip A. Hart had sent to the Honorable OREN HARRIS, chairman of the House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, opposing enactment of the natural-gas gouge bill of 1957–58.

The two letters succinctly set forth why the bill is not in the public interest, and I hope all Members will read them.

STATE OF MICHIGAN,
OFFICE OF THE GOVERNOR,
Lansing, February 19, 1958.

Hon. JOHN D. DINGELL,
United States Congress,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN DINGELL: The Harris-O'Hara bill vitally affects the welfare of the people of Michigan.

On behalf of the people of the State of Michigan, Lt. Gov. Philip A. Hart and I have written Congressman OREN HARRIS urging that this measure be defeated. A copy of this letter is enclosed for your information.

Sincerely,

———, *Governor.*

FEBRUARY 19, 1958.

Hon. OREN HARRIS,
United States Congress,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN HARRIS: As the Governor and the Lieutenant Governor of the State of Michigan we take this means to again express in behalf of the people of Michigan vigorous opposition to H. R. 8525, the legislation affecting regulation of gas producers which is soon to come before the Congress.

During hearings on this measure in 1957, before the House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, we made known to the committee the deep concern of the people of Michigan that the effect of the passage of H. R. 8525 would be an increase in consumer gas prices. We also sought to impress upon the committee the serious hardship of such an increase on gas users in Michigan, as well as the rest of the country.

Our concern is even greater today.

We oppose this measure, because so many of our residents are customers of the gas industry and will be directly affected by in-

creased rates. It is estimated that 85,000 persons using gas for space heating were added to the ranks of gas consumers in Michigan last year. The total number of users rose approximately 150,000 in 1957, so that we now have 1,403,000 persons using gas for some purpose. This means that a rate increase of 1 cent per thousand cubic feet would cost Michigan gas consumers $2½ million more a year than they are now paying.

Gas consumers have not escaped the drop in purchasing power. Gas is a necessity and unlike purchases of many other commodities, cannot wait until the gas consumer's income reaches a favorable level. An increase in the gas bill compels gas consumers to promptly divert portions of earnings from other purchases in order to heat their homes, to cook their meals, and in the case of industrial users, to keep furnaces going. Moreover, many gas consumers in Michigan have spent considerable sums of money and have shouldered sizeable debt in order to convert homes and businesses for use of gas. All of these persons are "captives" who cannot avoid payment of increased rates.

In our present economic crisis, it is also important that we do not ignore the disastrous effect any increase in the cost of necessities can and does have on the growing numbers of unemployed. The increase in the total number of jobless in the amount of 1.2 million during period from December 15 of last year to January 15, 1958 should make us shockingly aware of this situation.

We have our share of jobless in Michigan, amounting to over 320,000, with 190,000 in Detroit alone. The effect of any increases in consumer prices is to increase the burden on the meager funds of our additional numbers of whom are being added to welfare rolls daily. For some this may create an additional drain on savings; but for most, it means that another chunk must be squeezed from the unemployment compensation check which is already too small to cover the cost of basic needs.

In examining considerations of H. R. 8525 now before the Congress we are particularly impressed with the absence of any claim by the proponents of the measure that its passage will not result in higher rates. We conclude, therefore, that such proponents either are not concerned about the effect of increases or choose to ignore the whole issue. This is economic myopia of the worst kind. Rates now fixed by the Federal Power Commission assure producers reasonable returns and freeing them from the Commission's regulations, as the bill provides, would lead not to just rate increases, but we predict to unreasonable rates.

It is characteristic of utility rates that they be fixed, not by utility owners, but by a regulatory agency guided by law and responsive to the needs of the public. Neither the utility character of gas production nor the need for Government regulation of its rates has changed since such regulation was commenced. Public interest in this industry has multiplied many times as the number of gas consumers has risen to millions. The chain reaction of unreasonable rates by producers would be disastrous today, because of the inflationary effect it would have on the economy.

Gas producers cannot be said to be undergoing any financial hardship. Nor can theirs be the complaint that rising labor or other costs require higher prices. In 1956 alone, they seemed well able to spend sums in promotion of H. R. 8525 equal to almost two-thirds the cost to Michigan consumers of the increase of 1 cent a thousand cubic feet of gas to which we have referred previously. Their willingness to add to such expenditures so generously this year does not bespeak of economic peril in their industry. It does suggest the gains which are anticipated if the bill passes.

The industry, apparently does not intend to call off its drive for the opportunity to gouge its customers. Only the Congress can do what must be done to thwart this attempt. The President has indicated that he is for the bill. We urge that Congress take note of the dire consequences of enactment into law of H. R. 8525 and that, in the public interest, this measure be defeated.

Sincerely,

GOV. G. MENNEN WILLIAMS.
LT. GOV. PHILIP A. HART.

Is More Money the Answer?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILL E. NEAL
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 24, 1958

Mr. NEAL. Mr. Speaker, in this day when professional educators and Government leaders clamor for ever-increasing appropriations for teachers and facilities to provide an environment under which our youth may pursue an education, it is well to remind ourselves that our forefathers who were ambitious to acquire knowledge were inspired to exercise their own initiative toward perfecting their education under extremely primitive conditions.

The following description of a one-time typical mountain schoolhouse presided over by a dedicated pedagog served well in its time to instill youthful desires for more learning:

HUNTINGTON, W. VA., *February 15, 1958.*
Hon. WILL E. NEAL,
Member of Congress from West Virginia.

DEAR DR. NEAL: When talking to you on the phone a few days ago I mentioned some of the things that occurred during my primary school days while I resided with my parents at Logan, approximately 70 or more years ago. Principally with reference to the schools, school facilities, and the methods of a specific teacher, you stated you would like to have that information. Here it is:

We had principally the three R's—reading, writing, and arithmetic. We went to school in a one-room log schoolhouse. Floors were crude, rough-sawed lumber. Ceilings, rough-sawed boards laid on top of hewed joists, not even nailed, but laid loosely.

School attendance was on a voluntary basis, not compulsory.

We had a blackboard about 3½ feet by 6 feet placed against the log walls and for heat we had a pot-belly wood-burning stove. The wood for fuel was cut by the boys during recess and noon hours.

For seats we had split pieces of logs with legs (rough wooden legs).

We had for our writing lessons a rough wooden table hung from the side of the wall where logs had been removed. When the weather was bad the table was not dropped down but left to close the opening, thus in bad weather we had to forego our writing lesson and defer it until the weather was more comfortable.

Teachers in those days were very definite and positive in their attitude. They said what they meant and they meant what they said. Failure to obey meant the rod of correction and when our parents learned that we had been thus disciplined they applied the same rod of correction to us at home. Our books were McGuffey Readers, Goodrich History which covered the history of America from the landing of Columbus to the then date, Harvey's Grammar, Mitchell's Geography, and Ray's Arithmetic. This, I believe, was the extent of the books we had to study.

After we had completed the study of these books, if we had mastered them properly, we were eligible to take the teachers examination, even though we had mastered but one-half of them and if we passed such examination we were given a teacher's certificate.

During this period we had a teacher come to county by the name of John L. Puckett. He came to where McConnell is now located. On the very first day of school he placed a motto at the upper left-hand corner of the blackboard, or perhaps you would call it a moral. It read as follows:

"Insolence produces vice—vice produces crime—only by industry and thrift can we thrive."

This teacher, Puckett, taught for the 3 months' term, and on the last day of the term he had a program of recitations at which the students were permitted and requested to recite dialog, prose, poetry, and so forth, which the students may have committed to memory, and at the end of this program, to which their parents also were invited, Mr. Puckett made some closing remarks to both parents and children. These remarks went something like this:

"It has been a pleasure for me to have taught this term of school in Logan County. Generally, I believe every student has improved in his knowledge of the subjects taught. I have been pleasingly entertained in many of your homes; please accept my sincere appreciation of your fine hospitality. It is something I shall never forget. I know not if I shall ever pass this way again. To those of you students who may be fortunate enough to go to normal school I want to advise you to choose the subjects that will likely be most useful to you in your life's vocation. Master these subjects and gain all the knowledge you can from them. Then, upon finishing normal school, should you go to college, follow this same idea. Then, after you have finished school and selected a definite vocation, if it be teaching, try to do a better job than those who may have taught you throughout your period of learning. Should you decide to be a carpenter when you set to build a house use only good, sound material. When you start to prepare the foundation and have mixed the mortar to a proper consistency, add to it a liberal amount of good commonsense and you will then have prepared the first essential of doing a good job."

If we had a little more of the old-time methods used in these pioneer days of the life of America, I feel certain we would longer remain a free and independent country, and in the meantime have fewer nervous wrecks, fewer delinquents, and a more desirable country in which to live.

WILLIAM GUY PECK, Sr.

Poll of the 18th District of California

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CRAIG HOSMER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 24, 1958

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, recently a poll of California's 18th District was taken on many important questions of the day. Four different ballots were used. I thought the results would be of interest to my colleagues. They are shown on the accompanying table:

[Percent]

18th Congressional District poll	Yes	No	Don't know
BALLOT NO. 1			
1. Some people say our defense could be boosted by junking our Joint Chiefs-of-Staff system for a German-type Supreme Staff. Do you think it would work?	35	41	24
2. Should the cost of mailing a letter be raised from 3 to 4 cents (along with bulk mail and other postal rates) to help cut Post Office Department deficits?	79	18	3
3. Do you think social-security taxes on employers and employees should be raised, and social-security benefits and coverage increased?	63	34	3
4. Are tight money and high interest rates for awhile, assuming they actually would stop inflation, better than not stopping it?	67	20	13
5. Even though it might drive a lot of small farmers to the wall, do you think we would be better off to drop farm price supports and the soil-bank program?	57	31	12
BALLOT NO. 2			
1. In view of increasing defense demands, do you think raising the $275,000,000,000 United States debt ceiling would be justified?	63	29	8
2. Would a disarmament agreement with the Soviets on weapons of war help toward peace even without other steps to eliminate major causes of war?	19	69	12
3. Are recent Russian "successes" due more to their own hard work and sacrifice of living standards than to so-called United States "mistakes"?	66	25	9
4. Should the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act be extended another 5 years with authority to lower tariffs another 25 percent?	43	32	25
5. Should a law or constitutional amendment be written to say when and how a Vice President should take over when a President becomes disabled?	86	10	4
BALLOT NO. 3			
1. Defense and other fixed spending take up all but about $20 billion of our $72,000,000,000 budget. Do you think the $20,000,000,000 can be cut substantially?	43	45	12
2. Even if only a few of our allies would help in a showdown with the Reds, is our military aid program nevertheless helping to avert a showdown?	71	17	12
3. Assuming Government employees and pensioners should get raises, should taxes be raised to pay for them if not raising taxes would unbalance the budget?	47	44	9
4. Do you feel we could safely participate in an immediate and unconditional international ban on testing nuclear weapons?	21	72	7
5. Do you favor a multi-billion-dollar civil-defense shelter building program?	19	75	6
6. Do you think more money should be spent on our overseas propaganda efforts?	38	53	9
BALLOT NO. 4			
1. Should economies be made in Government domestic programs helping Americans in order to offset higher defense spending?	58	32	10
2. Do you believe that because of present world conditions we should wait a while before granting statehood to Hawaii and Alaska?	27	61	12
3. Do you think more emphasis on teaching science and math in the public schools would be a bigger factor in improving the education of United States youth than a broad Federal college scholarship program?	74	18	8
4. Do you favor legislation requiring labor unions to have their financial transactions audited once a year and the statements made public?	96	3	1
5. Should World War I veterans be granted a $100 per month pension at age 65?	50	38	12

The Recent Winter Rampage of Mother Nature Enabled the Railroads of the Nation To Add to Their Laurels as the Most Dependable Form of Transportation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 19, 1958

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, whether the Nation is engulfed in man-made wars that create national emergencies or falls victim to the relentless outbursts of Mother Nature, history records that the country's railroads have always met the acid test in providing uninterrupted service to the American people.

Termed the "arteries of the Nation" the railroads have demonstrated beyond doubt that they are the most dependable form of transportation, having kept pace with developments in that highly essential field from their infancy.

The recent paralyzing series of snowstorms that wreaked havoc and despair in various sections of the country are evidence of the dependability of the Iron Horse to give creditable performance under the most adverse weather conditions. It is a significant fact that the financial condition of the Nation's railroads have been impaired by the loss of revenue due to competing forms of transportation, notably the private automobile. Yet when the public demand for emergency transportation arises, we expect the railroads to have equipment ready for instant service.

The recent period of winter weather that gripped so many States and rendered useless other forms of transportation found the railroads capable of stellar performance despite the various obstacles that have been and are hampering them in their daily operations.

If we have learned any lesson from the recent icy grip of winter, it should be a new-found faith in the durability and dependability of the railroads of the country and the compelling need for expediting the adoption of a new and streamlined transportation policy. Such a national policy is imperative as a means of removing the inequities and disadvantages under which the railroads are now forced to operate, which have been revealed in testimony before the so-called Smathers committee of the United States Senate.

At this point, I should like to conclude my remarks by calling attention to the following copyrighted article by the noted columnist, David Lawrence, titled "The Railroads and Blizzards," which appeared in the February 18, 1958, issue of the Washington (D. C.) Evening Star:

THE RAILROADS AND BLIZZARDS—TRAINS' STATUS AS INVALUABLE STANDBY TRANSPORTATION SEEN PROVED IN STORM

(By David Lawrence)

Man may be talking big about going to the moon, but actually he hasn't conquered his own problems of communication on earth. The reminder comes when blizzards and freezing temperatures in our big cities tie up transportation and paralyze communications so that work stops, stores close, schools suspend, and whole regions take on a primitive aspect not unlike the 1890's.

This is a time when facilities like railroads which have had a hard time competing with newer forms of travel come into their own. Over the weekend when airlines were having trouble landing their planes in many places, buses were running less frequently and individual automobile riders were stalled on the highways, the mainstay of America transportation, the railroads, came through to carry a large section of the traveling public and to maintain the movement of food supplies and mail.

This correspondent on Sunday was on the afternoon Congressional of the Pennsylvania Railroad which usually makes the trip between New York and Washington in 3 hours and 35 minutes. As a result of the snarl in traffic in the rail yards, the train was more than an hour delayed in leaving the station in New York and took about 6 hours to make the trip. The number of people at each stop clamoring for a chance to get on the train was unprecedented. The rail officials allowed passengers to stand in all the aisles and squeezed them into every conceivable space—to give them service. Yet many of these same passengers ordinarily ride buses or their own cars or use the airlines.

Here is a standby means of transportation which America cannot afford to let lapse. The importance of iron tracks which can be cleared for travel in the worst storms, while many autos litter the highways unable to move and themselves blocking other cars cannot be overestimated. As long as there are steel rails to rely on, American people can maintain a semblance of normal life, no matter what happens in the way of weather.

It makes one wonder, incidentally, what kind of life the people of Soviet Russia lead today with such inadequate transportation.

With a population of more than 200 million the Soviet Union has only 72,400 miles of railroad track, compared to America's 220,000 miles. Turning to ordinary highways, the Soviets have only 127,000 miles of paved roads compared to about 2.3 million miles in the United States. This would ring the earth more than 90 times.

As for telephones, there are only 861,000 in the entire Soviet Union, compared to more than 60 million in the United States. This means that, in the Communist empire, people have to spend a lot of time going from place to place to do what a telephone call does for the average American.

So far as automobiles are concerned, the Soviets have only about 700,000 passenger cars, in contrast to about 56 million passenger cars registered in the United States. Yet the Soviets have more than two-and-a-half times the number of square miles of territory to cover.

Communication does substantially affect the opportunity of a people to enjoy a high standard of living. Russia has lots more wintry weather than the United States. What is occasional here in the way of storm paralysis is frequent in Soviet Russia.

There is, in other words, a lot of progress the Soviet rulers have to make before their people can enjoy the earthly things they should have instead of being compelled to see billions of rubles spent on sputniks. It is significant that, of all the published comment that came out of the United States when the first sputnik was launched last autumn, the criticism that all this was at the expense of human suffering in Soviet Russia was singled out for extensive treatment in the Soviet propaganda organs. It evidently got under the skin of the Communists. They have been trying ever since to spread their rebuttals, but these have a hollow sound.

For the people of the vast empire ruled by the Kremlin are, day in and day out, suffering privations which are intensified by primitive transportation and insufficient means of communication. It takes a blizzard or two in America to emphasize what the people of Soviet Russia are up against constantly—and such oppressed people certainly do not want another world war. They do want the right to control their own government, and they'll get it someday—for it's the only way to material well-being, too.

Bread and Butter Voting

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE M. RHODES
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 27, 1958

Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I include herewith an editorial from the New Era, official publication of the Conference of Eastern Pennsylvania Central Labor Unions:

BREAD AND BUTTER VOTING

Breadlines are an actual fact in Tennessee.

Unemployment is officially at 4,500,000—and probably higher than that by now.

Production declined sharply in January.

What's the administration doing about it? Well, Eisenhower issued a statement that things would get better, soon. Then he left for Georgia to play golf and hunt quail.

What's the Vice President doing about it? Well, he issued a statement that Republicans are betting on prosperity.

What's the Postmaster General doing about it? He's dangling a phony post office building program in front of the public as an excuse for raising postal rates from 3 to 5 cents.

Somehow, all of this has a ring of the 1930's when Republican Herbert Hoover was doing nothing in the White House while the Nation's economy was collapsing under him.

And once again the ruling clique of big-business men in Washington (with Eisenhower as their front man) is trying to pacify the Nation with tranquillizers.

We hear, once more, the familiar Hoover refrain that prosperity is just around the corner.

Back in 1952 Adlai Stevenson and the Democrats had a campaign song entitled, "Don't let them take it away." Republicans poohpoohed the idea and promised even greater peace and prosperity than the Democrats had provided.

Millions of American workers—including many who had faith in the Eisenhower administration—are now discovering that they were misled and deceived.

The Republicans did take it away.

This is an important election year. There is absolutely no point in pussyfooting. Workers want to know the truth and then vote accordingly. We believe that time and misfortune have proved that there is a relationship between your pay envelope and your vote on election day.

A Little Light on Walter P. Reuther

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
CLARE E. HOFFMAN
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 18, 1958

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, on January 20, 1958, Senator BARRY GOLDWATER of Arizona appeared in Detroit, Mich., and explained to the gathering, the political facts of life in that fine State. GOLDWATER apparently struck home with certain of the Socialist liberal element in my State as evidenced by the reaction of Walter Reuther to this well-documented speech.

Five articles written by George Todt of the Valley Times of California explain in some detail the contrast between Senator GOLDWATER's position and that of Walter Reuther, sometime labor leader and sometime politician, but all the time an ambitious, ruthless politician using employees' money, usually collected as dues, to further his own purposes, of which one seems to be the socializing of America. The first of these articles appeared on January 28, 1958, as follows:

REUTHER-GOLDWATER VERBAL TILT

"Insolence is not logic; epithets are the arguments of malice." Ingersoll.

Last Wednesday in Detroit the vice president of the United World Federalists in the United States and an ardent champion of so-called mental health legislation found himself ideologically bankrupt of ideas, so what did he do? In his desperation, he lashed out in the most churlish and despicable manner at his chief opponent—a great United States Senator who is his intellectual superior—and told a captive audience that he was a lunatic.

Unable and fearful to meet Senator BARRY GOLDWATER in honest face-to-face debate, here is the rude and ungentlemanly quote from Walter Reuther that he confided to 3,000 delegates at his UAW convention, and these are his exact words:

"GOLDWATER is mentally unbalanced—he needs a psychiatrist, he needs help."

"Ford, Chrysler and General Motors provided a platform in Detroit for the country's No. 1 political fanatic, the No. 1 peddler of class hatred, Senator GOLDWATER."

Here is the Senator's calm reply to the hatemongering of Reuther:

"This man cannot meet the charges that I, as well as others, have made about him and his drive for political power," said GOLDWATER, "so he now resorts to the age-old practice of name calling. He cannot stand to have the truth told about him. The only defense he can muster is to cry 'foul' or that his opposition are liars. Why doesn't he just hold still long enough to answer our questions about him without seeking to create smokescreens and diversions instead? Why should honest questions throw him into such a frenzy?"

Most of the American people would like to know the answer to that one. Let's analyze the situation. What do we find when we dig down for our facts?

First of all, let it be noted that GOLDWATER is an ideological champion of the Taft wing of the Republican Party and Reuther is a New Deal Democrat who is considerably to the left of Henry Wallace—actually, the closest thing we have to British Laborite Aneurin Bevan in this country today. Reuther once told the Americans for Democratic Action, of which he is also a vice president, that when he came to power in the United States "we would not go back to the New Deal, but from the New Deal." He meant by these words that the New Deal was not extreme enough to suit him—that it would merely be the jumpoff point for our downward plunge into outright socialism if he had his way with us.

Secondly, we may note that Mr. Reuther now begins to refer to class hatred in his diatribe against his opponent. What does he mean by the term "class hatred" in the United States of America? Where are the so-called classes anyway? The fact is that we don't have these socialistic divisions of society in our country, as is the case in Europe—where Mr. Reuther studied once upon a time. Frankly, this is Marxist technique, pure and simple.

But it is in the malicious and unjustifiable reference to insanity against an honorable opponent by Mr. Reuther that all patriotic Americans will see the most fearful kind of threatening handwriting on the wall. For we must remember that Walter Reuther is one of the foremost champions of Marxist world government in our Nation at this period of our history. Many patriotic organizations have indicated from time to time that the methods contemplated by the world government addicts in the United States includes the possible us of mental hospitalization of those who oppose their subversive aims in the future. Calling Adolph Hitler and good old Joe Stalin.

Now I have heard both pro and con sides of this argument, which is raging more or less undercover in the Nation today, and have resisted formulating a hard and fast opinion before more of the facts were in on the case. However, it must be stated, that Walter Reuther's vicious remarks concerning Senator GOLDWATER does much to lend credance to views which I had hoped were unfounded concerning the world government crowd—who idolize Mr. Reuther and all he stands for. Now what does he stand for? What does Senator GOLDWATER stand for? What kind of minds do they have? What kind of Americans are they? Who, in reality, needs the psychiatric treatment, who is mentally unbalanced?

For answer to this fascinating question of judgment, I shall render no decision for you at this time. I will leave it up to my readers to fairly decide the question in their own minds by themselves. I shall provide you in my next two articles with the ideology of both GOLDWATER and Reuther, from their own pens, and you may compare them together.

Examine the political philosophy of both men until you are satisfied. And then I

hope you will let me know who you think may be the No. 1 political fanatic in the country today. You pays yer money and yer takes yer choice. Fair enough? Will you participate in this little ideological contest between two opposing philosophies of Government? Are you willing to choose between good and evil of your own free agency? How about it?

Immaculate Heart College Mosaics on Display at National Housing Center

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GORDON L. McDONOUGH
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 28, 1958

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, the National Housing Center in Washington, D. C., is currently exhibiting a striking collection of jewellike mosaics which are the products of adult-education students at Immaculate Heart College in Los Angeles, Calif., which is located in my district.

The mosaics are an example of modern form created in the medium of a centuries-old art, and were made under the direction of Sister Magdalen Mary, I. H. M., chairman of art at Immaculate Heart College.

The exhibition of these modern mosaics at the National Housing Center is an important presentation of a form of art which presents new ideas in design for decoration not only in public and commercial buildings, but for indoor and outdoor decoration in the modern home.

The following articles concerning the exhibit at the National Housing Center testify to the importance of the technique of mosaicmaking developed at Immaculate Heart College under the direction of Sister Magdalen Mary:

An ancient art in striking modern form was unveiled today when 20 colorful, jewellike mosaics were placed on exhibition at the National Housing Center.

Made of various domestic and imported tiles, semiprecious stones, beads, glasses, jewelry, and shells imbedded in colored cement, the mosaics are the products of adult education students at Immaculate Heart College, Los Angeles. They were created under the direction of Sister Magdalen Mary, I. H. M., chairman of art at the college. Her students also designed the decorative banners which excited so much comment when they accompanied the exhibit, 100 Years of American Architecture, at the National Gallery of Art last spring.

The mosaics will be on exhibition at the housing center through January and February. Admission is free, and the housing center is open 7 days a week, 10 a. m. to 6 p. m. Mondays through Saturdays and from 1 to 6 p. m. on Sundays.

Both religious and secular subjects form the designs of the mosaics, which range in size from 12 by 16 inches to one that stands 77 inches high.

"The making of mosaics is a centuries-old art, but today it is enjoying a spectacular revival," said Richard G. Hughes, chairman of the board of trustees of the housing center. "In southern California particularly, architects are commissioning local artists to design and execute mosaic murals for public and commercial buildings, as indoor and outdoor decoration. Homeowners are buying small mosaics for wall ornaments.

"The Immaculate Heart College collection includes some of the best I have ever seen, and I recommend this exhibit to anyone interested in new ideas in textures, colors, and design for ornamental purposes, particularly in areas where tile is used. It is little wonder that these mosaics have received such acclaim wherever they have been shown."

Most of the mosaicmakers are nonprofessionals and include housewives, scientists, schoolteachers, laboratory technicians, engineers, secretaries, and nurses.

Mosaics are as old as history. In ancient Egypt, Sumeria, Mesopotamia, Greece, and Rome mosaics were used to decorate furniture, buildings, floors, columns, and fountains. Churches, particularly those in the eastern Roman Empire, featured mosaics for several centuries, but the art declined during the Renaissance, when fresco paintings replaced mosaics as the dominant art form.

At the Immaculate Heart College the technique of mosaicmaking is being used in a number of new ways and carried to a high level of art. After the current showing at the housing center this collection of mosaics will be shown in museums and art centers throughout the Nation.

Mosaics Displayed at Housing Center

For exactly a week now, visitors to the National Housing Center at 1625 L street NW., have come away in a variety of new moods, all of them inspired by some exquisite examples of an ancient art form—mosaics.

On display at the center through all of next month are some beguiling samples of this process, first practiced so long ago that recorded history cannot even approximate a date.

There is good reason to believe that orientals were first to work in mosaics. From them the Greeks learned and perfected it before passing it along to the Romans. In essence, a mosaic is the reproduction or imitation of a painting or design formed generally by means of pieces of opaque glass of different colors.

The examples at the center are the work of students of the Immaculate Heart College, in Los Angeles. There are 20 of them and they run the gamut of subject matter from the religious to the secular. All were executed under the direction of Sister Magdalen Mary, art chairman at the Los Angeles school.

Most of her mosaicists are nonprofessionals, having stepped for the experience from the ranks of housewives, scientists or office workers.

What the ancient Sumerians achieved with gems worth a king's ransom Sister Magdalen Mary's pupils have accomplished with discarded bottles, broken to bits for the purpose, smidgeons of costume jewelry, buttons and lowgrade gems.

Largest of the mosaics on display is Fred Mason's "Our Lady and Queen of the Angels," measuring 48x77 inches. Smallest is Sue M. Mullins' "Head of the Virgin," at 12x16 inches.

The informality which keynotes the absorption of the art under Sister Magdalen Mary is epitomized perhaps in the mimeographed catalogue of the show which refers to Nina Va Ingle's "Lady of the Rosary" as follows:

"It was originally planned as an Indian woman with a bowl on her head, but many people insisted on referring to it as the Blessed Virgin, so the artist added the rosary beads."

Centuries-Old Art Goes Modern in Exhibit Here

(By Jane Kottmeier)

A centuries-old art was viewed yesterday when 20 colorful modern mosaics were exhibited for their first big showing at the National Housing Center.

The mosaics were created by nonprofessional students at Immaculate Heart College in Los Angeles, Calif., under the direction of Sister Magdalen Mary, I. H. M., chairman of the art department.

Her students, who also designed the decorative banners for the exhibit "100 Years of American Architecture" at the National Gallery of Art last spring, include housewives, schoolteachers, secretaries, nurses, scientists, engineers, and laboratory technicians.

Nonuniform Textures

Departing from classical mosaics, this collection illustrates the modern usage of nonuniform textures and values, colored magnesite or cement and varying sizes of tesserae or the little pieces that makes up a mosaic. They have both religious and secular subjects.

Among those particular noted were The Man of Sorrows, a more classical design (the outline is clearly defined as in stained glass windows) in hues of purple and green, and The Music Makers which was developed from handmade tesserae and has a Byzantine reminiscence. Also The Prophet made of Venetian glass in shades of aquamarine and black and the unusually modern Virgin Mary made of colored magnesite studded with pearls, gold chains, and other jewels.

Mr. Richard Hughes, chairman of the board of trustees of the housing center, said the making of mosaics is enjoying a spectacular revival, particularly in Southern California where they are being used as indoor and outdoor decorations for public and commercial buildings, as well as for wall decorations in homes.

AFL–CIO Building Cited

Miss Zoe Apostolides, local artist previewing the show, commented that "many synagogues around New York have abstract mosaics" although few are to be found here. The AFL–CIO headquarters is perhaps the most exemplary building in Washington for its modern usage of mosiacs.

President of the American Institute of Architects, Leon Chatelain, said, "The high cost of mosaics is why they're not used more extensively. It's more reasonable to get them shipped from Italy. It's an old art which has been lost in our way of life when everyone is working for the dollar and the builder wants to save that $25,000.

"However," he added, "you can purchase little kits and do-it-yourself."

The exhibition will continue at the Housing Center, 1625 L Street NW., through January and February. Hours are 10 a. m. to 6 p. m. Mondays through Saturdays and from 1 p. m. to 6 p. m. on Sundays. Admission is free.

Statement of Carter W. Atkins on Tax Revision

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALBERT W. CRETELLA
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 24, 1958

Mr. CRETELLA. Mr. Speaker, it is with pleasure that I am able to include for the RECORD a statement on tax revision made before the Ways and Means Committee on February 7 by Carter W. Atkins, executive director of the Connecticut Public Expenditure Council, Inc.

This organization is a nonprofit one and highly thought of by many in the State of Connecticut and, indeed, the entire country.

I have known personally Mr. Atkins for a number of years and have been gratified in the past to receive his comments and recommendations on various subjects. I find that, like this statement before the committee, they have genuine merit and deserve earnest consideration by this Congress.

STATEMENT ON TAX REVISION TO THE COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS BY CARTER W. ATKINS, EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR, CONNECTICUT PUBLIC EXPENDITURE COUNCIL, INC., HARTFORD, CONN.

It is my privilege in this statement to speak not only for my own organization but also in behalf of the State taxpayer organizations of other States whose names are appended to this statement. These organizations, from States throughout this country, are supported by thousands of taxpayers in all walks of life. Among them are taxpayers who pay every kind of tax levied by our Federal, State, and local governments.

These organizations have long years of experience in the field of government, experience acquired through year-round devotion to the attainment of their objectives, namely, efficient, economical government and equitable taxes to support such government. Established to give attention primarily to the problems of their State and local governments, these organizations, and the thousands of taxpayers they represent, find that they now must be vitally concerned with the tremendous impact of Federal taxes on those who also support their State and local governments.

It is with this background of interest and concern that we direct your committee's attention to some basic and fundamental principles. They are matters of long-standing nature, and pertinent as they have been in the past, they deserve even greater emphasis today. We bring them to you, not as something offered for the purpose of a particular hearing but as deserving of your consideration and earnest application in all of your deliberations on the Federal tax structure.

Our program for tax revision embraces two highly important principles:

1. An income tax, individual and corporate, that embodies rates and principles which will not handicap this country in achieving and maintaining the greatest economic strength of which our system of free enterprise and individual incentive is capable.

2. A tax structure that leaves to the States and the local governments sufficient areas of taxation and sufficient taxpaying capacity to enable them to finance their needs.

With regard to the achievement of a better income-tax structure, you have before you legislation which would accomplish the objectives. Among the more important proposals are companion bills H. R. 6452, introduced by Congressman SADLAK and H. R. 9119 by Congressman HERLONG. Congressman SADLAK, a member of your committee, has made an exhaustive exposition on what his bill will accomplish, and much testimony in favor of this legislation and its principles has been presented, both to the Congress in the last session and to your committee in these hearings. We would not, in the brief time allotted to us, attempt to duplicate the many persuasive statements. Suffice it to say here that the organizations for which I speak want to see an end to an income-tax rate structure which destroys incentives, retards development, encourages evasion, and acts as a drag on our system of free enterprise.

We address ourselves now to an extremely important aspect of our tax structure which is all too often overlooked and one on which we feel particularly competent to comment. We direct your attention to the extent to which the Federal Government has preempted and usurped, at the expense of the State and local governments, both the area of tax resources and the taxpaying capacity of those resources.

The facts are that 25 years ago, the taxes taken from the American people by the Federal Government were only one-third as much as the total taxes collected by the State and local governments. In 1956, however, Federal taxes amounted to almost three times the total amount of State and local taxes. In the process of increasing its tax take from less than $2 billion in 1932 to more than $72 billion in 1956, the Federal Government not only pushed its tax rates to unprecedented heights, but, at the same time, extended the application of its taxes to include almost every kind of tax resources, the only major exceptions being the property tax and the general sales tax.

Putting it another way, over the past 25 years the Federal tax take has increased 40 times, while State and local tax collections have increased about 4½ times. Undoubtedly, State and local taxing capacity has been seriously and adversely affected by the tremendous rise in Federal taxes. The impact of Federal taxes on State and local taxing capacity is illustrated by comparing taxes with the personal income of all the people. During the 1930's, State and local taxes ran from 10 to 12 percent of personal income. In the 1950's, total State and local taxes had fallen to 7 to 8 percent of personal income. Federal taxes, which averaged 6 to 7 percent of personal income during the 1930's have been running at the rate of 22 to 24 percent of personal income in the 1950's.

In view of this startling transition, and especially in view of the fact that the Federal tax increase has been accelerating with greatest rapidity in the more recent years of this period, it would appear that the Congress has been heedless of the effect of high Federal taxes on the financial resources of State and local governments.

For some time now, we have seen the pressures increase for more Federal grant-in-aid programs and for more Federal money for existing programs. Some of these pressures are undoubtedly the result of resistance to increased State and local taxes, resistance produced in large part by high levels of Federal taxation. Many thoughtful students of this problem have been insisting that the Federal Government not only refrain from undertaking new grant-in-aid programs, but that it cut back as rapidly as possible on those which do exist and, at the same time, reduce Federal taxes to the point where the State and local governments may, if they wish, levy their own taxes for such programs.

There is no need for us to present here an exhaustive treatise on this matter. In the past 10 years, Congress has had the recommendations of authoritative sources including the Hoover Commission and now the Joint Federal-State Action Committee, recommending steps in the direction that we are here urging. There should be no need to belabor further the necessity for getting on with this job. The necessity has never been greater than the present.

Necessity now dictates that the Federal Government concentrate its efforts upon national defense. This is a function which the State and local governments cannot perform. They can, however, perform almost, if not all, of the functions embraced within the range of the Federal grant-in-aid programs provided the tax resources which are best suited to State and local use are not impoverished by the Federal Government.

It is interesting to note that in the years since the Korean war Federal expenditures for major national security purposes have fallen from 67 percent to 59 percent of total Federal expenditures. During the same period, Federal expenditures for other purposes have risen from 33 percent to 41 percent of total Federal expenditures. If the increase in Federal spending had been for defense purposes rather than for nondefense purposes, it seems quite clear that we might well have avoided finding ourselves in the throes of the present frantic program to catch up.

We suggest that the Congress now move to reduce the Federal grant-in-aid programs along the lines of the recommendations which have been made to it, and we recommend to this committee that it propose Federal tax reduction in such areas and in such amounts as will enable the States to pick up those programs. Specifically, we suggest that your committee recommend relinquishing the field of estate and gift taxes and all excise taxes of such nature as can be effectively utilized by the State and local governments as a whole. There are, of course, some taxes where the base is so geographically concentrated as to warrant retention by the Federal Government, and perhaps some others of such nature as to require Federal application for regulatory purposes.

Tax revision, as we propose it here, neither needs nor justifies an overall increase in Federal taxes nor an increase in the Federal debt. Turning back tax resources to the States for their use would be accompanied by corresponding reductions in Federal-aid programs. Any reduction in revenues resulting from revision of the income tax can be fully offset by seriously getting down to the business of adopting more of the long-neglected economies proposed by the Hoover Commission and many others.

We wish it clearly understood that we in no way oppose, and in fact fully support, whatever expenditures may be convincingly demonstrated as essential to our national defense. We are not at all persuaded, however, that our defense dollars are being efficiently spent, that serious effort is being made to eliminate waste and achieve economy, and that we are getting a full measure of defense for our money.

Our position was put succinctly by Senator MCCLELLAN of Arkansas, speaking at the 20th anniversary dinner of Tax Foundation on December 3, 1957, when he said:

"The strength we shall surely need in the long struggle ahead and in the might contest for supremacy in which we are now engaged with the totalitarian world cannot be found nor is it reposed in an insolvent government and a bankrupt treasury.

"The unprecedented obligations and the national debt that our Government has incurred, the heavy tax burden that is already upon our people, and the now exacting demands thrust upon us by world conditions, emphatically preclude and deny to us either the right or the luxury of any waste, extravagance, or nonessential expenditures whatsoever of the tax resources of this Nation."

We would only add that we will not find the strength we need except in a Federal Government which concentrates on national defense as its first order of business and leaves to the State and local governments the essential civilian services which they are best equipped to perform.

Connecticut Public Expenditure Council, Inc.; Florida Taxpayers Association, Inc.; Tax Foundation of Hawaii; Associated Taxpayers of Idaho; Taxpayers Federation of Illinois; Iowa Taxpayers Association; Massachusetts Federation of Taxpayers Associations; Montana Taxpayers Association; Nevada Taxpayers Association; New Hampshire Taxpayers Federation; New Jersey Taxpayers Association; Taxpayers Association of New Mexico; Citizens Public Expenditure Survey, Inc. (N. Y.); Ohio Public Expenditure Council; Oklahoma Public Expenditures Council; Oregon Tax Research; Wyoming Taxpayers Association; Missouri Public Expenditure Survey; New Haven Taxpayers Research Council, Inc. (Conn.); Waterbury Taxpayers Association, Inc. (Conn.).

From Washington Ahead of the News

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BRUCE ALGER
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 24, 1958

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following interesting editorial by Carlisle Bargeron entitled, "From Washington Ahead of the News"—The Commercial and Financial Chronicle dated Thursday, January 30, 1958—in which the farm program and the Secretary of Agriculture, Mr. Benson, are discussed.

While it is entirely possible that Congressmen representing largely the city areas may not understand farm problems as do those Representatives having a majority of their constituents in rural areas, I feel it important that the taxpayers of the cities be remembered in the farm debate. For my part, I have endeavored to study the farm problems as I do all issues which confront us, getting the pro and con, weighing the facts and deciding my vote on the merits of the arguments as I see them. What do we have here in the farm problem? We have the farm groups themselves arguing bitterly with each other, the American Farm Bureau Federation, on the one hand, and the National Farmers Union on the other. What is the Congressman to do as a student of the farm issue in properly representing his constituents who pay twice for the groceries, in the grocery store and with their taxes?

Is there any farm program that would please all the farmers, and for that matter Republicans and Democrats alike?

It seems to me that through our wartime bonuses and incentives which have not been discontinued, we have induced farmers to stay on the farm until now there are too many of them. The free enterprise principles of supply and demand, profit and loss if permitted to operate in the agricultural market would automatically be the balance factor matching farm production to farm products demand. This basic truth, it seems to me, we have not admitted. Hence any program will be unsatisfactory. Of course, we could throw up our hands and fully socialize the farmer with complete Federal regulation and total disregard for the cost to the taxpayers. Is this what the critics of Mr. Benson's policies are advocating?

Secretary Benson has undoubtedly one of the toughest jobs in Government and he is manfully striving to look after the farmers' interest, still endeavoring ultimately to return the farmer to a free market.

The editorial follows:

FROM WASHINGTON AHEAD OF THE NEWS

(By Carlisle Bargeron)

The Republicans have been holding a lot of $100 a plate dinners and while they have been quite successful in selling the tickets there was not much enthusiasm, at least at the Washington dinner. This could have been because there were no real headliners present, the President and Vice President both being away at Chicago and New York, respectively.

Just what is going on out in the country I am not prepared to say, but in Washington the Republican morale is at a low ebb. It is easy to get a Republican to agree that the party will lose at least 20 seats in the House in the next election and several Senators.

Some of this the Republicans, if they were a different breed, could correct. There is, for example, the question of Secretary of Agriculture Benson. The Republicans would do much better to stick with him than, as a lot of them are doing, joining in the chorus that he resign. If he were to resign tomorrow the Republicans would not pick up a single vote. Having gotten one scalp, the Democrats would go after his successor with the same fervor. Furthermore, for him to be forced out of the Cabinet would be an admission on the part of the administration that it had been wrong. If the Republicans who are wringing their hands and saying that Benson is going to carry them down to defeat were to use half of their energy in defending his policies, they would be much better off.

There is really something amazing about the position Benson is in. He is carrying out a program which has the full endorsement of the American Farm Bureau Federation, the largest by far of the farm organizations. Furthermore, the program is mostly supported by the National Grange, the next largest organization, but which is largely a fraternal and insurance organization.

Opposing is the relatively small but militant National Farmers' Union, an out-and-out New Deal organization in which "Baldy" Brannan, Secretary of Agriculture in Truman's Cabinet, is a leading figure. It is mostly active in the Middle West where it has come to own large granaries and thereby is quite prosperous. Not to suggest that its top leadership is Communist in the slightest, it does have a Communist infiltration.

This organization, through the money it makes out of its granaries, to which the farmers in several communities are completely beholdened for the storage and disposition of their products, spends millions of dollars a year fighting Benson and the administration. The administration, instead of fighting back, turns a deaf ear. Benson's personal inclination has been to counterattack, but his advisers insist that he do nothing. The facts are that even if Benson were to adopt the Farmers' Union program in toto they would still dig up issues against him because they are that kind of an organization.

Well, you would say the Farm Bureau which supports Benson's policies wholeheartedly—and there is a question whether the policies didn't originate with the Bureau—is a much bigger organization and can certainly offset the Farmers' Union attack. It could if it would.

But, although, in the Roosevelt administration, the bureau was in New Deal politics up to its neck, it has come in recent years to be nonpartisan and out of politics. Therefore, it does nothing except to tell about the resolutions passed at its national convention, to tell about its program, without any serious advocacy of either, and never saying a good word for Benson who is trying to carry out its program.

Republican candidates have ceased to look to the Farm Bureau for support. Indeed, the bureau never endorses any of them. It just goes along on its high principles. It may be that is the reason it is the biggest organization of them all but, insofar as national farm policy is concerned, it has ceased to have any influence whatsoever. A lot of Republican politicians, on the other hand, looking for aggressive support have tied in with the Farmers' Union, and thereby become bitter critics of Benson. Insofar as the country as a whole is concerned, it would not be a loss if they went down to defeat.

Hon. Cliff Clevenger

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN J. ROONEY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 24, 1958

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, as most of us now know, our distinguished friend, the Honorable CLIFF CLEVENGER, of Ohio, has decided to retire at the end of this 85th Congress after 20 years of painstaking and honorable service in this body. I very much regret that CLIFF has made this decision for I know that we shall all sorely miss him. CLIFF and I have sat together for the past 11 years on the Subcommittee on Appropriations for the Departments of State and Justice, the Federal Judiciary and Related Agencies where he has helped to save many hundreds of millions of dollars for the American taxpayers.

Recently, and on Abraham Lincoln's Birthday, the people of Bryan, Ohio, his hometown, tendered CLIFF CLEVENGER a very fine testimonial luncheon. In this connection I received a letter from a distinguished citizen of Bryan, Ohio, Mr. George Koch, which, under the permission heretofore unanimously granted by the House, I include with these remarks.

The letter follows:

FEBRUARY 12, 1958.

Hon. JOHN J. ROONEY,
Chairman, State, Justice, and Judiciary, Committee on Appropriations, House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. ROONEY: I believe you will be interested in knowing we, here in Bryan today, not only commemorated the birth of Abraham Lincoln, but also the day was made noteworthy in honoring the sterling, magnificent service of Hon. CLIFF CLEVENGER, upon 20 years' service as our Congressman of the Fifth Ohio District.

We wish it were possible for you to have been here on this occasion.

We greatly lament his decision to retire. His services will be a distinct loss to the district and our country. Many splendid tributes were rendered him. Tears were in many eyes in realizing his leaving the stage of action.

Congressman CLEVENGER has often confided to me of his warm personal esteem and friendship for you. He spoke of the splendid cooperation always accorded him as you worked in the course of duty together these many years.

It a great privilege to know him as a personal friend, and to merit his respect and confidence.

It has been authoratively stated he can trace ancestry back to times of William the Conqueror. This being true, is it little wonder that he has steadfastly measured lances with the enemy within the gates? That he stood firm, when others flee in fear?

Sprung from humble and solid origins, by sheer force of character he achieved, mastery of his own fate, abhorring being a mere chattel of the state. He, like countless other Americans who made this Republic great, to

use the words of Milton, "Preferring hard liberty before the easy yoke, of servile pomp."

We, therefore, of the Fifth Ohio District, appreciate deeply the many courtesies and generous consideration you have always shown Mr. CLEVENGER.

With kindest personal regards, I remain,

Most sincerely yours,

GEORGE KOCH.

Grow Old Along With Me

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES O. PORTER

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 24, 1958

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, as our life span increases, so do our needs. Throughout the United States today it has become apparent that the older citizen has problems undreamed of during the time of our forefathers, or even fathers. The senior citizen of today finds all too often that his savings are insufficient, that his experience is not sought, that his skills are ignored.

In my State of Oregon, a permanent Council of the Aging was established last year by Gov. Robert Holmes. Its 44 members are appointed for terms of 4 years.

The council investigates problems of the aging in Oregon, will provide a consulting service to local communities, and will cooperate with and assist agencies concerned with problems of the aging.

Recommendations from the council will be made to the Governor and, in turn, to the legislature.

This council was authorized during the last regular session of the Oregon State Legislature. My own pastor, the Reverend Wesley G. Nicholson, of Eugene, heads the council. He and the other 10 members of the executive committee will meet monthly in Portland. The entire council meets four times yearly.

The council recently hired an executive secretary, Miss Julia G. Johnson, a woman with considerable personnel experience. An office for this council has been established at the University of Oregon in Eugene.

Let me quote directly now from an article appearing in the Eugene Register-Guard of February 17, 1958:

In an attempt to learn what conditions are for the aging in Oregon, the council is planning meetings in communities of the State. Although the date has not yet been set, the first meeting will be held in Lebanon.

The council is aimed at stimulating programs in local communities and giving aid in helping to solve problems of aging people. Anyone who would like to meet with the council, to furnish information, should get in touch with Miss Johnson.

Much of the work of the council will be handled in subcommittee meetings. Appointed recently as chairman of subcommittees are the following: Employment: Earl Lovell, of the Oregon State Employment Service in Salem; education: James Sherburne, dean of General Extension Division of the Oregon State System of Higher Education, Portland; health: Dr. Jessie L. Brodie, Portland; housing: Mrs. Fannie K. Friedman, Oswego; community services: Mrs. Enid M. Rankin, Medford. Income subcommittee chairman will be announced later.

The entire council will meet four times a year, but the executive committee of 11 members will meet on the first Wednesday of each month in Portland. In addition to the Reverend Nicholson and Mrs. Lauris, of Eugene, others on the executive group include Elizabeth Baldwin, Volney Martin, Dr. Edward E. Rosenbaum, Mrs. Helen Zollinger, and Mrs. Margaret Sharp, all of Portland; C. F. Feike, Salem; William Goold, Lebanon; Henry L. Hess, Jr., and Dr. Donald Wair, Pendleton.

TVA Supplies Power for Army's Jupiter Missile Production, the Redstone Rocket Program, the AEC, and Other Vital Defense Agencies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOE L. EVINS

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 24, 1958

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Speaker, despite the efforts of its enemies to detract from its great achievements, the TVA continues to perform its vital service to the Nation ably and efficiently and to win friends by doing so. The Sunday Bulletin of Philadelphia, Pa., one of the Nation's great newspapers, recently took cognizance of TVA's record in a commentary on the editorial page. Because this brief but cogent article so ably gives the facts, I have asked unanimous consent to have it inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD. The article follows:

TVA'S GOOD YEAR

(By Ralph W. Page)

There is one thing that the administration can point to as a signal success during the past year. That is the performance of the Tennessee Valley Authority.

It has added to our prosperity, security and morale at home, and has been widely copied and emulated abroad. Statesmen and engineers from Arcady to the Antipodes have flocked to learn how it works. For this Tennessee river is the only one in the world whose total length and resources are all adequately managed and utilized by one operational agency.

The report covering the annual progress in all its manifold activities lays special emphasis upon the efficiency of the flood control mechanism under maximum stress, and the profit made by the electric power operations, strained to the utmost by the demands of the Atomic Energy Commission.

Last February there came the greatest inundation on the river since 1867. Without regulation this flood would have swamped the city of Chattanooga to the depth of 22 feet. The industrial center would have been a lake, 12,00 dwellings would have soaked or floated off, the population stranded, and business closed. The system actually confined the waters to their channel there and below, saving at least $70 million damage. Adding this to previous losses averted, the flood control operations have saved to date at $132 million—70 percent of the total TVA investment allocated to flood control.

On the electric power front the record was equally praiseworthy. The authority sold 57 billion kilowatt-hours of juice. Of this a major part was provided for the Atomic Energy Commission at low standard TVA rates that saved the Government and the taxpayers millions of dollars.

The net cash profit realized by the sale of electricity was $58,100,000. This represented a return of 4 percent upon the net investment of the Federal Government in these power facilities. Provision for depreciation added another $41,300,000, making a total of $99,400,000 cash available for payment to the Government and to invest in new installations.

Thirty million dollars was returned to the Treasury. With previous payments this amounted to $240 million so repaid—and this is $68 million more than the legal requirement to repay all Federal appropriations within 40 years of their receipt. This left the authority with $69.4 million cash for expansion.

In the light of this financial record it is amazing that the private industries and political sharpshooters can continue to reiterate that taxpayers all over the country are being gouged to provide a sinecure for the residents of the Tennessee Valley.

What is actually happening is that the American taxpayers are gradually acquiring ownership of this vast network of power stations free and clear, with all their investment repaid, and at the same time realizing a great saving upon the bulk of this power, which is sold to their Atomic Energy Commission.

Increase of Postal Rates

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 24, 1958

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend by remarks, I am inserting in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an editorial which appeared in the St. Louis Post-Dispatch of Thursday, January 23, 1958, entitled "Postage Should Go Up." This excellent editorial points up the basic problems facing our Post Office Department which necessitates a realistic readjustment of postal rates and the establishment of a congressional policy for the determination of postal rates:

POSTAGE SHOULD GO UP

One recommendation in President Eisenhower's budget message deserves favorable action in this Congress—not to balance the budget, which is probably beyond balancing, but to put a vital public service on a sensible basis. This is the renewed request for an increase in postal rates.

A year ago the administration, led by Postmaster General Summerfield, attempted to increase the letter rate from 3 cents to 4. That failed to pass although the National Association of Postmasters, representing 33,000 postmasters, not only supported the increase, but campaigned for it widely over the country. In St. Louis, Postmaster Dickmann was the leader in the effort.

The Post-Dispatch said then and repeats now that an increase in postal rates—including first-class rates which have not been raised since 1932—is desirable. For the administration to propose a 2-cent first-class increase when it could not get a 1-cent boost last year seems a bit on the unreal side. Perhaps the additional cent is designed as a trading point so Congress may shave the proposal to the 4-cent rate of last year.

Certainly the Post Office Department ought to charge more also for handling mail advertising. So-called junk mail—that addressed to merely "Occupant"—ought either to be eliminated or charged for at higher rates. The mail advertiser does not deserve a subsidy to help him pass out his handbills via the letter carrier's sack.

Neither do second- or third-class mail pay their fair share of postal service maintenance. Despite some recent increases in these rates, some second-class mail still enjoys a subsidy. This is a longstanding policy intended to encourage the education of the public. But today it is largely the means whereby advertising material is circulated at little cost. These rates should be increased gradually so as not to work a severe hardship on worthy publications of meager income. Last year the proposal was for an increase of 15 percent a year for 4 years.

One thing which the Eisenhower administration ought to do and a thing which it has been resisting is to follow the proposals of the Hoover Commission in the elimination of patronage and a continuing measure of spoils in the selection and handling of personnel. This is a basic recommendation which can be put in effect without any change in postage rates whatever.

There is no law that requires the postal service to pay its way and some citizens feel strongly that it ought not to do so. But there can be no serious objection to adjustments in rates which make them more nearly commensurate with the services enjoyed. The cost of handling the mails has gone up rapidly along with other costs, but postal rates have not kept pace. This is the fundamental fact on which Congress should base its study and response to the White House's proposals.

Delete the Dopesters

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PATRICK J. HILLINGS
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 19, 1958

Mr. HILLINGS. Mr. Speaker, as in many States, California has a serious problem in the trafficking and use of illegal narcotics.

Our Federal Bureau of Narcotics, under the able direction of Harry J. Anslinger, has been doing a consistently good overall job of dealing with peddlers and addicts.

However, our Federal program cannot succeed without cooperation of the States. I have advocated tougher State laws to deal with peddlers and addicts on the theory that coddling of peddlers and addicts merely encourage them to continue their nefarious and illegal practices.

The narcotics challenge in California is accurately set forth in a recent editorial entitled "Narcotics Challenge California," which was published in the Alhambra (Calif.) Post-Advocate. The editorial follows:

Three recent news reports have brought home to the citizens of this State the seriousness of the narcotics problem.

The 1957 Los Angeles County grand jury said in its final report that Los Angeles' narcotics problem has grown to such proportions that laws and law enforcement agencies no longer can cope with it.

In San Francisco, a State narcotics agent has been indicted on charges of selling dope to an addict.

In San Diego, the State senate narcotics committee heard that marihuana cigarettes and dangerous drugs are easily available below the Mexican border. The committee also heard that children have obtained heroin there.

Numerous laws have been passed to try to stem the evil traffic, to control the addict and to protect children, and new enforcement bureaus have been established. Officials have raised more warning signals.

There has been progress in the fight, but too many human beings still are being ruined by hopeless addiction and by the other contagions which accompany narcotics. Some of these victims are children.

There must be no relaxation in the crusade against dope in all its various forms. Law enforcement officers, educators, religious leaders, lawmakers, parents—all citizens—have to muster strength sufficient to match the seeming power and cunning of the peddler.

We cannot afford even a minor defeat in this crucial conflict.

Statement of the AFL–CIO Executive Council on Education

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HERBERT ZELENKO
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 24, 1958

Mr. ZELENKO. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to place in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the statement on education adopted by the AFL–CIO executive council at its meeting in Miami Beach, Fla., on February 6, 1958:

The failure of the administration to grasp the magnitude of the Soviet challenge is perhaps best illustrated in the way it has acted in the field of education. The President's program for education submitted to the Congress last week is too little and too limited. Let us hope it is not already too late.

While sputniks have dramatized our failures, the crisis in education has been with us for years. Every day of further neglect puts us further behind. America cannot afford to wait any longer. At every level, our educational system must be strengthened. No child should be deprived of the best possible educational opportunities because of lack of school facilities, because of lack of qualified teachers, because of financial difficulties, or because of racial discrimination.

The crisis in education is a national problem, with national survival itself at stake in this space age. The role of the States and the school districts will continue to be crucial, but the magnitude of the crisis is so great that a major national effort is essential. Yet the sad fact of the matter is that the President's proposed budget requests $300 million less for all types of educational activities than he requested in his last year's budget—before sputnik.

This incredible feat—reducing our educational sights in the face of new Soviet challenges—was accomplished simply by dropping completely any recommendations for a school-construction program and by substantially curtailing the 10-year-old program of Federal assistance to school districts affected by the impact of United States Government installations.

America, of course, needs more scientists and engineers. But we also need better trained diplomats and social scientists and language experts. The total war against tyranny depends upon our children's grasp of the humanities as well as the sciences. But neither the physical nor the social scientists will come from a vacuum. Their college and post-graduate training must be based upon a sound grounding in fundamentals at the primary and secondary levels. Yet, the administration has abandoned the school-construction program—with the prospect looming of a 500,000 classroom shortage within 5 years.

The administration's new education program has been ballyhooed as a billion-dollar program. But a billion dollars for 4 long years is just a drop in the bucket. There must be no ceiling on meeting the Nation's educational needs. Educational authorities have declared that America needs to invest billions of dollars more each year in our education system and in America's youth if we are to make real progress.

The AFL–CIO, in accordance with the proud record of organized labor for a hundred years, will continue to press for real support to education at every level and in every field.

We will support a school-construction program that will make a real dent in our growing classroom shortage.

We will support a program aimed at assisting in the recruitment and retention of the best possible teaching force, with adequate wages and decent working conditions assured to our Nation's teachers.

We will support a program of Federal aid to higher education which will make it possible for every American boy or girl who demonstrates ability and interest to complete a college education without regard to his financial condition.

There may be honest disagreement among Americans as to the best types of missiles we should develop, or how many Army divisions we should support. But there can be no disagreement about the need to protect America's most precious asset—its children. There can be—there must be—no limit on what we do to protect and strengthen this asset.

The AFL–CIO calls upon the administration and the Congress to move boldly and quickly. The future of our children and the world they inherit is at stake.

Estonian Independence Day, February 24, 1958

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HENRY S. REUSS
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 13, 1958

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, it is a great honor to join my friends of Estonian descent in commemorating Estonian Independence Day.

More than one chapter in Estonia's history speaks of valiant efforts to wrest political freedom from the clutches of oppression and tyranny. Today we mark her most notable success.

It was 40 years ago, on February 24, 1918, that Estonia proclaimed herself a republic. For years she stood as an esteemed member of the family of free nations. However, in 1940, over American protests, the Soviet Union occupied Estonia.

It is a tribute to their great religious faith, and to their love of freedom, that the Estonian people have not bowed down to the inhumane tactics of their oppressors.

Those noble people prize freedom.

Their actions offer continuing evidence of their bravery.

If Adams Can Rule SEC, What Agency Is Immune?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOE L. EVINS
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 24, 1958

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Speaker, the revelations before the Special Subcommittee on Congressional Oversight continues to disturb the people of our Nation not only by the facts revealed but even more by the implication of those facts. The Nashville Tennessean, on Thursday, February 13, commented pointly on these implications in its leading editorial. Under unanimous consent, I include it in the Appendix of the RECORD. The article follows:

IF ADAMS CAN RULE SEC, WHAT AGENCY IS IMMUNE?

Do we have a group of so-called independent Federal regulatory agencies which, though designed to be guardians of the public interest, are willing to jump through the hoop upon orders from the White House?

And how far has this power been abused?

These are only some of the questions that need to be decided by some congressional investigators, but not the House committee which has just fired its chief counsel when he was beginning to reach paydirt. * * *

Since Dr. Bernard Schwartz, retiring counsel, has charged "an unholy alliance between big business and the White House" in wrecking the hearings, there can be no coverup with a whitewash. And now that the ex-counsel's working notes—not the official files—have been turned over to * * * Senator WAYNE MORSE, of Oregon, we do not believe that the exposé can be stopped.

Regardless of what the undisclosed record shows, every Member of Congress knows that Mr. Sherman Adams, the White House spokesman and fixer, did interfere with the Securities and Exchange Commission in June 1955, as a means of hornswoggling the House of Representatives on an important vote pertaining to the malodorous Dixon-Yates deal.

This was brought out by Senator ESTES KEFAUVER as chairman of the Senate Antimonopoly Subcommittee, but not until Mr. Adams and the administration tried their hardest to keep the facts from coming out.

At first SEC Chairman * * * refused to talk when called as a witness but changed his mind under pressure and told how Mr. Adams had called him 2 days before the scheduled testimony of Mr. Adolphe Wenzell and had suggested a brief adjournment.

As a result of that adjournment, which was granted without argument, the House began debate on a $6.5 million appropriation for a Dixon-Yates transmission line connection without any knowledge of Mr. Wenzell's double role as adviser on Dixon-Yates and financial agent of the firm handling the project.

Under false pretenses, therefore, the House approved the appropriation on June 16 and it was on that very day that the SEC resumed its operations. Thus Congress and only some of the public were deceived by the Adams-SEC coalition with suppressed facts when they were needed most.

It becomes important to know how typical was this White House exercise of the big stick, aside from specific individual cases or corruption of which Dr. Schwartz speaks with feeling.

And let it be remembered that the voice of Mr. Adams is the voice of President Eisenhower, even when it appears to be different. For it is the rule that he does not speak unless the boss knows what he is saying, and approves. This has only recently been affirmed by the President.

* * * * *

Having created the regulatory agencies, Congress has a direct responsibility for them. If they have become creatures of the administration to any degree, it is a disgrace. Their only excuse for existence is protection of the public from varied interests and the mere thought that they are pawns of an unholy alliance is intolerable.

Right now the allegation of dirty work within the Federal Communications Commission has priority, but that is only the starting point. The mess is far reaching according to accumulating evidence, and it must be cleaned up.

Resolution Adopted by the Los Angeles Interexecutive Committee of the Armenian Revolution Federation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PATRICK J. HILLINGS
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, January 8, 1958

Mr. HILLINGS. Mr. Speaker, one of the most consistent and relentless foes of communism and other forms of oppression has been the Los Angeles interexecutive committee of the Armenian Revolutionary Federation.

I have had the pleasure of meeting with this group and I know the objectives of the committee and its members are in the highest of democratic tradition.

A resolution adopted by the committee clearly sets forth the goal of the Armenian Revolutionary Federation clearly and forthrightly. I know that this resolution will be of interest to all Members of Congress and the text follows:

Whereas the Armenian Revolutionary Federation was founded 67 years ago to overthrow the tyranny of the decadent and murderous Ottoman Empire and to defend the safety and Christian faith of the Armenian people; and

Whereas the ideals of the Armenian people and the Armenian Revolutionary Federation are identical with the hopes and aspirations of freedom-loving peoples all over the world; and

Whereas because of its adherence to the principle of self-determination of small nations, it has bolstered the democratic spirit in the Middle East and in Europe; and

Whereas the Armenian Revolutionary Federation has resisted the encroachments of communism in the Armenian schools, in the Armenian churches of all denominations, and in the Armenian community throughout the world: Now let it be

Resolved, That the five combined committees of the Armenian Revolutionary Federation in the Los Angeles, Calif., area memorialize the people and the Government of the United States of America that Americans of Armenian extraction enthusiastically endorse the policies and actions designed to free the captive peoples of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics as well as those policies and actions designed to support and strengthen the smaller and younger republics throughout the world; and let it be further

Resolved, That the five combined Los Angeles committees of the Armenian Revolutionary Federation extend their greetings and gratitude to the Honorable PATRICK J. HILLINGS, a Member of Congress from the 25th District of California, for his understanding and encouragement during the celebration of the 67th anniversary of the founding of the Armenian Revolutionary Federation in Los Angeles on November 24, 1957.

Respectfully yours,

ARRA HAIGAZIAN,
Chairman, Los Angeles Interexecutive Committee.

Resolutions Adopted by the Maine Federation of Women's Clubs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT HALE
OF MAINE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 24, 1958

Mr. HALE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter and resolutions from the Maine Federation of Women's Clubs:

MAINE FEDERATION OF WOMEN'S CLUBS,
Kezar Falls, Maine, February 2, 1958.

Hon. ROBERT HALE,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. HALE: You will note from the enclosures that the Maine Federation of Women's Clubs took action at their midwinter conference on several matters to come before the present session of Congress.

It will be greatly appreciated by the clubwomen of Maine if you would give your support and consideration to the matters of roadside billboards, humane slaughter of animals, and opposition to pay television. We realize that the billboard bill has been introduced in the House by you. This will register our support to it and hope that it will have a favorable passage.

Thank you for kindness and with every good personal wish for your continued success, I am,

Sincerely,

ELEANOR S. GARNER
Mrs. Allen F. Garner,
President.

Whereas the consideration of the best interests of the greatest number of people has always been of paramount importance to the Maine Federation of Women's Clubs; and

Whereas television vitally affects the interests of all the general public; and

Whereas the pay television promoters propose to invade the frequencies that have been set aside for free broadcasting; and

Whereas the members of the Maine Federation of Women's Clubs fear that pay television would eventually squeeze free service off the air and remove the citizen's freedom of choice in the selection of programs: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Maine Federation of Women's Clubs, at the midwinter conference, assembled in Augusta, January 23–24, 1958, goes on record as opposing pay television

versus free television service as it now exists; and furthermore be it

Resolved, That this resolution is adopted that a copy be sent to Senators MARGARET CHASE SMITH, FREDERICK G. PAYNE, Congressmen CLIFFORD G. MCINTIRE, ROBERT HALE, and FRANK COFFIN; the General Federation of Women's Clubs; and Mrs. Samuel J. McCartney, chairman of communications in the General Federation of Women's Clubs; and to the Federal Communications Commission.

Whereas the Federal Government is spending $27 billion to build 41,000 miles of interstate highways throughout the United States; and

Whereas there is a probability of pressure groups exerting influence toward the erection of signs and billboards along said highways; Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Maine Federation of Women's Clubs in convention assembled in Augusta, Maine, January 23–24, 1958 recommends that the member clubs demand that prompt Federal legislation be enacted to prevent the erection of advertising signs and billboards along these highways; and further be it

Resolved, That the clubwomen of Maine individually write their State and Federal legislators protesting the erection of signs and billboards along said highways.

Don't Sell the Community College Short

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HENRY ALDOUS DIXON,
OF UTAH
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 24, 1958

Mr. DIXON. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following:

DON'T SELL THE COMMUNITY COLLEGE SHORT

"In the conditions of modern life the rule is absolute, the race which does not value trained intelligence is doomed. . . . Tomorrow science will have moved forward yet one more step, and there will be no appeal from the judgment which will then be pronounced on the uneducated."—ALFRED NORTH WHITEHEAD.

To win our race for scientific, economic, and cultural supremacy, the United States must have better schools and that at the earliest possible date. To my way of thinking the great immediately available power of the junior or community college to help transform the educational picture is being somewhat lost sight of in our haste to strengthen the high school and the university. This new, local, rapidly growing, easily accessible and less costly institution must definitely figure prominently in all State and Federal programs designed for purposes as follows:

First, to prevent wasted brainpower of the top one-half of upper 25 percent of high-school graduates in United States; second to seek out, encourage, and guide the gifted; third, to improve the curriculum in math and science; fourth, to strengthen teaching at all levels by retaining and developing the very best teachers through such incentives as more comparable salaries, the employment of more student assistants on college level, the exemption of money spent in professional improvement from income tax and the exaltation of the role of the teacher; fifth to provide interest-free loans, fellowships, scholarships, work opportunities and other inducements that will aid talented, deserving, and needy students to receive as much education as will result in profit to them and to society alike.

I hold no special brief for the community college. Neither do I appeal for any favors to this type of institution which we cannot accord the high school or the university. I do insist, however, that it receive, in proportion to its size and importance, equal treatment and public recognition.

I am apprehensive just at this time because of two things; first, the junior college and its important role is not being sufficiently recognized in our educational planning; and second, there is some likelihood that it will be left out of some programs as was the case in the initial draft of GI bills wherein only the senior colleges and their students were eligible.

It is my pleasure to include herewith one short segment of an article in February 21 U. S. News & World Report representing Dr. Milton S. Eisenhower's appraisal of the city or junior college.

Question. There has been a lot of talk about city colleges and junior colleges. What do you think about that as a possible partial solution to this problem?

Answer. There are many kinds of junior colleges. Some are a two years' extension upward of high schools. Some are independent institutions controlled and operated in the community. Others are branches of State universities.

I have had experience only with the third type. They are very helpful. You can offer good solid work with the same academic standards as those of the parent institution near the student's home. You save him money for the first two years. The student may then transfer to the senior campus for the last two years of the baccalaureate program.

To the extent that I know the other types of junior colleges—such as in Maryland, Kansas, and California—I can say that they do a good job, too.

Question. Is it a cheaper method of getting those first two years of college education?

Answer. It's cheaper for the student—not for the institution.

Washington Report of Hon. Bruce Alger, of Texas

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BRUCE ALGER
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 24, 1958

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include my newsletter of February 22, 1958, a weekly report to constituents:

WASHINGTON REPORT

(By Hon. BRUCE ALGER, Fifth District, Texas)

FEBRUARY 22, 1958.—Heavy snow blocked roads, giving Government workers an enforced vacation. No traffic moved without snow tires or chains. As a result, the legislative week was lighter. Texas children would have loved this week in Washington.

George Washington's birthday is commemorated each year in the House by the reading of his Farewell Address, given as he retired from the Presidency. Every citizen could benefit from his counsel in this message. Some Members of Congress recognized a startling contrast to both the form and spirit of our Government today—as represented specifically by the President's foreign-aid message, received Wednesday, and generally by our huge Federal bureaucracy. Washington advised against alliances with foreign powers, partiality toward favorite nations, big public debt, and devices of "small, artful, enterprising minority" to control or change government. He praised constitutional checks, stressed the need of enlightened public opinion, and declared "religion and morality lead to political prosperity." This message suggests that jet aircraft replacing horse and buggy do not change the basic good sense of constitutional principles. They are applicable today. Surface conditions change, certainly, but basic principles endure.

The Yellowtail Dam land-purchase bill slid through the House on a voice vote, but not before the minority views of 10 Republicans on the Interior Committee were heard. The bill proposed to spend $2.5 million of taxpayers' money for the land for another public power and reclamation project, when the land was appraised as worth $50,000. The RECORD shows only one Texan voted to send the bill back to the committee (197 to 151). So the bill passed. Who's for saving the taxpayers?

Tax cuts and increased Government spending are surprising legislative companions and are being mentioned here by some Members. Reducing income and increasing outgo is obviously impractical, but is a part of the unreal economic world of Federal Government and politics. The real danger is the threat to the value of our money through inflation. Unfortunately, as experience shows, government has the power to water the dollar. Could it be the need for some politicians to generate issues that accounts for some trying to scare us into a depression, as stated this week in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD? (Analogy—demogogs rock the boat themselves to convince others there is a storm at sea.) This is the logical result of government transgressing its legitimate function. Since New Deal days, the Federal Government has taken the lead in economics and economic theory, while politically spending the tax dollars. Naturally, therefore, the administration is optimistic, the opposition party is pessimistic. Somewhere in between is the truth—and it should be the truth, not politically-motivated appraisals, that the public should have. Fortunately, government is not yet so influential on the Nation's economy as some allege it to be—yet it is possible to talk ourselves into recession and it is possible to build Federal Government beyond the point of return to free enterprise. Only the people, in their knowing and studying the truth, can keep government in its proper place.

Disarmament talk on our part as a result of Russia's alleged "desire for a breather" is now creeping into Washington columns and conversations. As one Washington columnist put it, "Russia has industrial and farm problems, needs a respite in competition with the West. From this respite could come better understanding and peace." How gullible can some be? Isn't this carrying Marquis of Queensbury rules a little far? Should we weaken our defenses for Russia's benefit? How can we trust the Communists?

The mutual security message from the President opened the year's controversy over foreign aid. After years of trial and error—the heavy cost to taxpayers, the mistakes and mismanagement, the misunder-

standing with foreign recipients—these and other considerations cause me to view the economic program with distrust. We seem to "dance to Russia's tune." Weakening ourselves economically to help others is not strengthening us or the team. We want respect before friendship. We cherish ideals of freedom and honor before peace and appeasement. It is our strength and example that attracts allies. We can't buy them. "Example is the school of mankind and they will learn at no other," as one homily goes. The United States must be the example. Or as Washington said, "There can be no greater error than to expect or calculate upon real favors from nation to nation." Even some of our military aid can be challenged. Our allies could become "neutrals" in a hurry in a hot war to save their own hides. This is human nature. More about mutual security funds later.

"Light" From the Humboldt Beacon

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUBERT B. SCUDDER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 24, 1958

Mr. SCUDDER. Mr. Speaker, in its leading editorial of January 30, the Humboldt Beacon has shed some bright light on the added tax benefits accruing to Federal, State, and local Governments from the Trinity Partnership Plan.

As the Beacon notes, is it not odd to find legislative opposition to partnership, when citizens from the heart of the Trinity territory come all the way to Washington to speak their case for joint development of Trinity by Government and private enterprise?

It stands to reason these folks know what Pacific Gas & Electric taxes mean to their local economies. Take Trinity County itself. Right now, Pacific Gas & Electric pays into county coffers $161,000 a year. With partnership, this would jump to a total of $397,100 or an increase of $236,100. Trinity depends on this company, then, for nearly 42 percent of its tax income. And with over 70 percent of Trinity Government-owned and tax-exempt, an extra $236,100 is far from chickenfeed.

Let us take Shasta County. Here is a county that depends on Pacific Gas & Electric for over 50 percent of its tax income. The company annually pays out $2,562,000 to Shasta. With partnership, this would be increased by $608,800 or a total of $3,170,800.

At a time when county costs and services are on the rise—when local indebtedness is at an all-time high—when the continuous stream of newcomers to our local communities makes for additional schools, roads, hospitals, etc., how can any area miss out on a tax benefit boon which Trinity Partnership assures to nine northern California counties?

The Humboldt Beacon editorial on this issue entitled "A Curious Comparison" follows:

A CURIOUS COMPARISON

It is a more than curious fact that several nonresident politicians are making their election campaigns against the Pacific Gas & Electric this year while the folks of Trinity and Shasta Counties, who live in the heart of the Pacific Gas & Electric partnership plan, even made the trip to Washington to speak for the big bad private utility which simply pays the bulk of taxes in those two counties.

In fact, with all of the bellowing by politicians, no one has ever contradicted the figures that Pacific Gas & Electric will pay: $62 million in local and State taxes, $88 million in Federal taxes, and $165 million for the use of the people's Trinity water to produce power—water that will again be sold by the Government to the valley irrigation districts for reuse by agriculture.

We have lived in northern California and Oregon now for nearly 32 years and no one will ever convince us that Pacific Gas & Electric Co. hasn't been a good operation for the advancement of this section of the State, nor that it will ever cease to be. We like that kind of partner in any business.

Getting Ready for a Birthday Party in Oregon

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES O. PORTER
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 24, 1958

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, "it took colorful men to create a colorful part of the world." These words are not mine. They appeared in a fine editorial in the Eugene Register-Guard of February 14, 1958, and refer to my native State, Oregon. Next February 14 Oregonians celebrate the 100th birthday of their State. During this century, now nearly past, colorful men have brightened the pages of history as it refers to Oregon and the Nation and sometimes the world.

Famous men, these past and present pioneers. Men like the late Jason Lee, Joe Lane, Os West, Charlie McNary. Men like my friends and colleagues in the Senate—WAYNE MORSE and RICHARD NEUBERGER.

The editorial appears herewith:

BIRTHDAY

This is Oregon's 99th birthday. From this day forward, until next Valentine's Day, Old Man Oregon will be in his 100th year, a milestone worthy of remembering. In 1959, which is actually the centennial year, the State will stage a birthday party in the shape of an exhibition which, it is hoped, will draw worldwide attention to this State.

But it is this year, this year before the centennial, that much of the work must be done. Committees will be working hard all year to make the birthday party a success. The rest of us would be well advised to familiarize ourselves with the exciting history of a century of statehood. This is true not only of the schoolchildren, but also of the rest of us.

Individually we could institute reading programs to learn about the great men and women who brought bathtubs and representative government to the frontier. We all need to know more about Robert Grey and John Day and Marcus Whitman and Joe Meek and Jason Lee and Joe Lane. Nor should we ignore the more recent figures that have made Oregon an exciting place to live. We should learn about Sylvester Pennoyer and Os West and Charles Martin and Dick Neuberger and Wayne Morse and Jim Hill and Ben Holladay and Jakie Kamm and Charlie McNary and Harry Lane, Joe's grandson. It took colorful men to create a colorful part of the world.

This summer it would do most of us good if we undertook a "See Oregon First" sort of vacation. Those of us who can should see Oregon's three forgotten corners, deep in Curry County, the vast reaches beyond the Steens and the alpine beauty of the Wallowas. And we should observe the many physical and social features that make this a truly diversified State—wheat and logs, peas and ore, city and hamlet, cowboy and fisherman, tidepool and glacier, desert and jungle.

A year hence we'll be hosts to the world. Now is the year to do our homework.

Art, the Old West, and Montana's Cowboy Artist, Charles M. Russell

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LeROY H. ANDERSON
OF MONTANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 13, 1958

Mr. ANDERSON of Montana. Mr. Speaker, a statue of Cowboy Artist Charles M. Russell will soon move into Montana's space in Statuary Hall in the Capitol.

Charlie Russell portrayed the old West in the days of the open range, the Indian and the cowboy, the outlaw and the vigilante. He was a master of colorful and graphic prose, of dynamic oils, dramatic black and white and vital bronze. He has joined Will Rogers and Bret Harte in Dodge City as one of the first five honored in the Cowboy Hall of Fame.

Next October, the National Gallery here in Washington will have an important exhibit of Russell works. I invite my colleagues to plan to see this outstanding collection.

Dr. K. Ross Toole, brilliant director of the Montana Historical Society, last Friday gave an address here in Washington before the Montana Society, which presented a most interesting and realistic appraisal of Charlie Russell. It was so interesting, scholarly, and thoughtful that I want my colleagues to have an opportunity to enjoy it, and so I ask that it be printed herewith:

CHARLES M. RUSSELL

Myth and legend have a way of clustering around history like pilot fish around a shark. They always will, I suppose. Often, like the story of George Washington and the cherry tree, they are harmless if aprocryphal. Sometimes, however, they are not.

Charles M. Russell as a person has suffered considerably at the hands of the myth makers, because he has emerged as both more and less than he was in fact. I want to talk about Russell, his works, and times this evening, not specifically but generally. Biographical sketches of Russell are available everywhere. So I won't give you a précis of his life. I am not qualified to analyze his works—and besides, Mr. F. G. Renner, of this city, has done that excellently—so I won't deal with his techniques. I simply want to talk about a remarkable man and why, in my estimation, he was remarkable. I think Russell's work will endure and I would like to tell you why I think so. But first I want to dispose of a few other matters.

So great is the emotionalism in Montana about Russell that an all-black-all-white situation prevails. Referring to this situation in a recent issue of Harper's magazine, the famous historian, Walter Prescott Webb, remarked that because of the dearth of artistic activity in our hinterland, because, in short, we have so little else we have elevated Russell to the stature of a Titian. It is hard criticism to take precisely because there is some truth in it.

Art is and must be organic, not static. Like everything else about us, it must change. It must change because, to be good, it must essentially be a reflection of today and what we are today. Great art has almost always been, at its inception, contemporary art. There are, of course, exceptions. But what artists have almost always tried to do since the beginning of time was to interpret their time, not someone else's time, but their own.

The dedication to, and emotionalism about, Russell, in Montana, has first of all led to a kind of corruption of local talent. Of the some 10 or 12 really talented painters in Montana today, the majority are trying to ape Russell. This is a pity because in spite of technical skill the result is essentially fraudulent. This fraudulence, or perhaps I should be more charitable and simply say superficiality, results because a painting to be enduring, must have at least this: It must be the product of a depth of genuine feeling in the artist. It must reflect something of his loves and hates and something of his knowledge. If it doesn't do that, it may be technically good. It can't be enduring.

First of all, then, the overpowering reputation of Russell has led to inordinate imitation and that, while it is a tribute to Russell, is too bad for the creative community in Montana.

Secondly, Russell has been appropriated and deified by a group not only in Montana, but in the West, who are not fundamentally interested either in the man or in his painting. They are solely interested in basking in the warmth of his reputation. These people, and the members of the Montana Cowboys' Association probably lead all the others, have done a great deal to make Russell appear to be the quintessence of the common man. They have done a great deal throughout the years, by the peddling of myth and legend, to make this most uncommon man seem common. These people see Russell as no different from themselves except that he happened to paint. He was, therefore, in no real way remarkable. He was, like them, just an old shoe sort of fellow. Thus creating him in their own image (or they are indeed old shoe) they bask in his prominence. This is the sort of thing that a teen-age lunatic fringe has done with the late James Dean, except that in Russell's case this coterie has assiduously made him less than he was both as a man and as a painter. Today these cowboys affect his hairdo, his dress, his stance, and a surprising number of them even write abominably sentimental poetry about the old days. Those were days they never saw and know little about. There are very few real oldtime cowboys among them.

On the other end of the spectrum there are the long-haired abstractionists whose venom toward Russell is perhaps a great tribute to him. Were they really competent themselves they would have no need to climb into the sunshine of recognition over the ruins of his reputation.

In the middle (and it is always uncomfortable to be in the middle) there are a substantial group of artists and laymen who have a great respect for Russell's art, who have an inkling that in a very direct sense he was a great human being, but who are concerned with our preoccupation with him because it does stifle artistic imagination, it does place a burden on the competent contemporary and it does channel talent into a sterile field.

The fact is the West of Russell is dead—and it is buried. It is stuff for the historian, the antiquarian and the writers of novels. But it is dead. The man who lives on Sixth Avenue, drives a Buick with hydramatic to his studio, keeps a saddle horse in a stable and affects cowboy hats, boots and a twang, but who spends most of his time before the television is a man who, in other words, is very much in the space age. He is simply not going to do much to interpret the Old West in paint. The best he can do is paint documentary stuff based on research. Indeed, he can only be an illustrator. And in the proper, not the loose sense of that word, illustrations simply aren't going to endure.

Thus, having reviewed these various attitudes toward Russell today—and I shudder to think how each will be enhanced when Universal-International comes out with its Charlie Russell Story—let us speculate for a moment about Russell and what he did.

I think it is necessary first to point out that the era of the cowboy was many things—but it was none of the things that the movies and fiction have made it. In the first place, it was the era of the open range. And it was over almost as soon as it had begun. You often hear the phrase today "Oh, he's a real old-time cowman." Well he isn't, or if he is he is indeed a rare and ancient bird. Because the open range was gone by the early nineties. In Montana it hadn't made a significant beginning until the early eighties. At most, in Montana, the West of the real cowboy lasted for only something like a decade. There are variations elsewhere in the West but nowhere did the period last for more than an historical moment.

In the second place, the cowboy had anything but a romantic job and it was anything but a romantic era. All the romance is ex post facto. Most of it dates to Owen Wister's novel The Virginian. The job was hard, monotonous, dirty, lonely, and unrewarding. And in between drives and roundups and riding, this romantic knight of the prairies usually spent his time drunk in a saloon or bedded down in a brothel. He was neither a gunman quick on the draw, a seam-faced range philosopher, nor did he feel himself closer to God than anyone else. It is strange, indeed, that we have chosen these men and this time around which to build perhaps the greatest American romantic legend of all. But we have. And there is, I think, a reason for it.

The United States Census Bureau officially noted the end of the frontier in 1893. It could not find a frontier anymore, an area marked by less than three persons per square mile beyond which there was nothing but country. To a large extent we are still not fully aware that the end of the frontier marked the beginning of a restriction on individual freedom and individualism. Frederick Jackson Turner, an historian of towering reputation, wrote his great works on this theme. And any contemplative view of the past proves him right.

So that the end of the open range, the end of the era of the cowboy, coincided very precisely with the end of the frontier and the end, therefore, of a whole wellspring of American individualism and freedom.

In those days, the nineties, when the frontier as a geographical concept was vanishing, when a whole basic American phenomenon which had held sway since the 17th century was flickering out, there were few, indeed, who marked its passing. It was, in a sense, a lingering death. There were still vast, unsettled spaces. There were vistas where the sky came down the same distance all around, but as a place of free land in unlimited quantities, a place beyond the law, a place where neither Congress nor any power save the power of the individual man himself could reach, the frontier was gone. It didn't go with fanfare or eulogies. It just slipped away. That is why not more than a handful of men in the entire United States (one might legitimately say in the entire world) noted or commented on its passing. The entire artistic production of Charles M. Russell is a commentary on the end of a great and important American experience. That is precisely why his works will endure and, indeed, increase steadily in value. That is why those who insist that he was merely an illustrator demonstrate that they have neither studied his work nor pondered the reason for his startling popularity.

People who love Russell's work doubtless have trouble in explaining precisely why. They say it is because of its fidelity as to landscape or color. Or they say it is because nobody could draw a horse as well as Russell. Or they say it was because he could paint action so well. But they are only really describing incidentals and byproducts. The real power of Russell's work does not reside in technique. It resides in the fact that he felt to the very depths of his being that an era was dying—and that it meant something. He always approached the subject obliquely, but he never strayed far from the theme. He had been a part of the era, not as an observer but as a participant. And he understood it. He chronicled it and its death. And he did so with a mixture of sadness, humor, and violence that no acute observer can miss in his work. And he did it honestly.

Given this depth of feeling, given this understanding and perception about his times, and given real talent with brush and clay, you have an artist, not an illustrator. Now add to these qualities these others: gentleness, geniality, and loyalty, and you have an uncommon man doing an uncommon thing.

You should not, I think, ever judge Russell by 1 or 2 of his paintings or a cursory look at many of them. Nor should you judge him by technique alone. The impact lies in a close look at many of his works.

Known as a painter of violent action you will find, for instance, that some of his most compelling works are compelling precisely because of a startling lack of action. Two utterly motionless mounted Indians, for example, looking down at the tracks of a wagon in the tall grass. Again and again his theme was portend, not action.

As for his humor, both in his paintings and writings, man's inhumanity to man is the core of it. In this regard Russell instinctively understood what Al Capp was talkink about when he said that the root of most humor is to be found in cruelty. Russell also found a root of humor in sadness. Notice how often pathos is an integral part of his humor. Here is a painting of a mounted cowboy on a cold and bleak Christmas Day holding aloft a bottle of booze while Santa Claus and his sleigh appear across the sky in the background. Because of subtle caricature, because of incongruity, your first reaction is to laugh. When you look again it is merely sad.

I, for one, am weary of the glib analysis of Russell and his work, either by the pseudo-abstractionists or by the clay-footed 20th century cowboy. Both use Russell for their own purposes and neither approach him objectively or thoughtfully. But irrespective of his critics on the one hand or his maudlin deifiers on the other, Russell's work will endure and increase in value.

Charles Russell was an immensely fortunate man. Very few of us have the opportunity to live our dreams. Russell did for nearly 20 years. Most of us are truly inarticulate—at least what we feel most deeply we can't express without groping. Not so with Russell. What he felt most deeply he expressed with skill and finality. Most of us cannot stand off and understand our times.

Russell could and did. And very few of us are widely beloved. Russell was.

I think the Russell exhibit scheduled for the National Gallery next October is an important exhibit. It isn't merely that it is good publicity for Montana, it is important in a much larger sense. If that were not true the society of which I am the director could not legitimately justify the considerable expense involved. This is not merely Montana hoopla, but an endeavor to interpret ourselves, the West of which we are a part, and the past of our country to the east. The best conceivable vehicle is an exhibit of the works of Charles Marion Russell, who, better than anyone among us understood the land in which he lived, the people in it, and the strange mixture of the benign and the malevolent, the beautiful and the ugly, the gentle and the violent. And he saw and understood all this contradiction without becoming a cynic.

I have intended none of this as a eulogy and yet I suppose I have eulogized this man. I confess to some prejudice. After all, I am a Montanan and I can't help being eternally grateful for a man who did so much to interpret for all time the country I love.

The Current Economic Situation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN LESINSKI
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 24, 1958

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I have watched the present administration go through its gymnastics of trying to outdo the Democrats. They did a good job, for a good foundation had been laid for a balanced economy. By paying off bankers through bond manipulations and high interest rates, by further depressing the farmers' income so that we in the cities are receiving them in droves, employment was spurted at the beginning. We had the fat years the Bible mentions and now the lean.

I have received a homey letter from a friend of mine back in the district. He to me reflects what the average American thinks. He has had a wonderful life but today finds himself in need.

His wisdom is such that I thought it only proper that all Americans get a chance to read his letter, for the commonsense, down-to-earth reflection is a lot more worthy of consideration than the high-sounding words of some of our highly placed economists, who seem to have lost track of the basic needs and trials of the ordinary human being.

I therefore submit for the RECORD the letter of Mr. George Belle, a man who has lived a full life and knows the facts, and is not misled by the one-sided observations of American newspapers and magazines.

The letter follows:

DEARBORN, MICH., *January 30, 1958.*

Hon. JOHN LESINSKI,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR JOHN: Should have written you in answer to yours dated December 16, 1957, but there was no real news, as to the things you tried to place me in. I did have a letter from a Fred Burke, administrative assistant, in the office of John C. Mackie. And, with the forms and other papers to have filled, well, John, I suppose they thought that I was just out of some engineering school and applying for a position. I just did not attempt to answer because to me it was wasted effort, when they saw my age—ha ha. Sure, I appreciate their writing me, but, what I was looking for was just a simple little job, seeing that I had enough practical experience, too, well say, "file a few blueprints, as they should be," or "Belle (George) take these plans over to some project, and see that the superintendent has them in his hands" and such a little job as that, and so forth. A little appointed position (placed on the payroll) knowing that there was dependency, whatever I was told or sent to do. And I realize that its quite hard to place anyone—unless all parties concerned are there—and the deal is made then and there. I'll bet that the Highway Commission has files loaded with such applications that was sent me—and completed too—by the youth coming out of schools and colleges. Mrs. Barc wrote about the jury. She didn't have any word. The other day I stopped to say "Hello" in your office and in our conversation she asked if I had heard anything about the jury. My answer was negative, and she made a note, on her pad to write again, as she was getting out some correspondence. So that's how it stand as of now.

I'm sure that you know that all the precinct delegates in the 16th Congressional District, Wayne County, Mich., were given engraved awards. I received one and very happy about it too. As I do have a small precinct No. 7, and the voters are just plain people, yet give their votes in general to the Democratic Party. And I believe that the Democratic votes will climb—not only in this precinct, but all of them—because so many here in my precinct are laid off. Some with years of service in the motor companies and also those plants who employ them, and as I might call feeder plants to the motor industry. It's not a healthy situation at all, as these people around here depend on each week's pay.

We have a grocer—the only one in the precinct—Mr. Leo Szabla, and in talking to him the other day—he was really worried—as he is carrying quite a few on his books, and in some cases finds it so that he has to place some in the hands of collection agencies (and as he says, "George, I hate to do that"). He tells me that it's impossible to buy from the wholesalers. Meats, groceries, etc., without cash. They demand it—and in some instances—there is a 30-day extension. Meats, he says, "it's strictly a cash basis." So that's just a part of what's going on around here.

Pensions is one of the solutions—very closely related to the economy of our country. I'm just going to scratch the surface of what I think as to this. Now, we, here in America, are living each moment in a fast scientific era. Each morning we arise and find that new things have been discovered. The question arises, "Are we able to absorb all these new things and have steady nerves or will these automated ideas mentally unbalance us?" The pick and shovel days have gone forever. True? And, in those days a man or woman could put aside a little for later years of security. And it was done. Home were bought just through savings from day to day. The dollar was worth its value—100 cents. The sons and daughters of those who came along in the days above mentioned are now in their late forties, fifties, and many in their sixties. Some were fortunate to have families, and other less fortunate. And, in their days, as years approached the dollar began to shrink. Prices as to one's livelihood arose and the layoffs from their jobs became in frequent evidence and to meet their financial obligations their savings were few and far. And the worries began. Loan companies charging high rates of interest lodged amongst many as cancer absorbs the blood cells. The inroads really took their toll. 1929—so well remembered. And, thank God, there was a man who came to our rescue—Franklin D. Roosevelt. Men who had earned $100 or more a week were glad to take up a broom and shovel for $14 and $18 or a little more, each week. Happy to have a job, to help provide for their families and themselves. The WPA—and all the working class of Americans were behind F. D. R. in anything he could do for them. The times improved gradually, people received every red penny that they had in the banks, all through the efforts of Franklin D. Roosevelt. And, on August 14, 1935, the Social Security Act was enacted. The beginning to all that we who have earned and gave a part of our earnings to carry on our Government will be given comfort and financial help throughout our lifetime. As we know that there are close to $18 million each day for 7 days the year around comes into the old age and survivors insurance trust fund. There are about $16 million paid out each day. So there is a decided balance always. Yet, the cost of existence is the same for all of us and there is enough in the fund to make so, that the costs of existence to those over 65 years wil be adequate. And, as of today, it's really not enough. Those men and women who have earned and contributed—too aged now to do any more—should be paid at the rate of $5–$6 each day, or from $150 and $180 per month to provide decent necessities, which in many instances would prevent illnesses through lack of nutritions. And, with these increased pensions, that money isn't saved—it's spent, which we need done, to uphold the economy of our country. Even if it was paid in script—which isn't a bad idea—it would be circulated, only coming from the old-aged pensioner. Aged mental health would improve because of their less worries as to where their monthly allotments, could further themselves with the necessities.

I have been following the sessions quite well in the RECORD and I have been watching each issue since the introduction of your bill—H. R. 9683. It's really worthy of consideration by all Members of Congress, and in reading your introduction of your bill, it should have support. I'm sure that what it takes is to be a very good mixer to gain support. So, JOHN, both Mary and I wish you every success in the second session of the 85th Congress. I note, but have not read it thoroughly, Senator PROXMIRE's bill—S. 3086. I'm sure you saw it on page 723 of Thursday's RECORD. I have read some of his Extensions of Remarks in the RECORD. I wish him, too, every success, as the Democratic Senator from Wisconsin. And I note on TV that the stations are fighting the paid TV, and use Congressman DINGELL's name as against any paid TV. Station WJBK, channel 2, Detroit, sent out a request for votes on paid TV. The return in 1 day was 900 against and 35 for paid TV. It was just a 1-day shot and it shows that it's a good average that people do not want paid TV.

That's about all for now, and hope that all is well with you there in Washington. Mary (Mrs. Belle) has recovered from her attack of the virus flu, and back as one of the Federal department store managers. But, so many of her help being laid off, she says that it's pathetic because some of those sales help need the few dollars that they get to help out in the home. Business is so bad. I read that the repossession of autos is percentwise up at a high figure. JOHN, this administration has really brought on a mental strain amongst families. I refer to families of the man who works in the factory with possibly a $100 weekly pay, and has to budget that for notes on the home, the car, the appliances, clothes for the children, and food. He has nothing for a little recreation. And, now, that man is laid off with a possible $30–$40 a week unemployment check to

take care of the needs that has cost him all of his $100 a week pay and maybe a little more borrowed dollars from his credit union or the like. And all this breeds mental family troubles, and above that, crime waves. And we are really having it here—armed robberies and all that goes with obtaining money. What are the Republicans doing to the country? I mean Republicans. Ha ha. They are really digging their own political graves. Always glad to hear from you, and let me know when the revised Congressional Directory is available for sale and the price. And, in closing, keep working on the old-age pensions—you will have lots of supporters. Mary was telling me that there is a Polish society over on the East Side—all old-age pensioners—who are out for a substantial increase in their pensions. Some one was talking about it in the store and some lawyer is the director. (Name unknown at present.) Remember both Mary and I to the family.

Most friendly, I remain,

GEORGE G. BELLE.

Foreign Aid

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES B. UTT
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 24, 1958

Mr. UTT. Mr. Speaker, you have heard about the tree that grew in Brooklyn. Now I will tell you about one of the bureaucratic trees that grows in Washington. In 1948 the Economic Cooperation Administration, which has had several fancy names, the last of which is the International Cooperation Administration—ICA—had 500 employees. By 1953 it had 4,000. In 1957 it had nearly 13,000, and still appears to be growing.

Last year when Congress cut over a billion dollars from the ICA budget—foreign aid—we were told that this cut would practically put them out of business. However, within a month after adjournment ICA expanded its personnel by at least 1,000 employees. Of course, in last year's authorization there was a sleeper in the form of lending authority to foreign enterprises which, in fact, will turn out to be free grants, for the simple reason that the borrower has to prove that he cannot borrow from private banking concerns nor from the World Bank nor from the Export-Import Bank. Most of the capital for these two banks is supplied by the American Government. Now, if the risk is too great for these two liberal lending institutions, they can apply to ICA for a loan.

The administration's request for foreign aid for the coming fiscal year is around $4 billion. In order to give you some idea as to how much $4 billion is, may I say that it is 4 times the total assessed valuation of Orange County, including our oil, our industries, our farmland, our homes, and Disneyland thrown in. It is equal to one-half of the total income taxes collected from the State of California in 1 year.

Much ado has been made about unmoral lobbyist tactics. In fact, President Eisenhower vetoed the Natural Gas Act of 1956 solely upon the ground of ill-advised lobby pressure, centered around the $2,500 campaign donation offered to a certain Senator. Two weeks ago there was great indignation shown because a certain man in Texas indicated in a letter that some of the money raised at the $100-a-plate dinner in Houston would be used to promote the Natural Gas Act of 1958, and the President and the chairman of the Republican National Committee quickly issued a statement that none of that money would be accepted by the national committee.

Against this backdrop let us take a look at what happened in Washington on February 25, tomorrow. A national committee of 1,500, headed by "one worlder" Eric Johnston, gathered for the express purpose of raising a million and a half dollars of tax-free money for the avowed purpose of lobbying a single bill through Congress which would cost the American taxpayers $4 billion. The jewel of consistency is certainly tarnished. In order to make this committee more palatable, high-ranking Democrats throughout the Nation have been included in order to keep the leftwing commentators from blasting the project out of water. Present at this meeting were President Eisenhower and ex-President Truman, Vice President Nixon and Adlai Stevenson, Secretary Dulles and ex-Secretary Acheson, and so on down the line, with each Republican having his Democrat counterpart.

The tab for this clambake was picked up partially by certain large corporations which would profit immensely through the sale of heavy equipment under the foreign-aid program and partially by the President's contingent fund.

The American taxpayer should condition himself to the greatest "snow job" in history. If, after 10 years and the expenditure of $70 billion on this program, the American taxpayer is convinced that it is not a proper role for our Government to play, why should his intelligence be insulted by such a fiasco? I received an invitation from Eric Johnston—on White House stationery—and the content of this report was my reply. They propose to spend on this lobby job about $9,000 for every million inhabitants in our country. The 28th Congressional District has nearly 1 million population, and I propose to spend at least $5,000 in my district as an offset to this propaganda, and I sincerely hope that the Internal Revenue Bureau will be as gracious with me in allowing this amount as a tax deduction as they were with the Eric Johnston committee.

At least, I will close this report in a lighter vein by resurrecting an old bromide of the Truman administration. The Prince of Monaco was visiting the White House and the President asked him if there were any Communists in Monaco. The Prince replied that there were absolutely none. The President said, "That's too bad; we can't give you any foreign aid." The Prince hurried home to his castle and sent a telegram to the Foreign Minister of France, Bidault, "You've got a lot of Communists. Send me a dozen; I need them desperately." Bidault replied, "I'm sorry; I can't let you have any Communists because I need every one I've got here; otherwise the United States will cut our credit."

Uncle Sam No Longer Model Employer

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES O. PORTER
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 24, 1958

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, the following article which appeared in the Washington Post for January 30, in the Federal Diary column, written by Jerry Kluttz, points up the crisis facing the Federal Government with a strong argument for immediate substantial wage increases:

CALIFORNIA EMPLOYEES' STUDY BLASTS INEQUITY IN WAGE STRUCTURES

(By Jerry Kluttz)

The Federal Government has surrendered its long-cherished position and reputation as a model employer.

It can no longer claim that it treats all employees fairly and squarely.

The Government is unfair, unrealistic, and unreasonable in the salaries paid its white-collar employees. The white-collar worker is the forgotten man in Government.

That stinging indictment of Uncle Sam as an employer and his different, inconsistent and conflicting salary policies is in a report prepared by the Alameda, Calif., Naval Air Station Association.

And the employee group, which conducted the study at its own expense, backs up its charges with convincing and shocking facts.

Representative GEORGE MILLER (Democrat, of California), described the document as exhaustive and painstaking, clearly demonstrating the sorry plight of the classified employee. He said the Government can't continue to ignore the problem.

The Alameda station—with 7,633 civilians, including 6,379 laborers and mechanics (wage board) and 1,254 classifieds (white collar)—is used by the Navy mainly to repair and overhaul planes on Pacific duty. It also has 1,065 military personnel on duty there. So the station has three different salary systems.

Since 1940, blue-collar laborers and mechanics there have received 14 pay raises which have increased their salaries an average of $3,348, or 157 percent.

In the same period, the white-collar classifieds have received only 8 increases that have averaged $1,610, or 70 percent.

Meantime, living costs have leaped 110 percent in the San Francisco Bay area where Alameda is situated.

A laborer-cleaner at Alameda is the lowest paid of the blue-collar workers. His starting salary is now $4,056, compared with $1,248 in 1940—an increase of 225 percent.

And this will jolt you: Of the 1,254 white-collar employees there, 815, or 65 percent, are paid less than a laborer-cleaner.

"Astounding?" the report asks, and then adds, "Yes; but it's true." That should rank as the understatement of the year.

The study observes that a GS-1 classified worker had a $1,260 starting salary in 1940,

which has risen to only $2,690 today. The classifieds' salary would be $4,095 if he had gotten the same increases as a laborer-cleaner.

Now don't conclude that Alameda is a horrible example of poor personnel administration. What's happening there is being repeated in hundreds of other places the world over, including the Nation's Capital.

Classifieds are taking a severe beating and this condition will continue until the pay laws are changed by Congress to insure equal treatment of all Government employees.

Think of this: Alameda is forced to start many white-collar college graduates at $3,670 a year, or $386 a year less than an unskilled laborer-cleaner.

Now Is the Time for Lebanon To Make Peace With Israel

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN D. DINGELL
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 24, 1958

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I recently saw an article in the Lebanese Gazette published in my own city of Detroit, Mich., on Thursday, February 20, 1958, entitled "Now Is the Time for Lebanon To Make Peace With Israel." Mr. Kanaan, the author, is a distinguished newspaperman and respected member of the Lebanese community of the city of Detroit. He is not deceived by the blandishments of Nasser and the Syrian fellow travelers.

I think his article shows the concern over the unity of Egypt and Syria, which all right-thinking men feel. I hope all will read this excellent article.

NOW IS THE TIME FOR LEBANON TO MAKE PEACE WITH ISRAEL

How long will the world remain blind to the realities of the Middle East?

A couple of dictators have formed a partnership, aiming to destroy several nations, and we seem to be fooled.

Wake up, America.

Wake up, leaders of the democracies of the world.

First Nasser and Kuwatly would like to destroy Israel. Then they will seek the destruction of Lebanon. Iraq and Jordan will follow. Then Khrushchev will have just what he wants—control of the Middle East.

Wake up, Lebanon. You are in greater danger than even Israel.

And little Jordan, woe unto you.

But the greatest menace faces the people of Lebanon. It is a Christian country, but the Moslem dictators of Syria and Egypt would like to swallow her up. Then, woe unto our fellow Christians. Their lives will be worthless.

We must beware of the danger and we must act now. This is the time to protect the democratic ideal and to be on guard against the destruction of all human values.

What action is to be taken in this dangerous time for the Middle East and the world?

We urge an immediate peace between Israel and Lebanon. Then the two democracies can work together, they can act jointly in protecting their common borders and they can appeal to the world against aggression.

Then the Christians in Lebanon can be protected.

After that, little Jordan and its puppet king may come along and act jointly with the sensible people in the area to prevent the swallowing up of the area by dictators.

It is important that the facts should be known.

The new union between Syria and Egypt is no more nor less than a Community merger. Two pro-Communist countries got together on orders from Moscow. They must be prevented from causing too much damage.

Here is the warning that was made against the union by the famous columnist, David Lawrence, in the New York Herald Tribune:

"There are no sound reasons for uniting Egypt and Syria. The Egyptians are not regarded as true Arabs and there is no common border between the two countries. The real reason for the move is that the Soviet Union needed two pawns in the Middle East under a single stooge to play her game. The strategic moves of the Soviets in the cold war always have a military purpose. This time it is to gain possession of the very fuel on which the economy of western nations depends.

"While the West reads a series of hypocritical letters from Bulganin on disarmament, and while prominent Democrats in the United States take such missives seriously and make speeches calling, in effect, for peace at any price with the Soviet Union, the Communist dictators benefit from western disunity and naivete.

"Eventually the true significance of the Egyptian seizure of Syria will become clear. It is a move that makes war more likely in the troubled areas of the Middle East. It may prove to be the tinderbox for starting the flames of a world war, just as Hitler's tactics did in the 1930's."

David Lawrence provides ample proof that there is danger from the new merger. He wrote:

"Colonialism—in a more despotic form this time than ever known before—has emerged in the Middle East. Soviet imperialism is in the saddle. Egypt has taken over Syria, and Nasser, paralleling Hitler, is hoping to take over neighboring countries one by one.

"Without a vote of the people and with the aid of Communist infiltrators who will see that the forthcoming plebiscites are properly rigged to ratify the dictator's decision, Syria shortly will lose her independence altogether.

"The term Union of Egypt and Syria is an attempt to fool the world into believing that the two countries voluntarily created a single state. Actually, Nasser, aided by the Communist apparatus, engineered the deal, which in itself has no military importance but, as a source of potential friction can nevertheless be the forerunner of a world war.

"Just as Hitler's move into the Rhineland in 1936 and his later union of Austria with Germany did not immediately awaken the free world to the dangers ahead, so today's events in Egypt and Syria, even though more menacing, are not exciting worldwide concern. Nothing has been done as yet by the United Nations, for example, to inquire into this new form of aggression as the people of Syria are deprived of their sovereignty through the machinations of Soviet Russia.

"For Syria henceforth will be an Egyptian colony. There may be some show of resistance inside the country by the elements that do not want to see their country remain a captive of the Communist empire but, without some aid from the outside, Syria will become the tool of Nasser and of the Communist regime in Moscow.

"Most of the pipelines for the transport of the oil—constituting an alternate route from the Middle East countries to Mediterranean ports—are in Syria. So the coup means that the Communists, having first made sure that they control Nasser and the Suez, now hold in their hands the future of the oil resources of the Middle East.

"As a strategic moye in the cold war the Communists have obtained control over a very important area and now will begin blackmailing the other Arab countries in an attempt to force them into a pan-Arab union. The step constitutes a threat to Jordan and Lebanon, Saudi Arabia, and Israel, as well as to Iran, Iraq, and Turkey.

"So far as the United States is concerned, it is committed to supply military help upon request if the independence of Iran, Iraq, Turkey, or other Middle Eastern countries is threatened by Communist imperialism. This commitment was undertaken through the Eisenhower doctrine. Unfortunately, the Communists got into Syria before the pro-western elements there could assert themselves in opposition to Nasser. Moscow today controls all the radio stations at Cairo and has a large number of technicians of all kinds inside both Egypt and Syria. The annexation of Syria by Egypt will undoubtedly make it harder for the West to help the Syrian people to regain their independence. Certainly as long as Nasser is in command at Cairo, Syria will remain an Egyptian colony."

How long will the world remain silent?

How long will the Lebanese remain blind to the dangers that face them?

We appeal to our kinsmen and coreligionists in Lebanon, especially to the Christians in our former homeland, to act now, to make peace with Israel, to prevent the damage that is sure to come from the "federated union" of Syria and Egypt.

We appeal to the other sensible nations in the Middle East and the Near East, especially to Turkey, Iraq, Iran and Jordan, to stop the devils Nasser and Kuwatly now before it is too late.

Let us have peace with Israel first, then blessing will be poured upon the entire areas and there will be greater security for Lebanon.

Fellow Lebanese, make peace with Israel now.

Hope on Billboards

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT HALE
OF MAINE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 24, 1958

Mr. HALE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Washington Post of February 7, 1958:

HOPE ON BILLBOARDS

Senator KUCHEL, of California, has given a fresh spurt of hope to the campaign for curbing billboards on the 41,000-mile Federal Interstate Highway System. Last summer, Mr. KUCHEL voted in committee to kill a mild antibillboard measure. The vote was 7 to 6. But Mr. KUCHEL has had the courage and sense to revise his position and come up with a reasonable proposal of his own to prevent an unsightly ribbon of signboards from scarring the new highways. This affords a chance to get some antibillboard legislation out of committee and—for the first time—before at least one House of Congress for a vote.

The earlier Senate proposal sponsored by Senators NEUBERGER and GORE would have added three-fourths of 1 percent to the Federal contribution of States agreeing to keep billboards out. Mr. KUCHEL suggests the more tempting carrot of a 1 percent bonus—meaning that the Federal share would be 91 percent in States regulating signboards. But the Kuchel bill would somewhat narrow the scope of the prohibition. His proposal would not extend the billboard ban to highways running through incorporated towns, to signs authorized by specific State or local laws, or

to highway rights-of-way acquired before July 1, 1956.

Admittedly, there are gaps in this formula—gaps wide enough to squeeze through at least some hideous placards. Some States, for example, might pocket the bonus money and then violate the bill's intent once the money was spent. But this hazard was also present in the Neuberger-Gore formula, and Mr. KUCHEL's bill has the virtue of forcing affirmative, undisguised action to void national policy. In its essentials, the bill is the same as earlier proposals; it is good that Senator NEUBERGER has welcomed the Kuchel proposal. Something may yet be done. Maybe Mr. KUCHEL's conversion will stir some interest in the House, where Representative ROBERT HALE of Maine is still a lonely voice against billboards in a shamefully mute assemblage.

Oklahoma Salutes Carl Albert

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ED EDMONDSON
OF OKLAHOMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 24, 1958

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, on last Saturday night, people all over the country were aroused and inspired by the ringing messages of Democratic leaders who assembled at the dinner honoring former President Truman.

Oklahomans who were present, and our State's representation was both large and enthusiastic, were more than proud of the stirring speech delivered by the Democratic whip in the House, the Honorable CARL ALBERT.

The speech delivered by my colleague from the third district in Oklahoma was both a convincing indictment of an administration dominated by an autocratic Bureau of the Budget, and a clarion call for a return to the constructive leadership supplied by the Democratic Party.

The text of the speech follows:

SPEECH BY CONGRESSMAN CARL ALBERT, DEMOCRATIC WHIP, THIRD DISTRICT, OKLAHOMA, AT TRUMAN DINNER, WASHINGTON, D. C., FEBRUARY 22, 1958

The Democratic Members of the House of Representatives rejoice in the opportunity to join Democrats throughout the Nation in paying tribute to one of the great leaders of all time. In our legislative objectives we proudly take our cues from the Truman record. On that guide line and under the magnificent leadership of SAM RAYBURN and JOHN MCCORMACK in the House and LYNDON JOHNSON and MIKE MANSFIELD in the Senate, we will write a legislative record beneficial to the American people and we will chart the course of an overwhelming Democratic victory in November.

It is appropriate that we commemorate the services of President Truman on George Washington's birthday. Just as the Father of our country steered the infant Republic into a new venture in the science and theory of government, so President Truman with magnificent statesmanship guided this Nation into its new responsibilities as leader of the free world in the perilous days following World War II. It was President Truman who met the first threat of Communist expansion after World War II head-on with the Greek-Turkish loan. It was President Truman who defeated the Communist threat in Germany with the Berlin airlift. It was President Truman who inaugurated the Marshall plan and resurrected Western Europe from the ashes of war. It was President Truman who halted Communist aggression in Korea and thereby saved the Korean Republic and made the United Nations an effective, workable institution for world peace and spared it the fate the League of Nations had suffered a quarter of a century before. It was President Truman who conceived the NATO organization and gave to the Atlantic Community a unified approach to the threat of Communist expansion. The point 4 program of President Truman gave new hope to mankind, hope that has added lustre to the American flag throughout the world. This translation of America's generosity and sincerity into concrete programs for the benefit of our fellowmen has done more to advance the cause of world peace and brotherly love than anything else in our time.

When President Truman was in the White House he was President in fact as well as in name. When the President sent his budget to Capitol Hill we in Congress knew that it was his budget. We knew that he and his administration understood it and that they would defend it. The thought never entered our minds that some budget officer would be telling us in a few weeks that it did not mean what it said or that some Cabinet official would dare us to touch it under penalty of having funny things happen to our hair.

When President Truman left the White House he left a vacuum that has never been filled. Not one constructive thing has been added to the Truman accomplishments to meet the cold war threat. Eisenhower's one contribution to American diplomacy has been John Foster Dulles, Sputnik I of the Republican Party, with his "brinks, massive retaliations, and junkets through outer space." There was never a more sterile administration in all the history of this country.

Herein lies our great problem, our principal difficulty. Our trouble at home and abroad is not with our scientists or military leaders. Our trouble is at the summit. It is the lack of effective leadership at the top management level of the Government.

The experts tell us that defense-wise we are in mortal danger. Yet defense since World War II has cost over $400 billion. Our strength or lack of it cannot be measured in terms of dollars spent. The only realistic way to measure our defense is in terms of the power of our potential enemy. The Rockefeller fund panel which measured our defense in those terms asked for an increase in the order of $3 billion. The President's supplemental budget for this fiscal year raises the current defense budget some $1.3 billion above the Wilson level, which Wilson himself claimed wold be offset by the increased cost of inflation. During the last 3 or 4 years warnings have been sounded by scientists, military men, and congressional investigating committees that we were falling behind Russia in the race for ballistic missiles. These warnings failed to jolt the White House or the Secretary of Defense into action.

In 1952 the combined military strength of the United States was greater than that of any other nation. Today we are winning the race for second place. On every single day during the Truman administration the lead time of American arms over Russia was maintained on the side of our own safety. Every day since the Eisenhower administration took over Russia has been closing the gap.

The Roosevelt and Truman administrations developed the A bomb, the H bomb, the atomic cannon, the jet plane, sonar, radar and proximity fuzes. They developed guided missiles and atomic submarines. They made outstanding advances in landing craft and in aircraft carriers which produced such giants as the *Forrestal*.

In 1952 the United States was the undisputed leader of the world in scientific knowledge. Today we find ourselves wearing an international dunce cap, while the rest of the world concludes that our shortsighted policies have almost given the game to the Kremlin.

The budget ceiling has ruled too many decisions. A budget ceiling is important, but if survival is at stake it must be seen in perspective. Our military policy is dominated by the Bureau of the Budget, cloistered and removed from responsibility to the American people. This agency's withholding of funds appropriated by the Congress is the real bottleneck in our defense.

On the home front, the White House has had no control, if indeed, any knowledge of the economic policies of its own administration. These have been controlled in the Departments of Treasury and Agriculture. Hard money, high interest rates, and low farm prices have brought about a depression by design. Under Humphrey and Benson we have seen interest income exceed net farm income for the first time in history. Hard money and high interest rates have drained billions from the purchasing power of the American people while corporate profits have soared to new highs. Small business failures rose from 856 in 1955 to 1,192 in 1957, while giant mergers have increased as never before. No wonder the soup lines are forming. No wonder we have 5½ millions unemployed. Yet they keep telling us the economy is basically sound. They are talking more and more like Herbert Hoover every day. While they are not yet claiming that "prosperity is just around the corner," they are insisting that it is coming in July.

Democrats in Congress have reason to doubt that responsible management can be had from this administration. While Russia is spending more on the development of hydroelectric power projects than at any other time in history, the Eisenhower administration has decreed there will be no new starts in the development of the watersheds of this country. Today when the need for electricity on the farms of this country is greater than ever before the administration is sponsoring a bill which would turn the rural electrification program over to the Wall Street bankers. The Republican Party does not and has never set itself the task of improving the status of ordinary people. As elected officials they fail to represent the common body and follow philosophies prescribed by the select few which they, in fact, represent. Our country and the world can no longer tolerate the subjugation of our common interests by the Madison Avenue-Wall Street combine.

The Eisenhower administration is simply not going to furnish the leadership that will do the job. Indecisive, vascillating, and hand tied by the cliches of the Republican Party, this administration is not competent to cope with the issues of the day. Subservient to the moneyed interests, inimical to the laboring interests, cruel to the farming interests, and indifferent to small business, this administration has forfeited its right to the respect and support of the American people.

This country needs an overwhelming working majority of Democrats in the 86th Congress. This country needs Democrats in public office throughout the land. This is the answer to the Republican crisis in 1958. The Democratic Party and the Democratic Party alone has the formula, the program, and the leadership that will make this country strong and will keep this country free, prosperous, and at peace.

Rev. Horace A. White

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN D. DINGELL
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 24, 1958

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, Rev. Horace A. White died suddenly and unexpectedly from an illness not regarded at the time as which could be fatal. The city of Detroit lost a fine man and a devoted servant of the public. He was pastor of Plymouth Congregational Church, much loved by his parishioners. He served as supervisor to the Lapeer Consultation Center and was well known for his work with young men and women. A fine tribute to this wonderful man of God appeared in the Michigan Chronicle of Saturday, February 22, 1958, by Nelis J. Saunders, the Chronicle church editor, who is much respected for fine work in the church and civic communities:

REV. HORACE A. WHITE, ONE OF DETROIT'S MOST OUTSTANDING MINISTERS

(By Nelis J. Saunders)

Religious, fraternal, social, and civic circles will certainly miss the Reverend Horace A. White, who served, unselfishly, in each field for many years.

His participation was not of such that one would forget easily, but was always done impressively, cooperatively, and most of all, in a way, which was best for the whole and not an individual.

Those of us who worked with him directly know that when there were decisions to be made, whether he was involved or not, they were always expressed impartially.

We have listened to the same expression from many people, in all walks of life, who shall miss him as counselor, teacher, preacher, and lecturer.

Members of Plymouth Congregational Church, where the Reverend Mr. White served as minister, mourn not only because he will be missed in the pulpit but they have lost a real friend, who was to some, a father and others, a fine son.

The Reverend Mr. White was selected one of Detroit's 10 most outstanding ministers because of his numerous contributions to Detroit as well as to his own immediate community.

If a mother needed a friend to speak for her son and offer advice either before or after the child had become involved in some kind of problem, she always found that help by merely calling upon the Reverend Mr. White.

Another lady and several men told us of the experience they appreciated with the quiet, but dynamic and affective leader, when there was a need for a home for children, who were not wanted by their own relatives and how he helped to make it possible for the children to receive shelter and clothing.

There were other experiences told about his services when employment or other immediate financial aid was needed.

Still other experiences were told about his ability to coordinate programs, whether local, State, national, or international in scope.

The little man as well as the top men will miss the great leader. The Young Men's Christian Association will miss his participation in the programs during the year, especially the annual membership drives; add the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, the United Community Services, and the department of mental health, where he served as psychiatric social worker.

He will also be missed by the Lapeer Consultation Center, where he served as supervisor, and members of the housing commission cannot forget that he retired as president in 1948.

Cleveland citizens will also mourn the passing of the Reverend Mr. White because he left many marks of distinction as a result of his untiring efforts during his pastorate at Mt. Zion Congregational Church.

While in Cleveland he also served as social worker for the bureau of homeless men.

We feel that Plymouth Congregational Church will continue to work to carry out the plans of their former leader. Included was the plan to establish classrooms, small auditorium, and recreational area in the recently purchased building near the church on Garfield at Beaubien.

The Importance of Hitting the Moon First

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLAIR ENGLE
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 24, 1958

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. Speaker, I read with very great interest the report of William Randolph Hearst, Jr., on his recent trip to Moscow, as well as his subsequent statements on the international situation. I was particularly interested in his editorial in the Los Angeles Examiner of February 16, in which he stressed the great psychological advantage the United States would have in demonstrating a scientific and technological victory, at least in one field, over the Russians, by firing the first rocket to the moon. We need precisely that kind of demonstration, and I am calling the editorial to the attention of my colleagues for their serious consideration.

The editorial follows:

EDITOR'S REPORT: SOME NEED A KICK IN THE PERIGEE

(By William Randolph Hearst, Jr.)

This column took off last week from the launching pad of information received from good and accurate sources in Washington that we have the rocket capability of shooting the moon—right now—but aren't doing anything to translate capability into accomplishment.

The chief reason why the go-ahead is lagging far behind capability is an apparent failure to appreciate the tremendous psychological advantage to be gained throughou the world by sending a rocket to the moon, or some similar spectacular evidence that we have recaptured the lead in space. It is a presputnik attitude in a postsputnik age.

I am back on the same stand today because some strong corroboration has come in to back up my Washington information. This now comes from scientists in the jet propulsion laboratory of the California Institute of Technology at Pasadena. They designed our Explorer satellite, now orbiting so successfully that latest estimates say it will stay up there for four years, so they ought to know.

They say that all we have to do is shoot the moon or send a satellite to circle it, is to add a fifth rocket stage to the nose of the Jupiter-C, the rocket-missile that projected the Explorer.

Dr. Henry Richter, of the Caltech lab, has a provocative name for the technique. He calls it "a kick in the apogee." The part of the Explorer's orbit that carries it farthest from earth is called the apogee. The part of the orbit closest to earth is the perigee. So, naturally, the additional boost to send a satellite moonward should be delivered at the apogee.

I have gone into this as a buildup to the obvious thought that perhaps some of our psychological planners in the Administration and the Pentagon need a kick in the perigee before we can hope for that kick in the apogee.

At any rate, the Caltech lab has formally asked permission from the Defense Department to try to circle the moon with a satellite.

If it can be done as comparatively simple as they say it can, I hope the Defense Department won't assign the request to the considerations of a sub-sub-committee, subcommittee, full committee, and then review it back down again.

Let's get going, boys, let's shoot that moon. First.

A Strong Code of Ethics Is Needed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS M. PELLY
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 24, 1958

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, again I rise to urge that the House Committee on Post Office and Civil Service schedule a hearing on H. R. 10631. We need a strong code of ethics to spell out what constitutes improper conduct in the executive and legislative branches of the Government.

Under unanimous consent, I include the following editorial from the February 20, 1958, issue of the Tacoma News Tribune for printing in the RECORD which points up the joint nature of the problem of getting such a bill passed:

TOO GOOD TO BE PASSED?

Representative THOMAS B. PELLY, who recently called for a higher standard of ethics for Congressmen, has followed through by introducing H. R. 10631. He calls it the Government Ethics Act. It applies to both the legislative and executive branches.

"It is the purpose of this act to strengthen the faith and confidence of the American people in their Government by promoting high moral standards in the conduct of such Government," states the bill's introductory section.

Strange language for a congressional resolution, isn't it, this suggestion that the people need to have their confidence strengthened? The inquiry into the Federal Communications Commission shows, however, that it is not out of place.

The Seattle Congressman's bill spells out a code of ethics for Government to follow. All Congressmen and executive officials would have to report on all their outside income. Officials could not accept expense money from both Government and private sources. The bill would put a stop to former Congressmen and former Government men returning to their old haunts as lobbyists. It would not permit our Representatives to become "unduly involved, through frequent or expensive social engagements, with any

person outside the Government with whom he transacts business on behalf of the United States." A Member of Congress voting on a bill in which he has a strong personal interest would have to file with the clerk of his chamber a statement of the precise extent of that interest.

It is a strong code, one that would leave no doubt as to what is proper and what is improper conduct.

It deserves to be enacted into law. But will Members care to discipline themselves? That is Mr. PELLY's problem, and ours.

Flood of Filth

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN DOWDY
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 24, 1958

Mr. DOWDY. Mr. Speaker, day by day more people are being made aware of the destructive influence of salacious literature, and how it is degrading our communities, our homes, and our Nation.

The Baptist Standard, which is owned by the Baptist General Convention of Texas, February 15, 1958, issue, devoted considerable space to this question, including an article by Bill Pinson on the Flood of Filth, and several news items, all of which are as follows:

FLOOD OF FILTH
(By Bill Pinson)

A flood of pictorial and literary filth is pouring from many presses in this country. Crime and horror comic books, cheap paperback novels, men's entertainment magazines, true love or confession magazines, exposé publications, pinup magazines, pocket-size picture news periodicals, cartoon and cheesecake booklets, nudist journals, and figure-study periodicals compose a portion of the salacious literature that is filling the racks of our Nation's newsstands and forcing that which is decent off the shelves.

A few years ago such sex-saturated periodicals could be obtained from under the counters of some newsstands. Today, however, anyone, children included, can purchase salacious literature over the magazine counters in neighborhood grocery stores and drugstores, as well as downtown newsstands. People from all walks of life purchase the obscenity. The publications are found in the homes of active church members as well as in the hovels of sex perverts. Much of the obscenity is aimed directly at the curiosity and immaturity of boys and girls who sometimes use their lunch money and allowances to buy it. The present abundance of the filth is evident in the fact that it is a $500 million business a year.

The contents of these periodicals are poisoning the minds of the multitudes of people who read them. The filthy publications picture promiscuity as if it were normal. They cast a slur on decent homelife and picture women as being only sex instruments. Monogamy, chastity, and fidelity are pictured as outmoded ideals. Almost any issue contains stories of seduction. In many, fornication is represented as one of the common, everyday pleasures of life like eating and drinking. Indecent pictures of girls form a major ingredient in all the magazines. According to these periodicals the remedy for all the world's anxieties is the uninhibited release of sexual expression. Their overall attitude toward sex brands them as immoral from the viewpoint of Christian ethics.

According to court and criminal authorities the effects of the flood of filth are appallingly dangerous. A connection is noted between these publications and the growing number of nonsupport and desertion cases and the increase in rape and sex crimes. The magazines degenerate taste, debauch truth, interfere with normal sex life, take away the sanctity of womanhood, and create a craving for more lurid, violent, sexy publications. Salacious literature may be a result of a society that is surfeited on sex. But it is also a contributing factor to the sex mania that is a sickness of our society.

Christian conscience should urge us to be active in opposing the distribution of salacious literature and an examination of the Scriptures should compel us to act. The whole Bible is a basis for opposing the traffic in obscenity in that the Bible always opposes immoral practices. But specifically the Bible teaches that we should strive for purity of body and mind as necessary conditions of true fellowship with God (Matthew 5: 8; Romans 12: 1–2; Ephesians 5: 24; II Timothy 2: 22; II Corinthians 7: 1) and that passions are flammable and need to be guarded and directed (Matthew 5: 28; Romans 7: 23; and James 1: 13–15). Salacious literature flaunts the Scriptures by polluting the mind and inflaming the passions.

Some action has been taken against this trash, but not nearly enough. Many churches have been strangely silent on the problem. The greatest hindrances to effective opposition have been the lethargy of Christian people, due either to lack of information or lack of interest, and the vagueness of the laws dealing with the problems of salacious literature. Texas Baptists can be effective in dealing with this problem. As always, when facing a difficult situation, we should pray for guidance, strength, and wisdom. But then we must also act. By positive action Baptists must strive to create a wholesome mental and spiritual environment. To accomplish this, steps must be taken to shut off the source of the pollution.

The following steps are suggested:

Everyone should investigate the prevalence of salacious literature in his own vicinity and acquaint himself with the local, State, and Federal laws concerning such publications.

Parents should be careful about the kinds of periodicals they permit to enter their homes and should rid their homes of the obscene and salacious.

When objectionable stories or illustrations appear in a standard magazine, the subscriber should register his protest with the editor and back it up with a canceled subscription if the protests go unheeded.

Talk to magazine dealers in your neighborhood and tactfully express your disapproval of obscene publications. Suggest the removal of any that are on his stand. If they are not removed, do your business elsewhere and tell the dealer why you are doing so.

Obtain from local dealers the names of wholesalers and lodge formal protest to them against salacious literature. The larger the group backing this protest the more effective it will be.

Church groups can investigate newsstands and, when sufficient evidence is gathered and a standard of decency established, they can ask the removal of obscene materials.

Churches should suggest wholesome periodicals and books for their congregations. The churches should preach and teach to cure this sickness in our society by proclaiming the Christian concept of sex, home, and marriage.

Church denominational publications must continue to improve their quality so that people are eager to receive and read them.

Petition the State and Federal legislators for more stringent control measures.

Support legislation when it does come up.

Urge local law-enforcement agencies to enforce existing laws and report violations to them.

If every Baptist in Texas will act to eliminate salacious literature, its evil influence on the lives of thousands of young people and adults will begin to cease. Act now in your community. Don't wait, as some have done, for a series of rapes and other sex crimes, or a teen-age orgy, or a number of illegitimate births to shock you.

LEGISLATION AGAINST OBSCENITY

Last week saw important developments in the campaign against printed obscenity in which religious, civic, and legal authorities are increasingly joining forces.

In Washington, D. C., a House Judiciary Subcommittee opened preliminary hearings on legislation designed to stiffen the penalties for mailing obscene matter to juveniles.

Meanwhile, representatives of Protestant and Roman Catholic organizations testified at 2-day hearings on obscenity conducted by the new York State Joint Legislative Committee. Purpose of the inquiry, it was stated, was to determine whether further legislation is necessary to curb lurid publications and material which have aroused public indignation.

The Washington hearings focused attention on two bills introduced by Representative JOHN DOWDY, Democrat, Texas, following a congressional investigation of pornography in the mails which he conducted in 1956. The measures would make mailers of obscenity liable to prosecution in the jurisdiction where the mail is received as well as the place where it is deposited. The other would subject to severe penalties persons who mail obscene matter to persons under 19.

DOWDY has announced that he also will press for action on a third bill. This measure, he said, would add an habitual offender section to the mail laws providing a penalty of 20 years in prison upon a third conviction of mailing obscenity. The present maximum penalty is 5 years.

The Washington sessions marked the first time that so many Protestant groups were represented at such a hearing.

Among the groups were the Churchmen's Commission for Decent Literature, the National Association of Evangelicals, the Board of Temperance of the Methodist Church, the Southern Baptist Convention, the Churches of Christ, and United Church Women, a department of the National Council of Churches.

O. K. Armstrong, of Springfield, Ohio, legislative chairman of the Churchmen's Commission, told the subcommittee "we feel that this legislation will help correct a situation that has permitted an alarming growth, during the last few years, of a tide of pornographic, lewd, and obscene publications."

Clyde W. Taylor, secretary for public affairs of the National Association of Evangelicals, said the bills sponsored by Representative DOWDY cannot be considered censorship measures since they would merely enforce currently accepted standards and would not change present legal definitions of obscenity as upheld by the Supreme Court.

CONCERN INCREASES OVER TIDE OF OBSCENE LITERATURE

Representatives of Roman Catholic and Protestant church groups asked Congress for speeded-up legislation designed to halt the mailing of pornography and other obscene material. The Southern Baptist Convention was represented.

Congress was urged in Washington by the Evangelical Press Association to pass legislation to halt the tide of obscene, pornographic, and indecent literature on the newsstands. Representative JOHN DOWDY, Democrat of Texas, bill would stiffen existing penalties for the interstate sale of

pornography. They also would try offenders at the place where the obscene material is received as well as where it is mailed.

Support for State measures to curb indecent literature has been expressed by the Detroit Council of Churches. Stringent civil and criminal laws to control the sale of literature found to be against public morals was urged by the council. Bills will be introduced in the Michigan Legislature aimed at control of indecent literature.

Immediate Christian action to stem the flood of obscene magazines on the Nation's newsstands was urged at the annual meeting of the Methodist Board of Temperance in Washington, D. C. Board members were told that sex magazines are destroying American family life and casting aside the moral standards of centuries.

Some 500 druggists of the Northern California Pharmaceutical Association have voted to curb selling of lewd and lascivious books and publications.

Police in San Rafael, Calif., cracked down on a newsstand dealer for allegedly selling obscene pictures and other material. Police Chief Frank Kelly said his department "will not tolerate this type of article."

A Roman Catholic priest declared in Albany, N. Y., that 80 percent of the objectionable comics and obscene reading matter flooding this country is Communist-sponsored. He said former Communists had testified to this fact at closed congressional hearings in Washington.

The Irish News Agents Association in Dublin has asked the government to license the importation of books and to impose sanctions against importers who defy the censorship of publications board. Many Dublin booksellers have refused to take any publications of one American publishing house because they consider that some of the books the company has published are indecent.

Mrs. Clarence T. Nelson, of the United Church Women, a department of the National Council of Churches, asked that "teeth be put into legislation against pornography the same as against river pollution."

Billy H. Hood, of Washington, D. C., Churches of Christ evangelist, asked "protection for the Christian home" against "those who seek to destroy it by peddling obscene and immoral publications."

House Legislative Oversight Committee

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN D. DINGELL
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 24, 1958

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to permission granted, I am inserting into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD two editorials appearing in the Washington (D. C.) Post and Times Herald of February 21, 1958. The first is entitled "Loaded Dice." The second is a column by Mr. Marquis Childs entitled "The Art of Influence Gains in Cunning."

The country has been following with considerable interest the investigation of the Legislative Oversight Subcommittee. I am sure that everyone in Congress is aware that not only should the various Federal regulatory agencies, the so-called fourth arm of government, be fair, honest, and impartial guardians of the public interest, but that the Congress itself must see to it that these regulatory agencies are, like Caesar's wife, above suspicion.

The disclosures which have come from the House Legislative Oversight Subcommittee have been most disquieting to me. It appears that the climate in the Federal regulatory agencies has deteriorated to a point where vigorous action on the part of Congress appears necessary to restore the faith of the people in these quasi-judicial agencies and to restore what we regard as integrity in Government to these same agencies.

I know that my other colleagues here join me in a desire for a thorough, complete, impartial investigation of these agencies, and I know my colleagues share with me the concern that failure to make an adequate and complete investigation as a prelude to proper remedial legislation will make the integrity of the Congress of the United States open to question.

ART OF INFLUENCE GAINS IN CUNNING
(By Marquis Childs)

At the current investigation into the Federal Communications Commission, with sensational headlines over the business of influence peddling, is in the view of longtime observers here no more than a small sample of practices increasingly frequent in recent years.

The standards of the regulatory agencies, which undertake to police the operations of large aggregates of power and wealth, have steadily deteriorated. The pressures applied by those seeking favors have grown more pervasive and, at the same time, harder to detect.

The likelihood is that the present investigation will stop at what Speaker SAM RAYBURN has called flyspecking when it is the nature of the system itself that should be gone into.

A really courageous investigation, in the view of experienced observers, would tackle the community of interest between politics and politicians and the business interests supposedly under regulation. Such an inquiry would call not only for courage, but for skill and determination. The record shows that business will buy influence when it is for sale as the standards of a regulatory agency decline.

As valuable as are the prizes under the jurisdiction of the Communications Commission—television and radio franchises—the Federal Power Commission exercises an authority equally great over the utility industry. Water-power sites, public versus private development, decisions involving hundreds of millions of dollars—this is the jurisdiction of the five men on the Commission started by Theodore Roosevelt.

One of the big prizes here relates to the regulation of the natural-gas industry and whether gas at the wellhead is subject to regulatory control. For years the oil and gas interests have been trying by every means possible to change the law so that the Power Commission could no longer determine the rate on a commodity used by millions of consumers in the North.

In 1949 President Truman appointed his old friend, Mon Wallgren, former Senator and former Governor of Washington, to be chairman of the Federal Power Commission. Wallgren joined Harrington Wimberly, of Oklahoma, another Truman appointee, and a third commissioner to rule in the case of Phillips Petroleum that the Commission did not have jurisdiction over gas at the wellhead. The Supreme Court later knocked out that ruling.

In 1951 Wallgren retired to an estate near Palm Springs, Calif., where he has date and grapefruit groves. Before he had ruled for the Phillips company, which owns vast reserves of gas, Wallgren had joined two other commissioners in asking Mr. Truman to veto the natural-gas bill sponsored by Senator ROBERT KERR (Democrat, Oklahoma).

KERR had his own oil company and is allied with Phillips Petroleum. It is here, of course, that the rule of "conflict of interest," applied to the executive branch of the Government in one investigation after another, breaks down in the legislative branch. The list of Congressmen with TV and radio ownership is a long one.

Toward the end of the Truman administration the Republicans came up with some Democratic flyspecks—mink coats and food freezers—that were blown up to look as big as a barn door. Coming in as the new broom, the Eisenhower administration had an opportunity to dig into what was behind this petty business—the "mess in Washington" the campaign orators had talked about.

But, as the current inquiry is revealing, the present administration has followed the influence pattern. There have been numerous reports of White House calls to the Federal Power Commission. The Commission awarded the Hells Canyon Dam site—the biggest prize of recent years—to a private company.

There was another precedent. On the Commission some years ago were two men—Claude Draper, named by Herbert Hoover, and Leland Olds, named by Franklin D. Roosevelt—who were dedicated public servants. Although their political philosophies before they came on the Commission had been quite different, they were often in agreement on important decisions. What they agreed on was an interest more and more lost sight of—the public interest.

LOADED DICE

Filing an application for a television broadcast license is, at best, a costly gamble. Extensive and expensive engineering surveys must be made. A site must be purchased before the Federal Communications Commission will consider the application. Elaborate exhibits must be prepared to show the range of service to be rendered and the character of programing projected. Very considerable legal fees must be incurred. Applicants must travel to Washington and spend a good deal of time at hearings. It is a matter of record that one applicant spent $1 million on his application—all of it legitimately—before obtaining a license.

Anyone who takes such a gamble is entitled to expect that the game he enters is not going to be played with loaded dice. He is entitled to expect that the prize will be awarded on the merits of the exhibits and data and surveys and engineering research he has assembled at so much cost—and not on the basis of back-door influence exerted by Congressmen, administration moguls, political fixers or friends of rival applicants.

Oroville Mercury Gives Some Clear Answers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUBERT B. SCUDDER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 24, 1958

Mr. SCUDDER. Mr. Speaker, in their latest attacks against Trinity partnership legislation, Federal power interests have charged that the Pacific Gas & Electric Co. has been making a "kill" from its purchase of power from the Central Valley project. These slanted attacks are untrue and without foundation. As the

Oroville Mercury notes in its January 7 issue:

The answer by the company that it makes no profit whatever from that power cannot be denied. It is obvious that when a utility's profits are limited to a fixed percentage by a State regulatory body, then it cannot profit by a good contract made with the Government or with any other agency.

But there is another angle to this that should be considered. It is this:

If the P. G. & E. is unable to make a profit from an advantageous deal with the Federal Government, just who does profit from it?

The clear answer is that the company's customers get the profit in rates for power that are lower than they might have been.

The Federal power group maintains that P. G. & E. has been getting most of the Central Valley power. But it fails to distinguish between firm and dump power. The company gets only 10 percent of the firm power and the majority of dump power, power that would be merely wasted without absorption by an integrated company. As the Oroville Mercury describes:

The city of Sacramento is getting the bulk of the firm power. * * * The Government is lucky it has found an outlet for its cheap, off-peak product (dump power).

In its January 22 editorial, Trinity, Shasta Favor Partnership Plan, the Mercury builds its case for joint development. I respectfully request that the following editorial be included in the RECORD:

TRINITY, SHASTA FAVOR PARTNERSHIP PLAN

The supervisors of two counties, Trinity and Shasta, have gone on record in favor of the partnership plan for development of Trinity power. In Trinity County the factor that won favor with the board was that the power company, if it built the power facilities, would pay local taxes.

The answer by the company that it makes no profit whatever from that power cannot be denied. It is obvious that when a utility's profits are limited to a fixed percentage by a State regulatory body then it cannot profit by a good contract made with the Government or with any other agency.

But there is another angle to this that should be considered. It is this:

If the P. G. & E. is unable to make a profit from an advantageous deal with the Federal Government, just who does profit from it?

The clear answer is that the company's customers get the profit in rates for power that are lower than they might have been.

Board members attended the Washington hearing to testify for the plan.

In Shasta County a majority of the board favored the partnership plan, but we do not know why, because the Sacramento Bee, on which we must depend temporarily for news of the action, gave only the arguments of the side in favor of public ownership.

This matter of Trinity power is a proper one for all city and county boards to consider. It will have far-reaching effects. Up for decision is policy whether a few shall benefit from the power byproduct, or many. If the Government owns the power, 7 percent of the people of northern California will get cheap electricity. If the company builds the plant, 93 percent will benefit through the lowering effect on electric energy rates.

We should not let anyone tell us that the profit of low power will go to the company. This simply is not true. The company is allowed less than 6 percent profit. It is making this already. Any cheap power it can pick up must be passed on to the consumers without profit to the company. Everyone in the Oroville area is a consumer of power handled by the P. G. & E.

Institutional Fire Safety—A Paper Presented by Rev. Frank C. Bourbon, S. J.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JOHN J. ROONEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 24, 1958

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, there is an old saying that advises shoemakers to stick to their lasts, and by and large I think this is excellent advice. Not always, however. As an example, I invite attention of my colleagues to a very practical address on the specialized topic, Institutional Fire Fighting, made at the University of Maryland on February 6 by the Reverend Frank C. Bourbon, S. J., who for 3 years taught Latin and English at Gonzaga High School here. Heads of private and public institutions anywhere could profit by the recommendations so practically presented in Father Bourbon's address, which was part of the program of the second annual fire prevention short course conducted by the university's fire service school.

This young priest has an extensive background of practical experience as well as theory in fire fighting. Following several years of institutional work in this field he completed the civilian defense fire fighting course under the District of Columbia Fire Department, and since 1952 has been a member of the District's Emergency Fire Department. During 1952 and 1953 he was civilian defense coordinator for the Washington Archdiocesan Catholic schools and helped to set up civilian defense and fire drills in the schools. He has worked continually with the District Fire Department on fire prevention. At present he is an active member of the Woodstock (Md.) College Volunteer Fire Department, which in addition to safeguarding the college's numerous installations frequently supplements activities of the county fire departments in the Woodstock area.

The paper reads as follows:

INSTITUTIONAL FIRE SAFETY—A PAPER PRESENTED BEFORE SECOND ANNUAL FIRE PROTECTION SHORT COURSE OF THE FIRE SERVICE EXTENSION SCHOOL, UNIVERSITY OF MARYLAND, FEBRUARY 6, 1958, BY FRANK C. BOURBON, S. J.

CIVIL DEFENSE IN INSTITUTIONS

Institutions, by force of circumstances, must lead the way in civil defense preparations. After a major catastrophe of any kind, the institutional buildings which survive are used to house and feed and provide medical care for the helpless and homeless.

What preparations can be made? Once storage space is available (and there is wasted storage space in every institution), many items can be stockpiled. Such items would be canned and dehydrated food, medical supplies, extra clothing and bedding, emergency lighting equipment, and a battery-powered radio. Many of these items are available to institutions at a nominal cost from Government surplus. The Federal civil defense has also been distributing compact large medical supply units for emergency use to institutions in vital areas.

And here the job of educating the institutional residents begins. They must be made familiar with the enemy-attack warning, and how it differs from the fire alarm (e. g., fire alarms sounded on sirens, civil-defense alerts on claxon horns or steam whistles). When they hear the warning, where do they go? The shelter areas inside the building should be designated by men familiar with building construction. (Signs to mark routes to these shelter-areas in the building are available free from civil defense.) Fireproof construction, at least partially below ground level, sufficient exits for evacuating shelter-area quickly, as few window-glass exposures as possible—these are the features to look for in choosing a shelter area. In this area, sufficient chairs and tables should be provided so that all can relax. (In an alert or an attack they may be there for a long time. Plan for entertainment of some kind to keep them from getting restless or panicky.)

Interest in civil defense is best achieved by linking it to fire prevention, and making training in civil defense an integral part of fire prevention. Once done, it is a powerful force in readiness for any emergency. Instead of a creature without ancestry or hope of posterity, it becomes a full-fledged brother of the fire service.

The institutional fire department's biggest job is education—education of the people for whom they are working. It must convince the institutional officials that fire safety is absolutely necessary, as many of them take the attitude it can't happen to us. These officials will either be sold on fire prevention by the institutional fire chief, or by a disastrous fire, which will be costly, and may take many lives. Selling fire prevention is relatively easy in an institution where the officials and residents have the memory of a fairly recent disastrous fire.

Then, too, the institutional resident frequently has an attitude toward fire prevention which is far from ideal. Often this resident does not have the real conviction that the institution where he lives is really his home, even temporarily. So he is tempted to stand aside as a spectator, and let George (George here being the institutional fire chief) carry the whole burden. The changes of personnel and staff in many institutions are rapid, and so the permanence necessary for a stable fire prevention program is often not to be had. It is sometimes difficult to get the institution resident to follow instructions, even in an emergency. He has to take orders and instructions regularly, and he doesn't appreciate the idea of also having to obey those silly fire laws. Many institution residents are unacquainted with fire-prevention fundamentals. They are unacquainted with fire-fighting equipment and techniques. Many have never seen a modern fire department in action. They must be convinced that learning to protect themselves can be interesting.

So the institutional fire chief needs: interest, training, confidence, and personality. He needs the qualities of Dale Carnegie.

WHAT ARE THE PROBLEMS?

Many institutions are housed in old buildings, some of which have been modernized, and others have not. Unfortunately, some of the structural improvements have continued or increased existing fire hazards. Some institutions are housed in buildings converted from other purposes. Many religious and nonprofit communities are housed in converted mansions, which are not ideally suited for their purposes, and are extreme fire hazards in the bargain. These dangerous features can be eliminated, but they are costly, and so the officials of these institutions must be convinced that such alterations are necessary for the protection of lives.

We will take a glance at some of these classes of institutions, and the fire-safety problems they present.

Hospitals and nursing homes are institutions which present tremendous fire-safety

problems. They are often crowded, and house ill and feeble persons, who are incapable of helping themselves in an emergency. They are frequently understaffed, also.

Combined school and residence institutions, such as boarding schools and seminaries, often house large numbers of students, and they too present substantial fire danger. Scientific and laboratory equipment, overloaded electrical circuits, careless use of chemicals and cleaning fluids, and last, but not least, smoking in bed, are some of the dangers.

The third general class of institutions would comprise mainly schools, places of public assembly, and churches and church-connected buildings. The two biggest problems for these institutions are the peculiar structural features of some of them, and the difficulty of rapidly evacuating large numbers of people from them, without panic, in the event of fire.

Briefly, we will consider for each of these types of institutions the following points:

(a) What dangers do their individual situations present?

(b) What is the overall job of the institutional fire department, and what fire equipment is necessary?

(c) How can the fire department prepare occupants for an emergency?

(d) What is the precise job of the institutional fire department, once fire has started?

FIRE PREVENTION IN HOSPITALS AND NURSING HOMES

Nothing should be left to chance in such institutions. Fires must be prevented, because with so many sick and disabled persons the life hazard is extremely serious.

In these institutions every staff member should have a definitely assigned and clearly defined duty in the event of fire. Occasional drills (at least two a year) should be held. All staff members should participate, and the drills should be supervised by the local fire department. In some of these drills, personnel of local engine companies and ladder companies should, if possible, participate in the actual evacuation. This will familiarize firemen with methods of handling sick and crippled persons, and with the layout of the buildings themselves.

If, for any reason, it is necessary to keep doors leading out of residential areas of such buildings locked, the fire department should be carefully informed as to where, and from whom, the keys can be obtained. Some institutions demand that such keys be in the possession of at least three staff members on duty. Every moment the fire department has to spend on forcible entry means added time for the fire to spread, and added danger for the occupants.

A coded interior building alarm is a vital necessity in such buildings, so that staff personnel will know what section of the building must be evacuated first, and what stairways, elevators, and escape routes can be used to move the patients. This coded interior alarm should be so devised that it will trip a master alarm connected with the fire department.

Anyone interested in detailed information as to what one major hospital has done by way of complete fire-prevention planning should contact Mercy-Mercy Timken Hospital in Canton, Ohio. According to Fire Engineering magazine, one of the interesting things which this hospital has done is to mark with strips of luminous tape all windows which lead into clear areas. This is done to aid firemen entering the buildings. Complete maps of every floor of this building are in possession of nearby fire companies.

What should be done can best be illustrated by what was not done in one nursing home. As a result, this home burned completely in 1956, killing 72 persons, injuring many others:

The buildings were 65 years old, converted from other purposes, of brick and wood-joist construction. One hundred and forty-nine patients, mostly bedridden; only four regular attendants. All bed patients were located on the second floor. There was no interior alarm system; no sprinklers; no outside fire escapes or slides; no firewalls dividing the buildings; only 3 stairways, all unenclosed; only 3 exits from the main building on the ground floor (2 double width, and 1 single width); nothing in the building was flameproofed; the attendants had no training in mass evacuation or fire fighting.

FIRE PREVENTION IN COMBINED SCHOOL-RESIDENCE INSTITUTIONS

Many are housed in old buildings, perhaps of stone or brick construction. From the outside, they look fairly safe from fire. But don't let that fool you. Step inside. Between the inner plaster walls and the outside stone wall, there is a continuous opening from cellar to ceiling. Once a fire has entered this space, only prayer is likely to save the building. To further complicate matters, the sections of the interior of the building which have been modernized have another interior plasterboard wall over the old plaster, and a new hardwood floor over the original rough softwood flooring. The halls are generally not divided into sections and many of the stairways are open all the way up and out onto every floor. Additional rooms have been obtained by hanging a false ceiling from the building roof, and using these attic spaces for storage and living quarters. One thing they always love to do is polish floors, and so all the floors are oil soaked, and itching to burn. As new wings are added to the original buildings, firewalls are pierced to connect up interbuilding facilities, such as water and steampipes, and electric conduits. And some helpful soul is always propping open the self-closing fire doors. The original sprinkler system is overloaded, and in many cases, does not cover the whole building. The interior fire alarm is not coded, and so, when it sounds, the location of the fire is anyone's guess. To have things handy, paints, wax, and polishing oils are sometimes stored in the basement of the residence building.

Sounds grisly, doesn't it? Well, few institutions will fit that horrible description perfectly, but I have observed every one of these items in buildings with which I am familiar.

What should be the basic approach to fire prevention in such institutions?

First, try to choose a fire chief who combines the qualities of Einstein, Dale Carnegie, and Billy Mitchell. He should find out clearly from the institution president what authority, and how much support, moral, and financial, he will have. Then, let him find himself a crew of willing workers. He should made a complete inspection of the fire facilities of the institution, making complete maps of each floor and its equipment. These maps are extremely important. They should be clearly marked, and should include the locations of the electric, gas, and water shutoffs, as well as the main steam valves and sprinkler controls. The location and amount of water stored for emergency use should be noted. In his training sessions, he should familiarize every member of his crew with these items. A word here about the dangers of trying to run a one-man crew. The chief may, as he sometimes thinks, know everything. But, the fire may choose to start when he is not around. So, if he wants a cooperative crew, let him consult his crew, before setting up any program, and also inform them of any changes he makes. They are the ones who are going to have to do the work, anyhow, so why not let them know from the start what they are in for?

He should insist that a complete sprinkler system be installed, protecting every part of the building. The interior fire alarm should be coded, and every member of the fire crew familiar with the code, so that they can respond directly to the fire scene. He should have small, simple signs posted in every room, with instructions for occupants, when the fire alarm sounds. (Sample: "In case of fire alarm, rouse the occupants of the rooms on each side of you, close your windows and doors, and go immediately to the designated assembly spot outside the building.") One man on each corridor can be designated as an auxiliary fireman, to check his whole corridor, and then guard one exit, to see that no one gets inside, except members of the fire crew, and await further orders of the fire chief.

The fire chief should see that there is a 50 foot length of intact-cloth hose attached to each hall standpipe. He may find that most of the hand fire extinguishers are the soda-acid type. He will probably find that for purposes of maintenance, these might well be replaced by the air-pressure type. In each area where there is any electrical machinery, he should add CO_2 and dry-powder extinguishers. One large CO_2 and air-pressure-water extinguisher on wheels would be helpful on each floor. Once an interior alarm has been sounded, one member of the fire crew should take over the telephone switchboard, and handle all calls for help, according to the orders of the fire chief. If mobile fire apparatus is possessed by the institution, one fire-crew member should be assigned as driver and told to report to the hydrant nearest to the fire location and hookup.

The institutional fire chief should be consulted when plans for new construction are being considered. It is his job to point out the necessity of adequate firewalls between building sections; standpipes of sufficient diameter; adequate sprinklers and alarms; completely enclosed stairwells; self-closing and fusible-link fire doors; panic-bar doors leading to the outside; sufficient outside fire escapes; and sufficient hatches giving access to attic spaces and the roof. He should ask that a few lightweight ladders be hung on walls in the basement corridors, and reserved strictly for emergency use. Also, he should store at least a few large tarpaulins in a convenient place, for use as salvage covers. It should be his job to see that adequate first-aid equipment be installed in kitchens and powerplants and machine-shops (including blankets and bandages, and ointments, for treatment of burns). He must also insist that supplies of combustible materials of any kind be stored in a separate building by themselves.

At times, the institutional officials may look upon the institutional big chief as a big pest, but it will take only one major emergency to convince them that he is a very necessary evil.

FIRE PREVENTION IN CHURCHES, SCHOOLS, AND PUBLIC ASSEMBLY PLACES

Churches present a peculiar problem with regard to fire prevention. They are heavily crowded for a few hours each week, and then are almost empty for the rest of the week. They are huge enclosures, with few interior divisions or walls. They are high, and have sharply slanted roofs and inaccessible towers and lofts. Many are old-construction, with overloaded electrical systems and heating plants. They contain almost priceless treasures in church vestments and ornaments, statues, stained-glass windows and organs. And, incidentally, they are usually located in areas where valuable surrounding property will also be endangered, should they catch fire. Yet, in new church construction, relatively little attention is paid to fire protection features.

It is almost as though we were building our churches to burn. The fire losses to churches in this country in 1956 and 1957

were terrific. When a community loses a church through fire, something very beautiful and spiritually valuable has gone out of the lives of the people of that community. What can be done to protect the sacrifices and labor and love of God that these churches represent?

When modernizing an old church, the first things to be tackled are the electrical systems and the heating plant. The majority of church fires start here. An adequate detection system is absolutely necessary, since the church is closed a good part of the time. Complete sprinklering, and automatic alarms (such as rate-of-temperature-rise indicators), are essential, especially in the more inaccessible parts of the church. Since candles and open-flame lamps are often used in church services, flameproofing of all church hangings and decorations is important. Few churches have sufficient exits to clear a large crowd quickly, without panic. The fire team during church services must be the ushers. The pastor should insist that every usher be trained in mass evacuation and in the handling of ordinary fire equipment. He should ask the local fire department to supervise an evacuation of the congregation during church services, at least once a year. This will reduce the element of panic, if it ever has to be done for real. (Make it near the end of the service, as a certain proportion of the congregation are not likely to return until the following week.) The pastor should take the local fire officials on a tour of the church building, and map and point out for them the objects of special value, such as organs, statues, stained-glass windows, or altar-vessels, which should be removed immediately to a place of safety in the event of fire.

FIRE PREVENTION IN SCHOOLS

Most jurisdictions today are very strict and thorough in their school fire inspections. Even if, in some places, the law does not require such frequent drills, a fire drill once a month is practical. This, if carefully supervised by school officials, is valuable disciplinary training. The school authorities should have brief fire-drill instructions posted, and then enforce them rigidly. A well-run school fire drill is an interesting spectacle. If the school officials make it perfectly clear that they are dead serious about fire safety, the students will be dead serious about it, too. All staff personnel should be required to take part in every drill, and each shoud be assigned a definite job. The school fire official should personally check on their performance. If it can possibly be done, have a demonstration put on occasionally by the local fire department, during the fire drill. This will heighten the interest on the part of all. As an example: In a Washington, D. C., high school where I formerly taught, one Wednesday afternoon, during assembly period, we had a combined fire safety, civil-defense lecture program in the school auditorium. Battalion Chief Grunwell represented the District of Columbia Fire Department. In a half-hour talk, he explained the hazards of using cleaning fluids, smoking in bed, wiring up hotrod cars, etc. His interesting talk and demonstrations held the undivided attention of 600 teenage boys. (If there are any high-school teachers in this group, they know what an accomplishment that is.) He was followed by Mr. Joseph Chambers, the then Deputy Director of Federal Civil Defense, who explained the plans of the civil defense for working with other emegency agencies in the event of a natural or a manmade disaster. His interesting presentation, plus the decorations which he had received from his country, made it impossible for the fertile minds of his teenage audience to wander. On the following morning, a school fire drill was held, and the District of Columbia Fire Department responded just as they would in the event of an actual fire. They put their hose lines and aerial-ladder pipe in service in the schoolyard, while Chief Gruenwell explained the operation to the assembled students over a public-address system.

The reactions to this program were very interesting. For many of the students, and for most of the faculty members, it was the first time they had seen a modern fire department in action. Most of them had seen engine and ladder companies on the move, but they had no clear idea of what the detailed job of each unit was. Students and faculty alike were amazed to find that the firemen and the chief had a detailed knowledge of the layout of the school buildings. Preassigned locations for each unit; radio communications between units; aerial-ladder water towers; fog applicators, etc., were news to many of them. The fire drill was no longer a chore; it became something interesting and almost enjoyable. Everyone now knew why they had been instructed to do the things they were doing.

There are many other things which can be done to make fire prevention interesting and memorable for the young. The secret lies in getting a man who is really convinced of the necessity and the possibilities of fire-prevention education; and then giving him a relatively free hand, and the necessary cooperation.

FIRE PREVENTION IN PLACES OF PUBLIC ASSEMBLY

Several almost unbelievable tragedies which have occurred in the past several years in places of public assemblage make clear to us what has to be done in this area.

In auditoriums, all stage curtains and inflammable properties can easily and inexpensively be sprayed with flameproofing chemical. Many cities require the installation of a fire curtain, which can be dropped quickly between the stage and the body of the auditorium in the event of fire. Usually it is required that there be one standpipe installation, with a 50-foot hose extension, on each side backstage. Fire departments will gladly send a man to check fire equipment in an auditorium or theater before a production starts. Many municipalities will require that he remain until after the performance is over. At all events, check the extinguishers and standpipes, and see that all of the exit doors are unlocked and unobstructed. It would be helpful if battery-powered lights were mounted over each exit, as well as ordinary electric exit lights. In the event of power failure, these lights, plus the flashlights which the ushers carry, will be a partial insurance against panic. Never allow extra seats to be set up in an assembly hall or auditorium, so that the aisles are even partially blocked. This would make a speedy evacuation more difficult, cause injuries, and heighten the danger of panic. Also, a portable battery-powered public-address system would be a wonderful investment for a theater manager.

In halls where tables are set up for dinners, or for the inevitable bingo, try to assure that there will be room enough for two people to walk side by side between each table, after everyone has been seated. Separate the kitchens of such halls from the main body of the hall, if possible, and provide large CO_2 and dry-powder extinguishers in the kitchen for protection against grease flash fires. All exit doors should be of double width, and unobstructed by coatracks, or concessions, or storage of chairs. It would be well if off-duty or retired firemen could be hired as special policemen for such events. These precautions will not prevent small fires and emergencies from developing. They will, however, prevent them from reaching panic proportions.

CONCLUSION

In summary, institutional fire-safety precautions must be devised to fit the individual institution. Available financial and manpower resources will determine the completeness of the program. However, I have tried to touch briefly on those features which can reasonably be adopted in the majority of institutions. If the man responsible for supervising fire-prevention is interested and active, he needn't fear making a few mistakes. His interest in his work, and the interest in other people which he thereby demonstrates, will win for him cooperation from others, and indulgence for his occasional mistakes.

Defending Our Courts: The Duty of the Legal Profession—Charles S. Rhyne, President, American Bar Association

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLYDE DOYLE
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 24, 1958

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, by reason of unanimous consent heretofore granted me so to do, I am pleased and honored to present what appears to me a very pertinent article by the distinguished president of the American Bar Association, to wit, Charles S. Rhyne, of Washington, D. C. This same article by this distinguished American lawyer appeared in the American Bar Journal for February 1958:

DEFENDING OUR COURTS: THE DUTY OF THE LEGAL PROFESSION

(By Charles S. Rhyne, president of the American Bar Association)

("Judges, not being wholly free to defend themselves, are peculiarly entitled to receive the support of the bar against unjust criticism and clamor." This sentence is from canon 1 of the Canons of Professional Ethics. In this article, Mr. Rhyne calls attention to this cardinal rule of professional conduct, pointing out that lawyers must always distinguish between criticism of judges' decisions (which is often a professional duty) and criticism of judges. In times like ours, when the Ship of State is sailing in stormy waters, men often disagree with decisions of the courts, and violent disagreement leads to impassioned personal attacks upon judges. It is this sort of attack, Mr. Rhyne declares, from which lawyers ought to defend courts. The article is taken from an address delivered before the State Bar of New Mexico last September.)

Our system of government is no stronger than our courts, and our courts are no stronger than the strength of the public's confidence in them. The ever-rising tide of criticism of judges and our courts makes this a most appropriate time to remind lawyers of their duty to uphold public esteem for our judiciary so as to maintain public confidence in our courts as an institution of government. Some of this current criticism is of such character as to lead to disrespect and loss of confidence in all law, all courts, and all lawyers.

The preamble to the Canons of Professional Ethics as promulgated by the American Bar Association provides:

"In America, where the stability of courts and of all departments of government rests upon the approval of the people, it is peculiarly essential that the system for establishing and dispensing justice be developed to a high point of efficiency and so maintained that the public shall have absolute confidence in the integrity and impartiality of its administration."

Our Government was established with three separate branches specifically to create a balance of power. The checks which each of these branches has on the others are our best insurance that the absolute power necessary to form a tyranny will never vest in any one branch. If the American public loses its respect for our courts, one third of our governmental system of checks and balances will be stripped of its power. This is axiomatic, for no organ has power absent either respect or fear; and fear has never been an arm of democracy. If one of our 3 branches of government may be destroyed, none is safe. Unless our court system can maintain its position of dignity and respect in the eyes of our public, the foundation of our way of life is in danger. The truth inherent in this reasoning is sufficiently grave to merit our thoughtful, objective consideration. Personal reactions and judgment as to any individual recent decision must be laid aside and the grave problem of the current situation considered.

It is deeply disturbing that the nationwide attack on our courts has gone beyond criticism of individual decisions to the hurling of personal insults and vilification at judges and that this type of attack has reached the point where the confidence of the public in our courts as an institution of government may be impaired. Defense of our judiciary as such an institution must not and should not interfere with or impair the right and duty of any man to express reasoned criticism of any decision of any court he believes to be erroneous.

The American people have not hesitated to rebuke powerful and popular Presidents who struck out against the courts and especially the Supreme Court of the United States, and our people are not likely to be swayed by the hysterics of the lunatic fringe. But there is danger indeed, when the courts are assailed by sensible and well-intentioned citizens who have let their disagreement with individual decisions lead them into irresponsible criticism of the courts as an instrument of government.

In discussing this subject one would be less than frank if he did not face up to the fact that while other coutrs have been criticized, the major target of the current criticism is the Supreme Court of the United States. But there are attacks on other courts, and recently an article by a nationally known newspaper columnist made a violently vicious attack on all lawyers and all courts. So while the Supreme Court of the United States is used as an illustration, the problem herein discussed is by no means limited to that Court.

Certain issues which have come before the Supreme Court recently have been highly controversial. The segregation cases, regardless of their resolution, were bound to offend the convictions of an appreciable portion of our population. The internal security decisions grappled with the basic conflict between the rights of the individual and the necessary powers of the sovereign. Again public opinion was bound to be divided. But what case in the Supreme Court is not highly controversial and highly important? There are no easy cases in the Supreme Court of the United States. The more important the case, the more nicely balanced the conflicting interests involved, the more essential it is that criticism and debate concerning the decision be conducted on a high plane.

THE ERIE CASE—A SCHOLARLY OPINION

There is certainly nothing wrong with criticism of judicial decisions. Many great advances in our jurisprudence have stemmed from the reasoned criticism of judicial decisions by lawyers and scholars. It is well to recall the opening sentence of Mr. Justice Brandeis' landmark opinion in *Erie Railroad Company* v. *Tompkins*. "The question for decision," he wrote, "is whether the oft-challenged doctrine of *Swift* v. *Tyson* should now be disapproved." Whether you agree or disagree with his conclusion, you must concede that Mr. Justice Brandeis' scholarly opinion was a tribute to the constructive criticism and searching historical evaluation to which the doctrine of *Swift* v. *Tyson* had been subjected.

Thus, it is not at all disturbing that large numbers of intelligent persons should disagree with the legal reasoning of the Court, the authorities cited, or lack of them or the ultimate decision. But it is extremely serious that personal insults are now hurled at members of the Court in place of criticism directed at their decisions. One may disagree with an opponent, and yet respect him and his motives. Disagreement is a sure sign of intellectual activity—the freedom of thought which is essential to democracy. But when that disagreement runs rampant in the form of malicious charges directed toward undermining and smearing the opponent, this is cause for freedom-loving men to become alarmed. For this type of attack cares little for the virtue of truth.

All of us are somewhat familiar with the history of the Supreme Court of the United States. In its decisions one can trace most of the significant social, political and economic trends and developments of our Nation. The Court began its role as a resolver of great national issues in the classic case of *Marbury* v. *Madison*. The majority opinion by Chief Justice John Marshall stated that conflict between a Federal statute and our Constitution must be resolved in favor of the Constitution, the supreme law of the land. Although this declaration was actually mere dictum, it was widely accepted as controlling on the power of the Court to rule on the validity of Federal statutes.

Opponents lashed out at the language of the opinion. Many eminent men, among them President Jefferson, were extremely critical. They took the position that each branch of the Government had the exclusive power to pass on its own authority. Rational grounds were advanced for this argument. Certainly many persons must have considered the decision that the judiciary could overrule the legislature to be a violent misuse of judicial authority. Yet, now we look upon *Marbury* v. *Madison* as the very cornerstone of constitutional law. Absent this review of the constitutionality of Federal legislation, the basic rights and freedoms we prize would be unprotected. The "gross usurpation" of 1803 is the "genius of John Marshall" today.

McCulloch v. *Maryland* introduced a line of decisions in which the Court established the supremacy of the Federal Government in certain areas of power. Each infringement of States activity and each addition to Federal powers brought forth a new barrage of criticism. So vehement and bitter were the feelings that several plans were suggested to limit or transfer the appellate jurisdiction of the Court where the validity of statutes was involved. A number of eminent persons, including Senators and Representatives, joined in this crusade; but, fortunately, wiser heads prevailed. We now recognize the value of most of these decisions. All sections of our great Nation have pulled together in time of emergency. Our commerce has not been hampered by duties, taxes or retaliatory measures between our States. The Court's interpretations of our Constitution, even in the face of violent opposition at the time when made have made us nationally strong today. And I say this as one who respects and advocates States rights and deplores the ever-expanding octopus of the Executive Branch of the Federal Government. While not a legal matter strictly, it is only fair to insert a footnote here that State inaction in meeting modern needs and problems has contributed largely to that expansion.

THE DRED SCOTT CASE—THE ATTITUDE OF LINCOLN

The equality of man has always been a contentious issue. Every American reads in grade school how the Supreme Court returned Dred Scott to slavery. The hue and cry which arose from the abolitionists then was equal to any modern attack by segregation forces. President Lincoln was extremely displeased with the decision. But he made a statement which we would all do well to ponder:

"We know the court that made it has often overruled its own decisions and we shall do what we can to have it overrule this. We offer no resistance to it."

This was the position of a man willing to shelve his personal disappointment rather than lead an attack as he said against "our whole republican system of Government—a blow which if successful would place all our rights and liberties at the mercy of passion, anarchy, and violence." This must be the position of our legal profession. We must take the lead in upholding respect for our judicial system. Fight particular decisions if you believe they are erroneous. Endeavor to have them overruled. But we must not disparage the status of our courts as an institution of Government by blanket attacks upon the courts, or even a particular court.

It is needless to continue tracing the history of the Supreme Court in support of the thesis herein stated. It is well known to all. Never a decade has passed that some great controversial economic, political or moral issue has not been resolved. Time has proved many of the decisions to be not only correct but brilliant. Others were later seen to be shortsighted or shallow and were overruled. But would we have it otherwise? Would it be better to have as our High Court of Justice a board of nine pacifiers whose chief function is to concede some basic value here and wtihhold a little justice there in an effort to appease a minimum of, say, 90 percent of the public? Or would we have nine legal minds, men, not gods, who wrestle with the great judicial issues of our day and resolve them to the best of their ability? Is our first concern that every decision be correct, important as this is? The answer is clearly no. It is more important that we have independent judges, free to decide unfettered by outside pressures. If unpopular decisions can result in loss of appellate jurisdiction or impeachment of judges, how can we hope that fear of consequences of decisions—or what is even worse, political corruption—may not seep into and rust the scales of justice?

Never forget that there were lawyers to present both sides of every great issue before our courts. The Court is persuaded or urged by lawyers to the decision it announces. Few indeed are the issues that are so one sided that all will agree on the ultimate decision.

We lawyers are part and parcel of this judicial process, and we are the only participants who can perform the public service here proposed. Our clients are not equipped to do it. Self-imposed judicial ethics and tradition forbid any response by the judiciary to attacks upon it, no matter how false or unwarranted those attacks may be.

Canon No. 1 of the American Bar Association's Canons of Professional Ethics provides in part:

"It is the duty of the lawyer to maintain toward the courts a respectful attitude, not for the sake of the temporary incumbent of the judicial office, but for the maintenance of its supreme importance. Judges, not being wholly free to defend themselves, are peculiarly entitled to receive the support of the bar against unjust criticism and clamor."

Judges of our courts speak publicly only in the discharge of their judicial function. They must bear criticism, even irresponsible and vicious criticism, in silence. These men

have given up the right to criticize in order that the rest of us might be secure in that right. But we of the bar have no such restraint upon us. It is, therefore, up to us, the members of the bar, to speak up in defense of our courts as an institution of government. Our duty is to assume leadership here and see to it that our people have the correct facts and a proper appreciation of the place of the courts in our system of government. We cannot be content merely to note the comforting fact that an institution which has survived the petulance and displeasure of a Jefferson, a Jackson, and two Roosevelts—to say nothing of the tirades of lesser men—almost certainly has the strength and vitality to survive present attacks. The bar has its own obligations to discharge, and it is important to all of us that we do not fail in those obligations.

It is not my purpose either to defend or to criticize any particular decision of any court. The basic point is that we of the bar have a duty and a responsibility to perform in maintaining the confidence of the public in our courts. Such confidence is the foundation of our whole system of government, and we must never allow it to be impaired or destroyed. We as a people may talk loud and strong of rights and liberties, but rights are as nothing without a redress and protection in the courts. Chief Justice Marshall so truly said:

"The judicial department comes home in its effects to every man's fireside, it passes upon his property, his reputation, his life, his all."

Recall also that the preamble to our Constitution recites that one of the purposes for which it was created was to "establish justice." Certain it is that the judiciary as one of the three great branches of our Government has always played a basic role in the lives of our people. Our people have a right to justice, soundly and properly administered. And we of the bar have a duty to make the people secure in their rights. We perform that duty by defending the courts against unjust attacks.

Do not forget, either, that the prestige of the bar depends in large part upon public confidence in, and esteem for, the courts as an institution of government. When we are guilty of irresponsible criticism of judges and the courts, we are striking a body blow at our own standing in the estimation of the public. We are in effect fouling our own nest.

These are critical times. The forces of communism are constantly trying to undermine our institutions. One of their principal goals is to create distrust and dissension within our Nation—to make us doubt our way of life. Certainly this is no time for our own people to add impetus to the Red attack. For no institution in our Government is so directly opposed to the concept of a supreme state as our courts. The rule of law and the supreme state cannot coexist.

A PRICELESS HERITAGE—FREEDOM UNDER LAW

As lawyers and officers of the courts, we, of all Americans, are best able to appreciate our priceless heritage of freedom under law. In our daily life we see the great principles of democracy applied by our court system. We tend to take them for granted. But whenever we stop and think, we must recognize that not one of our priceless freedoms—speech, religion, press, even criticism of government—would be safe without the final safeguard of the courts. Our whole future as a Nation and as a people depends upon the maintenance of our independent judiciary to preserve the rights of our people.

It is well to stress again that our court system is not above censure. No organ of government is. None of our institutions are perfect. As Mr. Justice David Brewer of the Supreme Court said in 1898:

"It is a mistake to suppose that the Supreme Court is either honored or helped by being spoken of as beyond criticism."

But there is a vast difference between criticism stemming from constructive analysis of particular decisions and the uninformed, misleading statements and insults which are currently being hurled. As President Lincoln suggested, time spent in ranting and raving would be better used working to establish the fallacy of the unpopular holding. But no degree of disagreement justifies degrading the foremost protection of our finest heritage—freedom under law—a protection only the courts can guarantee.

The American people have traditionally been ready to respect their courts and to look to them as the ultimate guardians of their liberties. "Justice," as Daniel Webster said, "is the greatest interest of man on earth. It is the ligament which holds civilized nations together. Wherever her temple stands, and so long as it is duly honored, there is a foundation for social security, general happiness, and the improvement and progress of our race."

To insure justice in our land, we lawyers must do all in our power to preserve the respect of the public for our courts. We are dually obligated as dedicated servants of the public and as officers of the courts to speak forth on every occasion to maintain confidence in our courts.

The stake of the public at large in this matter is tremendous. A respected and strong judiciary and a respected and strong bar are essential to maintain our system of freedom under law. Maintenance of that freedom is essential to the continued liberty of our people, and the continued liberty of our people is essential to the future of free peoples everywhere.

Dearborn Township Board Condemns Gas Gouge Bill, H. R. 8525

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN D. DINGELL
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 24, 1958

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, as you can recall, the proponents of the gas bill have time and again told us that they presume to speak on behalf of the consuming public in this country.

I am sure that the membership of this House recalls that no consumers were at any time consulted in the drafting of the present natural gas bill, H. R. 8525. To show the concern of true representatives of the consumer I again insert into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the views of elected representatives of consuming families. This time it is a resolution of the Dearborn Township Board, one of the real local units of government in the State of Michigan. These citizen representatives, concerned over the impact of the gas bill on the consuming public in their constituencies, passed a resolution condemning the gas gouge bill, H. R. 8525. I hope all Members of Congress will read this resolution and will understand that passage of H. R. 8525, the gas gouge bill, is not in the public interest.

DEARBORN TOWNSHIP,
Inkster, Mich., February 14, 1958.

Resolution presented by Thorne and supported by Canfield:

"Whereas the Harris-O'Hara bill to remove gas producers prices from Federal control will be heard shortly in the House of Representatives; and

"Whereas natural gas is a natural resource and as such is the property of the people of the United States; and

"Whereas it has been estimated that if this bill passes householders cost in the Detroit area will rise approximately $25 million;

"Whereas if this bill passes no existing agency will be able to police the pricing policies of natural gas: Therefore be it

"*Resolved*, That the Dearborn Township Board at a regular meeting held Tuesday, February 11, 1958, hereby urges each of you to do everything possible to defeat this measure and be it finally resolved that a copy of this resolution be sent to President Eisenhower, all Michigan Congressmen, both United States Senators, the Utilities Commission, House of Representatives and a copy be spread on the minutes of this board.

"Yeas: Bullinger, Thorne, Canfield, Caples, Greenlaw, and Warner.

"Nays: None.

"Motion adopted."

I hereby certify the above is a true copy of a resolution adopted by the Dearborn Township Board convened in regular session February 11, 1958.

WILLIAM H. THORNE,
Clerk, Township of Dearborn.

Fortieth Anniversary of Lithuanian Independence

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD A. GARMATZ
OF MARYLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 24, 1958

Mr. GARMATZ. Mr. Speaker, it has been 40 years since Lithuania was proclaimed an independent country, ending 123 years of Russian rule. What joy and happiness there must have been in that nation at that time! And what progress they made in every area, after their freedom from Russian domination. The Lithuanian people people proved that they were ready and able to assume their place among the free and sovereign nations of the world. But, unfortunately, this independence, this progress, this happiness was shortlived. In 1940 the country was again invaded by Soviet troops, and up to this time is still under Soviet control.

As an American, I am grateful and proud that our Government has never recognized the present Lithuanian regime as representative of the people and has not accorded it diplomatic recognition. But I feel we must do more than that. We must take positive action. Through the United Nations, we must support a firm policy to help Lithuania and all the other captive nations of eastern Europe to regain their freedom and independence.

We must make it possible to bring more refugees from these countries to the United States. The Americans of Lithuanian descent have added much to

our culture and will continue to do so if given the opportunity. We must do everything possible to assist in safeguarding the cultural heritage of Lithuania, whose language and literature are among the oldest in the Western World. On February 15 the Council of Lithuanian Societies of Baltimore again observed Republic of Lithuania Day, and it was my privilege to attend. At this gathering, the following resolution was unanimously adopted:

Resolution unanimously adopted after due deliberation by American citizens of Lithuanian descent, of the city of Baltimore, at the commemoration of the 40th anniversary of Lithuania's independence held under the auspices of the Council of Lithuanian Societies of Baltimore at Lithuanian Hall on the 15th day of February 1958:

"Whereas 40 years have elapsed since February 16, when the Council of Lithuania at Vilnius proclaimed to the world the determination of the Lithuanian people to become an independent nation; and

"Whereas during its brief period of freedom the Republic of Lithuania capably managed its own affairs and successfully and progressively raised the economical, cultural, and educational standards of its people; and

"Whereas as American citizens, we are proud of the fact that the United States Government publicly condemned the flagrant Soviet acts of aggression and violence against Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia, and still recognizes their independence; and

"Whereas freedom-loving people everywhere are placing their hopes, their destinies and their future in the steadfast and unconditional adherence by the free democracies to the principles of justice and humanity: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved, That we Americans of Lithuanian descent, being fully aware of the graveness of the international situation and concerned over the fate of the Lithuanian Nation, urge the Government of the United States to continue to combat the forces of aggression until true and lasting peace is achieved."

Both the mayor of Baltimore and the Governor of Maryland issued special proclamations, which read as follows:

PROCLAMATION BY MAYOR THOMAS D'ALESANDRO, JR., DESIGNATING SUNDAY, FEBRUARY 16, 1958 AS REPUBLIC OF LITHUANIA DAY IN BALTIMORE

Whereas every year, on February 16, the Lithuanian colonies throughout the Nation gather together to commemorate the Independence Day of Lithuania, now temporarily under the domination of a ruthless dictator nation, whose armed might has for the time being crushed all opposition on the part of the freedom-loving people of Lithuania and other nations who eagerly look forward to the day when liberty and justice will prevail throughout the earth; and

Whereas despite cruel and tyrannical suppression, the freedom-loving people of Lithuania never cease to work and pray for liberation from the bonds of enslavement, and look forward with earnest yearning to that happy day when all of Lithuania will be able to enjoy the blessings of peace and contentment; and

Whereas the city of Baltimore is justly proud of the many citizens of Lithuanian birth or ancestry, who have made many important contributions to the civic and industrial welfare of our community, and who have been able to enjoy the freedom denied their compatriots in Lithuania.

Now, therefore, I, Thomas D'Alesandro, Jr., mayor of the city of Baltimore, do hereby proclaim Sunday, February 16, 1958, as Republic of Lithuania Day in Baltimore, and do urge all our citizens to give serious thought to the many cultural and economic contributions made to the welfare of the world by Lithuanians of the past and present, and to join with the people of Lithuania here and in their native country in prayers for the return of peace, so ardently desired by freedom-loving humanity.

In witness whereof, I have hereunto set my hand and cause the great seal of the city of Baltimore to be affixed this 5th day of February, in the year of our Lord, one thousand nine hundred and fifty-eight.

THOMAS D'ALESANDRO, Jr.,
Mayor.

EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENT, ANNAPOLIS, MD., GOVERNOR'S PROCLAMATION, REPUBLIC OF LITHUANIA DAY, FEBRUARY 16, 1958

Lithuania is enslaved, her people have been deported and mass-murdered, religion is ruthlessly suppressed and freedom obliterated.

But it is not easy to shackle a liberty-loving nation. It is doubly difficult when that nation has known the great experience of freedom.

Lithuania has known and gloried in that experience.

We—as Americans—cannot ignore these yearnings for our own basic beliefs. We share the struggles of Lithuania to break the Kremlin yoke.

Showing their faith in a free future, Americans of Lithuanian descent continue to celebrate this day—February 16—as Lithuania's Independence Day.

In recognition of the courage of the Lithuanian people and in support of all men who fight for freedom, I, Theodore R. McKeldin, Governor, proclaim February 16—the 40th anniversary of Lithuania's independence—as Republic of Lithuania Day throughout Maryland.

Given under my hand and the great seal of the State of Maryland, at the city of Annapolis, this 15th day of January, in the year of our Lord, 1958.

THEODORE R. MCKELDIN,
Governor.
CLAUDE B. HELLMANN,
Secretary of State.

The group was honored by the presence of the Honorable Joseph Kajeckas, Chargé d'Affaires ad interim of Lithuania, who addressed them in the Lithuanian language. A translation of his remarks follows:

This anniversary of Lithuania's independence is out of the ordinary. It is the first such anniversary in many years without the late Minister Povilas Zadeikis among us. We grieve at this, but we realize that although the time of his service is past, the aspirations of the country he served remain unchanged, because their source—Lithuania's glorious past, undying rights and national tradition—remains likewise unchanged. Let us open the curtain somewhat on the glorious past.

According to Prof. Clarence Manning, of Columbia University:

"The Lithuanians had established a powerful and independent state in Europe during the Middle Ages. They were able to check the German drive to the east for centuries. They protected Europe against the Mongols and the Tatars. They furnished a power and a government behind which the Eastern Slavs could live in peace and safety with a freedom that was unknown in Muscovite Russia. They blessed their subjects with more human freedoms than in the neighboring countries. They encouraged education and toleration, and they played their part in the general development of European civilization."

We know, however, how the greed of powerful neighbors overwhelmed the progressive, humanistic state of Lithuania, the darkness of a seemingly endless night descending on Lithuania. That night continued until the momentous February 16 that we commemorate today.

Four decades have passed since that day when a group of Lithuanian patriots in Vilnius proclaimed Lithuania a free and independent state, thus fulfilling the prayers and aspirations of many years. Let us recall the path of suffering that was traversed: Unsuccessful insurrections to restore Lithuania's honor; the period of the suppression of the press, accompanied by the smuggling of books into Lithuania; the school of suffering, when mothers secretly taught their children while at the spinning wheel; the exile of persons to Siberia for the use of prayerbooks and texts in the Lithuanian language; the persecution of Muravyov; Kraziai; impressment into military service; Russification; economic subjugation; and even the erasing of Lithuania's name from the map. Such was the fate of Lithuanian sons and daughters, deprived of their ancient state. Such was the sad tale of Lithuania's subjugation.

"Let Lithuania be darkened and silent," the oppressor had said.

But with the Act of February 16, the chains of slavery were broken. Lithuania's breast sighed its relief as the weary nation took on its new life, as Lazarus come from the grave. With the Act of February 16, she turned the imposed shameless page of her history, the story of her suffering, and dedicated herself to the work of reconstruction. Fortunate were those who lived to see that day, but how many were there who closed their eyes on life with the sight of their nation's plight still before them.

One of those who died such an untimely death is the man whose 100th anniversary we celebrate this year, Vincas Kudirka. During the years of freedom, I was fortunate enough to have been able to visit his tomb on the banks of the Sesupe, and during this jubilee year, I remember that visit with pride. That man, besides his numerous writings and the composition of the national anthem, left for his countrymen the advice, "My Lithuania, when your enemies sink their teeth into you, you will survive only if, as a hydra, you grow several heads when one is severed." Today more than ever, the systematic extermination of the Lithuanian nation goes on. Thus, it is appropriate for us to keep Kudirka's warning in mind. At the time when Lithuanian heads in the homeland are being cut off by the enemy's slaughtering, it is at least possible for Lithuanians abroad to help save the situation. Their heads and hearts can be saved for the Lithuanian cause; they not only can, but should be saved, since Lithuania's cause is also the cause of the whole free world. If the light of liberty is extinguished anywhere in the world, the prospect of peace and freedom for all nations is made just that much darker. John Donne rightly said "Ask not for whom the bell tolls: It tolls for thee."

"As many as the dying leaves of autumn," fell Lithuania's sons in defense of her freedom. Let us especially remember on this occasion the brave men who were the signers of Lithuania's Declaration of Independence. Most of them have either passed away or were killed, and to honor their memory and in general to honor all those brave men who gave their lives for Lithuania, I now propose a minute of silent prayer. (* **)

I will not enumerate the blessings of Lithuania's freedom. There are too many among you who have been witnesses to those blessings, and you know them full well. Neither will I detail the darkness and cruelty of Lithuania's present enslavement. Between Lithuania's past freedom and present enslavement, the contrast is enough to sadden the hearts of all men who cherish human dignity and the beautiful and good acts of a brave nation.

On February 16, though, we remember past celebrations, when people having decked their homes with the tricolored symbols of their country, rejoiced in the proud displays and songs of the Lithuanian Army on parade. In villages and towns, men, women, and children of all ages joined their hearts in happy song, while organizations came in bands to the house of prayer to thank their God for the blessings of His peace and the fruits of liberty under the independence won through so many centuries at such a price; they came in throngs to the Tomb of the Unknown Soldier to honor his heroism and of all those who fell in loyalty to his own cause; they went to the public halls to enumerate their achievements, to feasts, toasting a nation reborn in freedom. The invalids of the wars of independence were proud of their sacrifices for the fatherland. That day was always the greatest of occasions for a Lithuanian: The day of his rejoicing and the day of his honor.

So it was in the days of freedom. And now? The conquered banner of our country has been furled; either it is cruelly mangled by the invader's boot, or reverently hidden by men who still keep its faith. Going to church together in organized groups is prohibited. The Lithuanian anthem, during the jubilee year of its composer, is silenced. Lithuania's military uniform is no longer seen, and the soldiers' happy song has died. Silence holds its dominion over the Unknown Soldier's sarcophagus: A cruel and alien hand has scattered and desecrated its honored stones. The enemy's sacrilegious power left no room for the crosses which once stood by that holy shrine, but has irreverently plucked out the symbols of a brave nation's suffering. The bugle's tribute to the colors at this tomb is no longer heard at sunset; the liberty bell, like America's own, that Lithuanian-Americans had given their country, no longer tolls its angelus in accompaniment to the soldiers' prayers as our nation's flag began its descent. That pregnant moment at the sunset when Lithuania's amber, green, and red gave over its domination of our country's rolling fields and peaceful plains to the stillness of night is gone now, and lives only in the memories of men whose burning faith in a once strong, grand, and proud national heritage can never leave their hearts.

The ugliest side of present-day imperalistic communism consists in the fact that they justify the murder and extermination of innocent people, innocent Lithuanians, as being virtuous. If the annihilation of a person or of a nation serves communism, then, in their jargon, "that is good and to be praised." If the trampling on of solemn treaties serves communism, in their dictionary, that is good and meritorious. If lying serves communism, then one can lie as much as possible; the more you lie, the better Communist you are. To serve their purposes, the notions of freedom, independence, democracy, coexistence, peace, colonialism, etc. are distorted beyond recognition.

Let us glance briefly at the record of imperialistic communism's lies, violence and treachery. With Lithuania, the Kremlin had numerous well-written and valid treaties, among them the treaty of nonaggression, but it trampled on these treaties with the clearest of consciences. Stalin isn't blamed for this by his successors; the undertakers of Lithuania's freedom, Molotov and Dekanozov, did not suffer because of the violation of those treaties: they were punished for something else; for the cruel deportation of innocent Lithuanians and Baltic people in general to Siberia, Serov also was not punished. He remains even now firmly entrenched in the Kremlin's upper echelons.

The Soviets speak of the creation of a neutral zone in Eastern Europe. Long ago, such a zone existed in the Baltic States without the helping hand of the Kremlin. The Baltic States freely declared themselves neutral on the eve of the last world war. What better conditions for peaceful coexistence could one dream of? However, such conditions were nat suitable of the Kremlin's carnivorousness.

This month, there is being distributed in the United States a Soviet propaganda magazine in which Moscow praises itself for a new discovery in economics. They supposedly have done away with unemployment in Lithuania, and for this they seek credit. We give them that credit, but it cries to heaven for vengeance, after having killed Lithuanians, after having deported hundreds of thousands of them, after having sent countless other as volunteers to labor in their virgin lands, after having frightened away tens of thousands of Lithuanians as refugees to the western world, they praise themselves for having gotten rid of unemployment. But brains aren't necessary for such a discovery: all one needs is a guitless thirst for blood, and the discovery produced is called barbarism. The Soviet version of their discovery is understandable, however, when we remember that lies and deceit were and are now the Soviets' sputniks: fellow travelers.

Gen. Mark Clark, who negotiated with the Communists for about 10 years, was right when he stated that "There is no decency in the Communists. They'll cheat, they will lie, they will murder, they will do anything to attain their end of world domination, and they will sign a solemn pledge today, fully intending to abrogate that pledge the next day."

Albert Camus, the 1957 Nobel Prize winner, said that "the Hungarian revolt blew to bits the biggest lie of the century: a lie that tried to pass off a regime of police tyranny as a proletarian revolution."

But let us return to our commemoration. Let us, on this solemn occasion, give thanks to those who so much deserve it. First, let us give thanks to the suffering Lithuanian nation. She, by her perseverance, safeguards the aspirations of the Lithuanian people, which aspirations created the basis for the act of February 16. She is preserving those aspirations also at present for a future resurrection of the nation. We are grateful to the signatories of the act of February 16; we especially wish that the three living signers of that act may live to see it renewed in a new birth of freedom. We give thanks to the Lithuanian Army, thanks to which we enjoyed 22 years of independence.

We are grateful to the Government of this country, especially President Eisenhower and Secretary of State John Foster Dulles for their nonrecognition of Lithuania's occupation by force, and for their numerous meaningful statements in that regard, together with the statement that Mr. Dulles made on this particular commemoration this year.

We thank the governors of the several States and mayors of cities of this country for their highly esteemed proclamations throughout the years; also we thank numerous Senators and Congressmen for their many stirring speeches supporting the aspirations of the Lithuanian nation and sympathizing with her plight.

In general, we thank all friends of Lithuania and the great-hearted American people for the various ways in which they have supported Lithuania's cause.

Finally, we thank all our own countrymen and Lithuanian-Americans: those who organize in liberation efforts; federations; alliances; organizations; sponsors of Lithuanian-language radio programs; the reverend clergy; writers and journalists; teachers, especially the sisters in our Lithuanian schools, and all those individual persons who in one way or another have rendered their aid toward Lithuania's liberation, the easing of her plight, and the raising of Lithuania's good name above her great sorrow.

The Lithuanian nation will remain eternally grateful for such wholehearted and noble efforts. She has a long memory as regards her benefactors in the hour of misfortune. Today, Lithuania is stepping into the 5th decade of proclaimed independence, but is also finishing the 18th long year of slavery. She has not yet reached the crest of her Golgotha. One can still not see the end of her way of the cross. But in her suffering and anxiety, she is greater than the so-called Man of the Year for 1957, just as Nero's persecuted Christians were greater than the Emperor who was powerful enough to hold the lives of men in his balance. In the first road of suffering to Golgotha, the long arm of the Roman law was required to force a bystander, Simon of Cyrene, to help carry Christ's cross.

Lithuanians need no police power to help carry the cross of their suffering nation: a Lithuanian heart is sufficient. Thus, especially in this jubilee year, which is also the jubilee year of our country's patron, St. Casimir, let us be determined to bring down the cloud over Lithuania's horizon, to light the fire of freedom once more in her sky, to ease the suffering of Lithuania, to help it keep and persevere in the hope of freedom until the Easter morn and the resurrection of that oppressed nation. For rise it must: it cannot have suffered so much in vain. God bless our common efforts to this end.

In this connection I would also like to insert in the RECORD a translation of a message broadcast by Mr. Kajeckas to the Lithuanian nation, over the Voice of America program, on the 40th anniversary of Lithuanian independence.

Fellow countrymen, free Lithuanians are well aware of your thoughts which you hide from the occupant on February 16th. We are members of the same body, and we feel in unison. Therefore, while observing this anniversary, we are mourning your lot, and deeply sympathize with you.

This year we are also observing the memory of Vincas Kudirka. This is the centennial anniversary of his birth. On all the continents, free Lithuanians are singing his anthem which is banned in his own homeland.

Three days later is the 20th anniversary of the death of Adomas Jakštas. A great many of you remember him. According to Vaižgantas, he was the third pillar of the Lithuanian nation, beside Basanavičius and Kudirka. He escaped exile to Siberia only because he happened to die on the eve of Lithuania's dusk.

A free Lithuanian today renews his determination to work and to make sacrifices for the sacred rights of Lithuania, and a brighter tomorrow. We firmly believe in that morrow. You must believe, also.

Lithuanian day is celebrated in America en masse and in solemnity. Gratitude is voiced to the United States Government for not recognizing, until this day, the act of violence against Lithuania. The Lithuanian tricolor waves proudly above the Legation of Lithuania in Washington, to remind of your rights and of the injustice done to you. This tricolor waves proudly and freely, just a few blocks away from the Embassy of the oppressor of the Lithuanian people. The Lithuanian Legation receives visitors, fellow nationals and others, who call to pay respects to the representatives of a free Lithuania, your representative, and to wish for his people freedom, and an end to suffering.

Captive brothers and sisters, I greet you most sincerely on this honorable anniversary. I wish you undaunted hope and perseverance in your trial. I also voice my thanks to you. You and your parents have preserved the nation's aspirations which formed the basis for the act of February 16th. By your suffering under the injustice and by your perseverance you continue to attest to the world that the Lithuanian people's aspira-

tions remain alive and that the nonrecognition of the occupation correctly reflects your will.

During this anniversary year of independence and Kudirka, let us seek strength from Lithuania's past: Let thy sons seek strength from thy past.

Let us take strength and solace also from the other honorable anniversary—that of St. Casimir. This year is the 500th anniversary of his birth. His interceding for Lithuania to God is influential and certain. Lithuania is closest to his heart.

May God protect you during this jubilee year, and bring closer to you the dawn of real freedom, so well earned by your suffering.

Secretary of State Dulles, on the 40th anniversary of the declaration of Lithuanian, Latvian, and Estonian independence, issued the following statement, which I believe should be included in the RECORD:

This year marks the 40th anniversary of the declarations of national independence of the peoples of Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia. Although in 1920 the Soviet Union recognized their independence, renouncing forever all sovereign rights in the Baltic States, in 1940 the Soviet Government forcibly incorporated Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia into the Soviet Union. This action was quickly denounced by the United States Government.

The United States remains convinced that relations between all nations must be governed by the principle of equality and guided by justice and law. It believes that the peoples of Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia have a firm right to choose their own political, economic, and cultural systems. Determination, industry, and love of freedom characterize the peoples of these Baltic States. These qualities have enabled their kinsmen here to make a valuable contribution to the development of the United States. The United States Government is confident that the same qualities will carry the peoples of Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia successfully through the present tragic days and enable them to regain the rights of which they have been unjustly deprived.

Mutual Savings Banks Threatened

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 18, 1958

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I am again calling attention to proposed legislation which would be most unfair to mutual thrift institutions, their members, and their depositors. Mr. Edward P. Clark points out this unfairness in his statement before the House Ways and Means Committee on January 27, 1958, as follows:

SUMMARY STATEMENT OF EDWARD P. CLARK ON BEHALF OF MUTUAL SAVINGS BANKS' COMMITTEE ON TAXATION BEFORE THE HOUSE WAYS AND MEANS COMMITTEE, JANUARY 27, 1958

My name is Edward P. Clark. I am president of the Arlington Five Cents Savings Bank in Arlington, Mass. I appear on behalf of the country's more than 500 mutual savings banks and their depositors. We appreciate the opportunity of appearing before you.

We have filed a full statement of our views, and I respectfully ask that you make it part of the official record of these hearings. In the brief time I have, I can only summarize briefly our views. We strongly urge you to take no action which would reduce our allowable reserves for losses or limit our deduction for interest to savings depositors.

Mutual savings banks have no stock or stockholders. They are operated solely for the benefit of their depositors. They do not engage in a general banking business, as do commercial banks, and are not obliged to use part of their earnings as dividends to stockholders.

Savings banks are operated under strict State supervision. All earnings are distributed annually to depositors, except for amounts required for necessary reserves. All distributions to depositors are taxable.

For more than 100 years, our principal function has been to promote thrift and encourage personal savings. As the President indicated in his Economic Report, personal savings are vital to the future of our country. We now have savings deposits of more than $31 billion in some 21 million separate accounts. More than 2,400,000 of our accounts are held by school children. The average deposit on July 1, 1957, was $1,431.26.

Another important function of mutual savings banks has been to provide home financing. On September 30, 1957, we had about 60 percent of our assets, or $20.8 billion in mortgage loans, mostly residential. We have furnished funds for homes not only in our own 17 States, principally in the Northeast, but in the South and West as well. As of November 30, 1957, we held about $3.6 billion in mortgage loans in nonsavings-bank States. These States include Arkansas, California, Florida, Louisiana and Texas.

The $31 billion-plus of savings deposits must be protected against the losses which are inevitable in poor times. Since mutual savings banks have no stockholders, they must protect these deposits by retaining a portion of their earnings as surplus, undivided profits and reserves. To do any good, these moneys must be accumulated in advance of losses. The importance of retained earnings to the savings banks and their depositors is a vital point on which they differ from all stock corporations. It is also the only point on which their tax treatment is in any way different from that of stock corporations.

When Congress repealed the exemption of mutual savings banks in 1951, it recognized that the safety of the depositors' savings and the continued existence of these mutual institutions depended on their ability to accumulate adequate surplus as reserves. Accordingly, it provided that if their total surplus, undivided profits and reserves were less than 12 percent of deposits, they might add any or all of their taxable income to a bad debt reserve until the surplus, undivided profits and reserves equaled 12 percent of deposits.

These tax-deductible additions to bad debt reserves can be used only for losses. If used for other purposes, they become subject to tax. When total surplus, undivided profits and reserves equal or exceed 12 percent of deposits, no further earnings may be retained without payment of tax.

H. R. 8737 would reduce the 12 percent to 5 percent. The record of the 1930's shows that at least 12 percent is necessary. In 1929 the mutual savings banks had book reserves of 11.5 percent. They survived only because they were able to reduce interest rates to depositors faster than their earnings declined so that a substantial portion of the losses could be met from current income. In some instances interest to depositors was reduced from 4½ and 5 percent to 1 percent. This is bad because interest is needed by depositors during tough times.

There is a mistaken impression that the bad-debt reserve allowance of mutual savings banks gives them an advantage over commercial banks in competing for savings deposits. This is not the case. Amounts placed in bad-debt reserves can be used only to protect deposits against losses. They cannot be used to pay more interest to depositors and thus attract more deposits.

The real complaint of commercial banks is that they pay more corporate income tax than mutual institutions. But this is not the result of the mutuals' reserve provisions. The reason commercial banks pay more corporate tax than mutual banks is that they have stockholders. For every dollar they pay in dividends to stockholders, they have to pay a dollar in tax. This corporate tax burden will not be reduced 1 cent by changing the 12 percent figure to 5 percent. As a matter of fact, a substantial number of mutual savings banks (51 out of 128 in New York State alone) have more than 12 percent in surplus, undivided profits, and reserves accumulated long prior to 1951. The Internal Revenue Service has ruled that institutions in their situation are not entitled to a bad debt reserve, and cannot have a deduction for additions to bad-debt reserves. To that extent the commercial banks have a tax advantage over them. Even so, they pay less corporate tax than commercial banks, because they distribute the bulk of their earnings as interest to depositors and do not pay dividends to stockholders.

Though commercial banks pay more corporate income tax than mutual banks, the mutuals and their depositors furnish the Treasury with the same revenues per $1,000 of assets as the commercial banking industry. The attached exhibit I shows revenue of $4.86 generated per $1,000 of assets in the savings bank industry in 1956 as compared to $4.87 in the commercial bank industry.

In 1956 savings banks paid out 68.11 percent of their gross earnings as interest to depositors. In the same year, insured commercial banks paid out only 15.1 percent of their gross earnings as interest to depositors and cash dividends to stockholders. These figures show that mutual savings banks place a much higher percentage of their current earnings in the tax stream through their depositors than commercial banks through their depositors and stockholders. Commercial banks place net retained earnings in free surplus, which can be used to pay dividends to stockholders or to increase the value of stock which can be disposed of at capital-gains rates. No savings bank depositor can derive any capital gain from retained earnings. The sole function of these earnings is to protect the savings.

Mutual savings banks must margin new deposits by 12 percent in order to protect them. A bank whose deposits have increased by $2 million must be able to set aside $240,000 for their protection. Otherwise, the safety of all existing deposits will be diluted, and the trustees would likely decide under these circumstances to limit the acceptance of new deposits. This would have the effect of reducing funds available for home financing everywhere, and particularly in nonsavings banks States, including Arkansas, California, Florida, Georgia, Louisiana, and Texas, in which mutual savings banks have in recent years invested approximately $3.6 billion.

Congress determined in 1951 that 12 percent surplus, undivided profits, and reserves were required as a total reserve to protect depositors. Since then there has been no test of the adequacy of such reserve. In New York State the minimum statutory reserve is 10 percent of deposits; to this must be added other reserves determined by the supervisory authorities and trustees to be necessary. In Massachusetts the minimum statutory reserve is 7½ percent, and the maximum 15¼ percent of deposits. The supervisors in the principal savings banks States advised Congress in 1951 that surplus, undivided profits, and reserves of 13 to 15 percent of deposits are required. These authorities are in the best position to determine what constitutes adequate reserves. Such reserves can only be accumulated through retained earnings.

In addition to exhibit I showing a comparison of probable revenues from the two industries, I have several other exhibits attached to my statement, all of which are very important.

Exhibit II is intended to correct an important misunderstanding, to wit, the confusion between adequacy of a bad debt reserve and adequacy of a bank's capital. Some commercial bankers imply that mutual institutions are allowed a bad debt reserve of 12 percent of deposits while commercial banks are allowed only 1 percent. It is erroneous to say that mutual savings banks have a 12 percent bad debt reserve. When these banks became taxable in 1952, the surplus, undivided profits and reserves constituted part of the 12 percent. If a savings bank's surplus, undivided profits and reserves exceed 12 percent, it is fully taxable. If they are under 12 percent, the bank can retain tax free only such earnings as are added to qualified bad debt reserves and then only until the total of its surplus, undivided profits and reserves equal 12 percent of deposits.

Exhibit III compares the growth of savings deposits of mutual and commercial banks from December 30, 1950, to September 25, 1957. It shows there has been no great disparity in the growth of savings accounts during that entire period. Exhibit IV, dealing with the period December 31, 1956, to September 25, 1957, shows that the growth of savings deposits in commercial banks has greatly exceeded that in mutual savings banks. There is no factual basis for the charge that commercial banks have been handicapped by our reserve provisions in the competition for savings.

H. R. 8737 would also limit the deduction of mutual savings banks for interest paid to depositors to 3 percent. Today all taxpayers, including individuals and business corporations, are allowed to deduct in full interest paid, and there is no reason for any deviation from this general rule in the case of the banking industry. Mutual savings banks are required by law in most States to pay out all earnings to depositors, except amounts required for reserves. If any ceiling on interest paid by banks is desirable, it should be set by the supervisory officials, and then only in an emergency.

Traditionally mutual savings banks have paid more interest than commercial banks. This is shown in exhibit V, a table of interest rates paid by mutual savings banks and commercial banks from 1935 to 1956, inclusive. This is because they do not have to appropriate any income for stockholders.

Exhibit VI contains pertinent information which will enable the committee to evaluate the statements which Mr. Athur T. Roth presented to this committee on January 23, 1958, relative to the taxation of mutual savings banks.

We therefore urge that no action be taken by your committee on H. R. 8737 or any other similar proposal.

Exhibit I

Comparison of tax revenues per $1,000 assets of insured mutual savings banks and commercial banks for 1956

	Insured mutual savings banks	Insured commercial banks
Total assets Dec. 31, 1956	$25,282,000,000.00	$216,145,000,000.00
Interest to savings depositors	609,000,000.00	806,000,000.00
Dividends to stockholders	0	617,000,000.00
Total interest and dividends	609,000,000.00	1,423,000,000.00
Federal income taxes:		
Estimated taxes paid by savings depositors and stockholders [1]	122,000,000.00	285,000,000.00
Taxes by institutions	1,000,000.00	770,000,000.00
Total Federal income taxes	123,000,000.00	1,055,000,000.00
Total Federal income tax per $1,000 of year-end assets	4.86	4.87

[1] Estimated tax liability is based on minimum tax rate for 1956.

Source: Annual Report of the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation for 1956. See tables 107, 108, 115. All amounts have been rounded off to the nearest million.

Exhibit II

Capital accounts as a percentage of deposits—commercial banks compared with mutual savings banks as of September 30, 1957

(There has been much misunderstanding about the so-called bad debt reserves of mutual savings banks. The bad debt reserve so-called of 12 percent for the mutual savings banks is in fact the entire capital fund which has been accumulated by them for years by way of surplus and undivided profits. The so-called bad debt reserve, which is an incorrect designation, should be compared with the capital accounts of commercial banks plus their bad debt reserve in the following table.)

ALL COMMERCIAL BANKS

	Percent
Capital, surplus, undivided profits, and reserves other than bad debt reserves, approximately	[1] 10
Adjusted to include commercial banks' bad debt reserve of about 1 percent of deposits	1
Adjusted to include suggested additional 4 percent of deposits for commercial banks	4
Total allowance of tax-free capital and reserves	15

MUTUAL SAVINGS BANKS

	Percent
Surplus, undivided profits and reserves (includes bad debt reserves), approximately	[1] 11
Ceiling on tax-free accumulation of surplus, undivided profits and reserves under present law	12

[1] The above figures are derived by calculating the ratio of capital accounts to deposits of commercial banks, as shown in the Federal Reserve Bulletin of November 1957 and the ratio of surplus, undivided profits and reserves to deposits of mutual savings banks, as shown in reports of the National Association of Mutual Savings Banks. The figures so derived, 9.1 percent and 9.9 percent, respectively, were then adjusted upward by about 1 percent in each case to allow for the higher valuation placed upon bank assets under Treasury regulations than in published bank statements, which by banking law and tradition includes writeoffs which are not recognized for tax purposes.

It is perfectly apparent that if the commercial banks obtain an orthodox bad debt reserve of 5 percent of deposits (which would be an increase from about 1 to 5 percent), they would not be subject to taxation for some years until this maximum accumulation has been reached, except such amount as might become due as they appropriate earnings to pay cash dividends to their stockholders.

Exhibit III

Comparison of growth of savings deposits in mutual savings banks with commercial banks from Dec. 30, 1950, to Sept. 25, 1957, inclusive

(Much has been said about the competitive disadvantage of the commercial banks in obtaining savings accounts but the table below shows that they have not lost ground in the savings field. In the early 1950's many large commercial banks evidenced little interest in savings deposits.)

Savings deposits in—	Dec. 30, 1950	Sept. 25, 1957	Percentage increase
Mutual savings banks	$20,009,000,000	$31,190,000,000	55.88
Commercial banks	36,503,000,000	55,420,000,000	51.82

Source: Federal Reserve Bulletin, November 1957, p. 1245.

Exhibit IV

Comparison of growth of savings deposits of mutual savings banks and commercial banks from Dec. 31, 1956, to Sept. 25, 1957

(This table illustrates that during recent months, after many commercial banks raised their interest rate to 3 percent, the savings accounts in commercial banks increased at a much faster rate than those in mutual savings banks.)

Savings deposits in—	Dec. 31, 1956	Sept. 25, 1957	Percentage increase
Mutual savings banks	$30,001,000,000	$31,190,000,000	3.96
Commercial banks	50,908,000,000	55,420,000,000	8.86

Source: Federal Reserve Bulletin, November 1957, p. 1245.

EXHIBIT V

Comparison of interest rates on savings deposits paid by mutual savings banks and insured commercial banks, 1935–56

	Mutual savings banks	Insured commercial banks
1935	2.60	2.01
1936	2.53	1.72
1937	2.43	1.62
1938	2.36	1.55
1939	2.26	1.43
1940	2.12	1.30
1941	2.05	1.20
1942	2.02	1.10
1943	1.93	.93
1944	1.85	.87
1945	1.80	.87
1946	1.74	.84
1947	1.83	.87
1948	1.87	.90
1949	1.97	.91
1950	2.07	.94
1951	2.19	1.03
1952	2.48	1.15
1953	2.59	1.24
1954	2.67	1.32
1955	2.75	1.38
1956	2.85	1.58

Source: Annual reports of the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation and National Association of Mutual Savings Banks.

EXHIBIT VI

STATEMENTS AND TESTIMONY OF ARTHUR T. ROTH

Mr. Arthur T. Roth, president of the Franklin National Bank of Long Island, which advertises itself as "the dominant bank" of Greater Long Island, testified before this committee on January 23, 1958, as the self-appointed representative of the commercial banks. Mr. Roth's testimony is part of a New York legislative struggle over a proposed amendment to the banking laws to allow savings banks to have branch offices in the suburbs, which, if successful, would break down the protective wall of his dominant position. Mr. Roth filed with this committee large excerpts of a report of the New York State Bankers Association (in the drafting of which he had an important part) submitted to the New York State Legislature. We do not desire to trouble this committee with a recapitulation of the arguments which have raged in Albany for the past few years. We therefore direct this appendix principally to the points in Mr. Roth's verbal statement.

COMPARISON OF TAXES PAID

Mr. Roth has dramatically, with the aid of an artistically prepared graph, pointed out that his bank paid more in Federal tax in 1955 than all insured mutual savings banks, and has related this figure to deposits. This comparison is misleading. In the first place, he has compared the savings deposits of mutual savings banks with the combined savings and demand deposits of his bank. Franklin National paid no interest on the demand deposits and made most of its taxable profits through the use of the interest-free demands deposits. In the second place, his bank paid taxes because it retained earnings for stockholders. Mutual savings banks have no stockholders. Franklin National's payments of interest to savings depositors, like those of the mutual savings banks, were made before tax.

In evaluating Mr. Roth's figures as to the taxes paid by the Franklin National Bank and the mutual savings banks, it should be noted that in 1955 the insured mutual savings banks paid out $536,256,000 in interest to depositors, which at 20 percent would have produced from the depositors $107,251,000 in taxes, while the Franklin National paid no cash dividends to stockholders and only $3,573,620 as interest on deposits, which at 20 percent would have produced $714,724 in tax from the depositors. As a proportion of assets, Franklin National generated in 1955 $7 in tax per $1,000 of assets, while the insured mutual savings banks generated $4.62 per $1,000. Although the tax generated by the Franklin National exceeds that of the mutual savings banks, the difference in revenue realized by the Treasury from the two operations is nowhere as large as Mr. Roth would have this committee believe.

Franklin National kept large sums out of the tax stream by paying nominal amounts of cash to its stockholders, $2.85 per share for the entire period from 1950 to 1957, inclusive. During the same period it distributed very large stock dividends which were not taxable in the hands of its stockholders. These stock dividends were as follows:

	Percent
1950	9.3
1951	101.60
1952	6.62
1953	34.26
1954	4.9
1955	3.87
1956	30.23
1957	2.5

Moreover, in 1955 there was a stock splitup of 2 shares for 1.

Parenthetically, it should be added that these facts make it obvious that Mr. Roth's bank has suffered no competitive disadvantage by reason of the reserve provisions of the mutual savings banks.

OUT-OF-STATE LENDING

In fighting the mutual savings banks in New York State, Mr. Roth has seized on every issue he could use to protect his dominant position. He has objected strenuously to the savings banks' sending New York savings funds to southern and western States for home loans. He has favored restrictions against out-of-State lending by New York savings banks.

RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD is located in Statuary Hall, House wing, where Mr. Raymond F. Noyes is in attendance during the sessions of Congress to receive orders for subscriptions to the RECORD at $1.50 per month, and where single copies may also be purchased. Orders are also accepted for the printing of speeches in pamphlet form.

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. No sale shall be made on credit (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board, or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D. C., at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer plus 50 percent: *Provided*, That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized bookdealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by bookdealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

PRICE OF THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

The Public Printer is authorized to furnish to subscribers the daily RECORD at $1.50 per month, payable in advance.

Remit by money order payable to Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D. C.

PRINTING OF CONGRESSIONAL RECORD EXTRACTS

It shall be lawful for the Public Printer to print and deliver upon the order of any Senator, Representative, or Delegate, extracts from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the person ordering the same paying the cost thereof (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 185, p. 1942).

CHANGE OF RESIDENCE

Senators, Representatives, and Delegates who have changed their residences will please give information thereof to the Government Printing Office, that their addresses may be correctly given in the RECORD.

Daily Digest

HIGHLIGHTS

Senate cleared for President bill to increase debt limit and took up bill on postal rates.

Senate

Chamber Action

Routine Proceedings, pages 2213–2236

Bills Introduced: 15 bills and 3 resolutions were introduced, as follows: S. 3332–3346; S. J. Res. 154; S. Con. Res. 67; and S. Res. 264. Page 2218

Bills Reported: Reports were made as follows:

S. 1438, to amend the U. S. Code relating to the bonds of U. S. Marshals (S. Rept. 1300);

S. 2239, 2493, 2613, 2691, 2718, 2819, 803, 2712, 2538, 2621, 2650, 2657, 2733, 2818, and 2849, private bills (S. Repts. 1301–1315);

S. 213, to confer jurisdiction on Court of Claims to render judgment on customs employees' claims to extra pay for overtime services performed after August 31, 1931 (S. Rept. 1316);

S. Con. Res. 67, private bill (S. Rept. 1317);

S. 3341, to extend the special school milk program for 3 years (S. Rept. 1318);

S. 3342, to extend for 3 years the dairy products program for the armed services (S. Rept. 1319);

S. 3343, to extend the brucellosis eradication program for 2 years (S. Rept. 1320); and

H. R. 5836, to readjust postal rates and to establish a congressional policy for the determination of postal rates, with amendments (S. Rept. 1321). Page 2217

Bill Rereferred: Committee on Banking and Currency was discharged from further consideration of S. 2594, to transfer certain property and functions of the Housing and Home Finance Administrator to the Secretary of the Interior, and the bill was then rereferred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. Pages 2222–2223

Private Bill: Senate cleared for President's signature S. 1714, private bill, after concurring in House amendments thereto. Page 2230

Nevada Land: Conference report on S. 1568, conveyance of certain public land in Nevada to Colorado River Commission of Nevada, was adopted. This action cleared the bill for the President's signature. Page 2267

Debt Limit Increase: Senate passed without amendment and cleared for President H. R. 9955, to increase temporarily the public debt limit by $5 billion. Prior to this action, Senate rejected by 12 yeas to 74 nays, Cotton motion to recommit the bill to Committee on Finance, and rejected by 27 yeas to 56 nays, Lausche amendment to confine the debt limit increase to $3 billion instead of $5 billion.

Motion to reconsider the vote passing the bill was tabled. Pages 2236–2239, 2243–2249, 2252–2261, 2272–2273

Postal Rates: H. R. 5836, to readjust postal rates and to establish a congressional policy for the determination of postal rates, was made Senate's unfinished business. Page 2273

U. S. S. *Arizona* Memorial: H. R. 5809, to provide for a U. S. S. *Arizona* Memorial at Pearl Harbor, was displaced as Senate's unfinished business when motion was adopted to consider H. R. 5836, postal rate bill. Pages 2243, 2273

Nominations: Nomination of John M. Allison, of D. C., to be Ambassador to Czechoslovakia, and three judicial nominations, were received. Page 2275

Program for Tuesday: Senate recessed at 6:33 p. m. until noon Tuesday, February 25, when it will consider H. R. 5836, postal rate bill. Pages 2273, 2275

Committee Meetings

(*Committees not listed did not meet*)

PRICE SUPPORTS

Committee on Agriculture and Forestry: Subcommittee on Agricultural Production, Marketing, and Stabilization of Prices continued its hearings on proposed legislation dealing with price supports, today on supports for milk and dairy products. Testimony was received from Senator Proxmire; Gordon K. Zimmerman, director of research, National Grange; and Herbert W. Voorhees and Frank K. Woolley, both of American Farm Bureau Federation.

Hearings continue tomorrow.

Appendix

Concentration on Colleges of Education Aid Proposals

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MIKE MANSFIELD
OF MONTANA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, February 25, 1958

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Leading Education Aid Proposals Concentrate Largely on Colleges," written by George W. Oakes, and published in the Washington Sunday Star of February 23, 1958. Mr. Oakes is a special writer for the Star. He is one of the most competent men in the field of education. He has given the subject much study, both at home and abroad. I believe that what Mr. Oakes has to say will be of great value to Members of the Senate in their consideration of the numerous legislative proposals covering the field of education which will undoubtedly come before the Senate during the course of this session.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LEADING EDUCATION AID PROPOSALS CONCENTRATE LARGELY ON COLLEGES

(By George W. Oakes)

The congressional search for a politically practical Federal aid-to-education program now appears to have narrowed to two major approaches—the administration plan and the Hill-Elliott bills. There are many other bills, of course, but these are the ones receiving the most attention and likely to receive the most support.

Proponents of an all-out aid program are far from satisfied with either bill, declaring that they deal only indirectly with two major needs—additional school facilities and higher pay and quality standards for teachers. But they are inclined to go along with the proposals in the belief that politically they are the best that can be obtained at this time—and with the secret hope that expansion of their provisions can be accomplished during consideration in House and Senate.

Both the $1 billion administration plan and the $3.5 billion Hill-Elliott bills are similar in two basic respects—each attacks the educational problem mainly at the college rather than the school level and each puts the greatest stress on the sciences and mathematics. The problem of raising the quality and standards of school teachers—generally recognized as fundamental to any real improvement in American education—receives secondary though important attention in both pieces of legislation.

FIGURES SHOW PROBLEM

A few facts from the Office of Education based on the current school year show how critical the school problem is:

1. Enrollment increased by 1.3 million full-time students in public elementary and secondary schools for a total of 32.9 million pupils—an increase of 4.3 percent over a year ago.

2. There were 91,200 full-time teachers with substandard certificates—an increase of 1,800 or 2 percent over a year ago.

3. The number of pupils in excess of normal capacity in public elementary and secondary schools was reported by the States as 1,937,000—of which 70.9 percent were in elementary schools.

4. The States reported that a total of 140,000 additional classrooms were needed in the fall of 1957.

The chief ways in which the administration and Hill-Elliott bills would tackle these problems is through proposals to increase the number and quality of teachers. Senator Hill states that $1.2 billion of 40 percent of the total funds recommended under his proposal will provide Federal assistance for programs directly benefiting secondary and elementary schools.

These include fellowships for graduate study, an expansion of teacher summer institutes and extension courses and funds for other devices to improve the standards of school teachers.

However the Hill-Elliott and administration bills only include small amounts for the most serious single problem school teachers face—inadequate pay. Federal funds for teachers are considered politically explosive at the school level because of integration and at college level because denominational and some private institutions might fear indirect Federal control.

SCIENTISTS BACK HUMANITIES

Despite the fact that both the administration and Hill-Elliott bills stress the sciences and mathematics, the scientists themselves are the most ardent opponents of legislation that would give undue preference to these subjects. Their voices are the loudest for aid to both humanities and science even if the aim is simply to produce outstanding scientists.

Research scientists like Dr. Isidor Rabi and scientific educators, such as President Fred Hovde of Purdue University, emphasize that the broad approach is the only wise one in attacking our educational problem. House and Senator committee members plan to call for testimony from leading scientists and scientific educators in order to dramatize this point. In fact, the prospects are that Senator HILL would be prepared to broaden his bill to give greater scope to the humanities in relation to the sciences.

College scholarships at a cost of $160 million per year are perhaps the dominant feature of the Hill-Elliott bill. At present it is estimated that 60,000 to 100,000 of the top 10 percent of the Nation's high school students do not go on to college mainly for financial reasons.

VARYING SCHOLARSHIP TOTALS

Although both the National Education Association, which favors an annual Federal education appropriation starting at $1 billion now and rising to $4.5 billion per year in 4 years, and the American Council on Education both support federally-financed college scholarships, each organization only proposes 20,000 per year whereas the Hill-Elliott bill would establish 40,000 annually. The administration bill would provide for about 10,000 scholarships.

As presently drafted, the Hill-Elliott legislation would not include the factor of need in granting these scholarships. The authors recognize that unless both need and ability determine the awards, many who can afford to pay for a college education will obtain it at the Government's expense. Therefore they are likely to make their bill conform to the administration's in this respect.

But neither bill takes account of the fact that nearly all college students cost more to educate than they pay in tuition fees. College presidents are pointing out that Federal funds for facilities, equipment, etc., should acompany any large-scale scholarship program.

Regardless of any Federal scholarship impact, college facilities will have to be doubled by 1970 mere to meet the needs of an expanding population. For this reason the American Council on Education urges that an initial amount of $375 million in Federal grants and loans be made available for construction of academic facilities not provided for in either administration or Hill-Elliott bills.

This would be in addition to the present college housing loan program which the administration proposes to increase. But Senator HILL would postpone action on Federal funds for college facilities until the first steps now being recommended are enacted.

CONSTRUCTION ISSUES

Last year school construction legislation, favored then but not now by the administration, failed by a handful of votes in the House, killed by the integration issue.

Both major proposals now before Congress were drawn up on the assumption that school construction cannot be enacted in this session primarily because integration, effective as a guillotine before Little Rock, would be more devastating today.

They fear that insertion of a school construction plan would again split supporters of aid to education over the integration issue.

It's quite possible that the business recession may present a compelling argument for such public works programs as school construction and college buildings. Already some governors and Senators are calling for schools rather than post offices.

If the normal spring pickup in employment should not be substantial, this new factor may turn out to overshadow traditional objections to Federal aid and may even revise the political strategy of such vigorous supporters as Senator HILL. The PWA in the 30's, using mostly Federal funds, built thousands of our present schools throughout the country.

Emergency Public Works Grants

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALBERT GORE
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, February 25, 1958

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in

the Appendix of the RECORD a resolution adopted by the Tennessee Municipal League, which urges a public works program to provide employment opportunities for those who are now unemployed.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESOLUTION ON EMERGENCY PUBLIC WORKS GRANTS BY FEDERAL GOVERNMENT ADOPTED BY BOARD OF DIRECTORS, TENNESSEE MUNICIPAL LEAGUE, FEBRUARY 10, 1958

Resolved, That Mayor Ben West of Nashville be requested to confer with members of the Tennessee congressional delegation concerning a PWA-type Federal program of emergency grants for State and local public works projects;

Resolved further, That any such program should incorporate the principle of direct city-Federal relationships in grants for projects under municipal jurisdiction, and similar direct contacts for projects under State or county jurisdiction;

Resolved further, That any such program enacted by Congress should include grants for the following types of public works facilities: public buildings, fire halls, etc.; streets, sidewalks, curbs, and bridges; drainage; parks and playgrounds; schools; docks, and harbor facilities; hospitals; sewerage, and water systems; incinerators; refuse disposal equipment; airports; and similar projects.

It is believed that in lieu of establishing a new public works agency to achieve the fastest economic relief to distressed areas, the authorization of funds to the Army Corps of Engineers and Bureau of Reclamation for water resource development will give the best results.

Such a program could be carried out as follows:

1. Institute widespread program of local flood prevention and drainage projects to provide maximum employment by use of hand labor for channel clearing, brush removal, snagging, etc. Much of this could be put underway in a short time because of small amount of engineering needed. This is best for rural areas. (See following list for representative examples.)

2. Replace funds deleted by Bureau of the Budget from Corps of Engineers and Bureau of Reclamation fiscal year 1959 construction program and add to this any additional funds which can be efficiently utilized for continuing projects or new starts in original fiscal year 1959 program.

3. Urge passage of omnibus rivers and harbors bill by House resolution to provide authorization for new, well-justified projects.

4. Provide funds for any worthwhile projects already authorized but in deferred status or in the new omnibus bill.

5. Urge passage of bills authorizing municipal and industrial water supply, recreation, etc., to be credited as monetary benefits.

6. Urge passage of a bill which would revise criteria for establishing benefit-cost ratio to permit crediting of economic benefits to regions caused by impact of the project on both construction employment and future industrial development potential.

CONGRESSIONAL RESPONSIBILITY

The responsibility for the authorization of Federal projects, and of controlling the funds appropriated for their construction, rests with Congress.

The Bureau of the Budget is infringing upon and thwarting the authority of Congress by selecting projects for construction and allocating funds appropriated by Congress for such specific projects.

We are opposed to these practices of the Bureau of the Budget and recommend that Congress now reassert its constitutional authority and responsibility and direct that the funds appropriated by Congress be expended for the specific purposes for which the appropriations are made, and that Congress prevent attempts by the Bureau of the Budget to exercise control over the mandates of Congress.

BENEFITS

We urge Congress to establish a formula which will assign an economic value to all benefits, direct and indirect, resulting from water resource projects, including domestic and industrial water supply, irrigation, pollution abatement, enhanced land values, recreational advantages and economic benefits associated therewith, as well as those benefits presently recognized, and that such values be used in computing the benefits-to-cost ratio of all such projects.

Public-works improvements available for immediate construction—Clearing, channel improvement, or levee projects for flood control

TENNESSEE	
Oneida, Tenn. (Pine Creek)	$200,000
Collins River, Tenn. (agricultural area)	100,000
Woodbury, Tenn. (Stones River)	25,000
Franklin, Tenn. (Harpeth River)	100,000
Spring City, Tenn. (Piney River)	50,000
Soddy, Tenn. (Soddy Creek)	150,000
Big Brush Creek, Tenn. (agricultural area)	400,000
Fayetteville, Tenn. (Elk River)	50,000
Chambers Creek, Miss.-Tenn. (agricultural area)	400,000
Owl Creek, Tenn. (agricultural area)	50,000
Lake County (Harris ditch)	300,000
Wolf River	2,900,000
Loosahatchie River	2,000,000
Dyersburg flood protection	290,000
Obion and Forked Deer Rivers	8,000,000
ALABAMA	
Bear Creek, Ala. (agricultural area)	3,000,000
Huntsville, Ala. (Pinhook Creek)	150,000
Flint River, Ala. (agricultural area)	800,000
Mud Creek, Ala. (agricultural area)	150,000
Paint Rock River, Ala. (agricultural area)	700,000
KENTUCKY	
Cumberland, Ky. (Poor Fork)	50,000
Harlan, Ky. (Clover Fork)	50,000
Corbin, Ky. (Lynn Camp Creek)	1,000,000
Laurel River, Ky. (agricultural area)	400,000
Hopkinsville, Ky. (Little River)	1,000,000
Clarks River, Ky. (agricultural area)	800,000
Channel Lake No. 9—Reelfoot	122,000
Obion and Mayfield Creeks, Bayou Duchein	4,500,000

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I wish to point out in connection with this matter that on yesterday President Eisenhower delivered an address, as reported in the New York Times of February 25, 1958, before the National Food Conference.

I ask unanimous consent that there be printed at this point in my remarks three paragraphs from the President's address, as reported in the New York Times.

There being no objection, the excerpt from the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

But I beg of you, let's don't be trapped into expenditures that have no useful purpose except to hand out something—that have no useful purpose except that of helping a man exist for the moment.

Let's do it by the means of doing things that need to be done in our country.

Naturally, we have to provide for our own security, but we have today on the shelves of Government all sorts of worthy projects, some of which have been already approved by the Congress—or indeed where annual or partial appropriations have been made. If those things are useful—and we know that they are because they have been approved both by the Congress and by the executive studies—then let's use this time of slack employment to push these projects. When we have full employment, that is no time, as I see it, to be pushing Federal projects to compete with private industry. It would be far better to push these projects when there is the time of slack employment. I think it's just ordinary horse sense. I think all of us agree. So let's do that.

Brotherhood Week

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN MARSHALL BUTLER
OF MARYLAND
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, February 25, 1958

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement I made recently in connection with Brotherhood Week.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR JOHN MARSHALL BUTLER, REPUBLICAN, OF MARYLAND

Brotherhood Week is dedicated to the purpose of bringing together Christians and Jews in a bond of brotherhood and good fellowship. It serves to remind all of us that we are children of God seeking to carry out His will in our journey through life. It reminds us that we are all brothers and as such we must learn to live and work together in the interest of all people regardless of religious or political faiths. It reminds us that prejudice and hate can destroy us and each thing we hold dear. The emotion of hate is an emotion we cannot entertain and enjoy mental and physical health. It festers with us and grows like a cancerous tumor to bring eventual destruction of our soul. Prejudice is akin to hate and ultimately builds up to hate. It has no place in the teachings of God.

Today godless communism threatens the liberty of free men and their right to worship God as they see fit. It acknowledges no difference between the faith of the Christian and the faith of the Jews. In fact all faith in a Supreme Being is outlawed in the Communist philosophy. We all know the answer to such godless dogma. We know that all of us who believe—Christians and Jews alike—must unite in brotherhood. So strong can such a brotherhood become that we can defeat the evils of communism, preserve our religion and our belief in the dignity of man.

Such a brotherhood composed of God-fearing people throughout the world is our refuge against Communist domination. We must in these hours of trial turn as one to God. For then we shall find salvation.

Brotherhood Week is a sincere effort to bring good people of all faiths together in a spirit of understanding and in the tradition of good neighbors. I am indeed proud that

in my own small way I am permitted to make a contribution to this noble purpose.

It is my prayer that the seeds that we have sown will blossom into full flower. That in our time we will come to witness the elimination of war and hate through the brotherhood of man. This is as God intended it. When we achieve brotherhood we can truly beat our swords into plowshares and peace and good will will cast a permanent ray of sunshine on the earth. And then God in His heaven will smile on us and we shall feel His nearness as never before.

Custodian for Supreme Court

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HERMAN E. TALMADGE
OF GEORGIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, February 25, 1958

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled, "Supreme Court, Custodian of Law, Stands in Need of Own Custodian," from the February 19, 1958, issue of the Augusta (Ga.) Herald.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SUPREME COURT, CUSTODIAN OF LAW, STANDS IN NEED OF OWN CUSTODIAN

If there existed anywhere a modicum of doubt as to Senator RICHARD B. RUSSELL'S feelings on States rights, the Supreme Court, and integration, the Senator certainly must have dispelled it Monday in his speech before the Georgia General Assembly.

Addressing the body for the first time since he relinquished the governorship a quarter century ago, the distinguished solon minced no words, pulled not a punch when he termed world communism, the Supreme Court, and integration the greatest threats to the American way of life existing today.

The Georgian leveled his fiercest fire at the Supreme Court for its power seeking and its efforts to establish a judicial oligarchy to impose its own peculiar doctrines to mold the United States into a creature of their own liking.

RUSSELL also roundly condemned the Eisenhower administration for being so preoccupied with enforcement of the Court's integration decree as to give Russia a virtually free hand in its drive for world domination. But at the same time, he made it crystal clear that he regards the Supreme Court—supposedly a bastion of the American way—as the chief villain.

He does so rightfully. In its pursuit of its indeed peculiar doctrines—based upon bits of esoteric sociology rather than upon the foundations of constitutional law—the Court has come to mollycoddle communism on the one hand, actively abet interracial strife on the other. The Court's record in these respects needs no recitation. It is known to the country and to most of the world. It speaks openly for itself—and against the Court.

RUSSELL'S speech—though it did not broach the subject—made just as crystal clear the need for a curb upon the Court. From his address it is all too apparent that the Nine Old Men have made not a grab for, but a deep salient into, the lawmaking provinces of Congress—and in this has had either the active or tacit backing of the White House.

Unless such a curb is placed upon the Court, and so long as it remains as presently composed, it will deepen that salient.

The means of applying just such a restraint upon the Court are ready at hand. Indeed, they have long existed in the Constitution itself. And a year ago, Senator JENNER, of Indiana, called for legislation to place such a curb upon the Court by limiting its appellate jurisdiction in certain cases—among them essential rights of Congress, the executive branch, and the various States.

But unlike Midwest Republican JENNER and most southern Democratic Senators and Representatives, the rest of Congress has remained apparently unaware of their danger. They have been reluctant to act on JENNER'S S. 2646, which would restrain the Court.

Instead Congress philosophizes.

The Greeks, who also were philosophically minded, had a word for it—but the realistic, law-giving Romans had a phrase for it:

Quis custodiet ipsos custodes? Who shall keep the keepers themselves?

The Supreme Court, the appointed custodian of the law, itself needs a custodian. We can suggest none better than Congress.

Second World Bank Proposed by Senator Monroney

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM E. PROXMIRE
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, February 25, 1958

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, the junior Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY] is one of the most brilliant students of international finance in this country. He has recently made a wise and constructive proposal for the establishment of a new kind of world bank. His proposal is discussed in an editorial in yesterday's New York Times.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, the editorial on Senator MONRONEY'S proposal.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Times of February 24, 1958]

THE MONRONEY BANK

When the United States exports at the rate of $21.8 billion a year and imports at the rate of $13 billion a year, as it did in 1957, the slack has to be taken up somehow. We have tried to do this by giving away money, by lending on easy terms and by investing at market rates. Various forms of foreign aid have provided us with what we may truthfully call profitable investments, measured in terms of international security. We have lent some money directly and some through the World Bank, and we have tossed a relatively few million dollars into the operations of the United Nations. We have backed cautiously away from that enticingly named project called SUNFED (Special United Nations Fund for Economic Development), though we have recently dipped into our petty-cash drawer to offer $20 million to enlarge the United Nations technical assistance program.

Now comes Senator A. S. MIKE MONRONEY, of Oklahoma, with a plan, scheduled to be presented today, for a new international agency to make long-term, low-cost loans. We would take 30 percent of the proposed billion-dollar capital stock, leaving the rest for the other 59 members of the World Bank. The Monroney bank would lend where the World Bank cannot, without a government guaranty. Sometimes it might take part of a loan as a sort of second mortgage, with the World Bank taking the rest. It would deal with the hard currencies when these were needed and with soft currencies where they would suffice. Unlike SUNFED, which has been expected to deal largely in grants, the Monroney bank, like other banks, would expect to get its money back someday. It just wouldn't be quite as sure about this as the World Bank is.

Some ambitious thinking—part of it wishful, perhaps—has gone into this project. In time the Monroney bank might grow to the point where large grants through other agencies wouldn't be so necessary. Certainly this device would be a relief to some recipient countries whose inhabitants are tired of being regarded as poor relations. If the neoprotectionists did not put roadblocks on our imports these investments might in time stimualte a flow of trade between developed and underdeveloped countries that would not be so dangerously favorable.

Senator MONRONEY has talked with the experts here and abroad and seeks support on both sides of the aisle. Something useful might come of his suggestion.

Segregation in Little Rock, Ark.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STROM THURMOND
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, February 25, 1958

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, the board of trustees of the public school system in Little Rock, Ark., has asked the United States district court to suspend its racial integration order pertaining to Central High School in that city. It is an acknowledged fact that the quality of education in this school has been impaired by the conditions brought about by the court order last September and the subsequent order by President Eisenhower sending paratroops into the city.

I ask unanimous consent that an editorial touching on this subject from the Greenville News in Greenville, S. C., entitled "The Courts Owe Children Relief" published in the February 24 edition, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE COURTS OWE CHILDREN RELIEF

Events of the past months have clearly shown that Central High School in Little Rock is, in the existing circumstances, wholly incapable of performing its prime function—the education of its students.

For that reason, the request made by the school's board of trustees that racial integration orders be suspended should be granted immediately.

The board making that request is the same one which drew up the original plan of integration. Whether the course of events that followed were the inevitable result of that plan or whether they were deliberately and

gratuitously designed to frustrate it is a question that will be argued forever.

But the hopes that some solution could be worked out, and the educational process continued, dimmed when Governor Faubus ordered National Guard troops to keep the Negroes out and vanished when President Eisenhower ordered paratroopers to enforce their admission.

Since that time, Central High School has been a battleground. Racial incidents among students have been almost daily events. Threats and false reports of bombings have been as frequent.

One of the 9 Negro students, a girl, was recently expelled after participating in many troublesome incidents. On Saturday, it was announced that 2 white boys had been suspended for 2 weeks for carrying cards reading "1 down and 8 to go," an obvious reference to the Negro girl's expulsion.

These are the extreme, publicized cases. Can anyone doubt that beyond them, and beneath the surface, there lies a smoldering dissension that makes education impossible? How can teachers teach in such surroundings? What can be accomplished other than further aggravation of an already festering sore?

The board of trustees attributes the opposition to integration to flammatory propaganda, and makes an indirect bid for further Federal force to help it solve its problems. Since it was the author of the integration plan in the beginning, this attitude is perhaps to be expected. An admission now that perhaps it had moved too far and too fast would be hard for the board to make, human nature being what it is.

But the board did frankly admit that it cannot now have integration without impairment of the quality of education it is capable of providing under normal conditions. And it asked the court to suspend the integration order until such time as the deliberate speed required by the United States Supreme Court can be further defined and legal procedures worked out.

In short, the board admits the situation at Central High is intolerable and it asks for some relief.

The courts owe that relief to the innocent children at Central High School.

How Long Will This Recession Last?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. SPARKMAN

OF ALABAMA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, February 25, 1958

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, in an article entitled, "How Long Will This Recession Last?" written by the very fine economic commentator, Sylvia Porter, and published in the Birmingham News of February 18, we find some most interesting facts and some very provocative suggestions. I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HOW LONG WILL THIS RECESSION LAST?

(By Sylvia Porter)

How long will this recession last?

Unless you're living in a vacuum, it's no secret whatsoever to you that our country is well into the third important recession since the end of World War II, well into the 25th business slump of the past 100 years.

Unless you're a member of the school that believes the way to meet the challenge of a business decline is to pretend the decline doesn't exist and to avoid reading anything about it, you are fully aware that the economic landscape has been splattered by minus signs in the past several months.

You know that production of goods in our land has been sliding, joblessness has been mounting, failures have been soaring, profits have been dropping, incomes have been falling, etc.

Since you are reading this column, I'm assuming you are not living in a vacuum and you know the dismal statistics.

And I have an idea you have often asked yourself and others just the question with which I started this report: When will we begin to pull out of this?

One possibly profoundly significant clue may lie in the history of past business downturns. Specifically: Only one business down spiral during the 20th century—the catastrophic depression of 1929–33—has lasted more than 2 years.

The downward phase of every other business cycle since World War I has been over in a year or a little more than a year.

In the past 75 years there hasn't been a business shakeout which has lasted more than 18 months.

The period from the top to the bottom of the 1948–49 recession covered only about 9 months and the period from the top to the bottom of the 1953–54 recession covered only about 12 to 13 months.

Now let's get to the present:

While some economists date the start of the current decline as far back as December, 1956, the most authoritative sources figure the late boom topped out in July 1957. This is the formal view of the National Bureau of Economic Research, the Nation's leading authority on business cycles.

This also appears the official judgment of the Federal Reserve Board, our country's powerful central bank.

In short, the conservative opinion is that the 1957–58 downturn has been going on for 7 months.

What does this imply?

If you use history as a basis for forecasts, it suggests that the odds are at least even that we'll hit the bottom of this recession by August.

It suggests that if the decline is still persisting in August, the odds will be mounting every week thereafter on a quick end to it.

The foregoing is a key reason why so many economists are members of the so-called mid-year club—are going on the line with predictions that this recession will be turning into stability and recovery by mid-1958.

Let's be even more specific.

The bust of 1920–21 lasted a little over a year. During that slump, industrial production, measured by the Federal Reserve Board's index, plunged 33 percent.

The collapse of 1929–33 lasted 45 months. During that panic production crashed over 50 percent.

The slump of 1937–38 lasted a year. During that rough period production fell a full one-third.

Then came World War II and the war boom.

The first postwar downturn of 1948–49 lasted 9 months, cut production about 10 percent.

The second postwar downturn of 1953–54 lasted about a year and 1 month, also cut production about 10 percent.

The third postwar downturn is on now, is 7 months old, already has cut production about 8 percent.

We're in it, we're going to stay in it awhile and, as this summary has emphasized, even short slumps can be painfully steep.

But, if history does repeat, we're in the latter stage of downturn.

And if history does repeat, prompt, proper antislump actions, plus our basic strengths, should cushion the drop and end it before 1958 has run its course.

Adequate Funds for Support of National Cancer Institute

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD L. NEUBERGER

OF OREGON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, February 25, 1958

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, a thoughtful and stirring letter from the noted American writer, David L. Cohn, appeared on the editorial page of the New York Times for February 23, 1958. The letter voices a powerful and moving plea for far more adequate funds in the vital and urgent field of cancer research.

This letter by Mr. Cohn is certainly forceful support for my legislative proposal to have the Congress appropriate half a billion dollars to support the research projects and grants of the National Cancer Institute.

I ask unanimous consent that the letter, headed "Funds for Cancer Research," be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FUNDS FOR CANCER RESEARCH

To the EDITOR OF THE NEW YORK TIMES:

Recently Lawrence G. Derthick, United States Commissioner of Education, told Congress that we have "less information about our children than we have about our hogs." Then Senator NEUBERGER, of Oregon, aired his findings.

He had found that cancer—aside from accidents—is the greatest killer of American children. He had learned that cancer eventually strikes 2 out of every 3 American families, and unless some cure is found 16 people in every 100 are destined to die of cancer. The humane Senator proposes that Congress appropriate $500 million for cancer research; a sum adequate perhaps to the need.

It just happens to be equal to the sum we annually spend for popcorn and potato chips. It is somewhat less than the sum we spend annually for repairing television sets, but since those who own the sets are also those who eat the comestibles, it hardly seems fair to ask them to do more. Certainly few in Washington believe the Senator will get his money, what Dr. I. S. Ravdin, chairman of the Board of Regents of the American College of Surgeons, aptly calls venture money, in cancer research.

The reason for the inadequate appropriations for cancer research is demonstrably clear; it may be insurmountable. It is that men are not hogs, alas.

No one in his right mind decries hogs. They have extraordinary qualities. Thus they alone, as I heard in my Mississippi childhood, can see the wind. And even when grown to dowager estate they move gracefully on ballet-dancer's feet. But their most beguiling quality to those who grow them is that they are mortgage lifters, while their conversion of grain into meat makes corn our most valuable crop.

DEATH RATE

Suppose, then, it should appear that 16 of every 100 hogs were destined to die of can-

eer, the rate projected for us. The country would face a huge economic loss. The Middle West economy would be dislocated and much of our whole economy. Consumers would wail sharply about sky-high meat prices.

Under the circumstances, would Congress then debate whether it could afford to appropriate enough money to solve the problem? Would it not, rather, tell scientists: "Estimate how much money you need to find the cause and cure of pig cancer and we'll appropriate it."

A few years ago Congress spent millions to eliminate hoof-and-mouth disease among Mexican cattle. Joint Mexican-American teams slaughtered thousands of heads of cattle, compensated their owners, and burned the carcasses. Whatever the cost we would not run the risk of a dread disease crossing the border and imperiling our huge investment in beef animals.

We have apparently concluded as a people that if there is not enough money to go around for research into diseases of animals and diseases of men it is better to keep our hogs healthy and let our children die.

DAVID L. COHN.

Lithuanian Independence Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN MARSHALL BUTLER
OF MARYLAND
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, February 25, 1958

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement prepared by me commemorating the 40th anniversary of Lithuanian independence.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR JOHN MARSHALL BUTLER COMMEMORATING THE 40TH ANNIVERSARY OF LITHUANIAN INDEPENDENCE

When we speak of Lithuania, we refer to more than a country—we have in mind a brave and gallant people whose fine qualities contribute to the traditions of many other nations in which they may live. It has been said that one of the most important factors of America's success has been its ability to accept and preserve the rich heritage and culture that the forefathers brought with them from their homelands across the seas. America at its greatest reflects the traditions of other lands just as our history records the many brave and gallant deeds and the manifold contributions of peoples of many national origins.

The people of Lithuania have made a notable contribution to America. Although Lithuania is not a large nation, its peoples' deep religious faith, reverence for freedom and independence, tenacity and gallantry, and resistance to oppression have kept this nation among the most important in Europe for countless centuries. We in America, as well as the people of the other nations of the world, are greatly indebted to Lithuania.

It is, therefore, most appropriate that freedom-loving people throughout the world pause to do homage to Lithuania upon its 40th anniversary of independence.

During the early days of governmental development in Europe, Lithuania set the pattern of noble principles which henceforth would be the mark of the Lithuanian nation. Indeed, this early period from 1200 to 1450 is often referred to as the golden age of Lithuanian history. Unfortunately, the glories, the prosperity and the freedom of these days were not to last. Union with Poland, the rise of Prussia and Austria compromised Lithuanian independence in the centuries to come. Finally, in 1795, Lithuania, along with Poland, suffered the tragic fate of being partitioned among the then powerful nations of Europe and it was Lithuania's unhappy lot to be annexed to the Russian Empire.

Imperial Russia throughout the 19th and 20th centuries was no less oppressive that the dominance of Soviet Russia today. The harshest policies were invoked to crush and destroy the Lithuanian people. Patriots were deported, heroes executed, and schools and universities closed. The national language was outlawed and the name of Lithuania was even removed from all maps. However, with steadfast devotion to their high principles, the Lithuanian people carried on under adversity and on the 16th of February 1918 asserted their independence.

Ranking among the great tragedies of history are those dark days in 1939 when, without provocation, Soviet Russia seized Lithuania by military force. Once again the freedom, independence and democracy cherished by the Lithuanian people became both a memory of the past and a dream for the future. The tragedy of world events during the past two decades brings remorse and sadness to the hearts of all of us. The merciless depravity of the Communist dictators, their never-ending cruelties and relentless pressure to stamp out every trace of Lithuania's great national heritage continue without pause. As in the past, however, these efforts have been totally unsuccessful. Lithuania is neither broken nor discouraged by the stark realities of the present. The will to resist grows stronger with every outrage committed against them. While the future remains to be told, one factor has been established for all time—the undying will of the Lithuanian people to be free.

We in America, as well as her countless friends throughout the free world, will also remain true in our struggle to free Lithuania and the other freedom-loving nations of Europe which are now under the Communist yoke. We shall take courage from the valor of the Lithuanian people of today and of the past. We shall be sustained by their devotion to our common cause. We shall continue to struggle with every resource at our command to overcome the Communist conspiracy which would enslave the entire world and which now has gallant Lithuania within its grasp. We will be steadfast in the principle that all peoples can live in peace, at liberty and with honor.

I salute the people of Lithuania and join with free people throughout the world in praying that liberty and independence will soon be restored to them.

Soil-Bank Blunders

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HERMAN E. TALMADGE
OF GEORGIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, February 25, 1958

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled, "Government Liable for Benson's Folly," from the February 19, 1958, issue of the Atlanta (Ga.) Constitution.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

GOVERNMENT LIABLE FOR BENSON'S FOLLY

Inexcusable blunders that have characterized administration of the soil-bank program reached their worst stage in the handling of applications from cotton farmers this winter.

First of all, Congress must shoulder its share of the blame for authorizing the program and then failing to provide sufficient funds to finance it.

Next, Secretary of Agriculture Benson and his armchair farm advisers showed their usual disregard for farmers in the haphazard way in which provisions were set up to receive applications.

Thanks to the stupidity of the United States Department of Agriculture, long lines formed in the cold of night in front of county Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation offices on the eve of the opening of the application period.

The signup period, announced as extending from January 13 through March 7, was shut off after 4 days. Funds were exhausted. Senator TALMADGE reports he has been informed 11,332 Georgia cotton farmers are on the waiting list.

The ASC State committee's ruling to stick to a first come, first served basis for allotting soil-bank acreage takes care of those at the head of the lines and leaves the others out in the cold. The committee had a final choice of doing that or prorating the acreage, which officials said would have meant a maximum of not more than 6 acres per farm.

Either way it was a bad situation but it does seem much fairer to have divided the acreage than to pay some at the front of the line as much as $3,000 each and others nothing.

The only logical way for the Government to clear up the mess, mainly created by Benson through mismanagement, is for Congress to appropriate more money for the program in line with a bill introduced by Representative PAUL BROWN, of Elberton.

The expenditure can be charged off to Benson's folly and if it costs him his job, it will be a good bargain for the Government.

Herbert Ravenel Sass

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STROM THURMOND
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, February 25, 1958

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, on February 18 Mr. Herbert R. Sass died in the city of Charleston, S. C.

Mr. Sass was one of the foremost literary figures of his generation. He was known as a spokesman for the southern point of view on national, social, and political problems; as a writer on wildlife in the Carolina low country; as a distinguished historian; and as a contributor to the Charleston News and Courier for more than 50 years. He was a lifelong resident of Charleston and a descendant of some of the most distinguished families of that part of South Carolina.

He was a man of rare intellect, broad culture, and with a great talent for the written word. I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the Appendix

of the RECORD two editorials memorializing Mr. Sass. One is from the Charleston News and Courier of February 20, 1958, entitled "Herbert R. Sass," and the other is from the State of Columbia, S. C., for February 21, 1958, entitled "Herbert Ravenel Sass."

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Charleston (S. C.) News and Courier of February 20, 1958]

HERBERT R. SASS

Both in his writings and in his personality, Herbert Ravenel Sass embodies the best of what has come to be known as the Old South. A new generation of southern writers has mocked the term until even some of those who know and revere the Old South have begun to wince at the mention of it.

While there is no denying that the world moves on and people with it, we do not believe that the heritage of an era dies within the limited life span of its sons and grandsons. Something remains always from the more distant past. It is up to succeeding generations to screen out the good from the bad.

Mr. Sass was one of a few in his time endowed with the gift to make the selection and interpret it for his readers. He fitted the political and social theories of John C. Calhoun to the requirements of another century. Though he seemed to look back to glory, in the phase that became the title of his best known book, Herbert Sass by no means was a dreamy dweller in the past. He was thoroughly aware of the present and had foresight for the future.

Trained in assessing the flow of current events by long service in a daily newsroom, Mr. Sass never lost the newspaperman's sense of the urgency of tomorrow's headlines. Yet he also had the perspective of the historian who is familiar with the course of human events, and the naturalist, who studies the physical character of the earth and the wildlife on it.

A man of intelligence, of good humor, of broad culture, and above all of unshatterable integrity, Herbert Ravenel Sass fortunately also had the eloquence of expression to share his gifts with a wide audience. For 40 years his books and his magazine articles have been known for quality.

His associates of the News and Courier for half a century respected him as a craftsman. His friends welcomed his company. His fellow townsmen rejoiced in his eminence. All these and many more have reason today to mourn his death and to cherish his memory.

[From the State, Columbia, S. C., of February 21, 1958]

HERBERT RAVENEL SASS

The death in Charleston of Herbert Ravenel Sass removes from our midst a man not only beloved by many, but who stood as a pillar of our society in all its phases.

Editor, scholar, historian, patriot, lover of the lesser creatures, poet, and novelist, Mr. Sass was a man of many parts. To his associates he was universally known by the casual name, incongruous to his scholarly dignity, of "Hobo," given him by the urchins of his beloved Charleston because of his gangling 6-foot, 5-inch frame and unruly shock of red hair. While Mr. Sass undoubtedly did not relish the title he gracefully tolerated it.

Mr. Sass' writings of wildlife must have deepened human appreciation of the animal kingdom, and throughout his long and full career he never forgot these—his first loves in the literary field. He likewise provided a scholarly and searching article on the South's position on the race question in the Atlantic Monthly 2 years ago. His historical novels dealt with subject from Indians to the society of the Old South, Look Back to Glory being judged by some as better than Gone With the Wind. In some respects it was more frankly realistic. It was long considered for filming, but unfortunately, came out simultaneously with Margaret Mitchel's opus, and was finally laid aside. We always considered the title subtly misleading of the hard realities which it detailed.

Despite his full career Mr. Sass was never too busy for the little amenities of life, and unfailingly answered every communication from friends so long as his strength permitted.

South Carolinians lost a stalward citizen who came close to being an institution.

Federal Regulatory Agencies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM E. PROXMIRE
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, February 25, 1958

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, much has been said and written recently about the conduct of the independent regulatory agencies. Because of its importance to good government, however, I do not hesitate to offer something further on the subject. The Milwaukee Journal published a thoughtful editorial in its February 21 issue which ought to have wide circulation.

I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed, as follows:

EVERYBODY'S DOING IT—MAKES MESS EVEN WORSE

In 1951 the Civil Aeronautics Board, seeking to protect the judicial character of its proceedings, published a regulation that reads:

"It is improper that there be any private communications of the merits of the case [currently before the Board] to a member of the Board or its staff or to the examiner in the case * * * [by] any person, either in private or public life, unless provided by law."

In other words, it is improper to bring pressure on the judge. Yet outside influence on regulatory agencies, pressure by fixers, interference by sources as high as the White House itself are old stuff in Washington. It's common knowledge.

Some commissioners on regulatory bodies invite private influence, or create the appearance of it, by accepting favors from those they regulate or those who seek to benefit by official decisions. This is substantiated by the still toddling investigation into regulatory agencies by the Subcommittee on Legislative Oversight. One example: The acceptance by Chairman John Doerfer of expense money, honorariums, and house guest invitations from persons whom his Federal Communications Commission regulates.

"This procedure," Representative TEWES, Republican of Wisconsin, said in Milwaukee, "is followed by every regulatory agency. You can't indict anyone for doing what is established policy."

Why can't you? For some persons it's established policy to chisel on income taxes. That doesn't make it right.

An example of White House interference is also at hand. Subcommittee records show correspondence between Sherman Adams, the President's right hand, and Murray M. Chotiner, formerly Vice President NIXON's campaign manager, about intervention in an airline case before the CAB. One letter, from "Sherm" to "Murray", said: "I went over carefully the North American case with the Acting Chairman of the Civil Aeronautics Board." And it offered further "assistance."

Chotiner was charged by Senate investigators in 1956 with having clients who were interested in him because of his connections high in Government. He lost his job with NIXON as a result. What was his interest in the North American case? Hardy K. Maclay, the attorney of record in the airlines case, says: "Chotiner's sole function was to determine the attitude of the Republican administration."

And Chotiner was able to go right to the White House and Sherman Adams for his contact. Chotiner also went to CAB Commissioner Harmar D. Denny, then Acting Chairman, but Denny says: "I would not have talked to him about the case." It would have been improper. Yet Sherman Adams wrote that he did that very thing in Chotiner's behalf.

Surely enough has been seen in the early funmblings of the subcommittee to demand a full investigation of the regulatory agencies, the chumminess of some Commissioners with those they regulate, and interference by outsiders, including the White House. Surely there's a new mess in Washington.

Foreign Aid to Enemies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HERMAN E. TALMADGE
OF GEORGIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, February 25, 1958

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled, "Squandering Our Money," from the February 19, 1958, issue of the Griffin (Ga.) Daily News as written by its talented and distinguished editor, Hon. Quimby Melton, Jr.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SQUANDERING OUR MONEY

Egypt, Syria, and Yemen have formed an antiwestern, anti-American union.

This is bad enough. What makes matters even worse is that Uncle Sam has poured millions of dollars down those ratholes. The money was yours and mine, taken from us in taxes to give away to foreign nations which are our avowed foes. The Central Government in Washington has dipped its sticky fingers into your pocketbook and into mine to give our own money to our enemies.

When Egypt, Syria, and Yemen formed their union, we asked Senator HERMAN TALMADGE to secure information on how much money Uncle Sucker has given them. We received his response today in the form of a report from the Legislative Reference Service of the Library of Congress.

It shows that from July 1, 1945, through fiscal 1957, the United States poured $129,219,000 into Egypt and another $1,319,000 into Syria. For some delightful reason which we do not know, Yemen failed to get anything. The only explanation we can offer is that Yemen is a very small country, and the

spendthrifts in Washington may have overlooked it.

Furthermore, the above figures do not include military expenditures. The Legislative Reference Service's report has this on it, "Note: These totals do not include any military assistance as country totals are classified."

So anybody's guess is as good as anybody else's as to how staggering the true total is.

Now bear in mind that we have given this money to what have become enemy nations, countries which have ganged up and jumped headlong into the Russian orbit. And bear in mind that it is money which the central Government in Washington has taken from you in taxes.

There is no doubt in our mind that some foreign aid was necessary. It was Christian as well as expedient to help rebuild the ravaged nations of the world immediately after World War II. And it was expedient to assist Greece and Italy and France to help keep them from turning communistic.

But it has been foolhardly in the extreme to squander taxpayers' money and to throw millions into every nation in the world at the expense of the American taxpayers. As Senator TALMADGE has pointed out time after time, you can't buy friends. Nor can the American taxpayer bear the world's financial burdens alone.

Now, when we hear the incompetents and the spendthrifts beat the drums for more foreign aid, let us remember the more than $130,500,000 which we have poured down the ratholes of Egypt and Syria.

Then let us insist that the American taxpayer at least get a chance to catch his breath before we return to the fools' game of throwing money to the winds.

QUIMBY MELTON, Jr.

Letter of Committee for Collective Security

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THRUSTON B. MORTON
OF KENTUCKY
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, February 25, 1958

Mr. MORTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a letter written to the President of the United States on November 20, 1957, by Mr. Goodhue Livingston, Jr., chairman of the policy committee of the Committee for Collective Security.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

COMMITTEE FOR COLLECTIVE SECURITY,
New York, N. Y., November 20, 1957.

The PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES,
The White House, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: The free world is confronted today by the greatest threat to its security that it has ever faced—far greater than it recognized several months ago. The ingenuity and daring that the Russians have manifested by their recent achievements in the field of missiles and satellites emphasizes the gravity of the menace. All peoples who support the concept of a free world should join in a declaration of interdependence and should mobilize their total political, military, economic, and scientific resources in the interest of their collective security.

The Committee for Collective Security therefore urges the immediate creation of an intimate working association among the 42 nations who have allied themselves to defend the free world. They are the members of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, the Southeast Asia Treaty Organization, the Organization of American States, and the Baghdad Pact.

To effectuate this proposal we urge that each of these groups convene an early meeting to draft a program for collective action to mobilize the total strength and resources of the free peoples. Once a practicable program is developed, the four groups should meet jointly to translate it into action.

We urge the United States at the coming North Atlantic Treaty Organization meeting in Paris to promote this proposal for rebuilding the confidence and the strength and the determination of the free world to face the threat of the Soviet Union, Red China and their satellites.

Sincerely yours,

GOODHUE LIVINGSTON, Jr.,
Chairman, Policy Committee.

Widening Private Markets for Foreign Debt Securities

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, February 25, 1958

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I am pleased to serve as a cosponsor of Senate bill 3318 with the distinguished chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, the senior Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN]. Our purpose is to bring before our committee, and hereafter, the Senate, this proposed legislation, which has been recommended by the administration, for extension of the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended.

Within the 20 pages of the bill are to be found the usual wide variety of authorization and amendment proposals which will, of course, have the intensive consideration of our colleagues in extended hearings, prior, no doubt, to considerable amendment of the bill. I particularly commend, for the consideration of the Senate, the provisions of Senate bill 3318 bearing upon the development loan fund.

Today, however, I should like to talk about a parallel economic activity; in this instance, the expanding role of private bonds floated by European countries in the American security markets.

Last Sunday's New York Times contained a most interesting article pointing out that new borrowing by the Dutch port of Amsterdam, in The Netherlands, represents the fourth such floating of foreign bonds in the United States since the end of World War II.

The previous bond issues were by Norway; Belgium; the European Coal and Steel Community; and, in 1947, The Netherlands government, itself.

As I have frequently expressed on the floor of the Senate, I welcome the increased activity of sound foreign debt securities, just as I welcome the increased role of sound foreign equity securities. I emphasize, as in all previous instances, the word sound.

We are interested in having foreign governments stand soundly on their own feet. We are interested in having private enterprise, the system of risk taking, shoulder as many of the burdens as possible, rather than have the United States Federal Government bear burdens which are increasingly difficult, in view of our own national budget problems.

We are anxious, however, that the American investor be treated fairly.

We can hardly fail to remember the bitter record of default on many foreign bonds which marred the era between World Wars I and II.

It is in the interest of sound international relations and it is in the interest of the free enterprise system that every effort be made to maintain financial integrity in stocks or bonds floated at home and abroad.

When handled soundly and managed in a way faithful to the terms of their prospectuses, such securities can be great instruments for man's progress and prosperity.

When abused, mismanaged, or defaulted, the contrary becomes true; and then ill will, economic stagnation and reverses, and loss of international confidence result.

Sound banking practices by central governments, by central banks, by private banks, by private corporations, or by quasi-public corporations are at the heart of international economic development.

I send to the desk the text of the New York Times article and ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PRIVATE MARKETS LIKELY TO PLAY LARGER ROLE IN WORLD FINANCING

(By Paul Heffernan)

The pending borrowing by Amsterdam, the Netherlands, in the United States market bears out recent signs that private markets for debt securities are likely to play a larger role in the international flow of capital in the years just ahead.

The Dutch port and financial market has never before borrowed in the United States and only once before—in London in 1931—has it borrowed outside of the Netherlands. It is the first European city to offer bonds here since the securities laws were adopted in the 1930's.

It is the fourth European governmental entity to offer bonds in the United States since the end of World War II. The others have been Norway, Belgium, the European Coal and Steel Community and the Netherlands Government.

The Netherlands loan, which totaled $20 million and was floated here in 1947, was the first postwar requisition on the United States market by a foreign government. It was paid off last year. Belgium and Norway also have repaid certain of their postwar borrowings.

The Amsterdam loan will total $15 million and will raise funds for the city's electric utility system. The Dutch port is going abroad for money because the Netherlands capital market is hard put to meet the heavy demands being made upon it by corporate and municipal borrowers. The Bank for Netherlands Municipalities, a financing vehicle for municipal borrowers, had to pay 6 percent on its latest financing at home.

The Amsterdam loan here probably will bear an interest coupon of 5¼ percent.

So far, Cuba is the only Latin-American nation with a record of default to have marketed new dollar bonds on the basis of restored credit. Probably it is only a question of time when other Latin-American names, or those of the enemy axis of World War II, will be linked with new issues in the public market. In the Latin American field, either market yields from such investments would have to fall substantially from present levels or the borrowers would have to pay interest rates—be they 6, 7, or 8 percent or more—that truly reflect the rank their names command in the free market.

Volume of trading in foreign dollar bonds on the public exchanges is light compared with the market of the 1920's, but the gradual way in which the market is being rehabilitated cannot be judged only by the volume of transfers.

Since the 1920's, much of the whole public bond market has become institutionalized—that is, has become the interest chiefly of financial institutions rather than individual investors. A consequence has been for much of the volume trading to be done on a wholesale basis away from the public exchanges.

The New York Stock Exchange is now trying to get some of this business back to the public auction market. The exchange tries hard not to forget that in 1928 more foreign bonds were traded in on the New York Stock Exchange on one day than in a whole month now.

The restoration of the foreign bond market is going forward perceptibly, if only gradually, on several fronts. Some instances follow:

Since the end of World War II, nearly $400 million of foreign dollar bonds, not counting those of Canada, have been floated in the United States market. Borrowers other than Canada and top-credit European nations were Australia, Cuba, and South Africa. The biggest borrower was Australia, whose purpose was largely the refunding of dollar obligations coming to maturity.

The defaulted bonds of former enemy nations of World War II—Germany, Japan, and Italy—have been restored to good standing with but minor exceptions and are selling at yields comparable with the returns of many domestic corporate obligations of investment kind.

Latin American nations, whose defaults on external debt did much to discredit the foreign dollar bond market in the 1930's, are gradually wiping the slate clean. Except for Bolivia, all of the Latin American obligations are paying interest on dollar debt. Most of these nations, Brazil is an outstanding example, are cutting back sharply external debt service commitments by repatriating substantial blocks of bonds each year through sinking fund purchases. Over 15 years, Brazil has reduced dollar-bond debt from more than $300 million to about $75 million. Of this, about $24 million are 3¾-percent obligations without stated maturity, a debt likely to be brought to an end within the next 3 or 4 years through sinking fund payments.

The International Bank for Reconstruction and Development (World Bank) is exercising a constructive influence for restoration of the public market. The bank's own dollar bond issues traded in here run to more than $1 billion. Moreover, the bank's policy is not to lend money to a debtor in default on his obligations to private investors. The bank also tries to share its loans with private investors. Sometimes a borrower from the bank will float a loan in the private market at the same time, as Belgium did last year. Often commercial banks and other financial institutions take parts of the loans negotiated by the World Bank. At the end of 1957, private financial institutions had put up more than $375 million of the money figuring in credits negotiated with the bank, most of it without any guaranty from the bank.

SOME WIDE VARIATIONS

Obligations of the well-seasoned investment names of Europe—Belgium, Norway, Germany, Denmark, and Italy—run for the most part from 4 to 5 percent. Wide yield variations are often to be found between the obligations of the same issuer, the differences stemming largely from tax advantages related to low-coupon bonds selling at big discounts from principal value.

Farther afield from Europe, bonds of Japan, Australia, and South Africa—good investment names—are yielding about 5.6, 5.8, and 4.5 percent, respectively.

The most speculative interest-paying bonds are those of the Latin-American nations. In the Brazil list, Rio de Janeiro, the State of São Paulo, and the State of Rio Grande do Sul have outstanding 2-percent bonds due in 2012. The Rio de Janeiro issue is selling at 38, the Rio Grande do Sul at 51, and the São Paulo at 92.

What Is the Law of the Land?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERMAN E. TALMADGE

OF GEORGIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, February 25, 1958

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Law of the Land?" from the February 21, 1958, issue of the Nashville (Tenn.) Banner.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LAW OF THE LAND?

Who makes the law of the land?

How is it made? By judicial interpretation, or by congressional enactment?

These are valid and challenging questions just now; and they need competent answer before recklessness under pressure's wild momentum—and without the brakes of study and reason—carries the country to the point of no return.

Actually, the Constitution is—originally—the law of the land. It hasn't been amended in any of the particulars today distored into invasion of basic rights. Nor has Congress officially forfeited the rights of exclusive legislative powers. Where the Supreme Court encroaches upon that domain, Congress can act to redress the grievance of invasion.

For example: In June 1950, the Supreme Court reversed the judicial rulings of a century—which under present theory had been the "law of the land"—to divest coastal States of their tidelands rights. It held on that date that the Federal Government has paramount rights to the tidelands.

Supposedly then that became the law of the land. And every subordinate court would be expected to deal accordingly with any case before it.

Congress did not accept that. Congress was of the opinion that the issue was one for legislative determination. A little under 3 years later, Congress did act on the question, and overwhelmingly. It enacted a law restoring tidelands title to the States, to the extent of their historic boundaries.

Only Congress can deal adequately and authoritatively with the present issues, insofar as Federal responsibility is concerned.

It has that obligation—primarily to assert just where the lines of authority fall; and they fall exactly where the Constitution drew them. Otherwise the law of the land is a nebulous instrument, subject to capricious change without benefit of legality—an item of confusion, abuse, and danger.

Justice to American Indians

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD L. NEUBERGER

OF OREGON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, February 25, 1958

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, as we near the time when the Senate Subcommittee on Indian Affairs must reach a decision on the thorny Klamath Indian question, I feel that all possible evidences of major public opinion should be brought to the attention of my colleagues.

An excellent and thorough editorial, entitled "Justice to Indians," was published in the February 17 issue of the Roseburg News-Review, of Roseburg, Oreg., under the byline of Charles V. Stanton, editor and manager, of that daily newspaper.

I particularly commend Mr. Stanton's editorial to other Members of the Senate because, although I do not agree with every item included in the editorial, I believe that Mr. Stanton has emphasized most effectively our shabby record in the past of injustice, indifference, and even exploitation toward our Indian wards.

I am pleased that Mr. Stanton has concluded his editorial with this sentence:

Senator NEUBERGER, in my opinion, is on the right track in demanding that a coordinated management plan be set up by Federal purchase of the reservation assets.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that this informative editorial appear in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JUSTICE TO INDIANS

(By Charles V. Stanton)

Frequently—and often quite violently—I am in disagreement with United States Senator RICHARD NEUBERGER'S political policies and actions. I am remiss, I know, in being so habitually critical without mentioning the time when I am in agreement. He is to be commended for his work in conservation and I have agreed with nearly all of his activities in that field. Like most people, however, I haven't given commendation when I should, but seldom have missed an opportunity to criticize.

Without knowing too much of the issues involved, I am, with what limited facts I possess, in sympathy with the Senator's proposals for handling the troublesome problem of the assets of the Klamath tribe of Indians.

There are, I know, a good many factors concerning which I am ignorant. The problem, I also am aware, has some political aspects. But from what I know of the situation, and from what I have been able to learn through study, I believe Senator NEUBERGER'S insistence that the assets should be purchased by the Federal Government provides the logical answer.

Congress has passed legislation that would terminate Federal guardianship over the

Klamath Tribe of Indians. The Klamath Indians own a very rich reservation with a substantial income from timber sales and grazing fees. Termination of guardianship requires that the Indians be paid for their tribal assets.

MANY VALUES INVOLVED

One of the plans advanced is that the forest lands, consisting principally of ponderosa pine stands, be sold to private interests, provided the purchasers were pledged to sustained yield management of the timber.

The Klamath Indian lands, however, have many values other than timber stumpage.

The forest lands have an important bearing on the water supply of the area. The reservation has high recreational value, particularly hunting and fishing. Grazing lands should be managed in such manner that their productivity will not be destroyed, as so often happens when greedy interests permit private range to be overgrazed.

If the reservation is sold piecemeal, it will be extremely difficult to preserve all the resources tied to the lands as a whole.

It is very true that purchase of the reservation will require a substantial piece of change, something in the neighborhood of $125 million. But is that a large investment to preserve resources for future generations, when we match it against the billions of dollars being spent in developing engines of destruction, or the millions we are sending abroad to win friends and influence people?

DUTY TO INDIANS

The way Indians were treated provides one of the black pages of American history. We conquered the original inhabitants through superiority of manpower and weapons. Many thousands of Indians were deliberately murdered. We often killed men, women, and children indiscriminately. We made treaties in which we recognized rights of the Indians to certain lands, then callously broke the treaties when the land was found to contain mineral or other wealth. We pushed the survivors onto reservations, then subjected them to a guardianship which has done little to advance their social or economic status.

At approximately the same time Indians were being placed on reservations, we freed the American Negro from slavery. The Negro was tossed out into a hostile society, left homeless and destitute. Yet today the Negro has become a powerful minority, is solidly entrenched in business, industry, and profession. No racial minority in the world's history has come so far and so fast as has the American Negro. Yet his advancement has come almost solely through his own efforts and in the face of widespread opposition.

On the other hand, the American Indian, supposedly given the protection of a beneficient white father, is as bad off as when he was first made captive on the poorest lands that could be found for him. Those who left the reservation and entered society have, in many cases, done well, but the reservation Indian, except for those few places where tribal assets have produced large incomes, have made virtually no social or economic advancement since being made the wards of the Federal Government.

The contrast between the Negro and Indian is one that should be carefully studied by those people who tend to follow the line of socialism.

The Federal Government in terminating its guardianship over the Klamath Indians has a grave responsibility, in my opinion. That responsibility is to see that the assets of the tribe are disposed of at proper value and that rightful distribution is made of funds.

That will be hard to achieve, it would seem to me, unless the Federal Government itself takes over the reservation to be administered as a whole under the management plans of the United States Forest Service or Bureau of Land Management.

Senator NEUBERGER, in my opinion, is on the right track in demanding that a coordinated management plan be set up by Federal purchase of the reservation assets.

Problems Involved in Scientific Education

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. GLENN BEALL

OF MARYLAND

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, February 25, 1958

Mr. BEALL. Mr. President, of late, there has been much discussion in the public press, and, indeed, on the floor of the Senate, concerning the need in this country for advancement in our technical education.

Yesterday evening, in Philadelphia, the Honorable Theodore R. McKeldin, Governor of the State of Maryland, spoke at the annual banquet of the Presbyterian Social Union at the Bellevue-Stratford Hotel. His remarks are most timely, and are indeed appropriately to be read by those whose interest extends to the recognition of the problems involved in the promotion of scientific education.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printe in the RECORD, as follows:

WHAT IS MAN, THAT THOU ART MINDFUL OF HIM?

(Address of Theodore R. McKeldin, Governor of Maryland, Presbyterian Social Union annual banquet, Bellevue-Stratford Hotel, Philadelphia, Monday, February 24, 1958, 6:30 p. m.)

The increasing emphasis upon education is one of the most striking developments in American politics during the 20 years in which I have had a direct, professional interest in the study of that science—or, if you prefer, that art. For much longer than that it has been the largest item of expenditure of State and local governments; and today the President of the United States is urging upon Congress a large increase in Federal appropriations for the support of schools. A business so large has inevitably been the subject of debate since time immemorial.

But very recently—within the past year, in fact—a new note has been struck in the discussion, a note of urgency almost amounting to desperation. It has been demonstrated in startling fashion that in technology, a field in which we had thought our system of education especially strong, it is in fact weak; and that has raised suspicion of the whole structure. We are reviewing every phase of public education intensely, sometimes frantically, and the question in our minds is neither its cost, nor its extent, but its purpose.

We have realized at last that education is a basic element of national defense, so both its cost and its extent are now academic questions. Whatever its cost, we must have it, and we must educate to the extent of student's ability to learn. The question in the forefront of our minds at present is what we shall teach.

It is obvious that we must bring our technological training, both in quantity and in quality, abreast of the most advanced nations. This implies a sharply increased emphasis on the teaching of science. On that there is general agreement. But the weakness exposed in technology has raised suspicion of weakness in other fields. Indeed, as regards modern languages it is no longer a suspicion—we know that our system is dangerously weak in that department. Nor does a day often pass without our hearing from some quarter a denunciation of the quality of American education in general.

The result is such a clamor of conflicting opinions as leaves the layman dazed and confused. Yet the layman, like it or not, is a participant in this debate. In the final analysis this issue, like all important issues, will be decided by public opinion. State and Federal departments of education may influence it; the National Education Association and the American Association of College Professors may influence it; presidents of State universities and of the Ivy League may influence it; but the deciding vote will be cast by the people who pay the bills. It is incumbent, then, upon every intelligent citizen to make up his mind for he may be called on to act sooner than he expects.

I do not mean that you and I should adopt any fixed position on details of educational policy. Nothing is more foolish than for untrained persons to interfere with details of the management of complicated enterprises; and education is as complicated as anything with which we have to deal. But it is possible for us to make up our minds as to what we want to achieve; and when we have done so, we have a yardstick by which to measure any specific policy that we may be urged to support. As between two policies, both of which measure up, let the experts decide; but when anything is proposed that cannot be shown to contribute to the main achievement, it is our right and our duty to refuse to consider it.

How, then, can one state an ideal of education that all intelligent men can accept? The idea that the purpose of education is to enable the student to get ahead in the world is widely accepted, but it is a low ideal. Wealth, power, social success are desirable, certainly, but a man who has no higher aspiration deserves none of them. The idea that education enables a man to serve his generation is better, but it relates to the student, rather than to the mature man whose school days are over. I have sought diligently for a principle that would cover all these, and yet a great deal more; and I believe I have found it in the place where wise men look for the summation of any great ideal—in the Holy Bible.

In the eighth Psalm the poet David asks a question, and to my mind finding an answer to that question is the aim and ultimate end of all worthwhile education. The question is this: "What is man, that thou art mindful of him?"

Every great spiritual religion—not Christianity alone, but Judaism and Islam as well—agrees that the Creator is mindful of man, and none of them claims that it is on account of man's own worth and dignity. His body is one with the beasts of the field, and even his reasoning power seems to be an extension and development of that of the higher animals. But in man alone of all living creatures his Maker has planted a spark of His own divinity; and for that He is mindful of him. To fan this spark into flame is the highest human achievement; and the education that contributes to that achievement is the only schooling worth all the effort and expense we can give it.

We are told in Genesis that the Lord gave to Adam dominion over the earth and all that is in it. Science is the means whereby man exercises that dominion, so I believe that the study of science is one of man's duties. But the Lord also laid upon him the duty of mastery over himself, and this is not achieved by science alone. To know

the universe is excellent; but to know our own place in the universe is even more imperative, and education that neglects that side of our development will inevitably produce a warped mind and a distorted soul.

This generation has had an appalling demonstration of what that means. Three generations ago German education, fascinated by the tremendous success of scientific training, fell into the error of believeing that it was all of education; and the fruit of that error was Hitlerism, a return to the bestial.

The Communist regime in Russia is repeating the mistake of the Germans. I am not here to defend the orthodox church of the Czars. I believe in the separation of church and state, and if they had been content to separate the two the Communists would have been right. But they were not content with that. They have tried to eliminate the very idea of God from their political system. The result is that they have erected a system that is dedicated to death and that has spread fear and horror throughout the world.

"When I consider thy heavens," sang the psalmist, "the work of thy fingers, the moon and the stars, which thou hast ordained; what is man, that thou art mindful of him? and the son of men that thou visitest him?"

The visit of God is the thing that purely materialistic education neglects. It can see Hitler buried under the ruins of his own flaming capital and ascribe that event to nothing more than the strength of his earthly foes. It will not believe that a system built upon lies, cemented with cruelty and injustice, bathed in innocent blood, was certain to be visited by a God who is not unmindful of man.

"For thou hast made him a little lower than the angels, and hast crowned him with glory and honor." So to reduce him lower than the beasts and to crown him with shame and crime is more than a wrong done to man. It is also an insult to God.

Any system of education that fails to take this into account is worse than useless, it is a guarantee of ruin. I do not mean that we should turn all our schools into theological seminaries devoted to religious instruction. The church and the home are the proper places for direct instruction in the creed. But I do mean that our schools should bear in mind the whole truth and in all their teaching make it clear that there is a distinction between man and the brute that the microscope cannot detect and the mathematician cannot calculate.

"The proper study of mankind is man," said the poet, but the word he used was "man." He did not say a vertebrate, genus homo, species sapiens, although that is man, regarded scientifically. But the proper study is more than scientific; it includes an examination of the spirit, as well as the body, and without that examination it is not only incomplete, it is misleading, it leads in the end to ruin and death.

That kind of education we cannot, must not tolerate, and any scheme that proposes it should be rejected instantly. It is all very well to teach the rising generation the triumphs of the human intellect, but it must be no less carefully taught the triumphs of the human spirit. Newton and Einstein, our youth must know, but not without also knowing Socrates and Homer. Long before our engineers launched a satellite into an orbit around the earth, Shakespeare and Milton had carried the spirit of man into the company of the stars.

Only thus can we maintain the position of dominion that the Maker of heaven and earth designed for us, for only thus can man retain rulership over himself, which is his ultimate victory. For "thou madest him to have dominion over the works of thy hands; thou hast put all things under his feet."

Processsing of Soybeans in Minnesota

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD J. THYE
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, February 25, 1958

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, I ask uanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Mankato Firm Is States Biggest Soybean Processor," written by Leonard Inskip, and published in the Minneapolis Sunday Tribune of February 16, 1958.

The story is interesting not only from the standpoint that it involves a successful Minnesota business firm, but also from the standpoint of the use of soybeans and the extensive shipment of soybean oil overseas.

It is obvious that the executives of this firm have been successful in finding new uses and markets for an agricultural commodity which has become important to Minnesota.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MANKATO FIRM IS STATE'S BIGGEST SOYBEAN PROCESSOR

(By Leonard Inskip)

MANKATO, MINN.—You walk up to a small white frame house on the south side of Mankato.

The house, located beside a railroad track and with some huge, blue storage tanks immediately behind it, bears little resemblance to the offices of most Minnesota companies.

Inside the front door, a pretty receptionist is almost too busy answering the phone to notice you.

"No, he's on long-distance," she says into the phone, "but can you hold for 5 minutes," apparently to a second long-distance operator.

A voice in another room says: "I want to put through a transatlantic call in an hour."

A teletype machine grinds out a message; a ticker tape reels off some soybean quotations from the Chicago market; a girl in a white sweater chalks some figures on a blackboard.

This is the bustling nerve center of Honeymead Products Co., the biggest soybean processor in Minnesota.

On Tuesday, the alert young company closed its second $3-million deal in recent months for shipment of edible soybean oil overseas.

The new order will involve shipment to Turkey in February and March of 8,800 tons of oil processed at Mankato from Minnesota-grown soybeans.

The earlier order, shipped in December and January, went to Spain.

On Wednesday, not content with just having closed the Turkish order, the company's young executives were deep in negotiations for another possible order with a European country.

These executives include Lowell W. Andreas, 36, president; James L. Maslon, 31, vice president, both located at Mankato; and Dwayne O. Andreas, 41, chairman of the board. Dwayne, Lowell's brother, lives at Lake Minnetonka.

Lowell Andreas and Maslon share a small office with other executives. On one wall is a big blackboard listing the latest Chicago quotations for lard, corn, soybeans, soybean oil, and soybean meal.

Andreas follows the blackboard closely, because he makes most of the decisions involving futures trading.

Each day, he jots down purchases of soybean futures and sales of oil and meal futures in three separate columns, to keep the company's buying and selling of futures in balance.

Maslon, son of a Minneapolis attorney, has charge of plant operations and sales.

The two young men take their business very seriously.

As a result, lunch hours are short (about 20 to 30 minutes at a nearby restaurant, and punctuated with transferred phone calls), but sales are long.

Sales in the current fiscal year probably will be about $40 million or more, compared with $33 million in the last fiscal year, which ended August 31.

"We're processing about 40,000 bushels of beans a day," said Andreas, "and in the next 12 months we hope to be up to 50,000."

This compares with 1,300 bushels a day when Honeymead acquired the plant back in 1947. Sales that year were about $1½ million.

The soybean operation has two roots.

In 1937, local Mankato people purchased a defunct tile plant and converted it to soybean crushing. During the war it was sold to a Washington State cooperative, from which Honeymead purchased it in 1947.

Honeymead Products Co., itself, was founded in Iowa, also in 1937, by the late R. P. Andreas, a former farmer who had gone into the elevator business and later into feed manufacturing.

Several small soybean crushing operations were established in Iowa to provide meal for its Honeymead's feed products.

In 1941, R. P. Andreas, father of the 2 present officers of Honeymead, sold the business to Cargill because 4 of his 5 sons were of draft age.

In 1947, Honeymead resumed operations with the purchase of the Mankato plant for about $350,000.

Since then the plant has been expanded, almost every year, with new equipment—until now it is a multi-million-dollar investment.

The company has 75 employees, most of them at Mankato. The employment figure is not big because operations of the giant processing plant are largely automatic.

Honeymead's expansion has taken several forms.

For one thing, there has been a continuing diversification within the area of soybean processing. Last year the company installed a refinery which enables it to produce edible soybean oil, the type currently shipped overseas. This oil is used in margarine, shortening, and salad oil.

Three years ago, Honeymead began producing soybean flour for industrial uses, such as in glue. Now it is also moving into the area of edible soybean flour.

Two years ago the company purchased the Henry Weis Manufacturing Co., Elkhart, Ind., a 100-year-old concern making toilet and shower partitions. It employs 250 workers and has sales of about $3 million a year.

Andreas says that to be successful the company has to grow, and that diversification into other lines is one way to do this.

"We're looking at this from a security standpoint, also," Maslon added. "Some year the return from the soybean business might be poor."

The Elkhart firm, a wholly owned subsidiary, now accounts for about 20 percent of Honeymead's total profit, although most of the Elkhart earnings are being plowed back into that business to improve it.

This year, Honeymead will process about 14 million bushels of Minnesota-grown soybeans, or about one-fourth of the State's crop. This is the equivalent to the output of about 700,000 acres with a cash value to farmers of about $30 million.

Principal owners of the company are the Andreas brothers and the Maslon family.

Address by Hon. John Stennis, of Mississippi, Before the Southern Regional Meeting of the American Bar Association

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERMAN E. TALMADGE

OF GEORGIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, February 25, 1958

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, on Friday, February 21, the able and distinguished junior Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS] addressed the southern regional meeting of the American Bar Association, held in Atlanta, Ga. His subject was Federal Judiciary Selection: The Letter—But the Spirit?

The address—eloquent, erudite, and grounded in the Senator's outstanding record as a trial judge himself—is of great interest to all who value the Nation's judiciary and wish to see it fulfill its appointed constitutional role.

I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, to have the text of the address of the junior Senator from Mississippi as delivered on that occasion printed in the appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FEDERAL JUDICIARY SELECTION: THE LETTER—BUT THE SPIRIT?

(Remarks of United States Senator JOHN STENNIS, of Mississippi, southern regional meeting, American Bar Association, bar activity section, selection of Federal judiciary, Dinkler Plaza Hotel, Atlanta, Ga., February 21, 1958)

First, let me heartily commend, as well as thank, the American Bar Association for your long, patient, and painstaking effort to improve the system of selecting members of the Federal judiciary. You have been concerned. You have worked hard. Your labors have borne some fruit. You must continue your good work.

CONSTITUTIONAL BACKGROUND

When the Constitution of the United States was drawn, approved, and ratified, it represented the best thinking of great men of stature. It has endured; its fundamental principles have withstood the test of time. It has served us well through the unparalleled growth of our country during its history, until we are now a nation of 172 million people.

Great care and detail was used in framing the provisions of this charter, but two latent defects have become apparent in recent years. At the time of the Constitution's adoption, these omissions were considered points of strength contributing to the independence of the Federal judiciary. These points are:

1. The Constitution does not undertake to restrict in great detail the jurisdiction of the Federal judiciary.

2. It does not prescribe qualifications for holders of judicial offices.

The prevalent belief at the time of the Constitutional Convention was that the judiciary was the least dangerous branch of government, having neither the power of the purse available to Congress nor the Armed Forces controlled by the executive branch. The emphasis was on making the judiciary independent. Some thought the bench would go begging.

Further, debates on the Constitution at that time clearly show that it was thought only a limited few highly trained lawyers would ever be considered for service on the Supreme Court; it was thought that only those most experienced and learned in the law would ever be appointed.

WARNINGS BY GEORGE MASON

In the constitutional debates Elbridge Gerry and George Mason and others warned that there was no limit of judiciary power and that it could absorb and destroy the judiciaries of the several States. Alexander Hamilton rejected such arguments and asserted, "The supposed danger of judiciary encroachments * * * is, in reality, a phantom." He said that the members selected would be chosen with a view to those qualifications which fit men for the stations of judges. His arguments prevailed.

In 1958 it is apparent that the Federal judiciary is neither weak nor helpless; the judicial self-restraint so relied on by Hamilton and others is greatly open to question. I am not here to condemn nor to criticize. I believe a new system of selecting members of the Federal judiciary is a constructive step and an essential step in strengthening this branch of our Government.

TWO RESTRICTIONS

This great document, which established the separation of powers in Government, is replete with regard to checks and balances, has only two restrictions relating to the Supreme Court.

The first is that justices were to be nominated by the President and, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, appointed to the Court.

The second is that Congress was designated to regulate the appellate jurisdiction of the Supreme Court.

The only reference to judges of inferior courts to be established by Congress relates to protection of their salary and tenure while serving in office.

In the process of selection of the Federal judiciary, the letter of the Constitution is followed now except for one interesting departure, which will be discussed later. But the question I pose here today is whether the spirit of the Constitution is followed in the present process of selecting Federal judges. And further, has not his problem grown beyond the personal grasp of any Chief Executive, and therefore does it not require the combined effort of many minds of those isolated at least in part from other public affairs?

PRESENT METHOD OF NOMINATION

First, let us examine the process of nomination now employed. The role of confidential adviser to the President is filled by the Department of Justice. Among the factors considered are: (1) The experience of the individual; (2) his character; and (3) political affiliations and activity. It is ironical that this latter consideration, which often appears to control judicial appointments, actually eliminates many good men who are eminently qualified as to character and particularly as to experience.

When the idea of political reward dominates the selection process it automatically eliminates many sitting Federal judges and many extremely capable State jurists of many years of experience who have forgone political activity because of their devotion to duty on the bench. Thus political experience is often inconsistent with judicial experience, yet all too often the former prevails as the criterion upon which the selection is made.

After considering the recommendations of the Department of Justice, the President personally makes the nomination, but the actual screening or narrowing the field of selection of eligibles has already been performed through the resources of the Department of Justice. Except in rare cases, the President does not have and cannot have personal knowledge of the individual, much less his judicial capacity.

The Department's other duties frequently call for it to be the agency of Government which hails American citizens into our Federal courts. In the majority of Federal cases the citizen is the defendant. When he is involved in a suit against the United States he is forced to appear in a United States court; against United States attorneys selected and employed by the Department of Justice; before a United States judge who owes his appointment to selection by the Department of Justice. This judge is sometimes a candidate for promotion, dependent on recommendations of the Department of Justice. Many defendants are bound to feel that the cards are pretty well stacked against them.

Independence of the judiciary and public confidence in the independence of the judiciary are not always the same but they are equally important. Public confidence in the impartiality of Federal judges is absolutely necessary. The people must not feel that the Department of Justice may influence the outcome of decisions by methods other than those based on legal merit. In order to bolster public confidence in impartiality, the process of selection of Justices should be removed from the Department of Justice.

The process could be changed by law, but such a course is not absolutely necessary. It could be accomplished by unilateral action of the Executive. In either event, it will be changed only when the sustained force of public opinion against continuation of this practice is manifested throughout the country.

ADVISORY COMMISSION

The Congress could by statute prohibit the Department of Justice from filling this role and establish an advisory commission to perform this service for the President. The commission could and should be composed on a nonpartisan basis of outstanding individuals, both lawyers and laymen, who would make selections on a nonpolitical basis. I believe that any step in this direction would be an improvement in the present process of nomination. I believe that some such step is absolutely essential in modern government. This is not intended as any criticism whatsoever of the present Attorney General.

—SENATE SHALL "ADVISE AND CONSENT"

Let us now turn to the other side of the coin, the process of confirmation. The Constitution provides in article II, section 2, that (the President) shall nominate, and by and with the advice and consent of the Senate shall appoint . . . Judges of the Supreme Court. * * *" Careful reflection on the words of this constitutional mandate leads to the logical conclusion that two separate duties are imposed on the Senate by its terms: to give "advice" and to "consent."

The phrase "advice and consent" has an ancient and honorable English and American constitutional history. It comes down through Magna Carta. It was used in the Second Charter of the Massachusetts Bay Colony in 1691. In 1787, those who cham-

pioned a strong Executive and those who championed a strong Legislature chose these historical words when they agreed certain powers should rest with the President with "the advice and consent" of the Senate.

At the present time—and it has been the practice since Washington's second term—the Senate as an instrument of Government merely gives consent to the nomination. Confirmation is consent. There is no advice officially given although the duty and responsibility are plain.

This advice which the Senate has been so reluctant to give could be, and probably should be, given by Senate resolution or Senate rule establishing minimum qualifications for appointments to the Supreme Court.

This I have sought to do by resolution introduced in the 84th and 85th Congresses, as follows:

"*Resolved*, That from and after the date of adoption of this resolution, at least one of each two successive nominees confirmed by the Senate for the office of Associate Justice of the Supreme Court shall, at the time of the confirmation, have had at least ten years of judicial service. For the purpose of this paragraph, 'judicial service' means service as a justice of the United States (as defined in sec. 451 of title 28, United States Code), a judge of a court of appeals or district court, or a justice or judge of the highest court of a State or of any other State court having general jurisdiction."

The proposal has gathered islands of support. But its chances for early passage are doubtful so long as the bar and public generally do not bring the sustained support of informed public opinion behind this proposal. The only objection which has been offered is that it interferes with the Presidential prerogative and power of nomination. I personally view it only as an exercise of a long neglected Senate responsibility. I believe that the language and meaning of the constitutional provision are clear and that a knowledge of history and the facts will sustain this point of view without additional legalistic arguments.

Thus, in Congress I believe that two steps should be taken to improve the selection of the Federal judiciary:

REMOVE DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

1. Removal of the Department of Justice from its role as chief advisor on judicial appointments. Substitute instead an advisory judicial commission, bipartisan and objective, who might solicit qualitative recommendations from local individuals, members of the legal profession and associations and other groups, on a confidential basis.

The appointment of Federal judges is another instance of a highly important Presidential function that is now entirely beyond the possibility of personal attention of the President due to the overwhelming demands of his office created by our new role in world affairs and the increased burdens of the Federal Government in domestic affairs. A new method is absolutely essential.

Frankly, I think the selective processes must be placed largely in the hands of persons who are not directly connected with the Federal Government. We cannot imagine a condition any time soon where any Federal official could equal the statement made in America in 1947 by the lord chancellor of England, Viscount Gowitt, whose prerogative it was to name men to the English bench when he said, "I am able to tell you * * * that I have never let political considerations weigh with me to the slightest degree in trying to get the fittest man. I have never appointed, incidentally, a member of my own party."

SENATE STANDARDS

2. Establishment by United States Senate action of very high standards for confirmation of Supreme Court nominations. I have already enlarged on this in connection with my remarks on the Senate resolution that I have introduced. Personally, I would apply the test of judicial experience to 1 of every 2 of the appointees and a minimum of 10 years of actual courtroom practice to 1 of every 2 of the appointees.

In the same manner, the United States Senate could set up standards for approval of nominations to the Circuit Court of Appeals, in which case I think the requirements for trial practice should be at least 10 years experience or at least 5 years of judicial experience. And by the same method, standards could be established for the approval of nominations to the district courts, which should include 10 years of actual courtroom practice and trial experience.

All these recommendations follow the letter and spirit of the Constitution and would give greater independence to the Federal judiciary as well as restore public confidence that future appointments are made from those best qualified.

ULTIMATE POWER STILL THE PRESIDENT'S

In conclusion, I want to emphasize above all other things the absolute necessity of a new outlook, a new sentiment, and a new method for making the selections of all Federal judges and Justices of the United States Supreme Court. This can be done without changing the ultimate power and responsibility of the President of the United States, the highest elective official in our form of government. We thus insure protection against any new menace arising from a new system. The ultimate responsibility of actual final nomination should remain with the President. It is the method that must be changed to meet practical conditions.

In all events, an informed and a sustained public opinion is essential in order to have a change for the better. Among other hazards, unless we improve the system, life tenure and other independence for members of the judiciary are seriously threatened.

Tribute to Fred Pabst

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM E. PROXMIRE
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, February 25, 1958

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, one of Wisconsin's leading citizens was lost to our State with the death of Fred Pabst. I think the editorial, One of Our Noble Men, in the February 21 issue of the Milwaukee Journal, is a fitting tribute to a man whose life contributed much to his community and to the State of Wisconsin.

I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ONE OF OUR NOBLE MEN

No need to write in praise of Fred Pabst's two distinguished business careers as a top national figure first in brewing and then in cattle breeding. His death Friday at the fine old age of 88 brings forcibly to mind instead what an attractive and lovable person he was, an honor to our civilization.

One is tempted to use terms that unfortunately sound derogatory to most ears today. He was an aristocrat, for instance, but only in the true and best sense of being a cultivated and courtly gentleman, ever thoughtful of others and with a high instinct for duty, living graciously but not preening himself on personal wealth.

He was a beer baron, if you will—not with any connotation of ruthless quest for riches, but as one of the handful of men who built a great industry and made Milwaukee its world famed center. One term that does not come to mind is gentleman farmer. No dabbler, Fred Pabst ran a successful farm enterprise with consummate studiousness and skill, evincing a deep love of the land that was one of his most endearing qualities.

The colonel—a title without meaning except that some friends thought it an apt mark of affection—actually was a gentle, shy man, kindly and generous. It was genuine interest as well as duty that found him always helping to serve the cultural and charitable needs of his community. He practiced the rule of brotherhood because he really felt that way.

In Fred Pabst, Wisconsin will remember one of its noble men.

Importance of a Liberal Foreign-Trade Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEVERETT SALTONSTALL
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, February 25, 1958

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an excellent editorial by Life International, which was published as an advertisement in this morning's Washington Post and Times Herald. It states succinctly and most persuasively the case for a liberal American foreign-trade policy.

There being no objection, the advertisement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LET'S TALK SENSE

This session the Congress faces a major decision on reciprocal-trade legislation.

It is a decision in which millions of Americans have a personal stake, because their jobs depend on it.

It is a decision in which every American has a large stake, because the well-being of our economy depends (to a greater degree than is generally realized) on a healthy international trade.

Right now our booming export trade is serving as a significant stabilizer for our economy, while activity is slow in the domestic sector.

During the past 3 years, the volume of foreign trade done by private United States businessmen has grown twice as fast as their domestic trade. Items reported last month by the Department of Commerce:

The ratio of export to domestic sales of nonelectric machinery, having climbed slowly but steadily since 1953, reached an alltime high in the third quarter of 1957.

Exports of construction, excavating, and mining machinery, which during 1953-55 were about one-fourth of domestic sales, became over one-third as large as domestic shipments in 1956 and in January-September 1957.

The number of commercial planes delivered to foreign airlines in the second and third quarters of 1957 was virtually one-

half the number completed for domestic customers.

The number of locomotives exported in January–September 1957 was nearly 50 percent as large as the number of new locomotives installed in domestic service.

In the case of cotton, the 23-year high of 7.5 million bales exported in the 1956–57 season permitted a reduction of over 4.7 million bales in Government-controlled stocks, notwithstanding the fact that domestic consumption was off by over one-half-million bales from the rate of the previous year.

In January–September 1957 exports of manufactured steel products rose by 1 million tons. During the third quarter, the ratio of net exports of steel products to domestic sales climbed to the highest rate in recent years.

Some chemical export sales (e. g., pesticides and antibiotics) have become as large or larger than domestic sales.

In contrast to domestic use of wheat, which declined steadily during the past 4 seasons, exports moved continuously upward over the same period.

Since exports are so patently important to our economy, and since other nations cannot buy our goods unless we buy theirs also, the minimum course indicated for Congress is to extend the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act under which international trade is now flourishing.

But this is no time for minimum courses. It is an ideal time for Congress to take a giant step worthy of our stature by sweeping away entirely the walls of trade restrictions between us and the friends on whom we depend.

We repeat here what Life, Life International, and Life en Espanol have said editorially to more than 30 million readers the world over:

"The American contribution to world economic development can only be in terms of the institutions Americans know best: i. e., the free-enterprise system. We suggest that this system, which some regard as a golden goose in the American barnyard, is instead a first class political weapon of intercontinental range.

"We propose that this weapon be employed in the following drastic manner: That the United States declare its traditional protectionism at an end, open its shores to the free enterprisers of all nations and embark on a new policy of free trade. The purpose of this dramatic move would be to strengthen alliances and set new standards of world prosperity to which communism can never aspire.

"Fortunately the free world has been enjoying a long boom, sparked largely by free enterprise. But this boom threatens to dwindle before it has begun to satisfy the world's unfilled need for trade and investment. Nor has the United States, the supposed headquarters of free enterprise, done nearly what it should to stimulate this boom toward its incredibly greater potential.

"A defensive United States trade policy represents a failure of leadership. The challenge to the United States now is to take a giant step and put its trade policy on the offensive. For that, the time is riper than ever.

"This step is to adopt the policy of complete free trade. The United States should declare it toward all countries willing to accept certain minimum standards under which free enterprise can work. The gains to America from such a deal would be immense, the costs small.

"Defense? Let the Armed Forces name the items they cannot trust to free trade and subsidize their domestic production openly instead of by tariff. Readjustment? Not more than 100,000 United States jobholders are vitally dependent on tariff protection; they could easily be assisted in their transition to new ones.

"Sentiment? Americanism? We are here proposing a new sentiment, a new Americanism, which sees its interest as identical with that of all free people who want the enormously higher living standards that will accompany a fuller international division of labor."

Labor Should Be Free in Our Republic

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM F. KNOWLAND
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, February 25, 1958

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Labor Should Be Free in Our Republic," which I prepared for the American Mercury for March 1958.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LABOR SHOULD BE FREE IN OUR REPUBLIC
(By WILLIAM F. KNOWLAND)

Long ago I learned that one of the penalties of public life is that abuse and deliberate misrepresentation of one's views and actions too often take place. It is one reason many able men and women will not offer themselves for public elective office. I have, however, great faith that the people can see through the political smog created by designing partisans and will separate fact from fiction. I want to outline some basic principles in which I believe.

As a free people we must always be on guard against the concentration of excessive power in government, industry, or in labor.

After much suffering and sacrifice, our basic American freedoms were achieved. We were able to establish and maintain, up to now, the concept of a government by consent of the governed. Power without responsibility is detrimental to the individual and to the preservation of the free way of life. The Constitution of the United States, with its guaranties of religious, economic, and political freedom, was instituted by men who knew that the power of government had to be diffused by men who knew that checks and balances were necessary if freedom for the individual was to be preserved.

At the turn of the century, as a matter of national policy, it became necessary to limit the expansive power of big industry. The passage of the Sherman and Clayton Antitrust Acts established traffic signals along our economic highway to protect the American people.

There has been much misrepresentation of my views regarding labor-management relations by those who seek to confuse rather than to inform. I believe that the right of an individual to join a labor organization should be protected by State and Federal law. I have supported such legislation both as a member of the California State Legislature and in the Congress of the United States. I believe in collective bargaining. It is, and will remain, protected by law. The right of collective bargaining calls for responsible conduct on the part of management and labor. It calls for negotiation in good faith. Collective bargaining should not, and must not, degenerate into coercive bludgeoning.

No group in industry or in labor should have the power to strangle the economic life of 170 million Americans. This is too much power for responsible leaders in industry or labor to want, and far too much power for irresponsible men to be allowed to have.

Just as monopolistic power in government cannot be countenanced by a free people, so it is true that monopolistic industrial or labor-union power cannot be allowed unchecked control over a vital segment of our national life. Neither industrial nor labor organizations should be above the law or be given powers which no nongovernmental agency should have.

The unons of the Scandinavian countries are based on voluntary and not compulsory membership. The late American labor leader, Samuel Gompers, supported voluntary and not compulsory unionism.

We are all concerned, or should be, regarding the rights of American citizens under our Constitution. Our right of employment is a basic civil right of the first magnitude.

Compulsory unionism denies the worker a freedom of choice.

1. It denies to millions of men and women the opportunity to earn a living except by agreeing to pay dues, initiation fees and assessments, and to submit to the discipline of a private organization.

2. It makes captive those of the membership who may oppose the economic or political policies of the union or may violently object to the coercive methods or the corruption of the leadership, yet cannot resign without losing their ability to work for a decent livelihood.

What American would want to live in a community without churches? Yet who would want to join a church except by free consent? To contribute except by voluntary action? To remain a member if his convictions dictated otherwise?

So it is with civic, veteran, farm and fraternal groups. The type of leadership, the benefits spiritual or material, the social or recreational assets of the organization are the criteria upon which free men and women should make their voluntary determination to join, to remain, or to leave. Why should industrial or business workers be denied the same freedom of choice? Compulsory membership, in effect, passes the taxing or disciplining power of a sovereign government on to a private organization.

Those who do not contribute to the United Crusade, Red Cross, cancer, or tuberculosis societies or belong to 1 of our 2 great political parties, benefit nevertheless. To that extent they are free riders. But would we want to substitute compulsion for voluntary giving and participation?

The disclosures before the special Senate Labor and Industry Investigating Committee were shocking to the previously uninformed public and to the membership of many labor organizations. It was shown that there are both labor and business leaders who will not of their own free will or morality, abide by rules of fair play.

I believe the rank and file of the members of labor organizations need additional protection, and toward that end I am having congressional legislation prepared. Such legislation, which I call labor's bill of rights, will include the following points:

1. The membership should be able to elect its officers by secret ballot and to have votes so cast be the only ones that are counted.

2. When their officers have become incompetent, have shown lack of integrity in the handling of union funds, or for other reasons the union members have determined that the officers should no longer represent them, the membership should have the power to recall the officers by secret ballot.

3. The rank and file of the membership of a labor organization should not be taken out on strike except by a majority secret ballot of the membership. Certainly, the economic consequences to the worker, his wife and family, to the community, the State, and the Republic can be of such serious consequences

that the members should have the power to make that determination by secret ballot.

4. The administration of the welfare funds of the union members should be protected in the same way that bank deposits and insurance funds are protected.

5. The initiation fees, dues, and assessments of members should be fully protected and handled with the most strict accountability and integrity.

All union financial transactions should be audited, and a full accounting should be made to the membership.

6. Union members should have the power to correct arbitrary and unlawful acts of union officials without fear of retaliation. Minority members should have the same kind of safeguards secured as for minority stockholders in similar situations.

7. National officers should not have the power to take over local unions without membership approval, except for limited periods and under adequate safeguards to the local membership. Nor should they, by creation of paper locals or extensive setting up of trusteeships over local unions, be able to perpetuate themselves in power.

These are issues of concern to the public at large as well as to the individual worker. They need to be raised and met.

Because I have raised these issues of voluntary union membership and a bill of rights for labor I have been marked by some for political liquidation. If I never hold public office another day of my life I shall not cease to bring this issue before the people of my Republic and my State.

In the meeting of the problems of our generation, we must show the same courage and commonsense as the men who gave us our Republic and, in the past, have helped to maintain it. As Republicans, Democrats, or independents we can all join in subscribing to the oath of Thomas Jefferson when he said:

"I have sworn upon the altar of God eternal hostility to every form of tyranny over the mind of man."

Necessity for Peace Between Israel and Neighboring Arab States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THRUSTON B. MORTON
OF KENTUCKY
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, February 25, 1958

Mr. MORTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a letter written by Mr. Clarence E. Pickett to the President of the United States under date of December 3, 1957.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CLARENCE E. PICKETT,
Philadelphia, Pa., December 5, 1957.

The PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES,
The White House, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: To establish political and economic stability in the Middle East it is essential that a peace treaty be negotiated between Israel and the neighboring Arab States. To this end agreement on the following issues is basic:

1. The problem of the Arab refugees should be resolved by permitting a limited number to resettle in Israel, and by offering equitable compensation to all of them for property lost or left behind. Resettlement of the refugees, both of those who return to Israel and of those who decide not to return, should be facilitated by an international loan administered through a United Nations agency.

2. Definitive borders between Israel and its neighbors should be established straightening the lines between the borders recommended by the United Nations in 1947 and those established by the armistice agreements of 1948.

3. The city of Jerusalem and the surrounding villages should become an internationally administered territory under the trusteeship of the United Nations in accord with the recommendation made by the General Assembly in 1947, both the Arab States and Israel participating in the administration.

4. Once peace is established, special consideration should be given to economic development projects for raising the standard of living of the entire region for the benefit of all its inhabitants. One of these projects is the harnessing and utilization of the waters of the Jordan River.

5. To achieve such a peace the United States should initiate in the United Nations an effort to obtain a consensus including all the principal powers.

Respectfully yours,

CLARENCE E. PICKETT.

Cosigners: William H. Baldwin; Vice Adm. Daniel E. Barbey (retired); Dean Harry J. Carman; Malcolm W. Davis; George B. Ford; Oscar W. Haussermann; August Heckscher; Bishop Henry W. Hobson; Paul G. Hoffman; James Kerney, Jr.; John LaFarge, S. J.; Chester J. LaRoche; Dr. Henry Smith Leiper; Goodhue Livingston, Jr.; Henry R. Luce; Dr. Robert M. MacIver; John Nuveen; Henry V. Poor; Prof. A. J. G. Priest; Dr. James T. Shotwell; Theodore C. Streibert; Dr. Henry P. VanDusen; William W. Waymack; William L. White; Prof. Quincy Wright.

Editorial Letters by Seymour E. Harris

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, February 25, 1958

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, during the fall months four significant letters written by Seymour E. Harris, chairman of the department of economics at Harvard University, to various newspapers and periodicals in this country, have come to my attention. Because I believe they merit thoughtful consideration by my colleagues, I ask unanimous consent that the letters be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

To the EDITOR OF THE NEW YORK TIMES:

In two successive editorials, the Times has criticized the recent statements of the Democratic advisory council. In the first, the Times points out that the objectives of the two parties are similar; in the second, that inflation is the product of the Democrats, not the Republicans.

The Democratic foreign policy statement stresses the deterioration of the foreign position of the United States, the loss of prestige, the weakening of our military position, the ascendancy of economy-minded Republican leaders, inclusive of President Eisenhower and Secretary of the Treasury Humphrey, over the requirements of the military, the imposition of military aid when it was not wanted or could not be used.

The folly of cutting $10 billion of military outlays in 1954 and the recent cuts in research expenditures even as our foreign position becomes more and more vulnerable, are enough to condemn Republican military and hence foreign policy. Or consider the fact that in the midst of a struggle to win allies and in the midst of a rapidly worsening situation foreign aid under Eisenhower has become about half as important relative to gross national product as under the Democrats.

But perhaps the most dubious part of the Times editorials relates to its comments on the inflation problem. Here let us grant that the intentions of the administration were good. But deeds, not intentions, count.

They failed to keep their budgetary expenditures within their promises of 1952 by $15–25 billion, depending on how they are measured. (Perhaps it was fortunate that they failed or our defenses would largely have been gone.)

Through their credit agencies they continued to lend and guarantee vast sums of money even as in 1953 and 1955–57 the Treasury and the Federal Reserve were inducing tight money.

They showed little hesitancy about spending when the additions were not reflected in budgetary figures. A good investigation of how accounting methods and spending practices have changed under the present administration is in order.

They talked about anti-inflationary policy at the same time that the President and Secretary Humphrey repeatedly showed that they did not understand the most modern weapons of anti-inflationary policy, namely, fiscal policy. They would only cut taxes in prosperity and hence inflate further, not in depression when tax cuts were needed to stimulate the economy.

Above all, the Times is wrong when they hold that the Democrats in recent years were the party of inflation. If the Times editors would examine the price history of 1932–52 and eliminate the war and demobilization years, then they would find that price rises per year were 6 times as great under the Republicans in the last 2 years as under the Democrats in 20 years. Even Secretary Humphrey, in the recent BYRD hearings, admitted that comparison of war and peace years was not fair. Yet the Times considers the rise of prices immediately following World War II, certainly an aftermath of the war, and also the rise related to the Korean war and compares these with the Democratic record. Note that from 1948 to 1950 consumer prices were unchanged at 102.8, suggesting the Democrats had stabilized prices before the Korean war.

If the Times wants to compare war records, then I submit that inflation, relative to resources going to war, was 14 times as great in the last large war run by a Republican (Lincoln) as in World War II, run by Roosevelt and Truman.

The Democrats condemn the Republicans, in short, for bringing on the disease which they like to associate with Democratic policy; for trying to contain it through the use of clumsy and contradictory policies; and for introducing a tight money policy which has failed of its objectives, which has been unfair in its incidence (as Secretary Humphrey admitted), which has failed to take account of the limitations of monetay policy (cf. the frank admission of impotency of the Governor of the Bank of England), and which associates, in a simple-minded way, money and prices. Above all the Republicans through their restrictive policy are jeopardising the stability and growth of our economy.

SEYMOUR E. HARRIS,
Cambridge, Mass.

To the EDITOR OF THE WALL STREET JOURNAL:

In a recent editorial, the Journal attacks the Democratic national council for

its criticisms of the Eisenhower monetary policies. The gist of the Journal's position is that the Democrats demand more money; and that means more inflation and higher, not lower, interest rates.

Unfortunately, the Journal misinterprets the Democratic position and also does not seem to comprehend the issues.

The Democratic council wants the administration to abandon a monetary policy of restriction which has failed to stop the inflation and which has been most inequitable in its incidence and which has contributed toward recession. That is not exactly taking a position for expansion of monetary supplies and inflation. (But the signs are now increasingly that an expansionary policy may be needed.)

Unfortunately, the Journal is wedded to ancient theories of economics. The way to increase savings and hence to cut interest rates and raise investment is not by reducing monetary supplies and income but by increasing incomes through reasonable monetary policies. Savings depend above all on the level of income.

Finally, the Journal has followed the Federal Reserve in supporting a scare campaign in re inflation. Indeed, when prices rise 1,000 or 100 or even 10 percent per year, interest rates may well tend to rise. But these are developments under galloping inflation, which is not an issue here. That the rate of interest has risen phenomenally in the last year or two has been the result not of inflation but of monetary restriction. In less than 2 years the Eisenhower administration has undone the great achievements of Roosevelt and Truman over 20 years in getting rates of interest down and hence stimulating investment—a needed ingredient of anti-inflationary policy.

SEYMOUR E. HARRIS.

CAMBRIDGE, MASS.

To the EDITOR OF NEWSWEEK:

In his column of November 11, Mr. Hazlitt criticized the Democratic Advisory Council statement on inflation and labels the Democrats the party of inflation and their statement as a fraud.

But to prove his point Mr. Hazlitt compares the price experience of 1945–52 with that of the Republicans from 1952 to 1956. This is grossly unfair. Mr. Hazlitt includes the 2 years immediately following the war, which with decontrol reflected the major part of the rise of prices associated with wartime inflation; and he includes the years 1950–52 of the Korean war. Had he compared the non-war years of the Democratic control, he would have found an annual rise of prices one-sixth as great under Eisenhower in the last 2 years. And in 1948–50 the Democrats had stabilized the price level.

It may be Mr. Hazlitt's view that the Democrats repudiate the only appropriate attack on inflation; namely, monetary policy. But it is not the general view of economists who insist that other weapons are more potent. The Republicans seem to be interested only in fighting inflation (and unsuccessfully); the Democrats, in monetary stability as well as growth, full employment, and equity.

SEYMOUR E. HARRIS.

CAMBRIDGE, MASS.

HARRIS ON SLICHTER ON KEYNES

In the anniversary number of the Atlantic, my distinguished colleage, Sumner Slichter, as usual has written a provocative and original piece on our economy. But as one who has done his share toward a spreading Keynesian economics in this country, I am disturbed both by the title of Slichter's article, The Passing of Keynesian Economics and also by the statement that "but Keynes' theory has turned out to have been wrong in all its essentials."

If the last statement is correct, then I find it difficult to understand Slichter's article. His stress on the consumption function (the relation of consumption and income) and investment as the crucial factors as well as his continued emphasis over the years on the need of more debt and money are Keynesian, not classical. The fact is, as a careful reading of this article will reveal, that Slichter is a great admirer and even follower of Keynes.

Indeed, Keynes may have underestimated investment possibilities and the place of consumer credit. But, in re the stability of the relation of consumption to income which was fundamental in his system (aside from cyclical variations), history has proved Keynes to be substantially right. In the peak years, 1929 and 1956, consumption was 95 and 93 percent of disposable personal income. Despite the great expansion of consumer credit, consumers' relative contribution declined, if anything.

Slichter does not prove his point by emphasizing the excess rather than the deficiency of demand. Keynes' point after all was that the private economy needed support of more government spending and even some planning. When the governments of this country spend $105 billion a year and the losses of World War II have to be recouped by both public and private spending and western Europe diverts funds to investment through Government planning, then the solutions are Keynesian. Where would we be with the $10 billion of Government spending in 1929 instead of the $105 billion of 1956? Consider the fears engendered today by the minor defense cuts. It is still to be proved that private enterprise can carry the economy without Government support.

SEYMOUR E. HARRIS,
Chairman, Department of Economics,
Harvard University.

Threat to Dairy Industry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM E. PROXMIRE
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, February 25, 1958

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, yesterday one of the organizations of the Pure Milk Products Cooperative of Fond du Lac, dairy farmers in my State, presented a splendid statement to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry concerning the severe blows that have been suffered by dairymen during the past 5 years, and warning of the terrible consequences that will follow if the cut in dairy income that is now proposed by the administration is allowed to go into effect. This statement is so full of important factual information that I want every Senator to have a chance to read it at once. Therefore, I ask unanimous consent to have it printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT OF PURE MILK PRODUCTS COOPERATIVE, FOND DU LAC, WIS., TO THE SENATE COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE AND FORESTRY, FEBRUARY 24–25, 1958

Pure Milk Products Cooperative is a bargaining association of more than 15,000 active dairy farmers located throughout Wisconsin and parts of Illinois and Michigan. Their milk is sold through some 160 dairy plants. About one-third goes to grade A fluid markets, while the other two-thirds goes for such manufactured dairy products as condensed and evaporated milk, butter, dry-milk products, and numerous types of cheese.

Pure Milk Products Cooperative urges prompt enactment of legislation of the type proposed in Senate Joint Resolutions 149 and 150 to hold milk prices in the coming year at not less than the $3.25 per hundredweight level of the 1957–58 marketing year. It is not in the interest of either dairy farmers or the national economy as a whole to cut prices in the manner proposed by Secretary Benson, which would result in a decrease of some 8 percent in the gross income of dairy farmers selling milk for manufacturing purposes.

Dairy farmers are in no financial position to withstand additional income losses in an economy in which dairy farm operating costs continue to skyrocket upward. While our membership is made up entirely of dairy farmers, it is not difficult for us to understand the effect of lower prices on other types of farmers. We believe it is imperative that legislation of the nature proposed by Senators HUMPHREY, AIKEN, and SYMINGTON be given prompt consideration to maintain farm income at not less than the levels of the current marketing year.

Agriculture has suffered from a serious cost-price squeeze in recent years, while the remainder of our economy has prospered, with the result that the seriously depleted reserves of farmers can ill afford further price cuts. Following is a comparison of total personal income for the United States, together with gross and net farm incomes.

Comparison of United States personal incomes and farm incomes, 1945–57

[In billions of dollars]

	Total personal income [1]	Realized gross farm income [1]	Realized net income from agriculture
1945	171.2	25.8	12.8
1946	178.0	29.3	15.0
1947	190.5	34.0	17.2
1948	208.7	34.6	15.9
1949	206.8	31.6	13.7
1950	227.0	32.1	12.9
1951	255.3	37.1	14.8
1952	271.8	36.7	14.3
1953	286.0	35.1	13.9
1954	287.4	33.7	12.2
1955	305.9	33.2	11.6
1956	326.9	34.4	12.1
1957	342.9	34.8	11.9

[1] 1958 Economic Report of the President.

Comparing the above figures, it becomes apparent that the net farm income from agriculture during the past 4 years has been down sharply from 1951–53 levels by about one-fifth and is running 30 percent below the 1947 level. On the other hand, personal income in the United States has gone steadily higher. Personal income for the Nation has increased each year by more than the total annual net farm income in the United States. In fact, total personal income has increased during the past 4 years by twice the average annual total gross farm income.

Wisconsin farmers have fared equally bad in recent years. Figures available from the

USDA indicate that from 1949 through 1956, net farm income in Wisconsin, a specialized dairy State, has decreased in a manner that places dairy farmers in a serious financial position.

Wisconsin farm income and production expenses

[In millions of dollars]

	Cash receipts from farm marketings and Government payments [1]	Farm production expenses [1]	Difference between cash farm income and production expenses
1949	931.7	613.3	318.4
1950	947.9	637.0	310.9
1951	1,142.1	722.5	419.6
1952	1,151.9	750.5	401.4
1953	1,071.3	721.1	350.2
1954	1,000.3	714.5	285.8
1955	984.8	719.2	265.6
1956	1,025.3	745.8	279.5

[1] Farm Income Situation,, September 1957, U. S. Department of Agriculture.

Wisconsin's net cash income has declined 34 percent from the peak 1951 level, and in the past 3 years has averaged only three-quarters of the 1949–53 average.

On the matter of national milk production, official figures show that milk production has not increased nearly as rapidly as population in recent years. In the past 10 years, our national population has increased about 20 percent, or about 2½ times as much as milk production. We have met our needs and maintained our small excess by outting deeply into that reserve milk production which was formerly kept on the farms.

The amount of milk used on farms has decreased from 20 billion pounds to 14 billion in the past 10 years, and of that milk sold by farmers we have increased the percentage disposed as whole milk from 77 to 88 percent. Even with this change in farm use and disposition of milk, we have sold from our dairy farms only 4 or 5 percent more milk than our domestic needs.

Manufactured milk is produced to a large extent in those areas having the least alternatives in farming. Such farmers are not likely to reduce their farm milking operations in response to lower prices. They will have to try to increase their output to meet increasing fixed expenses and to support their families. Cutting prices will not in our opinion decrease production in the specialized dairy States. The loss of rural income is more apt to cause serious financial problems for the entire community as farmers are unable to meet expenses and continue to make normal replacements of buildings, fences, machinery, and appliances.

Farm costs continue the rising trend of recent years even though milk prices have declined. In the past 10 years, while manufactured milk prices have dropped 12 percent, farm wage costs increased 33 percent, farm machinery prices advanced 67 percent, taxes climbed 85 percent, and interest rates skyrocketed 115 percent. Dairy farmers have been able to only partially combat this cost squeeze by increased production. Rural trading centers are already feeling the effects of a farm depression and its influence of farmers' ability to buy the products of our factories.

Although much publicity has been given the surplus of dairy products, we have had very little to spare in proportion to our total needs. We seldom realize that our daily diet includes nearly as much milk in our various dairy products as meats, vegetables, and grain products combined. The USDA reports of 1955 urban consumption per person shows a milk equivalent of 9.2 pounds per week as compared with 4.4 pounds of meat, poultry and fish, 3.9 pounds of vegetables, and 2.6 pounds of grain products. Our 4 or 5 percent reserve (misnamed surplus) of dairy products has been less than enough to have provided a per capita consumption equal to that of either 1947 or 1950, and would in all probability again be in serious shortage in case of a national emergency.

A 25 cents per hundredweight cut in milk prices will cost dairy farmers nearly $300 million, but will save the Government only about $13 million on costs of support purchases. It is not likely to have much influence on dairy products consumption if one accepts the findings of USDA Technical Bulletin 1168, a report well supported by other scientific research. This publication reports demand for dairy products to be very inelastic to the extent that we can expect only about 3 percent greater sales to result from a 10-percent decrease in resale prices. Such an increase might be offset to a considerable extent by the increased efforts of specialized dairy farmers attempting to meet their expenses. Furthermore, it's doubtful if producer price cuts will be reflected in consumer prices.

We further urge as a long-range approach, the enactment of the self-help dairy stabilization proposal of Senate bill 3125, sponsored by Senator HUMPHREY, of Minnesota, and both of our Wisconsin Senators, PROXMIRE and WILEY.

It is imperative that the present support level for dairy products be maintained until an alternative dairy program may be enacted and made effective. Our Nation cannot afford the chaos and hardship that will be felt by dairy farmers and their trading centers if we lower our present support level prior to the enactment of a long-range alternative program such as self-help programs that are before Congress for consideration.

The seriousness of the condition of our national economy has been emphasized by recent reports of the sharp increase to about 4½ million in our unemployment. This situation has become so serious that President Eisenhower recently recommended the expenditure of $2 billion for post-office modernization. Certainly there can be no justification for pulling down the level of the agricultural segment of our economy which has already been in the weakest financial position, when other steps are at the same time being taken to bolster the economy as a whole. We must take immediate steps to prevent further financial loss to the farmers supplying the most important factor in our livelihood—food.

We urgently request the earliest possible approval of Senate Joint Resolutions 149 and 150. These will provide for maintenance of farm income until you, as Members of Congress, can give consideration to sound long-range programs, some of which are before you already.

WM. C. ECKLES,
General Manager, Pure Milk Products Cooperative, Fond du Lac, Wis.

Key Religious Leaders Back Foreign Aid; Refute Charge That Economic Aid Promotes Materialism and Is Destructive of Religious Values

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER H. JUDD
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 25, 1958

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I include the following statements by outstanding religious leaders of all faiths, supporting continuation and constant improvement of our mutual-aid programs as powerful evidences of American concern for the well-being of all peoples as our brothers under God:

KEY RELIGIOUS LEADERS BACK FOREIGN AID: HOLD ITS CESSATION A SIN

"For the United States to discontinue or cripple its mutual-security program would please the Communists more than any one thing I can think of," declared Dr. Norman Vincent Peale, minister of the Marble Collegiate Church, New York, in a statement released today by the Foundation for Religious Action in the Social and Civil Order (FRASCO), of which he is a national sponsor. "Wherever I have traveled, I have found," Dr. Peale continued, "that thoughtful nationals feel American aid constitutes a serious and sincere effort to help them undergird free institutions."

This and other statements on mutual security from the standpoint of ethics and religion by leaders of four major faiths—Protestant, Catholic, Jewish, and Eastern Orthodox—were released today by FRASCO in the midst of the growing discussion which will reach a climax early next week in the White House Conference on Foreign Aspects of United States National Security. In view of recent controversy over whether foreign aid is or is not in accordance with religious principles, a number of key religious leaders have been pooled by FRASCO. Quoted below are some of the statements received in addition to the one by Dr. Peale.

A Catholic spokesman, Rev. James L. Vizzard, S. J., vice president, National Catholic Rural Life Conference, said: "All people of informed Christian conscience recognize in the mutual-security program our Nation's answer to a religious and moral imperative. Technical assistance and economic aid are the American way of fulfilling the injunction taught each in its own way by all great religions: Thou shalt love thy neighbors as thyself."

In similar vein, Rabbi Norman Gerstenfeld, minister, Washington Hebrew Congregation and a FRASCO sponsor, said: "The heart of western heritage of faith is the love of a righteous and merciful God and the love of man—because all men are the children of God. This love must express itself in acts of loving kindness, in aiding our fellow men so that they can solve the problems of poverty and disease, of slavery and tyranny. Foreign aid is not only good religion but enlightened self-interest, for the men we help will become allies in the building of a just world."

Dr. Paul S. Rees, minister of the Covenant Church, Minneapolis, Minn., and past president, National Association of Evangicals, said: "My observations abroad convince me that the discontinuance of foreign aid would be a disservice alike to our own country and to the free world. Weakness in administration should be corrected but no countenance should be given to any proposal for doing away with this arm of helpfulness in a world of need."

A second Catholic spokesman, Harry W. Flannery, president, Catholic Association for International Peace, stated: "It is my humble opinion that if the full significance of foreign aid could be brought home to the American people, they would be ashamed to realize how little of our national wealth is being devoted to its cause. We have been letting the people in underdeveloped countries believe that our interest in them is derived only from our struggle with the Soviet Union. We should give aid primarily, in accordance with our traditions, in the spirit of justice, and because we have a moral responsibility to do so."

Two Eastern Orthodox clergymen of Washington, Rev. Demetrios Kalaris and Rev. John Tavlarides, issued the following joint statement: "We Eastern Orthodox clergymen firmly believe that, in the interest of man's welfare and the manifestation of our Christian charity, special support should be given the policies of foreign aid of the United States. We believe that it is in the spirit of brotherhood under God that our country has provided for the needs of people throughout the world and not as some would have us believe, primarily because of selfish motivation or expediency."

In view of these statements, and many more that are of public record, declared Dr. Charles Wesley Lowry, chairman of FRASCO, there can be no doubt that attempts to attack economic aid as materialism and as destructive of our religion, our way of life, and the Constitution as recently charged by former diplomat Spruille Braden, find no support among American religious leaders.

"The contrary," Dr. Lowry went on, "is the case. Our economic programs abroad represent a wise combination of political enlightenment and spiritual sensitivity. In administering them it is important that mistakes be corrected and that our public servants be held accountable for their stewardship. To propose, however, to stop these programs because some mistakes have been made is to throw out the baby with the bath, with a vengeance. To do so would be the height of folly as well as a sin and a shame at this time when the atheists of the Kremlin are paying the American foreign-aid program the supreme compliment of rushing to imitate it."

FRASCO is an all-faith organization, founded in 1953, to oppose communism and all forms of totalitarianism with spiritual weapons and at the same time to mobilize Americans to strengthen the moral and religious bases of our own democracy. Its national headquarters are in Washington at the DuPont Circle Building. FRASCO's co-chairman is Dr. Edward R. Elson, minister, National Presbyterian Church. On its national advisory council are such national figures as Rev. Billy Graham, Catholic Bishop John J. Wright, Rabbi Edgar F. Magnin, Rt. Rev. H. St. George Tucker, Rt. Rev. Athenagoras, Rev. John F. Cronin, S. S., Dr. Ralph W. Sockman, Hon. Herbert Hoover, Henry Ford II, Charles Edward Wilson, and George Meany.

More Specific Aim in Education Urged

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 24, 1958

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include a very interesting article on American education, delivered by Leonard Orlando, head of science department at the Revere High School, which appeared in the Revere Journal, Revere, Mass., on February 20, 1958:

[From the Revere (Mass.) Journal of February 20, 1958]

TEACHER TELLS PARENTS—MORE SPECIFIC AIM IN EDUCATION URGED

The aims stated for American education were called gentle, nostalgic musing of a melancholy poet by Leonard D'Orlando, head of the science department at the high school, in discussing what parents can do to help elementary pupils during a meeting February 12, of the Shurtleff School PTA.

He said that the aims expressed by the United States Office of Education as freedom, peace, and the fullest development of the individual were a stream of pretty words reflecting a sort of willing of the wisp allegorical connotation to goals.

He called for a return to the very specific goals which were to create responsible American citizenship based on self-reliance, patriotism, industry, and the ability for independent action.

"Its main concern," he said, "was to equip the individual with the knowledges and skills essential to making his own way in the world at whatever level of activity his talent permitted and with a character imbued with God-given virtues.

"The goal was clear and there was no pussyfooting about the means of reaching it. Strict discipline, self and otherwise, hard work stimulated by a burning ambition, inspiration, and concrete down-to-earth ideas about right and wrong.

WERE SPECIFIC

"Our fathers, for example, expressed their goals for freedom in terms of responsibility, a word most of us have ignored so long, we have all but forgotten its meaning. They further expressed this goal by their faith and reverence for God. They had few material comforts. They lived on the edge of want, were cold, hungry, and lonely, but they were freemen. Free to worship, to speak their minds, to criticize, and to vote for the man of their choice. They were willing to endure untold hardships for the privilege of enjoying this freedom, because they knew there was no other way to keep it.

"Can we afford to do less, and still keep our freedoms? I think not."

D'Orlando compared the statement of United States aims in education with that of Russia, which was stated after an analysis to be to train the child and youth to be an obedient, industrious, enthusiastic, and highly competent servant of the state, thoroughly prepared to perform the functions required by a state bent on stepping forward as the premier industrial and military power of the world.

"One can vehemently disagree that this should be a goal, but surely no one can accuse the Russians for lacking goals. They definitely know what they want and are certainly not wasting any time getting there," D'Orlando said.

OUTLINES PROGRAM

Outlining a program of action for parents, D'Orlando said:

"We must teach our offsprings from earliest childhood the nobility of hard, honest labor. We must make them understand that education is a painful process, a very hard job, and cannot be met by playful people in a playful way. We must at every opportunity teach them to have faith and reverence for God. For as St. Augustine once said: 'Without reference to God, there can be no purity, no stability, and no progress in anyone's life.'

"We must give our children our deep abiding love, and through it a positive sense of security which they instinctively crave. We must ourselves clearly realize that all of us live in a world of cause and effect. If failures in school is the effect, we must insist that our children know the causes which brought about these failures without passing the buck. We must hold our children strictly accountable for all their conscious acts. We must teach them to look for the tremendous spiritual satisfaction which comes to one as a result of a job well done, and to understand the twin corollary that he must not look for tawdry rewards in anything unless he's first prepared to work for such rewards as though his very life depends upon it, and well it might.

FIRM FOUNDATION

"In our anxiety to make sure that our children get a little more out of life than we ourselves were able to get, we must not overindulge them and relieve them of the fatigues essential for the attainment of real success in life. Without a firm foundation in integrity and responsibility not much of a superstructure can be expected in the stature of our growing children.

"If perchance our children should sometimes decide to become 'monsters,' we must make them know that there will be sudden and certain retribution for such conduct.

"We must not be overawed by the pet theories of crackpot psychoanalysts and thus withhold administration of just discipline when it is needed for fear that such repression may establish a long line of inhibitions.

"Sooner or later our children will have to live with all kinds of repressions and prohibitions. Civilized society is topheavy with all kinds of legal prohibitions. Our legislative bodies grind them by the ton load every year. Organized society depends for its very life on legal instituted repressions. If this were not so then there would be a snarling jungle of elemental brutish forces mutilating each other out of existence. Is that what we want for our children and for our beloved America?

"Let us remember that to be worthy parents to our children is a 24-hour job, 365 days a year. It is a task full of hazards and much travail, but if it is conscientiously done, it can well be the dawn of a very beautiful era, for ourselves, for our very precious youth and for all the distraught world everywhere."

Recital by Sidney Harth, American Violinist

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THRUSTON B. MORTON
OF KENTUCKY
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, February 25, 1958

Mr. MORTON. Mr. President, I had the opportunity last Friday night of hearing Sidney Harth, who is now the concert master of the Louisville Symphony Orchestra, give a very impressive violin performance at the Polish Embassy. He was accompanied on the piano by Robert Below, a talented young artist who is a native of Louisville.

As a Kentuckian, I was proud of the magnificant performance of these two talented artists. I am particularly grateful to the Polish Ambassador and Mrs. Spasowski for their hospitality on this occasion.

I ask unanimous consent that an article by Howard Taubman, appearing in the New York Times and discussing the event, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

POLES PRESENT SIDNEY HARTH, UNITED STATES VIOLINIST

(By Howard Taubman)

The Polish Embassy tonight gave Americans a lesson in the proper way to take pride in their own artists. It disclaimed any intention to make propaganda, but it could not have succeeded better if it had tried.

The Polish Ambassador, Romuald Spasowski, and his wife presented Sidney Harth, American violinist, in a recital in honor of

his second prize at the Wieniawski International Competition in Poznan, Poland, last December. Mr. Harth will repeat his program tomorrow night at the Polish Embassy.

These are paid engagements, and they are giving Mr. Harth an opportunity to be heard in the Nation's Capital before distinguished audiences. Among the invited guests were leaders in diplomatic, Government, social, and artistic circles. Rarely has an official representative of a foreign country, particularly one in the Russian bloc, paid so graceful and practical a tribute to a young American musician.

The irony of the occasion lay in the relative indifference of his own countrymen to Mr. Harth's accomplishment. Louisville, where he is concertmaster of the orchestra, is an exception. He is appreciated in the Kentucky city because in the last 4 years he has been a force for good music through his playing, conducting, and teaching.

It was Louisville, indeed, that made possible his trip to Poznan. The orchestra board contributed $500 for his traveling expenses to Poland, and the Poles provided living costs and return passage. Louisville hailed Mr. Harth on his return.

But other Americans, particularly people influential in the music business, seemed to care little. On his way back from Warsaw Mr. Harth stopped in New York. He tried to get appointments with several leading concert managers but failed.

He could recall wryly the consolatory words of David Oistrakh, world-famous Russian violinist, who had served on the Poznan jury and had himself taken second place in this contest in 1935. As far as engagements were concerned, Mr. Oistrakh had said, second prize would be as useful as first. And Polish and Belgian agencies had offered Mr. Harth a 6-month tour in Europe. But things are different in the United States, though in all fairness it should be pointed out that the managers have more gifted violinists than they can sell.

Mr. Harth showed tonight that he is exceptionaly gifted. The Cleveland-born 32-year-old violinist has a glowing personality and a sweeping style. When he plays the Wieniawski Concerto No. 2 in D minor, with which he dazzled Polish audiences, he belongs in the grand romantic tradition. His tone is big, his phrasing rhapsodic, and his freedom of interpretation irresistible. Here is a musician with imagination and individuality, who is not afraid to say something personal with the music he undertakes.

In two movements from Bach's E minor Sonata for Violin Alone, Mr. Harth played not only with technical assurance but also with a freshness of feeling that gave the music immediacy. Nardini's E minor Concerto had both brilliance and warmth; the slow movement was particularly impressive. With his wife, Teresa Testa Harth, who is assistant concertmaster of the Louisville Orchestra, Mr. Harth gave a crisp and perceptive reading of Prokofieff's bristlingly difficult Sonata for Two Violins, Op. 56.

At the Polish Embassy, Mr. Harth had a colleague from Louisville, Robert Below, as his accompanist. In Poland he had had to adapt to strangers during the preliminary rounds while the 3 Russian competitors, who finished among the top 6, had brought along their own pianists. Even so Mr. Harth missed the first prize by only 3 points out of 900, and knowing observers thought that he deserved at least a tie with the winner, Rosa Fain, of Russia.

Safety Program of the Boy Scouts of America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. RICHARD L. NEUBERGER

OF OREGON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, February 25, 1958

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, as a member of the Senate Public Roads Subcommittee, I am particularly concerned about safety. Indeed, this has been one of the main reasons why our subcommittee has sponsored the $33 billion interstate highway program, to try to eliminate accidents on the open road.

One of the best statements I have ever seen on street and highway safety has been printed in a pamphlet entitled "Safety," which is published by that outstanding organization, the Boy Scouts of America. Although many Scouts themselves are below the age when they can legally drive a motor vehicle, the Boy Scouts of America nevertheless have a direct interest in trying to save lives on the highways, because the innocent victims of so many tragic and unnecessary accidents are young people.

I think it would be beneficial for all of us if the pamphlet on street and highway safety, as taken from the 1958 edition of the "Safety" booklet of the Boy Scouts of America, were reprinted in the Appendix of the RECORD. I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, that this be done.

There being no objection, the pamphlet was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STREET AND HIGHWAY SAFETY

The motor vehicle, the car, the streets and highways it travels on—these make up our country's biggest, most serious safety problem: traffic safety. This traffic safety is your problem, your parents' problem, the problem of safety experts, everyone's problem, the year round. It is not something you can tuck in your pocket and pull out when it's convenient. It's a real, everyday problem.

We're making headway in meeting the problem. Yes, more people are killed and injured in traffic accidents today than ever before. But more people are also driving than ever before. Fewer people are killed today per mile traveled than 20 years ago. Progress is being made. But we need more progress—faster progress.

What can you do about death on the highways? Certainly you've thought about it.

We ought to make the speed limit 50 miles per hour on all highways.

You've probably heard that suggestion. It might help and it might not. Actually, driving at high speeds causes fewer accidents than failure to follow other safe practices. A better idea is for everyone to become safety conscious—the pedestrian, the cyclist, the passenger in a car, and the driver. That's where you can help. By practicing safety, by knowing and obeying the laws, you will help reduce accidents. You can help reduce accidents by learning the causes of traffic accidents, then following the practices and advice given in this chapter.

PEDESTRIAN SAFETY

Failure to obey traffic rules and regulations; people in a hurry—these are the two major causes of pedestrian accidents on our streets and highways.

In a hurry, people cross the street between intersections and against traffic signals. They walk from behind parked cars, cross intersections diagonally, play in the street, and hitch rides on vehicles.

Some pedestrians are stubborn, defiant, and show very little or no courtesy. Stand on a busy corner in your community and watch pedestrians purposely walk in front of a car making the driver slow down. See how many pedestrians cross against the traffic light figuring they can get across before an oncoming car will reach them. They obviously don't think or realize what will happen when 3,200 pounds of metal hit 165 pounds of flesh and bone. Many pedestrians don't realize how long it really takes a driver to stop a car. Cars will not stop on a dime.

Good pedestrian safety measures to practice are:

Look in all directions before crossing a street.

Obey traffic signals, crossing on green light or the walk signal.

Do not cross streets diagonally.

Stand on curb or in safety zone when waiting to cross the street.

Go directly to opposite curb—don't fool around while crossing.

Give the driver the benefit of the doubt—he may not be able to stop as soon as you think.

Play in areas away from the street—do not dash into streets.

Walk and hike on the left side of the highway or the shoulder, facing oncoming traffic.

Watch out for passing cars when walking along the highway. Stop and stand back until they pass.

White at night—wear it or carry it when walking on roads and highways.

Carry packages and umbrellas so they do not obstruct your view.

Stop, look, and listen at railroad crossings even when you think you know when trains are due.

Obey railroad signals.

Stay off railroad cars and property. Walking along railroad tracks is, according to law, trespassing.

Look where you are going and obey traffic lights when crossing a street.

Wait in safety zones or on sidewalks for buses.

Get out of all vehicles on the curb side.

After getting out of any vehicle, wait until you are sure the way is clear before crossing the street.

Do not try to hitch onto moving vehicles.

Do not insist on your right of way.

BICYCLE SAFETY

Do you ride a bike? If you do, you are a driver right now. You drive in the streets and on the highways. As a bike driver you should stop for red lights and at stop streets. You have road rules just as the motorist does. Some cyclists even have licenses. Unfortunately, they also have and cause accidents.

Some 500 cyclists are killed every year. Enough cyclists are injured every year to fill 26 1,000-bed hospitals. Twenty-five percent are killed or injured when making an improper turn. Another 17 percent of the

accidents are due to cyclists riding through red lights and stop streets. Carrying extra riders results in many accidents. About 1 out of 10 bike riders involved in accidents doesn't have the right of way. Weaving in and out of traffic causes accidents. Other causes: Defective bicycles, running into parked cars, riding abreast of other cyclists, hitching onto motor vehicles, riding against traffic, showing off, parking improperly. Like automobile drivers, some cyclists go too fast and end up in trouble.

The cyclist isn't always at fault. In fact, half the motor vehicle-bicycle accidents are caused by motorists. Drivers open car doors without looking for cyclists first. Turning without signaling, not stopping at a stop sign, and passing on the right are other bad driver habits that result in bicycle accidents. Watch for these careless practices.

Remember that as a cyclist you are a driver—a driver of a 2-wheel bike today, a driver of a 4-wheel car tomorrow. Use these cycling safety rules:

Obey all traffic laws, signs, and signals.

Ride single file, close to right-hand curb. Ride with, not against, traffic.

Ride in a straight line—don't stunt, race, or weave in and out of traffic.

Look, then signal before turning or stopping. Use motorist arm signals.

Don't carry passengers.

Give pedestrians and motor vehicles the right-of-way.

Slow down and look carefully before crossing intersections.

Walk bike across railroad crossings, streetcar tracks, and busy intersections.

Don't hitch onto cars and trucks.

Don't shoot out of blind driveways and alleys.

Be alert for other vehicles, especially for cars pulling out from curbs and driveways.

Keep your bicycle properly equipped and repaired. Ride sensibly.

Don't try to squeeze in between cars and trucks.

Ride with both hands on the handle grips.

When riding at night, have a headlight and red rear reflector. For added protection use reflective strips.

Be sure your bike has good brakes and a warning bell or horn.

Don't pass moving vehicles on hills, curves, or at intersections.

Carry packages in carirers—not in your arms.

Ride at a reasonable speed. Don't coast down hills at high speed.

Park bicycle in safe areas, out of the way of vehicles and pedestrians.

Keep bike in good mechanical condition.

Be a courteous cyclist. Respect the rights of other cyclists, of drivers, and pedestrians.

PASSENGER SAFETY

Bees or bugs in the car have caused accidents. You may have read about them. They aren't the only passengers, though, that have taken a driver's attention from the road long enough for him to pile into a pole. Some people passengers distract drivers and cause accidents, too. They do it by arguing and jumping around in the back seat. They do it by carrying on a constant conversation with the driver while in heavy traffic or on dangerous roads. And they do it by clowning around in the car.

Other passenger-caused accidents result from crowding too many into the front or rear seat; putting head and arms outside the car; standing instead of sitting.

You'll probably be a passenger in someone's car today or tomorrow. How are you going to act? What kind of safety sense do you have? Follow these safe practices:

Make sure doors are properly closed.

Sit, don't stand. Stay put.

Let the driver do the driving. Don't distract his attention with unnecessary conversation and clowning, especially in heavy traffic and on dangerous roads.

Keep head, hands, and arms inside the car.

Obey the driver.

Get out of car on the curb side.

Never ride on the outside of a motor vehicle.

While on a bus, obey rules about not touching emergency door; keep aisles free of trash and personal belongings; hold onto seat or hand support when leaving seat; use handrail when getting off bus. After getting off bus, cross road with others at proper locations; look both ways before crossing.

DRIVER SAFETY

When you take seriously what you've read so far, when you practice being a safer pedestrian, a safe passenger, a safe cyclist, you will be taking a giant step toward solving this country's biggest safety problem. Suppose everyone had the safety sense you will have when you put what you've learned into practice!

But you still have the big step to take. You have to become a safe driver. And you don't have to get behind the wheel to do this, either. You can enroll in a driver education course at school. You can learn the basic driving facts right now, right here. You can learn to recognize dangerous traffic situations now; you can learn the causes of the accidents that take 38,000 lives every year.

Accidents happen everywhere, on back roads in the country and on Main Street in the city. They happen most often on curves and hills and at intersections. Time is an accident factor. Most accidents take place between 4 p. m. and 8 p. m. The next most fatal period is between 8 p. m. and midnight, followed closely by the midnight to 4 a. m. period.

Analyze 1 accident and you'll find more than 1 cause. Driving too fast for conditions is a common cause. More than half the drivers involved in fatal accidents violate a traffic regulation at the time of the accident. Other causes: driving under the influence of alcohol, bad weather conditions, failure to give right-of-way, failure to keep to right of center line, improper passing, disregarding traffic signal.

Some drivers think that traffic regulations are unnecessary or too stiff. This and other poor attitudes cause accidents. Lack of courtesy causes accidents; lack of driving skill causes accidents; unsafe condition of the car, physical handicaps, and many other factors are involved in accidents.

Driving is a privilege. It can be taken away if you don't behave right when driving a car. When you learn to drive, practice courtesy—there is no substitute. Along with courtesy, the following safe driving practices are important:

Keep your car in good mechanical condition.

Don't drive without a driver's license or permit.

Adjust seat and rearview mirror before starting car.

Make sure street is clear before backing out driveway.

Drive on the right side of the road.

Obey traffic officers and traffic signs and signals. Stop on red, go on green, slow down and proceed with caution if light is yellow.

Drive at reasonable speeds—at or below speed limit if weather and road conditions are good, slower if they are not.

Keep in right lane if driving slow on a highway.

Stay about one car length for every 10 miles per hour of your speed behind the car in front of you.

Don't weave in and out of traffic.

Pass cars on their left, on a straightaway, not on curves or near the crest of a hill.

Don't fight others trying to pass you—let them pass.

Signal properly when you want to turn, stop, slow down, or pass.

Don't jump a red light or try to get away before the other driver.

Keep both hands on the wheel.

Observe right-of-way rules.

At night:

Use low-beam lights when meeting other cars and when following another driver.

Slow down—don't drive as fast at night as in the daytime.

Keep windshield and headlights clean.

On long trips:

Ventilate car. Fresh air is a must.

Don't drive it drowsy. Park and take a nap.

Park car off road frequently, get out and walk around.

RIGHT-OF-WAY RULES

When approaching an intersection, give right-of-way to cars in the intersection.

When two cars enter intersection at same time, car on left yields right-of-way to the car on his right.

When you are in an intersection and want to turn left, yield right-of-way to cars coming in opposite direction if they are in or close to the intersection.

Give right-of-way to pedestrians at intersections and crosswalks.

Don't insist on your right-of-way.

II: More About Reuther—A Little More Light Explaining Walter P. Reuther's Ambitions

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
CLARE E. HOFFMAN
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 18, 1958

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, here is a little more light explaining Walter P. Reuther's ambitions, as seen by George Todt, in the Valley Times of California, January 29, 1958:

GEORGE TODT'S OPINION—MEN JUDGED BY THEIR UTTERANCES

"Inspiration and genius—one and the same."—VICTOR HUGO.

A couple of years ago, Senator BARRY GOLDWATER of Arizona expounded on The Fallacy of Common Man at the Robert Taft memorial dinner in Boston—and it was one of the most thought-provoking addresses I have ever read.

Here is GOLDWATER at his intelligent and pro-American best. I will quote a few revealing excerpts from his speech. Hold on to it and compare it with Walter Reuther's political and social philosophy for our people when it appears tomorrow.

This brilliant effort by the young Arizonian blasts the New Deal and excoriates the common man of socialism and in it Mr. GOLDWATER asked for the return of our people to the principles of the uncommon man who made America great in the past—with emphasis upon individual liberty, responsible freedom, and enlightened capitalistic free enterprise.

Listen to Senator GOLDWATER and judge his lucidity and sanity for yourselves:

"The preachers and prophets of gloom in our country—those despairing individuals who believe that we have reached the zenith of freedom's opportunities and must now revert to an antiquated system of slavery and

regimentation—have long leaned heavily, in the name of liberalism, upon the theme of the common man.

"They have employed the tyrant's tactic of division and disunity by appealing to the lingering prejudices of a system of ranks and classes which pure freedom does not recognize. When they speak, they speak not to all Americans as Americans, but rather they set labor against management, farmer against worker, black against white, Jew against gentile, Catholic against Protestant, rich against poor.

"In other words, they classify Americans according to race, color, religion, and occupation, and they say to each group that they are the common men who are being oppressed by the privileged few. The privileged few, of course, in the eyes of the socialist-minded pseudo-liberal is anyone who has enjoyed a measure of success and prosperity that is greater than that of the particular group of which he is speaking.

"Secretary of Labor James Mitchell called attention of this tendency of the New Deal's Social Democrats to turn our people into common men in an address at Flint, Mich., on January 20, 1956, when he said: 'The keepers of this doctrine were interested not in individual men but in collective man, massed man. For them social problems were quite simple. One merely had to determine what was good for collective man and then shove it down his throat like castor oil. The Government was of the people, for the people, but by the social planners.'

"A similar view is expressed by James B. Conant in his latest book, The Citadel of Learning, where he says: 'We in the free world, through our schools, colleges, and universities, seek to perpetuate that tradition of western culture which emphasizes diversity, controversy, and tolerance.'

"So where are we to find the common man the Social Democrats are always talking about? Is he of the Anglo-Saxon, Scandinavian, Germanic, Latin, Slavic, Celtic, or the score of other races which make up our population? Is he English, Irish, Scotch, German, French, Italian, Norwegian, Swedish, Czech, Polish, or among any of the other three score and more nationalities which people the United States? Do we find that our common man is a Catholic, Methodist, Unitarian, Presbysterian, Baptist, Jew, or any of the hundreds of other religious sects which flourish among our people?

"Is he the business executive, the city or rural lawyer, the office clerk, the shop manager or foreman, the factory worker, the school principal, the teacher, the corner grocer and his wife, the chainstore manager, the garage owner or mechanic, the department store clerk, the army officer or private, the housewife, or in any of the other thousands of occupations which make up our working population? We have over 67 million employed persons in all occupations today. Where is the common man in this total?

"They show one thing above all else: That there is no such thing as a common man in the United States. Every man and woman is an individual, with talents, interests, needs, hopes, and dreams of his or her own. Each person seeks freedom to live his own life, to develop his own personality and a fair opportunity to get ahead in the game of life on his own merits.

"America is the land which urges us to hitch our wagon to a star, to plan and to build on the rich foundations of our freedom and heritage of those who came before us and provided for us, and for the generations of Americans yet to come, the opportunities we have had, as well as inspiration to move ahead to yet undiscovered frontiers in this sanctuary of freedom.

"We need—desperately need—the uncommon men of our Nation. We need the courage and unquenched spirit of adventure which inspired the freedom of these United States. We need to encourage in all Americans the qualities which guided Bob Taft—Senator, statesman, and uncommon American."

This, then is the American Senator whom Moscow-trained Walter Reuther has labeled the country's No. 1 political fanatic, the No. 1 peddler of class hatred and has ranted that he is mentally unbalanced—he needs a psychiatrist, he needs help.

Tomorrow we will compare Senator GOLDWATER's ideology with Mr. Reuther's. Shall we all take a good look for ourselves at that time?

The Milwaukee Public Library Shows the Way to Public Understanding and Entertainment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, February 25, 1958

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, yesterday I placed in the RECORD a resolution of the American Library Association pointing up the continuing need for library service in rural areas.

Offhand, some persons, especially those who live in our largest cities, might not realize—because they have taken it for granted—just how important library service is.

The fact is, however, that the American public library represents one of the great cornerstones of the American free way of life.

The libraries accessible to almost every one of us—for example, the library right here in the Senate, the public libraries of the District of Columbia, the libraries in schools and colleges, the libraries of trade associations and scientific groups, and the libraries of myriads of other organizations—represent part and parcel of the American heritage.

Learning is available to all. Library books in the United States are not locked up, as in some Old World countries. Here, they are right on the open shelves, where the seeker of truth, aged 6 to 60 or beyond, can find his own answers, according to his interests, his desires, his curiosity, and his tastes.

So, too, we want the same service to be expanded in the rural areas, where far too many millions of Americans are still denied access to this great repository of man's experience.

I was reminded of these facts when I glanced through one of the recent splendid bulletins issued by the Milwaukee Public Library. On the four pages of this bulletin are shown a cross-section of what a forward-thinking, civic-minded library system can do for an entire community.

On page 1 is a bibliography in connection with last week's celebration of National Brotherhood Week. On page 2 is a list of civic events in greater Milwaukee. On page 3 is a list of library, radio, and TV programs. On page 4 is a continuation of references to the noble concept of brotherhood.

This is a sample illustration, therefore, of the diverse contributions of library systems in serving actively as spearheads of civic enlightenment and entertainment. I may say "incidentally" that smaller communities may not be able to afford this particular type of broad bulletin service, but I know there are likewise literally scores of Wisconsin communities where libraries staffed by dedicated public servants do perfectly wonderful jobs with modest financial resources.

I send to the desk the text of this bulletin, and I ask unanimous consent that the sample Milwaukee Reader may be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the pamphlet was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BROTHERHOOD OR EXTINCTION

(By Paul Gratke)

The 25th call to brotherhood has been issued by the National Conference of Christians and Jews. The call is to men of good will everywhere to work together for understanding and peace among men. The call is also to men whose prejudice, intolerance and hatred have blocked them from working and living in equality and justice with men of other religions, color or political point of view.

The question of brotherhood involves governments, business and education but its implications to the individual man, the citizen—in his relationships neighbor to neighbor, worker to worker, student to student—are of immediate concern in Brotherhood Week scheduled for February 16–23, 1958.

In helping people to prepare for this launching of a new year for brotherhood, the Wisconsin office of the National Council of Christians and Jews has issued a list of big ideas which—when men grow to recognize them and live according to their implications—can make life happier and more secure for all.

1. America is a land of many peoples, a country pledged to opportunity for all. When we deny any citizen his basic rights in employment, education, health care, recreation or housing we deny and betray the American dream.

2. Differences of national origin, status in life, religious conviction, color of skin or place of residence do not imply either inferiority or superiority of any person. Science finds no evidence that any racial group is biologically, intellectually, emotionally or morally inferior or superior. Differences which exist are the result of differences in opportunity.

3. In our world, where two-thirds of the human family are colored, the white minority can not expect to continue to dominate. Therefore, mutual understanding, respect, and cooperation are essential for survival.

4. No human is born with prejudices, but most of us learn at an early age the prejudices of those around us.

5. Today's rapid population shifts require development of better human relations, skills by all persons, especially those of intergroup understanding, cooperation and friendliness across racial and religious lines.

The recent warning by Adlai Stevenson that civilization faces brotherhood or extinction, which gave us the title of this article, has also been recognized by the authors whose books and pamphlets are listed:

Forbidden Neighbors, a study of prejudice in housing by Charles Abrams; the rise and spread of prejudice in housing in the United States with suggestions for a program of government and citizen action.

Man's Most Dangerous Myth by Ashley-Montague; shows the falsities upon which the myth of race is founded.

Books Are Bridges, American Friends Service Committee pamphlet; a list of books recommended for children.

Human Relations: Concepts and cases in concrete social science, by Hugh Cabot; 33 case studies including a hospital, a fraternity, and a family. Intended to give a foundation for group discussion.

Blessings of Liberty, by Zechariah Chaffee; analysis of fundamental personal liberties in our America for the past 40 years.

A Manual of Intergroup Relations, by John P. Dean and Alex Rosen; outlines techniques which produce changes in the status quo of majority-minority relations.

The 14th Amendment and Civil Liberty, by Richard A. Edwards, Carrie Chapman Catt Memorial Fund, Inc. Pamphlet; a brief survey of some aspects of the 14th amendment, protection of civil liberty with emphasis on the relationship between the 14th amendment and the Bill of Rights.

Race and Nationality in American Life, by Oscar Handlin; traces the origin of prejudice, and reveals some of the problems in correcting bias seated in historical inaccuracies.

People Come First; a youth guide to human rights in the community youth advisory board, Governor's Commission on Human Rights, Madison, pamphlet; a plan for human rights at home, in the school, church, club, and neighborhood.

Groups in Harmony and Tension, by Muzafer Sherif; by means of historical events and social psychological studies the author studies relationships both within and between groups. The influence which brings about harmony or tension in these settings is identified.

Racial and Cultural Minorities, by George Simpson; the causes and consequences of tensions between groups in the social structure.

Hundred Desires, by Eleanor Estes; a simple story which has become a classic in the children's literature of human understanding.

One God, by Florence Fitch; a description of three ways of worship, both objective and reverent, for children's understanding.

People Are Important, by Eva (Knox) Evans; differences and the reasons for them in this interesting and informal presentation for young people.

WHAT'S GOING ON IN MILWAUKEE

(Week of Monday, February 3, through Sunday, February 9, 1958)

Monday, February 3: Mental Attitudes in a Frightened World; Dr. Ralph Sockman (Town Hall of Milwaukee) Milwaukee Vocational School Auditorium, 8 p. m. No admission charge.

Chicago Symphony Orchestra concert, Carlo Maria Giulini, conductor, Pabst Theatre, 8:15 p. m.

George Axelrod's, Will Success Spoil Rock Hunter starring Ann Corio (Drama, Inc.) Fred Miller Theater, 8:30 p. m. Matinees Wednesday and Saturday, 2 p. m. (through Saturday, February 22).

Exhibit of Charivari Prints, by Honore Daumier (through February) Fioretti Studios, Alverno College. No admission charge.

Tuesday, February 4: Discussion groups; world politics, Llewellyn Neighborhood Library; American Democracy, Central Library; American foreign policy, Charles Allis Art Library (first of 10 consecutive meetings), 7:30–9:30 p. m. Registration fee.

Inter-personal Relations in Marriage; Dr. Ervin Teplin, lecturer (young adult institute and young adult group) Jewish Community Center, 8 p. m. No admission charge.

Baroque Music, Jack Wilson, lecturer (MacDowell Club) Merrill Hall, Milwaukee-Downer College, 8:15 p. m. No admission charge.

Wednesday, February 5: Madison String Sinfonia, Mount Mary College, 10:30 a. m. No admission charge.

Discussion groups; world politics, Nicolet High School and Finney Neighborhood Library; American foreign policy, Wauwatosa Adult School and Shorewood Opportunity School (first of 10 consecutive meetings), 7:30–9:30 p. m. Registration fee.

John L. Diedrich, World Wide High Lights (Museum Lecture Series) Milwaukee Public Museum Lecture Hall, 8 p. m. No admission charge.

11:30 a. m. WISN–TV (12): The Woman's Way, with Jane Doud; spotlighting the Central Youth Library with Miss Norma Rathbun, coordinator of youth services.

Thursday, February 6:

Discussion groups Russian foreign policy (first of 10 consecutive meetings) Central Library, 7:30–9:30 p. m. Registration fee.

6 p. m. WMVS–TV (10): Let's Talk It Over, with Nolan Neds and a panel of teen-agers discussing How Important Do You Consider Grades?

Friday, February 7:

Aubusson Tapestries, Two Worlds of France and Playgrounds of France (film program), Charles Allis Art Library 8 p. m. No admission charge.

All the King's Men, with Broderick Crawford, Joanne Dru and John Ireland (Museum Films of Contemporary America) Milwaukee Public Museum Lecture Hall 8 p. m. No admission charge.

Opening of the Ralston Crawford Exhibition (through March 9) Ralson Crawford, speaker. Milwaukee Art Center 8:30 p. m. No admission charge.

Booth Tarkington's Seventeen, Marquette Players Teatro Maria, 1210 W. Michigan St. (same time Saturday and Sunday and the following weekend), 8:15 p. m.

1 p. m. WTMJ–TV (4): Woman's World, with Beulah Donohue. Out of the Sea and Sky during the IGY Library Guests, Julien Pontier, and Lawrence Medley, Central Library.

LIBRARY, RADIO AND TV PROGRAMS

Saturday, February 8:

Young Tom Edison (museum young people's film program) Milwaukee Public Museum Lecture Hall, 10:30 a. m. and 2 p. m. No admission charge.

Little Lee Bobo (North Shore Children's Theater) Shorewood Auditorium, 2 p. m.

Robert Davis, Sicily, Island of the Sun (museum lecture series) Milwaukee Vocational School Auditorium, 3:30 and 8 p. m. (same time on Sunday). No admission charge.

Jose Greco and his company of Spanish dancers, Pabst Theater, 8:15 p. m.

8:45 a. m., WTMJ–TV (4), Your Library Story, Blue Nose. Storyteller, Janet Eggum, Finney Neighborhood Library.

10:30 a. m., WXIX–TV (19), Billy's Quiz, with Billy the Bookworm and Mrs. Alice Krahn; panel members from the Shorewood Public Library.

11:05 a. m., WTMJ, Young Moderns and Authors Talk Books; guest, Marie Mudra discussing her book Look Beyond Tomorrow.

11:30 a. m., WTMJ, What's New, with Esther Hotton highlighting the library's calendar of events.

3:30 p. m., WTMJ–TV (4), Young Moderns Talk Books; guest, Mrs. Victor Hamm discussing Robert Taliant's Evangeline and the Acadians.

Sunday, February 9:

Eric Pavel, Argentine Smiles Again (Shorewood travel and adventure series), Shorewood Auditorium, 3 p. m.

La Verne Gertrude Scheffler, soprano (youth in music concert series), Wisconsin College of Music Concert Hall, 4 p. m.

St. John's University Men's Chorus of Collegeville, Minn. (Cardijn Center), Alverno College, 8 p. m.

Music lecture, Philip Aaron and his quartet (young adult department), Jewish Community Center, 8 p. m.

3:30 p. m., WITI–TV (6): An Open Book, with Gene Halboth and readers reviewing the life and works of Guy de Maupassant.

4:30 p. m., WITI–TV (6): Public Conference, the President's Economic Report; guests, Roderick Riley, Ralph Ellis, Prof. Robert J. Barr, prof. Donald Schwartz; library discussion leader, Peter J. McCormick; moderator, Bruce Kanitz.

CONTINUING EVENTS

Exhibits:

Museum Artists at Work (Milwaukee Public Museum), Charles Allis Art Library (through February).

Printing in Milwaukee (Graphic Arts and Advertising Guild of Milwaukee), second floor, Central Library (through Saturday, February 15).

Israel: Contemporary Paintings, Jewish Community Center of Milwaukee (through February 23).

Modern Design in Printed Textiles (lent by the Scalamondre Museum, New York), Milwaukee-Downer College (through February).

Paintings and drawings by Jean Pichotta Gross, Marian Studio, Mount Mary College (through February 14).

Foreign Aid and Reciprocal Trade

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ELIZABETH KEE

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 25, 1958

Mrs. KEE. Mr. Speaker, two of the most controversial issues which Congress will face this session are now before the House. They are: First, a proposed $4 billion foreign-aid program; and second, the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act.

The debate on these two issues will be long and at times bitter. There is renewed determination on the part of an increasing number of House Members to force changes in the tariff-cutting reciprocal trade-agreements program to insure adequate protection for domestic industries. West Virginia people know from bitter experience what unfair competition from imports means. Other sections of the country are now experiencing the same economic hardship as a result of the program and Representatives from these areas can be expected to join the fight.

The foreign-aid issue was put before the House in a message from President Eisenhower. The arguments he used could well have been lifted word for word from messages on the same subject sent to Congress by former President Truman 10 years ago. Essentially, they are the same scare words, threats of defections by our friends if we do not continue aid on a massive scale and of a larger draft.

It is obvious, from talking with other Members of the Congress, that something more than rehashed arguments were expected. We have heard a great deal of talk from administration sources about a new look in the aid program. The truth is we are asked to approve the same old program.

It is safe to say that the House is going to take a long, hard look at the President's request. The administration's reluctance to take positive action to alleviate conditions of chronic unemployment in a growing number of sections or to act in a bold manner to reverse the current downward drift in the economy only serve to emphasize the size of the request for assistance overseas.

Many Congressmen are asking this question: "If it is wise and desirable to help other countries build sound economies, why is it not just as important to enable all sections to participate in prosperity at home?" These Members are not necessarily opposed to foreign aid. They are, however, determined that in times of mounting unemployment and economic recession more attention be paid to domestic problems.

This is not an unreasonable request. I am sure this point will be brought home to the administration in a most forceful manner before the debate on foreign aid is over.

It was only 2 years ago that President Eisenhower and Secretary Dulles assured Congress that the time had arrived to cut back on foreign aid and to work toward its gradual elimination. Now they are saying just the opposite. They want Congress to increase the appropriation and to spread our commitments even wider.

The President's economic-aid message poses many serious and grave questions. Before I try to answer them, I want to hear what Mr. Dulles and other administration witnesses have to say to the House Foreign Affairs Committee and to study all other testimony before reaching any definite decision.

A Synchronized Three-Point Farm Plan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KARL M. LeCOMPTE
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 25, 1958

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, considerable is being said about the farm problem, and I think it must be agreed that with all the efforts in Congress we have not as yet found a permanent satisfactory solution of the problem that seems to be present with every administration.

A successful and industrious young farmer in Iowa, Mr. Hollis Haskell, of Seymour, has given a great deal of thought to the subject and has worked out what would seem to me a plan that would have elements of success in it. The essential provision of his plan would be for the payment by the Government of support prices or soil-bank payments in kind; that is, paying a corn farmer for taking land out of production in corn at the current market price.

Mr. Speaker, I submit a brief statement from Mr. Haskell for the benefit of my colleagues who are eager to do what should be done with respect to this ever-present problem:

A SYNCHRONIZED THREE-POINT FARM PLAN

Every farm should have a soil map made in cooperation with the Soil Conservation Office and have a 5-year rotation crop plan. The corn base for each farm would be established from this plan.

From the production ability of the farm and the farmer, with the cooperation of the ASC personnel, the rate of rental per acre for the land put into the soil bank would be established.

No. 1: If the farmer wishes, he should be allowed to put all his corn base or any part of it into the soil bank and draw rental per acre which has been established for his farm, to the value of the number of acres put into the soil bank, the pay to be in money or corn from the sealed-stock supply. The cost of the corn should be market price at his local elevator at the time he receives the corn.

No. 2: If the farmer wishes he should be allowed to put all his corn base into corn or grain sorghum, harvest it for grain, and seal it to the Government at an average cost of production plus a reasonable profit figure.

In addition, he should be allowed to grow grain sorghum for farm use specifically for fodder or ensilage.

No. 3: The farmer who is at an age of retirement and wishes to do so, should be permitted to rent the whole of his farm to the Government (this also could be applied to all other phases of agriculture such as the cotton, wheat, and tobacco farms, etc.) at a nominal price so that he can pay taxes, other upkeep, mowing weeds, etc. Or, if he has his land rented, it could fall in the No. 1 or No. 2 categories.

Four Chaplains

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 25, 1958

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, the editorial which appeared in the Jersey Journal, Tuesday, February 18, 1958, entitled "The Four Chaplains," comments on my resolution (H. R. 5089), which would award posthumously the Congressional Medal of Honor to the four chaplains.

I believe it significant that the editor in describing the heroic act of the four chaplains indicates that it would be a perfect climax to Brotherhood Week if Congress would enact this legislation. For the act of the four chaplains in giving up their lives was, in the highest sense, an act of brotherhood. I might also point out, Mr. Speaker, that the American Legion legislative department of New Jersey in its statement to the New Jersey congressional delegation on Tuesday, February 18, 1958, recommended legislative proposals for the consideration of Congress, among which was the adoption of legislation awarding the Congressional Medal of Honor to the four chaplains.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include the editorial on the four chaplains:

THE FOUR CHAPLAINS

It would be a perfect climax to Brotherhood Week if Congress could find a way to award the Medal of Honor posthumously to the 4 chaplains who gave their lives 15 years ago so that 4 doomed soldiers might have a chance to live.

Two Protestant ministers, the Reverend George L. Fox and the Reverend Clark V. Poling, Rabbi Alexander D. Goode, and a Jesuit, the Reverend John P. Washington, gave their life preservers to four soldiers as a torpedoed transport sank. Then the chaplains clasped arms and prayed together until they were engulfed.

Because of a narrow interpretation of the conditions for awarding the Medal of Honor, they were passed over. It is given only for heroism in action and someone decided they were not in action. Just how much more a chaplain could be in action in the face of the enemy, is unclear. West Hudson's Representative PETER W. RODINO, JR., has introduced legislation to loose this narrow view.

The clear courage of their faith and the tremendous example of sacrificing themselves for their fellow man for the love of God, shine so beautifully in their noble act that a Medal of Honor can add nothing to its grandeur.

Awarding them the medal only would acknowledge our Nation recognizes it can learn from their example—learn a lesson it is striving so hard to teach itself by word and slogan this Brotherhood Week—a lesson they taught with their lives.

Lynn, Mass., Clergy Ask for Recognition of Deeper Meaning of Brotherhood

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 24, 1958

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am most happy to include messages from three faiths which appeared in the Daily Evening Item, Lynn, Mass., on February 19, 1958:

MESSAGES FROM THREE FAITHS—LYNN CLERGY ASK FOR RECOGNITION OF DEEPER MEANING OF BROTHERHOOD—REV. RICHARD A. WOLFF, REV. JOHN W. LYNCH, AND RABBI HARBURG DRAW LESSONS FROM OBSERVANCE

The Daily Evening Item tonight publishes three messages on brotherhood prepared by Lynn clergymen of three different faiths.

February is Brotherhood Month, observed throughout the United States, and this is Brotherhood Week. Mayor Thomas P. Costin, Jr., in a formal proclamation, has asked for a general recognition of the occasion by Lynn citizens.

The three messages which follow will give readers material for meditation on the significance of the observance.

(By Rev. Richard A. Wolff, pastor, Central Congregational (United Church of Christ))

Text, Isaiah 59: 2: "But your iniquities have separated between you and God."

Americans are famous bridgebuilders. We have spanned great rivers, built high trestles and superhighways that cross each other. We have not been so successful in bridging the gaps between nations, racial and religious groups.

In these areas, there are great gulfs which still need to be bridged. Why haven't we been successful? For the same reason that we have not been able to bridge the gap between God and ourselves.

Isaiah said that "your iniquities have separated between you and God." Yes, the iniquities of man—pride, selfishness, fear, ignorance, prejudice, and hatred—have separated us from God. When these barriers are bridged over, man comes close to God and when these barriers are bridged over, man can come close to his fellow men. It is precisely these same barriers that have separated us from other nations, races, and religions. Let us then bridge the gap between ourselves and God and become bridgebuilders for humanity. Thus, we shall build real brotherhood among men of all types and conditions.

In this Brotherhood Week, there is nothing more creative that we could do for the welfare of all humanity than to become bridgebuilders in the field of human relations.

1. Let us become bridgebuilders between nations. How we need to learn this art now when nations are divided by fear, suspicion, and military rivalry. The chief barriers to international cooperation are national pride, national self-righteousness, and a feeling of national superiority. World brotherhood must begin with the conviction that God is the Lord God and Ruler of all nations and He is the Creator and Father of all people. If we believe this is true, then we can believe that all men are equal and we can work together as brothers.

2. Let us become bridgebuilders among races. Just as God is the Creator and Father of all national groups, so He is the Creator and Father of all races. The yellow, white, black, and red are all equal in the eyes of God. The great sin of America is the sin of racial pride, the feeling of racial superiority which says that the particular race to which we belong is superior and, therefore, by implication, all other races are inferior. To believe in the fatherhood of God is to believe in the brotherhood of man. Yes, the brotherhood of the white man and the black man in the South, in the North, in this Commonwealth, in this city, and on our street. To bridge the gap between races is to lay the only real spiritual basis for democracy.

3. Let us become bridgebuilders, not only between nations and races, but also between religions. At this point, there is always the danger of being bigoted on the one hand or superficially tolerant on the other. In bridging this gap, let us not fall into either error. To say that one man's religion is as good as another's is false, for the test of man's religion is his character. "By their fruits ye shall know them." We know that there is a vast difference in the characters of men. To say that it makes no difference what a man believes is also a falsehood, for one's beliefs are the basis of his character, are the sources out of which character issues. We can, however, say that each man is entitled to the right of private judgment. This does not mean that all private judgment is right but it does mean that, if a man uses his best conscience and highest intelligence interpreting the word of God, his religious convictions are to be respected, whether they coincide with ours or not. Religion is a search for the truth. If a man is sincerely and openmindedly searching for the truth, then he is a religious man. We need to remove the barriers between ourselves and God ("But your iniquities have separated between you and God") that we might remove the barriers between ourselves and our fellow men. Thus, we can become champions of brotherhood between ourselves and our fellow men. Thus, we can become champions of brotherhood and good will, and become good bridgebuilders between nations, races, and religions. It is our unity under God which is the basis of all other unity.

(By Israel Harburg, rabbi emeritus, Temple Beth El)

Lincoln's birthday is observed annually throughout the country as a holiday which symbolizes the spirit of brotherhood. This theme of brotherhood, which is voiced all through the month of February, represents America at its best. The genius of democracy made it possible for the United States to become a Nation of many people, of various racial and geographic backgrounds. This theme of Brotherhood Month, though inherently American, is now understood and appreciated by freedom-loving people everywhere.

Millions of people, the world over, are now tired of the many years of hostilities; they are earnestly hoping and praying for an era of renewed world peace. Despite the clashes and the confusion of our day people are becoming aware of the fact that there is one world brotherhood and that the Creator of the Universe is the Father of us all. It is all so simple, yet it is not as simple as it sounds.

WILSON'S DREAM

Four decades ago Woodrow Wilson expressed his belief in the eventual formation of one world, composed of free nations, working side by side, conscious of a common destiny. Today these hopes sound more utopian than they did 40 years ago. At that time the Wilsonian ideals reflected the aspirations of many people who did visualize the possibility of just such a world, a world of mutual respect and of mutual trust.

Today, unfortunately, this whole theme sounds to many of us like a voice from another world. Day in and day out we hear of the aggressive despots of the Far East, of the intrigues in the Near East, of the depraved people behind the Iron Curtain and of the unreliability of some of our allies in Europe.

However difficult a cycle we go through in world affairs there is one thing we must guard ourselves against, if we want to retain our faith in the brotherhood of man. We must guard ourselves against the prevailing tendency to bestialize in our own mind the people of countries whove governments may not be in accord with ours at the moment. History has shown, time and again, that hostility and bigotry against one country or one race can soon be diverted to another and another. As soon as we dehumanize in our own minds groups of people abroad we can readily learn to become inhuman to neighbors at home. We have to learn to understand that prejudice is wrong, not because it is unkind or unfair, but because it eventually brings with it spiritual and national decline.

UNIVERSAL OUTLOOK

Students of American history are in accord that our most vigorous men of thought, including Abraham Lincoln, were those of universal outlook in the truest sense of the word. To be sure they all loved their country and their people and cherished the American way of life; but they were at the same time free from bigotry at home and from prejudice abroad.

One dares say that by and large the peoples represented in the United Nations, if only given a chance would cast their lot with those of us who seek world cooperation and world brotherhood. However, we should not delude ourselves in thinking that the United Nations Organization, or any other body, can effect and maintain world harmony while we sit back and enjoy our favorite prejudices. Moreover, this work of brotherhood cannot be accomplished merely through good-will activities. If it had been that easy we would have had world brotherhood a long time ago.

It is no simple task to undo the mental and spiritual ravishes wrought about by wars, by civil unrest and by race exterminations. To denounce the evil of prejudice is not enough. The first thing we have to do is to eradicate it in ourselves. That is very difficult. If we are at all candid we will confess that none of us are together free from bigotry. In the words of the poet, each and every one of us should say to himself: "What I have to do is to see, at any rate, that I do not lend myself to the wrong which I condemn."

(By Rev. John W. Lynch, Catholic chaplain, Lynn Hospital)

It is a lamentable situation that in a century wherein such astounding scientific progress has been made that the understanding and assimilation of the true values of life are so sadly ignored, or at least relegated to the status of the irrelevant. This erroneous evaluation of the purposiveness of life reflects itself in man's mutual association with his neighbor as an individual member of society and among nations as collective social entities whose reciprocal relations are in a sorry state in our time.

In a feverish desire to advance the transitory and ephemeral values and thus admittedly to elevate the standard of living of contemporary society, the modern attitude renders mere lipservice to the basic unchangeable fact that the destinies of man, his origin, his conservation in existence during his early pilgrimage, and his status in eternity, are in the hands of a worshipfully wise and infinitely intelligent Artificer.

NOT MERE BALM

There is an annual announcement to the effect that among books, the Holy Bible is the world's best seller. Yet, I fear, that in an era dedicated to the glorification of the effects of man's quest for an earthly paradise, the sacred Scriptures constitute a mere tranquilizer or soporific for the mind frenzied with unsatisfactory reactions and anxious disquietude after each plateau of advancing discovery has been explored and conquered.

The modern man must once for all time realize that the word of truth of an unchangeable and absolutely perfect deity furnishes not merely balm for tired minds, but a divinely inspired textbook on the purpose of existence of the one creature the wisdom of God saw fit, as the Scriptures relate, to receive dominion over all subordinate creation. For it was such a lofty prerogative that was vested in man alone. It was man and only man that was fashioned by the eternal plan of God to His own personal image.

The inspired author of Genesis relates that God completed all that He created in 6 days. As to the actual duration of these days of creation we are uncertain. Suffice it to say, the Scriptures are silent. The point is that on the seventh day "God ended His work which He had made and He rested on the seventh day from all that he had done." Modern man must emulate the Divine example of His Lavish Benefactor and turn the pearl of great price, the jewel of his very being, his intellect, to the true purpose of his existence.

Little wonder in mid-20th century world affairs, that the day of the Lord, the day for spiritual inventory, is occupied all too frequently with the extension of worldly pursuits or merely the soothing of the scars encountered in the perpetual conflict with passing problems.

ALL MEN EQUAL

The basis of man's enmity and antagonism toward his fellow man is rooted in his personal pride. But the sacred Scriptures tell us that God has molded man to His own

image and likeliness and that in the mind of God all men are equal. The antidote to pride is humility. Modern man, however, eschews humility and erroneously scorns it as weakness and indecision. The solution to the problem is not difficult; it is man who has made it appear so. Each one must sear into his soul a deep understanding and a dynamic desire to make his own the practice of the law as the Lord God expressed it, when He made answer to the learned doctor's query to simplify the law of God. The Scriptures relate "Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with thy whole heart, with thy whole soul and thy whole mind. This is the greatest and the first commandment, and the second is like to this, thou shalt love they neighbor as thyself."

Love has only one true definition and that is, speaking simply, to give. The command (and there is something final about that word) is to love God and similarly to love the crown of God's visible creation, our neighbor, or our brother. Who is our neighbor or our brother? Our neighbor or our brother is every other being fashioned by God in a manner like to our own.

CLEAR COMMAND

Thus the essence of brotherhood is deeply rooted in the cryptic and clear command of God to love Him and because of the infinite stamp of likeness to God in each man, to evidence similar sentiments to the universality of mankind for that very reason. May the understanding we have reached of true brotherhood derive its motivation from the irrefutable and inspired textbook of the Lord God according to these words found therein, "Let us therefore love God because God has first loved us. If any man say I love God and hateth his brother, he is a liar. For he who loveth not his brother whom he seeth, how can he love God whom he seeth not. And this is the commandment we have from God that he who loveth God loveth his brother."

Let each individual apply this antidote by a firm and determined recalling of God's fundamental law, so clearly enunciated in the great commandments of love. Love of God for His unspeakable excellence and love of our brother, who is everyone other than ourself, for "He Who Is" has so commanded us.

The divine blueprint of brotherhood is clear and lucid, the individual interpretations of men have been miserably inaccurate. May we look again and look long with an elevated mind and interpret this blueprint more faithfully.

A Miracle if Congressmen Start Policing Themselves

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS M. PELLY
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 25, 1958

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent I include an ediorial which appeared in the February 19, 1958, Bremerton Sun and which speaks for itself:

THE RIGHT IDEA, BUT—

There isn't a thing wrong with Congressman TOM PELLY's bill for disclosure of income by Members of Congress and Government officials paid more than $10,000—except one thing. It will be a miracle if the Congress adopts it.

It should. The Bainbridge Island Congressman makes much sense with it. It is a very simple bill. It says that the income of all those officials be made public, not only as to amounts to money received but from what sources.

That bill, if adopted, would fry a lot of folderol and without the necessity for a lengthy mass of congressional investigations with their contradictory statements by chest-thumping politicians who protest too much.

PELLY's bill simply would require every big inhabitant of the Federal goldfish bowl to state his income and its source. The voters would do the rest. It isn't difficult to imagine what would happen to a Congressman who voted to give the natural-gas boys higher rates if the Congressman's income statement showed a fat contribution from those gas gentlemen.

As PELLY said in presenting his bill, "The rules have been conspicuous by their absence" in the case of a high standard of conduct for officials and particularly for Congressmen.

That's the trouble. It will be surprising if Congressmen suddenly decide to start policing themselves.

Manila Found the Answer

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. E. C. GATHINGS
OF ARKANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 25, 1958

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Speaker, it is with distinct pleasure that I look forward to receiving in my mail copies of the newspapers published in the First Congressional District of Arkansas, for these newspapers carry the news of a continuation of industrial development and balance of economy that will bring more employment to the people of Arkansas and assist them in combating the low level of economy imposed by falling farm prices. The February 21 issue of the Crittenden County Times, published at West Memphis, Ark., was of special interest—for it carried on its editorial pages an excellent statement of the industrial growth of the city of Manila, Ark., outlining how the fine citizens of that community joined together to bring to their area an excellent new industry.

On the front pages of the Crittenden County News of that same date the headline reads, "Dover Will Locate Plant Here." The article concerns the location of the Dover Elevator Accessories Division plant in West Memphis, to occupy an 8,000-square foot industrial building for the manufacture of elevator passenger cabs and accessories—the first industry of its kind to locate in the Mid-south area.

This is an indication of the rapid development of industrialization in the Arkansas delta area, and its is a pleasure to include with these remarks the editorial which appeared in the News as an indication of the manner in which Arkansas citizens are working together to improve their economy:

MANILA FOUND THE ANSWER

West Memphians and other Arkansans can find a perfect example of the power of community effort in the little northeast Arkansas city of Manila.

Last winter, Manila's citizens rolled up their sleeves, worked together, and got themselves an industry. The story of how they landed a plant by using the old smalltown barn-raising spirit is told in the current Arkansas Industrial Development Commission advertisement being run by newspapers in the State as a public service.

A manufacturer of womens' sportswear, Stanley Manufacturing Co., was interested in Manila. But in order to land the plant, Manila had to have a building for the plant. There was a vacant building that was basically what the Stanley people needed. It had once been an old auction barn and at another time a skating rink. And it needed a lot of work before it could be used as a plant.

Manila didn't have the money to have the necessary work done on the building, so the people decided to pitch in and do it themselves. Doctors, lawyers, farmers, electricians, ministers, merchants, everybody worked. The ladies wanted to help, too, so they kept the workers supplied with hot coffee and food. Almost overnight, the old building had been transformed into a suitable plant for Stanley.

There was still a need for financial help to cover taxes, insurance, and interest on the building. To cover this, 40 men pledged to pay $5 per month for 5 years. Part of this money was also used to buy whatever materials weren't donated.

And on January 21, a proud Manila turned the keys to the plant over to the Stanley people. It was a plant that hard work and community cooperation had built—a plant that would provide employment for 100 people in the area.

Some small towns continually ask, "What chance do small towns have? What can we do?"

The answer can be found in Manila.

Protest Drop in Dairy Price Supports

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. COYA KNUTSON
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 25, 1958

Mrs. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I insert in the RECORD protests of two groups of spokesmen for farming and industry in my district, the Beltrami County Board of Commissioners and the Blackduck Civic and Commerce Association. These are the people who have to "live with" the administration's farm policies:

Resolution requesting corrective legislation to maintain present price supports on dairy products

Commissioner Martin offered the following resolution and moved its adoption:

"Whereas the United States Commissioner of Agriculture advocates the lowering of price supports on dairy products from 82 percent to 75 percent, which is the basic minimum; and

"Whereas Beltrami County, Minn., is one of the counties in this area that derives much of its income through the dairy industry; and

"Whereas the lowering of the dairy price supports will affect the family farmers throughout the area: Therefore be it

"*Resolved*, That the County Board of Commissioners of Beltrami County urge corrective legislation be enacted to maintain the present price supports on dairy products; be it further

"*Resolved*, That copies of this resolution be sent to United States Senator EDWARD J. THYE and to United States Senator HUBERT H. HUMPHREY and also to our Representatives in Congress."

The foregoing resolution was seconded by Commissioner Pool and, upon being put to vote, was unanimously carried.

STATE OF MINNESOTA,
County of Beltrami, ss:

I, A. D. Johnson, county auditor of Beltrami County, Minn., do hereby certify that the foregoing is a true and correct copy of a resolution adopted by the Beltrami County Board of Commissioners at their annual meeting January 8, 1958.

Witness my hand and official seal this 10th day of January 1958.

A. D. JOHNSON,
County Auditor, Beltrami County.

BLACKDUCK CIVIC & COMMERCE ASSOCIATION,
Blackduck, Minn.

"Whereas the dairy industry is one of the major industries in the Blackduck area and in Minnesota; and

"Whereas the Commissioner of Agriculture advocates the lowering of price supports on dairy products from 82 to 75 percent which is the basic minimum; and

"Whereas the economic effect on the Blackduck area would mean the loss of approximately $29,000 per year income to the farmers and business places on main street; and

"Whereas the family farmers were in drastic need of financial aid prior to the lowering of dairy price supports: Be it

"*Resolved*, That the Blackduck Civic & Commerce Association urge corrective legislation be enacted to at least maintain the 82-percent support for dairy products; be it further

"*Resolved*, That copies of this resolution be sent to United States Senator EDWARD J. THYE, United States Senator HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, and our Representatives in Congress and other interested."

The above resolution was presented by the agriculture committee of the Blackduck Civic & Commerce Association and, upon being put to vote, was unanimously carried.

Dated in Blackduck, Minn., January 6, 1958.

PRESTON H. ANDERSON,
Secretary.

Attest:

C. GULSETH,
President.

Senator Byrd and Staff Will Continue To Serve

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BURR P. HARRISON
OF VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 25, 1958

Mr. HARRISON of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, the citizens of the Commonwealth of Virginia, and those throughout the United States who share his convictions as to the guiding principles of sound government, were cheered today by the announcement of Senator HARRY F. BYRD that he had bowed to insistent pleas and, with the acquiescence of Mrs. Byrd, had decided to stand for reelection.

While respecting the strong personal considerations which had prompted his original decision to retire from public life, Senator BYRD's admirers had hoped he would find it possible to continue his outstanding service to Virginia and the Nation.

It is reassuring, now, to know that Senator BYRD's staff in the Senate Office Building will remain on the job. This includes Administrative Assistant M. J. Menefee, known to thousands of Virginians as Peachy, who, through the years, has placed the public business ahead of personal welfare. Although rarely free from the pain of cruel wounds sustained in action in World War I, Peachy repeatedly has dared his disabilities to take him out of the Washington combat with bureaucratic redtape. He has carried on, providing personal service to Virginia citizens.

Also contributing to the high efficiency standards maintained in Senator BYRD'S office are Miss Meda Dick, the Senator's personal secretary; Mrs. Mildred Sime, Miss Martha Cropp, Mrs. Doris Bradshaw, and Mrs. Louise Miller Vaughan of the secretarial staff, and J. Heywood Bell, legislative assistant.

Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include an editorial which appeared in the Page News and Courier, of Luray, Va., before Senator BYRD reconsidered his retirement decision:

SENATOR BYRD AND PEACHY MENEFEE

The decision of Senator HARRY F. BYRD to quit the Senate is a shock and surprise to his many friends and supporters but there are few who do not sympathize and understand his motives for doing so. His frank statement of the situation which he faces emphasizes the sterling character and deep regard for duty which in our book makes HARRY BYRD one of the great men of the century.

When the editor came to Luray we only knew Senator BYRD from what we read about him in the newspapers and magazines. But what we knew we liked. We have seen him grow into a national and international personality. There have been those who have said that we have supported him for one reason or another, but we can say that we have supported him not so much because we liked him as a man or for other reasons, but because he represents what we believe to be genuine Americanism as we understand it.

Perhaps this type of Americanism has been outmoded but the fact remains that America has come a long way under its banner, and Senator BYRD has been one of its ablest conformists and most effective standard bearers. For the good of our country we hope that his retirement from the Senate does not mean that his influence and good judgment will be withdrawn from the halls of Government.

One good thing about the Senator's retirement is that it will, no doubt, mean the return of Peachy Menefee to Luray. His experience, congenial personality, and flair for getting things done, assures this community of a welcome addition to community life.

Menefee is probably the best known and respected senatorial secretary in Washington and as such has been a valuable friend of the people of Page County. Regardless of political affiliation he has at all times had an ear for any problem which affects the welfare or personal lives of Page County citizens. Through his good offices the Virginia Oak Tannery was given a big lift in resuming operations and he has been importantly identified with other successful community enterprises.

Senator BYRD and Peachy Menefee have made a great team in public life. It has been a strain which has put Peachy to bed over the weekends but he has stayed with it with uncommon determination, primarily because of his warm personal regard for the Senator and a deep interest in BYRD's purposes and political objectives. With such mutual regard we are sure that Senator BYRD and Peachy Menefee will continue to make a fine contribution on their return to activity in their home communities.

Virgina has had outstanding representation in the United States Senate in Senato BYRD and his official family. They have the applause and good will of the great majority of Virginians and fellow countrymen. They have earned a much deserved rest and we extend to them our good wishes and hopes for a long and rewarding career in their home communities.

Recommendations for Legislative Action to Alleviate the Perils of Unemployment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 25, 1958

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, the New Jersey State Congress of Industrial Organizations, through its president, Paul Krebs, addressing the New Jersey congressional delegation at a conference called today for the purpose of considering methods of alleviating the perils of unemployment and to inspire full employment in the Nation and State, offered a two-pronged campaign to meet the situation.

Significant recommendations covering a short-term program and a long-range stability program were presented to the New Jersey Members of Congress.

The State CIO said the short-term program is designed to assure immediate help to those currently suffering hardship as a result of unemployment and to create new jobs as quickly as possible. Such measures will not merely help relieve immediate problems, but can be used to meet similar situations in the future, and in addition, some of them will provide a substantial cushion to protect the economy against spiraling recessions, which tend to grow from the losses of purchasing power suffered by laid-off workers.

The specific short-term recommendations include the following:

First. Immediate action by Congress to enact minimum Federal standards of unemployment compensation to assure that all States will provide adequate un-

employment compensation benefits and duration, and other reasonable eligibility requirements, including a provision to limit disqualifications because of strikes to 4 weeks.

Second. Provision for Federal supplementation of State benefits until the States have had time to bring their laws into conformity with the minimum Federal standards.

Third. Legislation to protect laid-off workers unable to make payments on home mortgages by a Federal moratorium for the period of their involuntary unemployment.

Fourth. Consumer purchasing power should be stimulated by increasing the personal income-tax exemptions from the current $600 to a minimum of $800. This will be immediately reflected in higher take-home pay checks due to reduced withholding taxes and will enable low- and middle-income families to increase their spending, thus providing employment. It will also provide large families with the most dependents with the most help.

Fifth. Telescope production schedules on defense contracts currently in production in distressed areas to provide maximum employment with a minimum of delay.

Sixth. Construction schedules on public works in distressed areas for which contracts have already been let should be telescoped to provide maximum employment opportunities immediately. Other projects planned for such areas should be gotten under way with a minimum of delay.

In presenting its recommendations for the long-range stability program, the State CIO council stated that "it is not sufficient to concern ourselves only with the immediate crisis. There are numerous measures which should be undertaken with a view to strengthening the economy and helping to prevent repetition of similar unemployment crises in the future, as well as policies designed to insure swifter and more effective action if unemployment should threaten."

The long-range stability program included the following:

First. Federal financial aid to municipalities to clear property of obsolete plants and to replace them with new, modern, and diversified facilities to provide new employment opportunities.

Second. Increase the purchasing power of millions of low-wage workers by amending the Fair Labor Standards Act to provide a minimum wage of $1.25 an hour, with extended coverage.

Third. Raise Social Security Act pensions to levels adequate to provide an American standard of living to retired workers and their dependents, extend coverage to groups not presently covered and provide pensions for disabled workers regardless of age.

Fourth. Present policies in the allocation of defense contracts should be liberalized to permit effective use in counteracting unemployment. The remnants of the policy of industrial dispersion, completely senseless in the era of the H-bomb, must be ended so that work can be made available to areas where there are idle workers already housed and already provided with essential community facilities.

Fifth. Speed implementation of Federal programs for highway construction.

Sixth. Federal aid for the construction of schools to wipe out the current deficit of 300 classrooms and to build the additional 265,000 classrooms which will be needed by 1960.

Seventh. Federal aid for the construction of hospitals to wipe out the current deficit of 838,000 beds and to provide additional beds required by our expanding population.

Eighth. Federal aid to assure construction of 2 million housing units per year, including middle-income, as well as low-income housing, to provide good homes in healthy neighborhoods for all Americans.

Ninth. Grants and long-term low interest loans to States, counties, and municipalities for the construction of public buildings, airports, and other public facilities.

Tenth. Establishment of a permanent Commission on Technological Change composed of representatives of labor, farmers, management, and Government, to keep under constant review developments in automation, atomic and solar energy, and other innovations and to make appropriate recommendations to Congress and the President to assure that the fruits of technologcial advance are fairly shared and full employment achieved and maintained.

Eleventh. Federal aid to education to provide scholarships, increased salaries for teachers, and adequate funds for research.

Twelfth. Immediate restoration of farm-price supports to 90 percent of parity, more extensive use of farm surpluses to relieve hunger both at home and abroad and development of a new and sound farm program.

Thirteenth. Liberalization of Government lending policies to help small business and stricter control over the exercise of monopoly power by mammoth corporations.

Fourteenth. Vigorous prosecution of the Kefauver subcommittee's investigation of wage-price-profit relationships to expose the reasons for existing high prices and to deter further inflation.

Fifteenth. Legislation to impose public responsibility on the exercise of vast power of the Federal Reserve Board to throttle business activity and employment by cutting off the supply of money and credit.

I believe, Mr. Speaker, that recognizing the sense of urgency that exists to meet this grave problem which faces America, all Members of Congress should seriously consider the above proposals.

The Threat of a Depression in the United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLIFFORD P. CASE
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, February 25, 1958

Mr. CASE of New Jersey. Mr. President, New Jersey's senior Senator [Mr. SMITH] and I each received yesterday similar letters from Mr. Harry B. Haines, publisher of one of New Jersey's fine newspapers, the Paterson Evening News. In his letters to us, Mr. Haines spelled out his real concern that, in effect, America is worrying itself into a worse economic situation than is actually the case. With the same letter, Mr. Haines forwarded to us an editorial from the Paterson Evening News which appeared on February 25 urging the proclamation by the governor in every State of a Believe in America Week from March 23 to March 29.

The motivation of the Paterson Evening News is surely to be commended, and I know that our colleagues in the Senate will be very much interested in this proposal which, after all, affects all our States.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD Mr. Haines' letter, the editorial, and the public statement which I made when I was asked to comment on this proposal.

There being no objection, the matters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE PATERSON EVENING NEWS,
Paterson, N. J., February 22, 1958.

Hon. CLIFFORD P. CASE,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CLIFF: There is no more important problem before the Nation today than our economy which is threatened more by a psychosomatic illness than by an actual malady. Americans are talking themselves into what could easily become a major depression.

I have been giving serious thought to the matter and have come up with a program that I think can put an end to the defeatist attitude which is permeating the national scene, and, restore once again inherent American sanity, courage and progressiveness.

I enclose a reprint of an article which will appear on the first page of the Paterson Evening News on Tuesday, February 25, and I urge you to read it thoroughly. I especially direct your attention to the summation in which it is proposed "that every Governor in every State of the United States proclaim Believe in America Week from March 23 to March 29.

You will note that the essence of this page one editorial discussion is the grave impact on our economy by the negative attitude Americans have taken which has lead to a chain reaction of a suspension of necessary buying in all phases of everyday life. Our proposal is that Americans be galvanized into an affirmative attitude and that during

this week of Believe in America, the trend will be changed as a result of which there can very speedily be restored great facets of reemployment in industries which are now so sorely beset.

Immediately upon receipt of this letter would you please be kind enough to acknowledge to me what you hope to be able to do in the United States Senate; in the Department of Commerce, Labor and other agencies which might be affected by a movement of this kind?

Emphatic public pronouncement by yourself and by other statesmen and leaders whose interest you may be able to stimulate will serve to bring this matter into proper national focus and I am supremely confident that thus, in a dramatic stroke, we will be able to turn the present-day tide of doubt and fear into one of courage and optimism.

As one deeply concerned about our great country, I appeal to you for your energetic enlistment in what I think you will agree is a paramount cause before the country.

With every good wish, believe me to be

Sincerely yours,

HARRY B. HAINES,
Publisher.

[From the Paterson (N. J.) Evening News of February 25, 1958]

A PLAN TO END DEPRESSION TALK IN THE UNITED STATES

No cause, no purpose, nothing is of avail unless there is a deep and abiding belief in it.

A country is only so strong as its people are willing to be strong—and its progress and growth and strength are measured by the dedication of its citizens.

America was born of a principle—the right to the pursuit of life, liberty, and happiness. The Pilgrims crossed what were then still uncharted, foreboding seas, to come to a land of wilderness, to found a land of freedom.

So this is America, greatest country in the world, principal bastion of freedom, around which radiates the hope of millions upon millions of people against the slavery of despotism and dictatorship.

Men and women have died by the millions to preserve America, to keep it thriving, pulsating.

Must we die—should our only willingness to fight for these United States be in the blood of our young pouring out in battle? Should we not fight just as courageously to maintain a happy life?

These are days different than when Washington lived. Now we have two kinds of war—the war on the battlefield, in the air, of the atom, and the rocket and the cold war. Each is devastating in its finality.

THE CHALLLENGE TO THE UNITED STATES

A country like the United States, steeped in democracy and willing to free deadly Communist spies just to preserve our own priceless free-speech heritage, must be on the alert 24 hours a day, 365 days a year, against the deadly preachments and onslaught of conniving communism.

The Machiavellian Soviet leaders, aware of our penchant for freedom and protection of it in all its connotations, don't want a killing war.

But they do want to keep the cold war aboiling, to mix a metaphor. They send up a sputnik, and in 24 hours, a nation that was economy-bent suddenly goes panicky and is ready to spend billions to counteract it. The Commies proclaim the newly discovered virtues of their wonderful school system in which every boy and girl is a budding scientist ready to discover some new and frightfully superior wonder to envelop America. So liberty-loving and fun-seeking Americans panic all over again—more schools, more universities, more colleges—make everybody a scientist.

How mixed up can we get? Are we rock-and-roll crazy? What about American resourcefulness, ingenuity, determination, knowledgeability?

Have we lost it all?

Do we have to have a depression because the propagandists say conditions are bad?

Of course conditions aren't the best. You can't tell a man who's out of a job that he's making good pay. Just as you can't convince the fellow who has a headache that he's in tiptop shape.

WE CAN TALK OURSELVES INTO IT

But by the same token, we can talk ourselves into being sick. A fellow will walk down the street feeling tops, all's well with the world. Another will come along and tell him he doesn't look well. By golly, within 30 seconds, the clouds are in the skies, the poor victim is beginning to feel sick to his stomach and in 5 minutes, all's wrong with the world.

Doctors call this condition psychosomatic. The illness is more mental than physical.

A person with nothing wrong can overnight become a real patient with an illness as bad as if it weren't fancied. You're as sick as you believe you are.

America is now in the throes of a psychosomatic slump.

The more we talk about depressions and about how bad business is, the worse we shall become.

The disease is contagious. People who are doing well, perhaps better than ever, begin to worry. They reason: Maybe conditions are bad.

Better retrench. Won't buy that new car we had planned; make last year's suit do; cancel out the new clothes, forget about a new refrigerator, or gas or electric stove, was gonna buy a new heating system for the house, or pick up an air conditioner in anticipation of a hot summer.

Cancel all these things out. Better warn Sister Josie, Counsil Emil, have a chat with those nice neighbors next door.

Depression: The cry begins to echo through the land. The politicians, those hearty fellows who love to spout and maybe thus hurt the fellow in the other party, make the halls resound with their mournful wailing. Their bellies are full, they're continuing to reap their own harvests.

But their pitiful cries about the plight of the Nation add to the heart-rending scene.

So people stop buying. Business slows down in the stores. Clerks are laid off.

MANUFACTURING A DEPRESSION

The stores stop buying, cancel their orders in the factories. So factories shut down.

Auto dealers are loaded with cars because the people who could buy aren't. They've heard about a depression. So the auto factories shut down.

No autos? No refrigerators? No gas stoves?

So the steel mills shut down.

Thus is a depression born.

Well, Mr. and Mrs. America, we've got enough built-in safeguards against depression in this country to make it unlikely to happen.

If there is a depression, it will be man-made, made by all of us.

So we propose that something be done about it.

Let's start believing in America.

If all over this land of ours, those of us who need things and have postponed buying them, were to start buying what we need, stores would hum, mills would start booming, and the unemployed would in short order be back on the job.

America can be as healthy as its people want it to be.

BELIEVE-IN-AMERICA WEEK

We propose that every Governor in every State in the United States proclaim Believe-in-America Week, say from March 23 to March 29.

Believing in America will only be translating into tangible action the inherent, abiding faith of our Founding Fathers and of our people since the United States came into being—that this is the greatest country on earth.

The Communists would love a depression in the United States.

So what's not to the liking of the Commies is what's good for us in this country.

To every governor in these United States, we are sending this message of Believe-in-America Week, in the solemn and deep feeling that the best answer to a threatened depression is to prevent it.

And the best way to prevent it is to adopt the antidote. The best antidote is to do something about it instead of waiting for the ailment to creep up on us.

Believe in America?

Well, say so—and make your word count with action.

STATEMENT BY SENATOR CLIFFORD P. CASE, NEW JERSEY, ON BELIEVE-IN-AMERICA WEEK, MARCH 23–29, PROPOSED BY PATERSON (N. J.) EVENING NEWS

The Paterson Evening News one of New Jersey's fine newspapers, has highlighted an extremely important aspect of America's economic strength—our confidence in America and in ourselves.

Surely, this most commendable effort should be supported to the hilt. At the same time, all those in private life and at the State and local as well as the national level of government—must give our unremitting attention to discover and carry out specific measures to spur an upturn in economic activity and in employment, with particular attention to the distressed areas which exist in New Jersey and other parts of the country.

What Is Parity for the Farm Housewife?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAROLD D. COOLEY
OF NORTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 25, 1958

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, the farm families of America have no greater champion than our distinguished colleague, Mrs. COYA KNUTSON, of Minnesota. Mrs. KNUTSON is a devoted and dedicated American servant and is at all times interested in the well-being of those who till the soils of her State and Nation. She is the only woman ever to serve on the House Committee on Agriculture. As chairman of that great committee I have daily observed her in the performance of her duties. She is a tireless and effective worker and is at all times especially interested in the welfare of the farm housewives of the Nation.

Last week Mrs. KNUTSON addressed the 20th annual National Farm Institute at Des Moines, Iowa, on the subject What Is Parity for the Farm Housewife? I think that many people who have the interest of agriculture at heart will want to read this speech. I, therefore, have asked unanimous consent that the text be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD:

What Is Parity for the Farm Housewife?

(Speech presented by Congresswoman Coya Knutson, 9th District, Minnesota, before the 20th annual National Farm Institute, Des Moines, Iowa, February 14–15, 1958)

Last fall I talked to women in my district who told me about some very surprising changes taking place among farm women.

Their searching eyes, asking and looking for answers in my face to their problems when they told me for the first time since they had lived on the farm the past 25 to 30 years it was necessary for them to seek employment outside the farm home. This was not easy since in my district there are very few opportunities for jobs.

However, in this particular area was a lefse factory. Lefse is a flat, Norwegian potato cake—a good way to use leftover cold mashed potatoes at home—which is becoming a favorite commercial product.

The women were employed for $5 a day but it took them out of the home all day and the children, after school, came home to an empty house. This appalling disease of home absenteeism has invaded even the rural people of our land. It will be difficult to measure until sometime in the future, what effect this kind of exodus will have on our farm families.

Farm women know more about parity than we realize. They have learned about it the hard way—by doing without electricity, by doing without running water in the home, by raising families without central heating. They learned about parity by doing without modern kitchen and laundry equipment for many years after they were common in the urban home.

Millions of farm women now breathe a prayer of thanks for REA every washday or oftener as they use electricity to lighten their household tasks. As recently as 23 years ago only 11 percent of the farm families enjoyed central station electric service.

Hundreds of thousands of housewives are now drawing running water at a kitchen sink as a result of the improved parity position of agriculture in the 1930's, 1940's, and 1950–52. But there are still too many farm wives who cannot enjoy that labor-saving luxury.

When farm income falls below parity, farm women and children suffer even more than the men who operate the farms.

Farm-production expenses and farm investments come first. The farm housewife and her family get along with the income left after paying the farm bills. Today her husband obtains a return for his labor which approximates only 40 percent of the hourly wages of her urban cousins.

If you men in the audience will pardon me this morning, I want to talk particularly to the women. I know farm women are much more interested in dollars than in percentage ratios, so I am going to talk about farm parity in terms of family income.

May I give you some plain figures. In 1956 families on the 2.2 million commercial farms received $5,415 as family income. Over half the farms, the 2.7 million low-income farms were eliminated to obtain this figure. And how does this compare with income of nonfarm families?

In 1956, all nonfarm families, including those on "skid row," public relief, and social security averaged $6,900 or 27 percent higher than those on commercial farms.

Let me name a few more income comparisons which bear on the parity position of the housewife: Roughly one-fourth of the farm family income on commercial farms came from nonfarm sources in 1956. Since 1947–49 family incomes from farming on commercial farms have dropped 19 percent while the incomes of nonfarm families, again including those on skid row, have increased 41 percent.

And before we leave these income comparisons let me point out that the average commercial farm family had a large investment in farmland, livestock, and machinery which a nonfarm family does not have. If one deducts interest on his farming investment, families on commercial farms received incomes in 1956 of $3,615 or only 52 percent as high as the average of all nonfarm families—again including those on social security and public relief.

Friends, I come from a district where most of the farms produce for commercial markets and my farm families are not at all happy with the disparity between their incomes and those of their urban relatives. They are disturbed by the reports in the press that farm groups and Members of Congress representing rural districts are badly split on what should be done about our low farm income while nonfarm income is booming.

They are very much disturbed by the continued attacks on existing farm programs and the "sweep sirup" about increased farm income just around the corner if only the Secretary of Agriculture is given authority to lower price support levels.

Farm families in my district think this is economic nonsense. They believe it will take stronger medicine than this to restore farm income to a parity position. I am told that polls taken in your State indicate a similar lack of confidence in the effectiveness of simply lowering price supports.

Contrary to popular belief, farm-minded Members of Congress are not widely split. Commodity groups are not at war with one another. If there ever was a day when one commodity group tried to solve its problems by dumping them on other farm groups, that day is past. A united approach of agricultural commodity groups appears strong enough to pass comprehensive farm legislation this year. Thirty-five commodity groups have set up six different committees for study. Some Republicans are talking of having enough votes to override a veto of the farm bill, providing compensatory payments are included to get industrial Democrats' votes. They all agree on the parity-income concept to replace price parity in their approach to farm legislation. This concept is actually in the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, section 301 (a) (2). However, present bills are designed to clarify and make specific this section.

There are more differences within commodity groups than between groups as to the type of Government assistance desired.

Those of you who are dairymen know how difficult it has been for you to agree on specific programs. Feed-grain and livestock producers find it especially difficult to agree on a program. I am told that even the peanut growers are having some difficulty in agreeing on a new approach to their price and income problems.

But the pressure of economic events is forcing these commodity groups to reach agreements. Some of the largest commodity groups such as producers of sugar beets, sugar cane, wool, cotton, wheat, rice, and dairy products are largely agreed on desirable programs for their commodities.

There are wide areas of agreement between the leaders of these commodity groups. All agree that each commodity has unique marketing problems—that each commodity should be treated on the basis of its needs. The common purpose of each proposed program is to promote orderly production and marketing and to improve the bargaining power of the producers when they take their product to market.

It is evident from recent meetings of the House Committee on Agriculture that there is no split in the farm bloc providing we consider all commodities at the same time and give equal attention to the producers from the different regions.

The experience of both the sugar and wool producers indicate that a commodity group can agree on a program—and if it is a reasonable program, farm minded Members of Congress will get together and pass the desired legislation.

Nonfarm people have shifted in their thinking about the desirability of reducing farm price supports. At first they were all for farm price support reductions. They expected food prices and expenditures for farm programs to drop.

They have been bitterly disappointed in both respects—retail food prices reached an all-time high in August 1957 in spite of a 16 percent drop in farm prices since 1952. Expenditures for farm programs in the year just closed also reached an all-time high and promises to continue at about the same level in the immediate future.

Now that unemployment is increasing in most of our urban areas more and more nonfarm Congressmen are saying we must hold the line on farm income supports and not allow a further reduction in farm income to create even more unemployment.

Remember that farmers are laboring people's best customers, buying steel, rubber, appliances, automobiles, machinery, and great amounts of gasoline, oil, and electricity. By the same token, laboring people are the farmers best customers. They have common interests and common goals.

The premise on which every bargaining takes place between labor and management is that laboring people should have parity income. That is the basis of the cost-of-living automatic pay increases in some collective bargaining agreements. Farmers as well as other workers deserve this insurance and full employment, or at least a steady income with which to buy labor's products. In this way, labor is not thrown out of work because of farmers' inability to buy and the whole exchange continues on an even keel.

You are all familiar with the theme song that past farm price support programs have wrecked our markets and are a millstone around the necks of farmers. Using the misleading figures supplied by our own Secretary of Agriculture every city newspaper has carried stories on the high cost of farm price support programs. But neither the city nor the farm papers have carried comarable stories citing the benefits of these rograms either to farmers or to other groups such as our school children.

Why hasn't our Secretary of Agriculture prepared a summary of the benefits of farm-price support programs comparable to his sommary of costs? When he does I am confident he will have to tell us that on a year-to-year basis farm price support programs have increased farm income $2 to $3 for each $1 of Government expenditure—in addition to accelerating technological advances.

Why hasn't our Secretary of Agriculture told you that each year for the past 4 years farm price support programs have removed from $1.8 billion to $3.2 billion of farm products from commercial markets and either distributed these products outside regular trade channels or kept them in storage?

Why hasn't he told you that except for this removal of products from commercial markets farm income would have dropped even further since 1952?

With net farm income already down to the $12 billion level isn't it reasonable to suppose that in the absence of these price support programs it would have dropped at least another 25 percent? Many think the drop would have been even greater.

We have heard again and again that the way to achieve parity for the farmer and his wife is to lower price supports and expand markets.

Surely we must expand our markets as rapidly as possible. But why hasn't our Secretary of Agriculture told us that in spite of all the promotional efforts of producer groups, food processors, retail food

distributors and the Government, United States farmers received fewer dollars for the larger quantities of food delivered to consumers in this country in each of the last 2 years than they received for the smaller quantities they delivered 5 years earlier?

When talking about market expansion, he should have told you that the farm value of the food consumed by United States civilians in 1956 and 1957 was only $18.8 and $19.5 billion as compared with $20.1 and $19.0 billion in 1952 and 1953. In 1956–57 as compared with 4 years earlier, farmers incurred sharply higher costs and delivered 14 percent more products to consumers who had substantially higher incomes, yet received fewer total dollars for them. Frankly, I think these official USDA figures make the prospects for farm family income very poor indeed if plans for its improvement depend on lower price supports and market expansion.

But we canot continue existing programs indefinitely. Under indifferent and confused administration they are merely reshuffling our surpluses. Feed grains are now at record levels and still increasing. Existing programs also are costing too much. They are not adapted to meeting the problems of agriculture today.

It has been suggested, but not by me, that one method of reducing costs is merely to give the Secretary of Agriculture authority to lower price supports. It is costing about $3 to $3 billion a year to maintain supports at current levels. These costs can be eliminated by reducing price supports to free market levels. But farm income would drop even more than the price support costs. This can best be illustrated right now where Mr. Secretary of Agriculture wants to lower dairy supports by April 1. The lowering of supports from 83 to 75 percent will cost the dairy farmers a $200 million to $250 million loss of income to save the Commodity Credit Corporation about $100 million. This is the point that is passed over in painting the rosy picture of lower price supports, greater flexibility and more freedom in agriculture.

But this is not the only road open to United States farmers and their wives. Commodity groups are developing plans and proposals which will lower government costs, increase producer flexibility, yet bettering farm income.

These groups know that they are faced with still lower incomes in the immediate future if the Secretary of Agriculture is given more authority to lower price supports. They know they are faced with lower incomes if they do not devise new programs to replace the old ones which are proving to be ineffective and too costly. Sliding-scale parity worked fine when the farmer raised his own horsefeed 20 years ago. It does not work when he feeds expensive "gasoline."

These commodity groups realize that they have common interests even though each must take a different road to reach its goal of orderly production and marketing with improved bargaining power for its members.

I did not come to this great National Farm Institute to bring a message of gloom and doom. In this connection I am reminded of the conversation I had with a farm woman in a poor agricultural area a few years ago. She said, "Mrs. KNUTSON, do you know what parity means to the farm women in this community? It means moving the little house out back up next to the bedrooms."

For the farm women in this great Midwest, parity means even more than this. Perhaps it means family progress such as was reported by Johnnie after visiting his urban cousins who had moved from the rural community two years earlier. Returning home from his visit, Johnnie's mother asked the normal question, "How are Aunt Jane and Uncle George getting along?" Johnnie's reply was, "Oh, just fine, but they have moved their bathroom inside and are eating out of doors now."

I take pride in the progress made in modernizing the farm homes in the 1940's and early 1950's. I am joining efforts with farm leaders and with those Members of Congress who are trying to develop a farm program which will maintain farm family incomes at levels which will permit the repair and replacement of these modern conveniences as they wear out.

We also would like to see farm family incomes reach a parity where they can enjoy as many leisure hours each week as urban families. We are greatly encouraged by the developments in recent weeks. In view of all the factors in the situation I can assure you there is basis for optimism that a good farm program can be developed in this session of Congress. By a good farm program I mean one which will make it possible for farm families to make economic progress comparable to that of nonfarm families.

I know that it is coming. I know the grassroots sentiment. I know this sentiment is seeping up through commodity groups and through the congressional representatives. Therefore, there is no split in the farm bloc. If it isn't recognized by farm representatives, we will see a terrific revolution this fall in farm areas.

Long-Range World Textile Analysis Urged

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 6, 1958

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a very illuminating and educational article on our textile industry by Mr. Harry Riemer, editor of the Daily News Record, New York, N. Y., which appeared in that issue on January 16, 1958:

LONG-RANGE WORLD TEXTILE ANALYSIS URGED
(By Harry Riemer)

What is our textile industry worth to our country:

1. In national security?
2. In employment?
3. In the important part it plays in clothing us all, and thereby giving us dignity and self-respect?

These sound like stupid questions, because the answers are all so obvious.

Yet from all we read and hear, these are questions that should receive attention at top levels in Government, as well as by our industry leaders.

UNITED STATES TEXTILE SURVIVAL?

Taking the world picture into consideration, we must ask ourselves today—how much of our textile industry can survive without proper protection, during the next 25 years?

What is needed now—and what should be started without much further loss of time, is the study of the economies of practically all countries in the world.

This is being written only from a textile viewpoint—but there may be other industries equally interested in such an international study, because they may be in a position similar to that in which textiles now find themselves.

How many of the nations of the world will become aggressive textile competitors for all of us here in the next 25 years can only be surmised.

However, to anyone who has had firsthand contact with many of the areas where such potentialities exist, there is an appreciation that intercompetition all over, in textiles, can reach a point that can overwhelm us.

To cry for higher tariffs—and even for quotas, is not the answer.

International ill will and antagonisms result from protective plans—unless they are based on the fullest competitive studies of economies of all the countries involved.

Then, with such complete information it is possible to move in a manner to which there can be no objection.

We are strong for international good will; we know that every country must trade with other areas; we know that industrialization is the fundamental program of all underdeveloped sections; we want to do all we can to help and encourage all of these.

WHAT IS REASONABLE?

On the other hand, a decision must be reached as to what is reasonable and what is unreasonable.

Who should make this study?

Should it be the American Cotton Manufacturers Institute? Should it be by a congressional committee or a tariff committee—under Government sponsorship; should it be by the Textile Workers Union?

As long as the study is thorough, made by impartial statisticians, it hardly matters who does it—as long as it gets started pretty soon.

Such a sudy would have to consider not only wages—but also workloads, fringe benefits and anything alse that could enter into a comparison of costs.

When we were in India in May 1955, it was remarked to us a couple of times that while their wages were very low it was also true that their workloads didn't compare with ours—that they usually had at least seven men doing the work of one man in an American cotton mill.

In Japan, also, we were told that their workloads didn't compare with ours.

Fringe benefits are an element that should be included exhaustively, as these are mentioned pretty nearly everywhere.

Perhaps our protective system can be worked out so that wherever economies improve, these would be given consideration in the tariff approach.

All of this may not be easy—but it seems to be the only answer to the mess for which we are headed.

Thus far from all we can learn, the only thing that has been done by the industry has been to emphasize what is generally regarded as the Japanese situation.

NO BACKWARD COUNTRIES

However, the writer believes it is timely to repeat some of the things he has reiterated frequently since his eight months world air tour in 1955.

First we must recognize that there are no longer any backward countries from the viewpoint of industrial thinking.

Some may be underdeveloped and face real problems in their industrialization—but they are alert—and have leaders in each case who understand our know-how, and who are determined that their people shall have at least a little of all the things which we enjoy.

We must recognize that the so-called backward countries have ambitions for betterment, just as we have.

The drive for industrialization, to give needed employment, is one phase of combating poverty—and a very important phase.

Textiles invariably are the first step in industrialization of an underdeveloped country.

Then come the needle industries, sewing.

Establishment of these textile and garment industries comes quicker than anyone of us is willing to believe.

EXPANSION DEMANDS EXPORTS

Once established, it is a definite sequence that there must be expansion, and with expansion comes the need for seeking export outlets. This applies everywhere.

Logically this means more and more goods from low economy countries coming into international competition wherever we have markets—as well as the likelihood that we are bound to feel the combined impact here in this country in our own direct markets.

In addition, some of our own export markets are likely to become self-sufficient in the course of the next 25 years.

One particular instance of this is in the Philippines—and there are others also.

To indicate how conditions can be reversed it is well to remind that 30 years ago India was a tremendous customer of Great Britain. India imported from Manchester something like 1.6 billion square yards of cotton cloth annually in those days.

In 1955 India shipped over 100 million yards of cotton cloth to England—and Manchester gloated over the fact that the Indians gave them permission to ship about 16 million yards of novelty goods into India.

It is reasonable to assume that South Africa will be self-sufficient in textiles in 20 years.

UPHEAVAL IN WORLD MARKETS

We must consider that there has been a tremendous upheaval in foreign markets—involving big losses of trade by a number of countries which are now engaged in the desperate struggle to replace their lost markets.

Just a few instances to illustrate:

Holland has lost Indonesia which was formerly one of its important markets.

France lost Indochina and is now in the process of losing north Africa—both very important markets to her.

Germany has lost the Balkan States' business which was very important to her before World War II.

England has lost most of South Africa among other markets.

The net result of all this is that each country is striving to replace these serious losses.

Germany has made big inroads over England in South Africa. Holland has made a strong bid for the South African business.

In Johannesburg, which we called one of the best listening posts in the world for information on textile developments everywhere, except India—but including the Iron Curtain countries, we sensed a bit of this unsettlement and highly competitive feeling that is current in all areas.

CANNOT POINT A FINGER

In our world survey of textile and apparel industries, it is a mistake to point a finger at any one country.

True, the immediate problem may rest in one particular center—but if we are to show ourselves as understanding of what is really going on in the world—then our approach must cover a review of the economics of practically all areas, as proposed.

Textile importing nations everywhere will become less and less dependent upon their present suppliers during the next 25 years.

This will affect all of the textile exporting countries, including ourselves.

Such a course has been obvious for some time—but it is becoming more and more pronounced, particularly when one realizes the hopes and ambitions of many countries which are still immature in the production of textiles and apparel.

We have not begun to feel the effects of the dislocation that has taken place since the last war.

Japan finds herself struggling because some of her former markets are still lukewarm because of World War II.

Indonesia was one of Japan's big markets—and Indonesia has been described as "broke"—plus the fact that the reparation problem between these two countries was never settled satisfactorily. (EDITOR'S NOTE.—Japan and Indonesia arrived at a reparation settlement agreement recently.)

The writer did hear a complaint in some countries in Europe—as in Greece—that the French had found ways and means to circumscribe the Organization of European Economic Cooperation which the writer was told did not permit export subsidies.

Those are merely a few instances of the many things that are going on which got very little attention over here.

EFFECT OF LOSING MARKETS

Now let's consider a few of the other elements which are likely to develop as formidable influences during the next 25 years—and for which we should be preparing right now.

To start with, when the Philippines become self-sufficient in textiles to a large degree, several nations, including Japan and ourselves will have lost another good customer.

When we were in India in May 1955, considerable concern was expressed there about the textile manufacturing strides being made in Pakistan.

Pakistan, which was a purely agricultural country less than 10 years ago, has already installed some 2 million spindles.

Some of the India cotton textile executives regarded Pakistan as a greater threat to them than any other textile industry.

In recent months some of our textile executives here have become aware of the potentialities of India, although this writer has been pointing to this for their consideration for more than 2 years.

Generally, India has a textile industry about half the size of that of the United States—from the point of view of the mill operation.

India has been producing something like 5 billion square yards a year in its mills, under conditions involving restrictions on new machinery and employment.

The alert executives in India have ambitions like ours. They want to expand—and when the opportunity permits they will expand.

India produces about 1½ billion yards of hand woven fabrics a year.

RED CHINA INDICATIONS

One of the most important revelations was that which we encountered in Singapore in May 1955—where we learned that the Red Chinese were shipping cotton goods into the Malayas—subsidized by the Peiping government to get money exchange.

Since, there have been other important developments in Red China.

We printed a dispatch some months ago that Red China had ordered 5 million spindles from Japan. Thus, Red China could have a textile industry as big as that of Japan within the next 15 years or so.

It is fundamental in commercial activity everywhere to want to grow.

When there are indications that the home trade has been satisfied, next thoughts turn naturally and logically to export markets.

The writer feels that, in a way, he "discovered" the fact that Hong Kong had become an important textile producing area.

Hong Kong has over 300,000 spindles running more hours per year than the spindles in any other country. They estimated it as the equivalent of about a million spindles running 1 shift.

Someday Indonesia will have its own textile industry.

Taiwan has textile ambitions according to reports from our correspondent.

Someday Australia will expand in textiles.

In June 1955, Egypt had ambitions to have 3 million spindles—modern—during the next 10 years.

Egypt was doing everything possible to discourage imports and to encourage home production of textiles.

Little Israel has been making substantial progress in textiles and they are seeking foreign markets.

There are several factors in Europe that can have much significance during the next 25 years.

SPAIN HAS POSSIBILITIES

Spain had something like 100,000 looms—mostly old. She was interested in modernizing, but she didn't have the money nor the credit.

It is reasonable to assume that these problems will be overcome some way over a period of years, and then Spain can become one of the top textile-producing countries of Europe.

Portugal has a smaller industry, but its executives are alert, think in terms of modernization; and they have been interested in foreign markets.

No one knows what the common market of Europe is going to mean, but the best guesses are that this will be attended by modernizing of equipment, an increased business among the common-market nations, and that the United States will be among those who will suffer from the further losses of export markets.

BEHIND THE IRON CURTAIN?

Next, and by far not the least to be considered, is what has been going on behind the Iron Curtain.

The firsthand reports of our own correspondent, direct from Russia, have indicated that the Communists have big ambitions in textiles.

While in Johannesburg in June 1955, the writer heard a great deal about textile progress among the satellite countries, such as Czechoslovakia, Hungary, and Poland, and endeavoring to compete on a cut-price basis. Austria must also be considered in this category.

This is merely a quick, general overall picture. Perhaps the writer has overlooked many angles that should be in this recapitulation.

However, there should be enough in this article to make one realize that the world is on the move in textiles and that if our own textile industry means anything to us in employment, or in national security, then we should already be seeking out every bit of information that is available that will permit a fair comparison of the economies under which our industries here in America must work and those in the other nations of the world.

Relationship Between Agricultural Policies and the Plight of the Small-Business Man

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. FLOYD BREEDING

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 24, 1958

Mr. BREEDING. Mr. Speaker, recently while in my home area, the Fifth District of Kansas, I was presented with several petitions authorized by local small-business men, which I believe point up graphically the relationship between the administration's ruinous agricultural policies and the economic plight of the small-business man.

In my area, as in many other areas of the country, when the purchasing power of the farmer is reduced, the small-business man of the community is the first to reflect his customers' economic loss.

Secretary of Agriculture Benson's proposed cut of 22 cents in the wheat-support price structure will, I feel certain, have a disastrous and far-reaching effect on the small-business life of this country. I believe that conclusion is forecast dramatically by the below-listed petitioners; they state quite plainly, "Our incomes are almost wholly dependent upon the purchasing power of the farmer. The announced cut in wheat supports from $2 to $1.78 is a devastating blow to us and the farmers alike. This 22-cent cut in addition to the previous 37-cent cut over the past several years is bringing bankruptcy to the door of small-business men."

At the risk of seeming repetitious, I should like to underscore a statement made recently by the distinguished chairman of the House Agriculture Committee: "Our economic depressions have been farm led and farm fed."

Congressman FLOYD BREEDING,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN BREEDING: We, the undersigned businessmen, appeal to you to do all possibe to reverse the deliberate moves of the administration to institute further cuts in farm income. Our incomes are almost wholly dependent upon the purchasing power of farmers. The announced cut in wheat supports from $2 to $1.78 is a devastating blow to us and farmers alike. This 22-cent cut in addition to the previous 37-cent cut over the past several years is bringing bankruptcy to the door of small-business men. Other commodities, as you know, are similarly affected. We look to you for outspoken and courageous leadership in all-out effort to salvage our rural economy, our small towns, and cities.

M. S. Lyman, Manager, Reno Consumers Co-op, L. L. Bornholdt, Reno Consumers Co-op, Hutchinson, Kans.; Floyd Pennington, Implement Business, Meade, Kans.; H. E. Hilst, Implement Business, Earl H. Van Voorhis, Oil Business, Charles E. Gibson, Johnson Lyle Hardware, K. C. Farney, Farney's Sewing Center, William Max Eldredge, Eldredge Mattress Factory, Garland F. Henson, Henson Dairy Supply, W. O. Brooke, Kansas Janitorial Supply Co., Ira L. King, King Electric Co., E. J. Gilchrist, Jack's Clothing, Hutchinson, Kans.; M. C. Peterson, Little River Co-op, F. E. Hodgson, Little River Hardware, H. A. Cordell, Phillips 66 Dealer, C. E. Morris, Lumber Dealer, L. F. Hitchings, Lumber Dealer, A. J. Williamson, Furniture Company and Undertaker, Little River, Kans.; J. D. Stowits, IGA Store, Earl Gibson, Gibson Drug Co., W. A. Henry, Lyons Shoe Shop, R. A. Perry, Cafe, Nora M, Imel, Cafe, Dean Davison, Oklahoma Tire & Supply, Mrs. Warren G. Sewell, Television Clinic, Richard D. Smith, Gadget Clinic, Arthur L. Adams, Adams Decorating Center, Cartner Pettus, Cartner Pettus Furniture, W. S. Dayton, Dayton Hatchery, Lyons, Kans.

Congressman FLOYD BREEDING,
House Office Building,
Washington D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: We, the undersigned businessmen, appeal to you to do all possible to reverse the deliberate moves of the administration to institute further cuts in farm income. Our incomes are almost wholly dependent upon the purchasing power of farmers. The announced cut in wheat supports from $2 to $1.78 is a devastating blow to us and farmers alike. This 22-cent cut in addition to the previous 37-cent cut over the past several years is bringing bankruptcy to the door of small businessmen. Other commodities, as you know, are similarly affected. We look to you for outspoken and courageous leadership in an all-out effort to salvage our rural economy, our small towns and cities.

Phillips, gas station; F. C. Cadwell, blacksmith; O. L. Eck, food dealer; C. Kempke, cleaner; Lehner, locker plant; Perry O. Tarrant, Gambles; Charley Blackly, bake shop; Mrs. Fred Prene, restaurant; W. L. Vogelgesang, barber shop; T. F. Wick, variety store; B. & B. Grocery, grocery store; Haven Pharmacy; Dean W. Fahrback, banking; Haven Shoe Shop, shoe repair; Edward C. Rubner, barber shop; Whetstone Market, food market; May's Store, dry goods; John Lake, Haven Electric; Wendell Chain, garage; Erich Schmidt, Haven Dairy; Kock Bros., hardware; Dr. H. K. Voth, dentist; K. D. Cantwell, mortician; Delmar D. Ferguson, Haven K-T Service; H. H. Stecher, investments; Jack V. Parker, Haven Body & Supply Co.; Walter L. McElwain, McElwain Motor Co.; Herman Engweiler, Engweiler Hardware; Ida Green, Green's Cafe; C. C. Stelter, service station; Jack Earnst, liquor store; Arthur Tonn, Farmer's Co-op Grain Co.; Haven Journal; C. H. Diener, M. D.; C. J. Reynolds, Haven, Kans.

Eisenhower Policy: "Don't Rock the Boat"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 17, 1958

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, our prosperity, our allies, and our prestige are vanishing. Some of the reasons for this disastrous accomplishment of the Eisenhower administration are eloquently set forth below in an article by Gerald W. Johnson, which appeared in the February 17, 1958, issue of the New Republic.

The article follows:

OUT OF CONTROL

(By Gerald W. Johnson)

Perhaps the situation is better, but it is arguable. At last we have launched a satellite a la Russe—but two of our nations are missing. Syria and Yemen have gone down the drain, and reports from Iraq are not reassuring. President Eisenhower is interested in maintaining civilian control over outer space, but democratic control of surface space is steadily dwindling. A cynic might infer that the President's interest in outer space is sparked by a foreboding that democracy is going to have to get off the earth.

But it is probably something quite different. It is more likely the President's fear, or the fear of those around him, that the American people are likely to get out of hand unless they are constantly reined in. It appears now that the Army was all set to go with this satellite in 1956. If it had been permitted to proceed our satellite would have led sputnik by a matter of 2 years; instead, it is trailing by 4 months.

It is perfectly true that the satellite, in and of itself, amounts to little; but the prestige attached to being the first in outer space amounts to a great deal. The administration, however, is not worried about prestige. It is worried about the budget, which for more than 20 years has been largely out of control of the established financial interests; and it is an article of faith among the well-heeled that when the budget is out of control of sound bankers, ruin is upon us.

The historical fact is, of course, that during the 20 years in which the budget was intelligently used for the support of the Nation, rather than the support of the bond market, the national economy climbed from a state of complete prostration to a level of wealth and power that it had never touched before. But we got rich without paying due deference to bankers; and it is wrong to get rich in that way.

So for 5 years the administration, manned at the top by millionaires, has been employing every imaginable device to dampen down this roaring energy that has, in fact, made us wealthy and great, but that has wrecked the nervous systems of thinkers of the Harry Byrd type—men who do not believe that the modern world really exists, but is an illusion created by wizards led by the monstrous Roosevelt, a merger of Merlin, Cagliostro and Eblis, commander of the Jinn.

They have not been able to have their way entirely. Pressure of outside events has forced their hand from time to time, and sputnik nearly upset the applecart altogether. But they have done enough to drag us down from the leadership of the free world, and to inspire the Russians with hope that they may, after all, take over the earth without firing a shot. It is a considerable achievement, even if the profit thereof is being collected by the Communists, not by us.

Unfortunately for them, however, the universe seems to be governed by certain laws that cannot be set aside even by Executive order. One of them was neatly stated years ago by the corn-fed bard, Walt Mason: "O human head! Majestic box! O wondrous can, from labels free! If man is craving fame or rocks, he'll get them if he uses thee!" But he will not retain them unless he continues the use indefinitely.

It is undeniable that the Republican Party used its head when it nominated Eisenhower, back in 1952, but that effort apparently exhausted it. The administration was barely 3 months old when Eisenhower announced unctuously that the party had at least succeeded in "raising the moral tone of Washington," and on that very day a knave snatched $165,000 of newly printed money right in Washington—more cash than had been stolen in a single grab during Truman's 7 years. Right then this superficial observer began to suspect that this administration, like Warren G. Harding, "lacks mentality."

That impression has not been erased by anything that has happened since. The loss of Congress in 1954 deepened it; so did the relegation to the rear of the men who put Ike across in 1952—Dewey, Saltonstall, Lodge, and their associates—and the disappearance from our sphere of influence of Indonesia, Siam, Egypt, Syria, Yemen, as well as the growing coolness of India and Western Europe, who can't actually leave us, but obviously would like to.

The sombre fact is that the banner of the great crusade turned out to be no oriflamme, but a wet blanket, and its war cry is a whispered, "Don't rock the boat." How long the American public will continue mesmerized is debatable, but eventually it will discover that it is being led away from the battle. For as loss follows loss, the strategy of the adminis-

tration is to launch no counterattack, but to deny that any real loss occurs. The progress of the cold war can be aptly described by adapting the phrase of a long gone British editor: "In the face of continuing defeat Mr. Eisenhower folds his hands; Mr. Dulles wrings his hands; and Mr. Khrushchev rubs his hands."

Roll Call Comes of Age

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDGAR W. HIESTAND
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, January 29, 1958

Mr. HIESTAND. Mr. Speaker, one of the highlights of each week on Capitol Hill is the arrival of our own "unofficial" congressional newspaper, Roll Call. It is perhaps the only nonpolitical report that Congressmen and Senators receive about their colleagues. More than that, however, it helps to knit Capitol Hill people into a community whose common interests, aside from politics, are reflected with each new issue.

Recently Roll Call came of age journalistically. Its editor, Sidney Yudain, has promised regular weekly publication. But in accepting this responsibility Roll Call is requesting that Members of Congress and their staffs, who benefit from each issue, share in making weekly publication possible by paying for their subscription just as they would with any "hometown" newspaper.

I have been proud to enter a subscription to Roll Call for myself and members of my staff, and I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to do the same so that this new Capitol Hill tradition, the Roll Call, may have a full and prosperous adult life.

No doubt Members of Congress would be interested in reading the following article which was included in the Washington Report column by Larston D. Farrar of the February 1958 issue of the American Press:

WASHINGTON REPORT

(By Larston D. Farrar)

Roll Call, the little Capitol Hill newspaper that was started 2½ years ago by Sidney Yudain, secretary to Representative ALBERT P. MORANO (Republican, of Connecticut) as a sideline, has now moved into its own comfortable quarters and, with the opening of Congress this year, became a weekly.

The little newspaper—it consisted of a mere four pages at times in the early part of its career—was published first on June 16, 1955. Except for a 4-month break during the 1956 election campaign, it has been published on a bi-weekly basis ever since.

Within months of the time it began to appear, Roll Call became known as the most quoted little paper in the Nation, and it still holds that title.

"This is the first successful newspaper devoted strictly to Capitol Hill in the history of the Congress," Mr. Yudain boasted in his first weekly issue. "Several earlier attempts had been made, but publication ceased after a few issues. Roll Call is the first weekly newspaper the Hill has ever had.

"The more frequent publication will permit this newspaper to keep a closer tab on Capitol Hill news, to bring up-to-the-minute happenings to our readers, and to better serve our advertisers * * *"

The new headquarters are at 433 New Jersey Avenue, SE., only a block and a half from the Capitol Building.

Sid Yudain, the editor and publisher, was no novice in the newspaper business when he started Roll Call. He started in the newspaper business as a youngster and was promoted fast—during early World War II days—to an editor's post. Handsome enough to be a movie star (he was in Hollywood for awhile, in fact), he was in the newspaper business in Connecticut when he came to Washington as secretary to Congressman MORANO.

FERTILE MARKET

As he agrees, Capitol Hill is a more fertile market for a newspaper these days than when his unlucky predecessors started out decades before him. There now are 10,000 persons on Capitol Hill, all of them drawing top salaries (many in the $10,000-a-year-and-up bracket), and a $100 million building program is underway. Obviously, Roll Call is serving a hometown market of people away from home very successfully, and advertisers are finding that they can reach this lucrative market through the Capitol's own lively newspaper.

We not only hope for Roll Call's continued success, we believe in it and confidently predict it.

Connecticut Contest Winners Find Moral Lessons in Huck Finn

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALBERT P. MORANO
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 25, 1958

Mr. MORANO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I wish to include two prizewinning essays in a contest for schoolchildren in the New York Herald Tribune.

The essays, which appeared in the February 22 edition, were both written by residents of Connecticut. One, Reeve Lindbergh, is a resident of my district, a student in the seventh grade at Darien Junior High School.

Christie Macaluso, a seventh grader at St. Joseph's Cathedral School, Hartford, Conn., answered the challenging title, "What Huck Finn Means to Me," with an eloquent treatise on tolerance, and equality of man.

Master Lindbergh is more the poet, more the weaver of dreams and fancy as he stands his ground, his magic world of Huck Finn, against the encroachment of the poor, ignorant grownup.

Both boys are to be congratulated, and I know that my colleagues will enjoy reading their interesting essays on a boyhood character dear to us all.

WHAT HUCK FINN MEANS TO ME—WHY TAME A WANDERING CHILD?

(By Christie Macaluso)

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—Third prize winner, Christie Macaluso, is 12 years old and is in the seventh grade at St. Joseph's Cathedral School, Hartford, Conn.)

"Unless you become as little children, you shall not enter into the kingdom of heaven." God did not say become as adults but as little children. There must have been a reason for this. God also said "Blessed are the poor in spirit, the hungry, those who weep, the hated, and the separated." Mark Twain personifies all this in his lovable character Huckleberry Finn, in the book by the same name. Huckleberry Finn befriended and enjoyed the company of Jim, a runaway Negro slave. All children, like Huck, are born without prejudice. The pigment of Jim's skin did not make any difference to Huck. They played together, they fished along the river together, they protected one another, and were faithful to one another. That Jim was a Negro meant absolutely nothing to Huckleberry Finn. Outside appearance meant nothing to him. Their main attraction was not in the outside, or the physical. They acknowledged that they both had souls, that they both thought alike, that they both enjoyed walks together, and loved riding on their raft down the river.

If a person was rich, and suddenly became poor, he would still be the same individual inwardly, even though he may be looked upon as a bum. He has the potential to pick himself up, and grow again.

To me, the book proves that the Negro and the white can, in the South, and anywhere in the world, integrate. They both have souls, and in the eyes of God they are born equal.

Adults seem to teach children to build a wall up between them and the "nigger," the Jew, the "Guinea," or the "Frog." Mr. Clemens, in his book, Huckleberry Finn, tells us, in his masterly way, that we are all born equal. The Declaration of Independence states in its second paragraph:

"We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain inalienable rights, that among these are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness."

Mark Twain seems to whisper into our ears, as we read through his book: "Down with the walls of ignorance, down with the walls of prejudice, and up with brotherly love, up with honesty, up with righteousness, up, up, up, to goodness, always and in all ways!"

(By Reeve Lindbergh)

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—Fourth-prize winner Reeve Lindbergh is 13, and is in seventh grade at Darien Junior High School, Darien, Conn.)

Huckleberry Finn. The most wonderful boy in the world. What child, girl, or boy, hasn't heard of him? Who hasn't poled a raft, sometime, somewhere, down the rushing Mississippi as Huck, with a close friend as the inseparable Jim. Even if the Father of Waters is a million miles away from your home, there's always a brook or trickling stream, that with a lively imagination can be turned into a Mississippi. A whistling on the roof, a call to Tom, an old widow and her sister who mean well, but all bring back wonderful memories to the grownup, and open a new world of adventure for us, the children.

You may have your Lochinvar, and Robin Hood, and all. But I'll bet that half of the children in our land would rather be pirates

with Tom and Huck than Galahad, or Lancelot, with some fair lady on the pillion.

I think that Mark Twain was a hero above all heroes. His book wasn't fiction. It was real life, with a touch of magic in it that most people don't notice. Ask any child what is so enchanting about that ragamuffin, Huckleberry Finn, and you've wounded them straight through the heart. They'll mumble out some defending answers, and inwardly vow to take bloody revenge on the would-be assassinator.

You may have your Galahad
And Lochinvar and all,
But give me a Missouri boy
With smudge on cheek and chin,
And a wooden raft, and a heavy pole
And a wistful way of talking,
And a large straw hat,
With a great wide brim
And I'll send your yoeman squawking!

Grownups can't seem to really understand why we want to be like Huck. They know the book is good and encourage us to read it, but not to follow it. "Be Peter Rabbit or Mary Poppins, or * * * or Becky, in Tom Sawyer."

"Oh, Mother," is the only outcome from a talking like that, and the young adventurer usually runs out the door. You see!

Huck the adventurer, Huck the wanderer. "I don't," a parent grumbles, "want my kids to get ideas. Why, Huck never settles down."

Oh, you poor ignorant grownup. Huck could never quit wandering even if he had wanted to. It was in his blood, and he couldn't stop it any more than a fish could stop swimming.

"Stop your foolish wandering,"
They begged, but he would laugh.
"Do you want the trees to crumple;
The buds to wilt and die?
The earth to stop her harvesting;
The river not to run?
The brook to stop its trickling;
The woods not to run wild?
Then why, my helpful neighbors,
Would you tame a wandering child?"

Ask any grownups what they think of Huck and the upshot will be: "He's a likeable young ragmuffin. He's all right. He's much too free to be a safe child. He's good for laughs." Laughs. Oh, grownups. They insult him as if he were ordinary or something.

Not that I have anything against grownups, it's just that they usually don't know what they are talking about. They're not insulting Samuel Clemens' creation, or a book that's left on a table somewhere. They are killing the dream of adventure, the goal of a million wanderers, the undisputed hero of the country child, and the ambition of the city one. Galahad will leave the girl at a certain age, and a high school boy will take his place in the saddle.

Fair Elaine, or Guenevere will be replaced on the pillion by a new and modern fair lady, but Huckleberry Finn will live forever at the top of children's hopes, and at the back of a teenager's mind. As each new reader closes the book to lie in dreams of glory, he'll find himself poling down the Mississippi with that prince of adventure, Huckleberry Finn.

Tax Law Loopholes Invite Mill Liquidations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 6, 1958

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include a specific proposal for correcting that tax loophole in the Internal Revenue Code which has caused so many textile mill liquidations in recent years. The proposal was submitted by Mr. Solomon Barkin, research director, Textile Workers Union of America, AFL–CIO, to the House Ways and Means Committee on February 4, 1958:

TAX LAW LOOPHOLES INVITE MILL LIQUIDATIONS

Within recent years scores of important textile mills have been closed with consequent losses of thousands of jobs because financial speculators have been able to make quick profits at the expense of the National Treasury. The TWUA has urged Congress to close the loopholes which make this possible.

The Internal Revenue Code allows a corporation to deduct from its net income in any taxable year the amount of its net operating losses suffered during the 5 preceding years (called carryforward) and the 2 subsequent years (carryback). Since the tax is applied to net income after the deduction of the loss carryover, the corporation's income tax is reduced.

When a corporation's ownership changes hands or it is reorganized, the loss carryover privilege is transferred with the corporation. The limitations on the use of this privilege are inadequate. When there is a change in ownership (where 50 percent or more of the stock changed hands during a 2-year period) the carryover is denied if a plant is closed within 2 taxable years of the date when the new owners purchased the stock. In a reorganization, if the stockholders of the corporation which suffered the loss retain less than 20 percent interest in the corporation which secured control of the business, the carryover is reduced. This provision is helpful to some corporations which have lost money because it permits them to offset the losses of one period with the profits of another. As a result their income is more stable. They are also thereby encouraged to invest in their business.

But financial speculators have bought out loss corporations, holding them just long enough to become entitled to the loss carryover rights and have then liquidated the business. The workers have been thrown out of jobs; the community has lost a plant; and the United States Treasury has been deprived of millions of dollars in tax revenue.

These predatory interests have been active in the textile industry. They have set their sights on companies which have lost money and offered financial deals to the owners which have discouraged them from considering renovating and modernizing their companies. After the loss company's sale, the speculators either closed them immediately or held them just long enough to qualify under the tax law for the loss carryover privileges. The buying interests offset the profits from other ventures against the loss carryover from the textile company which they had acquired.

Some of the more striking illustrations of textile plant closings attributable to the use of the tax carryover provision are the following:

1. Acquisitions of textile plants by corporations in unrelated businesses: Wanskuck Co. (Rhode Island woolen and worsted company) by the New England Butt Co. (iron castings and machinery); Boot Mills (Massachusetts cotton mills) by the Overseas Discount Corp. (holding company); J. L. Fead & Sons (Michigan underwear plant) by United Industrial Syndicate (holding company).

2. Acquisitions of textile companies: A. D. Juilliard Co., by United Merchants & Manufacturers.

3. Acquisitions by outside companies which later acquired nontextile interests: Gera Mills, Inc., by the List interests which bought electric and other companies; Botany Mills acquired by A. M. Sonnabend, a real-estate and hotel operator and subsequently bought companies in luggage, pearl, machinery, dolls, retail and other businesses; Powdrell and Alexander, acquired by George Meehan interests which subsequently acquired the Cincinnati Pepsi-Cola Bottling Co.; the American Woolen and Robbins Mills bought by Textron which liquidated most of them and engaged in many other businesses, including steamships; Utica Knitting Co., acquired by the J. A. Newman interests which later invested in other plants.

TWUA PROPOSAL

The TWUA insists that the loopholes in the carryover provisions of the tax law be closed and has proposed amendments which would deny the use of the carryover privileges in the case of a change in ownership of a corporation if a business is terminated at any time during the 3 years subsequent to the date of change. This rule would be applied whether the change in ownership is a result of purchase of the corporation's stock or a reorganization.

Remarks by Secretary of Labor James P. Mitchell at the 75th Anniversary Banquet of the Civil Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES B. BROWNSON
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 25, 1958

Mr. BROWNSON. Mr. Speaker, since the advent of democratic government, one of the most significant and important reforms to take place has been the replacing of the so-called "spoils system" with a comprehensive program of gathering to the Nation's rolls dedicated and capable career employees. One of our country's proudest moments had its 75th anniversary January 18 of this year. It was on this date in 1883 that our first Civil Service Act became law.

The Honorable James P. Mitchell, Secretary of Labor, as the principal speaker at the Indianapolis banquet in commemoration of the act's 75th anniversary, not only traced the progress of the program's development, but also presented the challenge which the future holds in store for all who are friends of the civil service.

Secretary Mitchell's remarks show him to be well deserving of the praise lauded upon him in the following quote from the Federal Agencies Banquet Committee's general chairman, John T. Sempa's invitation:

It would do us great honor if you will accept this invitation to attend as the principal speaker at our banquet. We are certain that there is no person in our country who has greater interest than you do in the welfare of all employees of the Federal Government and private industry; therefore, your message will be of intense interest and enlightenment to us.

So that all Members of Congress and others interested in this vital subject many have the benefits of Secretary Mitchell's remarks, I ask that his speech be inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

The address follows:

REMARKS BY SECRETARY OF LABOR JAMES P. MITCHELL AT THE 75TH ANNIVERSARY BANQUET OF THE CIVIL SERVICE, INDIANAPOLIS, IND., JANUARY 18, 1958

It is a real pleasure to meet with you, who are friends of the civil service here tonight.

Prior to the passage of the Civil Service Act 75 years ago today, the famed spoils system was the usual method of operation in the United States Government. As you know this system held that Government was the prize of the winning political party, to be cut up and distributed to the party favorite.

This philosophy, that left administrative chaos, abuse and inefficiency in its wake, was finally done away with by the merit system.

The Civil Service Act has been responsible for attracting a core of dedicated career employees who guarantee to this country efficient and capable Government administration, responsive to the needs and wishes of the people, and unprejudiced by considerations of political favor.

I am extremely pleased to have this opportunity today to say that in the years I have been in Government, and they are mounting up now, I have observed and worked with civil servants on every level and I have taken the greatest pleasure in going back to the critics of Government service in other parts of the country and telling them point blank that nowhere in the world is any organization so fortunate to have so many thousands of capable, dedicated, enthusiastic, intelligent, and topflight people as Government.

What really astonishes me is the degree of ignorance that exists in regard to the Government's work. Ask people what Government is and does in some places and they reply it is a big, expensive organization with headquarters in Washington that eats up the taxpayer's dollars by sending memos back and forth like a colossal ping-pong game.

Seventy-four years ago there were 14,000 men and women in Government. Today there are better than 2 million. The Government has grown precisely in proportion to the needs of the expanding population and growing country. What does the Government do?

Over half of all Government civilian employees work for the Defense Department, manning the complex defense establishment that is the shield of the free world. They design and fire our missiles. They help in the operations of the Army, Navy, and Air Force—freeing our 2 million servicemen for active training. Another 25 percent of all Government employees work for the Post Office. The rest are engaged in many different kinds of work. They print our money and then collect it back in taxes. They risk their lives in the underworld to maintain our laws, control the trade in narcotics, and guard our borders against undesirable aliens. They represent us to other nations. They operate dams. They bring the benefits of electricity to millions of farm families. They maintain extensive repositories of knowledge and conduct practical experiments with farm animals and farm soils as you here in Indiana certainly know. They administer laws like the Fair Labor Standards Act.

In short, the number of Federal employees that sit at desks and write memorandums is a fraction of the total, and an important fraction. Government is the biggest and busiest business in the country. It's big because the United States is big. It's busy because our responsibilities are many and our needs constantly growing.

Like all good things, the Federal service gets better with improvement, and constant attention to improvement is the price of good Government.

In recent years there has been tremendous improvement, generated from the President's conviction that the people in Federal service represent the Nation's best. A new appointment system was established that opened the way to full, permanent careers under the merit system for qualified persons. A low-cost group life insurance plan was established. Unemployment-compensation benefits have ben extended to Government workers for the first time. The ban on permanent promotions was removed and the ceiling on the total number of permanent appointments allowed has been lifted. A pay raise was granted. These are just a few of the improvements that have been made in recent years. But the need for improvement is constantly growing along with the need for more and different Government services.

One need is that of bringing the Government pay scale into a reasonable balance with that of private industry.

Just 4 days ago the President outlined his recommendations for Federal pay raises. There is a widening gap between Federal and non-Federal salaries, and these recommendations are designed to close that gap as well as improve Federal service generally. I want to present these recommendations for your consideration now:

First, Classification Act adjustments will be proposed to provide an increase of at least 6 percent to all grades of employees.

The emphasis in this adjustment is on the middle and top brackets which include the scientific, engineering, and managerial positions upon which the security of our country in a large measure rests. The present salaries of such professional men are not commensurate with the responsibility they carry compared with non-Federal professional men with equivalent responsibility. On the other hand, the raise has been extended across all Federal grades, as a matter of simple need and justice.

Secondly, the entrance level for college recruitment and intermediate salary rates for scientific, professional, and managerial grades will be adjusted upward.

Thirdly, pay incentives are provided for those who demonstrate marked proficiency in doing their work.

And finally, numerical limitations on the three highest grades have been removed altogether. The elimination of this ceiling permits more reasonable salaries for key scientists and executives.

These four steps—increasing the general pay level, offering higher entrance pay to college graduates, eliminating the ceiling on the top grades, and providing incentive payments for high proficiency—are steps toward the challenging future. They are not yet law and their eventual form will depend upon the deliberations of Congress. Nonetheless, they display in positive form the President's interest in making the Government equal to the challenge that confronts us.

That challenge can be stated in a single word: manpower. The tasks that the Government is called upon to perform are growing more and more complex, while the incentives for entering and remaining in Government service grow less impelling as industry service becomes more attractive.

Let me give you an example. Just last week, in Washington, the first President's Award for Distinguished Federal Civilian Service were announced. The recipients included an engineer who had developed the Sidewinder guided missile, a soil scientist whose studies into the nature of matter had opened entire new chemical fields, a career ambassador who had represented the country during a tense international situation, a Bureau chief with a remarkable record of maintaining the Constitution and enforcing our laws, and a department official who had made impressive contributions to the development of legislation.

These awards typify and bring into focus the manpower situation of Federal service. From one end of the occupational ladder to the other, Government is represented. This places Government in competition with private industry for the skilled manpower it needs. It is hoped the President's pay and other proposals gain for Government its fair share of the manpower pool.

A vital and important element in attracting, retaining, and developing to their highest capabilities men and women of exceptional ability is the 75-year-old merit system. For by offering to applicants a guaranty that their careers will be advanced on the basis of merit, without any other consideration, the Government can demonstrate its character as a fair and honest employer. By offering to those already in Federal service a guaranty that Government can more than match all the advantages offered by other employment, the civil service and proposed improvements will continue to maintain a solid, sound, and progressive core of workers to carry the Nation's work forward. Certainly, no more stimulating challenge could confront you and could be more worthy of your complete and continued dedication on this 75th anniversary.

Estonian Independence Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BARRATT O'HARA
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 24, 1958

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, today we commemorate the anniversary of Estonian independence. On this occasion we pay tribute to a heroic people who, having enjoyed the fruits of freedom and independence for two decades, are now the unwilling subjects of the U. S. S. R. The tragedy of Estonia is a telling, if tragic, lesson for the West.

By the terms of the peace treaty of 1920 that brought an end to Soviet-Estonian hostilities, Moscow recognized Estonian independence and pledged to respect its national sovereignty and territorial integrity. This pledge became the base of all subsequent Soviet-Estonian relations. In 1932, both nations concluded a pact of nonaggression. A year later they became signatories to the London protocol defining aggression. And, of course, both nations were members of the League of Nations and were thus bound by its precepts and agreements to live in peace.

The first Soviet breach of faith occurred in autumn of 1939 when at gunpoint the Estonians were forced to conclude a pact of mutual assistance which permitted the stationing of Soviet forces on Estonian territory. In an obvious attempt to sanctify or legitimatize their illegal act the Soviets included in the pact an article which restated the Soviet pledge to preserve and respect Estonian sovereignty and territorial integrity. In less than a year, however, the Soviets invaded Estonia and forcibly annexed that country to the U. S. S. R. By this act of aggression the Russians destroyed the entire fabric of relations that had been carefully and hopefully—at least

for the Estonians—built up since the peace treaty of 1920 and destroyed with it Estonian freedom and independence.

On this anniversary of Estonian independence day it is well for the free world to ponder the tragedy of this small Baltic nation. We look forward hopefully to the time when again the people of Estonia will enjoy the sweet fruits of freedom.

"You Keep Seeing Your Children Go Hungry"—St. Louis Argus Columnist Buddy Lonesome Spotlights a Not Unusual Case of Clean, Neat Household With Empty Larder

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEONOR K. SULLIVAN
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 25, 1958

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, I was deeply moved by a recent article in the St. Louis Argus written by Columnist Buddy Lonesome and built around a heart-rending letter his paper recently received from a distressed and desperate mother of five in a family where hunger has become too frequent.

Mr. Lonesome, a reporter who believes in the direct approach, was also moved by the woman's letter, but as a careful newspaperman decided to investigate the facts first hand before printing the letter.

What he found was a scrupulously neat home—clean sheets on the beds, clean furnishings, shabbily dressed but clean children—a family grateful to a neighbor for having given them some wood with which to keep warm—a family grateful for a little help.

If the facts are as Mr. Lonesome found them to be—and I am sure they must be—the particular family involved in this news account should certainly find help forthcoming in our city. The Argus columnist points out, however, that this is not an isolated case—that "there are hundreds, nay thousands of these people. They are ill fed, ill housed."

Mr. Speaker, the existence of so much hunger—and it is literally hunger—in our cities and towns at this time of recession is a national disgrace. Children in a million or more families in this country are being deprived of the opportunity to grow as healthy and happy youngsters.

A similar situation existed 4 years ago, during the recession of 1954. At that time, I introduced a food stamp bill to establish a national system of distribution of surplus food to all of our needy. Since those days, the need for such a measure has continued unabated. Even during periods of so-called prosperity and boom, we have millions of Americans on the thin edge of malnutrition not out of choice—not in order to reduce or lose weight—but because their incomes are insufficient to enable them to live decently. They exist below the absolute minimum level of nourishment.

Mr. Speaker, for those who doubt the existence of such conditions, I commend the following article from the St. Louis Argus by Columnist Buddy Lonesome entitled "Our Poor and Needy":

[From the St. Louis Argus]
OUR POOR AND NEEDY
(By Buddy Lonesome)

It's an undeniable fact that times are hard. While the experts continually assert there is no depression, it is also irrefutable that many, many St. Louisans are now out of work, hungry, sheltered because of their landlord's charity or taking beggarly jobs at miserably low pay. There are hundreds, nay thousands of these people. They are ill-fed, ill-housed. Because there are so many in similar travail, it is perhaps unfair to pinpoint one person's disastrous state of life. But the following letter touched me where I live. It was the desperate plaint of a woman continually scrambling for heat and food—not a new car, new house, new furniture or new clothes—but necessities. It follows:

"DEAR MR. EDITOR: I am a mother of five children and am desperately in need. I have 4 children home and 1 in the hospital and we have no source of income.

"I know there are hundreds of people just like us here in St. Louis, but you keep seeing your own children go hungry, or half-fed and you can't find a job; and all of a sudden you feel like something has just got to change. My husband hasn't done very much work since he came from Korea. I work whenever I can find a job but because I am asthmatic, jobs don't last very long. When my boss finds out, I always get fired.

"But to get down to the facts. I don't have food to feed my children and my landlord is about to put my children and myself out and I have no place to go. If I did, I couldn't pay my way there either. I can only wait until night when my children are asleep and cry my eyes out and pray as hard as I can that tomorrow will bring something for us. But nothing has come as of yet.

"I can't send my little girl to school tomorrow because she goes to Dunbar Branch and has to carry a lunch and I don't even have money to buy bread or anything else for her to carry. She doesn't have a warm enough coat to go back and forth from school, and home for lunch even if I did have anything to give her.

"I am 25 years old and would like a job, any kind of job that pays a salary. I don't have a high school education but my learning is fast and good. My husband is a construction worker and could get a job, but is unable to get a permit or paid up union card.

"We would like to know if you can help us. So we are writing to ask if you can help us' out. We are very desperate. I have no way of knowing if you will read this letter and laugh and throw it away or what.

"But if wishes are ever granted and God is willing, you will help us out. And maybe we both can get jobs to support our family and needs. Thank you very much and may God bless you.

"MRS. ETTA J. GARNER."

As you've probably guessed by this time, and despite the popular misconception, newsmen aren't completely hard-hearted. In fact, most of them will stand pretty still for a good, misty yarn. Along with Sonny Hawkins, Argus photog, I went to the house on Elliott to check the woman's story. We also felt duty-bound to personally assure the lady that nobody, but nobody, writes such a poisonous letter that it gets thrown in the wastebasket. In fact, if you can provoke a reader to call you nothing but a so-and-so, at least you have scratched his veneer. As for laughing at mail received, this corner stopped that after 6 months in this biz.

On visiting Mrs. Garner, the most impressive thing to me was the scrupulously neat way she kept her house. And with five kids underfoot, and the blatant ache of an empty larder, that's really doing something. The Garners live on the first floor, occupying a living room, bedroom, and kitchen. The living room had a big bed in it, along with the sofa. The sheets on the bed were clean, and the white leatherette covering two straight-back chairs was clean. The children were shabbily dressed, but clean.

When we walked in, Mrs. Garner declared that she was so happy now, maybe we ought not to worry too much about her. She said her husband had gotten a part-time job in Ferguson washing cars, and while he came home cold, he did manage to bring home money to buy a little food. "And bless Jesus," she cried, "we now have heat in the house." A neighbor who lived across the back alley, had given the family an armful of wood. "We didn't have any wood during all those cold days, last week, and had to stay huddled up in bed. I even started to send Yvette to school, today, so she could get warm. But thank God, somebody helped us."

That seems like such a little to be thankful for, doesn't it. Heat, just enough to keep the children warm. With the present hue and cry for scientific and technological advances in this crazy, tilted world, it is utterly primitive that so little has been done to feed and clothe the needy. Nor can it always be shrugged off with the inevitable cliche about individual enterprise. Until our needy are taken care of, how can the rest of us be really comfortable? As world citizens, not just Negroes, we have so far to go and so much to do. Meanwhile, we must also help in any small way we can, to bridge the void the Government is taking so long to recognize. When your neighbor is hungry, give him a crust of bread, when he is cold, give him a stick of wood. The favor just might be returned—later.

Estonian Independence Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 25, 1958

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, the year 1918 saw the end of the bloodiest and costliest war the world had known until that time. Belligerents and neutrals alike were glad to see the human carnage stop and they all welcomed the return of peace. To some peoples 1918 ushered in a new era; it brought them a prize for which they had been fighting for generations and even for centuries. In that year they regained their national independence and freedom. The Estonians were one of these peoples.

The Estonians had settled in their historic land long before our present era. There in the northernmost outpost of Europe they led a quiet and contented, but strenuous and hardy life. They constituted one of the smallest and homogenous ethnic groups in Europe, seldom numbering more than 1 million people. But they succeeded in maintaining their national identity and freedom. In 1710, however, their country was overrun by the Russians and they were forced to accept Russian regime

imposed upon them. For more than 200 years they lived under Russian oppressive rule and they never liked it. Their chief desire during all that time was to be free, but they were unable to attain their freedom without help from others. But some events in the course of the First World War worked in their favor. With the Russian revolution of 1917 czarist autocracy was overthrown and that government's authority over other nationalities was shattered. Thus Estonians felt free, and on February 24, 1918, they proclaimed their independence.

That was exactly 40 years ago, and unfortunately the new and independent Estonia born on that memorable day is no more. It became one of the first victims in the course of World War II. Since then the unhappy Estonians are suffering under totalitarian tyranny. But their hope for freedom and their desire for independence is not dead. It is living in the hearts and minds of Estonians still struggling for their liberty. Their sincere friends in the free world join them in the celebration of the 40th anniversary of Estonia's Independence Day and hope that soon they will attain their cherished goal of freedom with justice.

Toll Television

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. CHARLES B. BROWNSON

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 25, 1958

Mr. BROWNSON. Mr. Speaker, I am not at all sure whether Congress should interpose its judgment on the Federal Communications Commission in the matter of pay TV. The RECORD has been well filled with effective arguments against pay TV. I have read these articles carefully and preserved many of them for future reference. Under unanimous consent I am today inserting in the RECORD two articles presenting logical arguments on the other side of the picture solely in the interest of making both sides of this discussion available to my colleagues.

[From the Wall Street Journal of February 21, 1958]

TOLL TELEVISION

Opponents of pay TV have based much of their argument on the premise that it would eventually result in viewers being forced to lay out hard cash for entertainment now available for nothing. Subscription television people, on the other hand, are busy pointing out what they insist are the advantages of the plan—better quality shows, new movies, and Broadway plays, etc. And the Federal Communications Commission has decided to decide the question.

The quality of television offered the public today ranges from the terribly good to the good and terrible. Aside from the few outstanding dramatic, variety, and cultural shows, it seems unlikely to us that many viewers would be willing to pay for the run-of-channel output. Subscription television interests, however, are ready to risk their capital in the belief that people will pay for superior offerings.

If pay TV does come up with a consistently salable product it would force the networks to upgrade their own shows. If it fails to attract enough coins it will have been a nice try. Either way the public has nothing to lose.

And because it is the public who will really pass judgment, the FCC would do well to stop stroking its chin and let a full-scale experiment get underway.

[From the New York Times of February 23, 1958]

THOUGHTS ABOUT TOLL TV

(By Jack Gould)

The broadcasters have not covered themselves with glory in their all-out assault on pay-as-you-see television. In the last few weeks their screams of apprehension have done more to make the public aware of toll TV than even the system's promoters have managed to accomplish. By their frantic determination to make certain that subscription TV is stillborn the broadcasters may have given new impetus to the idea of a box office in the home. They are protesting too much.

While in their newscast the networks have been reasonably objective about toll TV, individual stations have recklessly editorialized in their own behalf. If their partisan propagandizing continues, the whole matter of TV editorializing may need review.

The Columbia Broadcasting System has wined, dined and entertained Members of Congress at a public function where representatives of the network's affiliated stations were solicitous hosts to the legislators from their home States.

The House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee accommodatingly adopted a resolution urging the Federal Communications Commission not to authorize a trial until such time as Congress had a chance to pass on the subject, which presumably would be in a few decades.

PROTESTS

The viewer on the sidelines would seem entitled to come to the conclusion that the broadcasters protest too much. If toll TV is so certain of success and destined to wipe out the existing system of advertising-sponsored TV, there must be something to be said for it. What are the broadcasters and the cooperative Congressmen trying to hide from the set owner and why are they so positive that the individual must be protected against himself?

This corner is of the opinion that toll TV faces very formidable odds; that the public is so accustomed to receiving entertainment without direct charge that it would be an uphill fight to persuade it to pay.

Perhaps, if only because of the vehemence of the broadcasting industry's campaign against toll TV, it is time to reexamine pay-as-you-see.

One of the main arguments of the broadcasters is that there is something sacrosanct about the present system, that because the airwaves belong to the public it is their inherent right to receive programs without charge. Actually, of course, a great deal of the spectrum is assigned to private commercial use for services the public does not hear.

Every station operator using the airwaves makes profits that are his and his alone. Under the present system the advertiser also benefits financially from the use of public property. To suggest that the promoters of toll TV are embarking on some undemocratic scheme because they want to use the airwaves for personal profit is just so much nonsense.

Another argument is the question of the public's interest. With toll TV, it is suggested, the mammoth profits will drain away all of today's talent and the public will be denied its present service. But less attention is paid to another form of denial. Large segments of the national audience nightly are being denied certain types of programing because such shows do not coincide with the understandable business objectives of sponsors. But must our culture over the air be restricted to one set of commercial standards?

DISSERVICE

The toll operators in this respect have done themselves a serious disservice by ignoring the economic realities of a mass medium. There has been loose talk, for instance, that seeing a single ball game might cost $1 and that a month of movies could run $9. These figures reflect the archaic reasoning of people accustomed to doing business in theaters or stadiums; they are incompatible with the more efficient distribution machinery that is home TV.

Toll TV should not be discussed in terms of dollars but rather in nickels and dimes. At 10 cents a family the potential national gross for The Bridge on the River Kwai could run to $4 million. It is conceivable that for 15 cents a week a family could see and hear outstanding scientists give three hour-long lectures leading to college credits. A world series game with a mass boxoffice could cost a nickel. After My Fair Lady has finished its Broadway run in 1975, a family of 5 might have to chip in only 2 cents apiece to see it.

When thinking about toll TV runs along these lines it becomes clearer that there is more than one way of judging what is the most democratic way of using the TV airwaves. It is possible that the public's enormous mass buying power, expressed through a convenient home box office, might drastically reduce the price of many things not all people can afford to enjoy today.

The real danger posed by toll TV—and one not adequately realized by the FCC—is that there may be too few subscription TV facilities, that pay-as-you-see TV won't have a chance to get started on a basis assuring its maximum potential. If, for instance, it is severely restricted, then its promoters will be out to make the maximum number of dollars just as the sponsor wants the maximum number of potential customers. In such circumstances there is real danger of the old pursuit of mass preference.

But if the FCC were to screw up its courage and throw open the unused ultra-high frequency channels to all and sundry who wanted to try toll TV, there might well be the multiplicity of choice. Probably the most democratic mass medium of today is the phonograph-record business. The millions who want Elvis Presley can hear him; those who want the Budapest String Quartet can have that.

If toll TV can be established with sufficient rival attractions so that the public can exercise discrimination, then there well could be the TV equivalent of, say, the Paramount Theater and the Little Carnegie. The great weakness of the present form of television is that it doesn't pay to cater at prime evening hours to small minority audiences; but with sufficient outlets those small audiences could pay for their fare and assure their producer a profit.

LOBBYING

Today's broadcasters in the long run will only defeat their own purpose by asking the public to close its mind to the possibility of change; in lobbying so vigorously for the status quo, they are only betraying their fatigue and age. If they want to battle toll TV, the way to do it is by showing on the air that it is unnecessary. But when they don the holy mantle of special privilege and suggest that they are the Nation's supreme and only big brother, it is time to call a halt.

The toll TV producers may fall on their faces but it is in the American tradition that they should have their chance. At least they are not frightened by the ultimate test: that the public can realistically register its

likes and dislikes by granting or withholding its patronage. Today's broadcasting industry never really has known such a stimulating influence of civilizing discipline. Perhaps today's broadcasters basically are terrified by the prospect of the unknown: the viewer having something to say directly about what he sees.

A Permanent Cure

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EARL WILSON
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 25, 1958

Mr. WILSON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, the extent to which the American people are becoming concerned over the economic plight of their country is forcefully indicated by the widespread response our colleague from New York [RALPH W. GWINN] has had to his proposals as embodied in H. J. Res. 355.

Briefly, his proposals would get the Federal Government out of competition with private business and would pave the way for certain other reforms which seem to be enthusiastically desired by many people. One of the greatest newspapers in the Middle West, the Indianapolis Star, has written splendidly in behalf of the GWINN proposals.

Under unanimous consent, I wish to include in the RECORD a sound and thoughtful editorial which appeared in the Star of February 17. I commend it to all members of this body as most worthy of consideration. It is as follows:

A PERMANENT CURE

Almost everybody is against the Federal Government going into private business, but almost nobody ever does anything about it. Congressman RALPH W. GWINN of New York is an exception. On the theory that you cannot cure socialism little by little, he wants the Federal Government to quit messing in private enterprise fields all at once. To make the cure permanent, he has proposed a constitutional amendment which has received less attention than it deserves.

GWINN's proposed 23d amendment was conceived by a Californian, Will's E. Stone, president of the American Progress Foundation. It would do three things: repeal the Federal income tax, outlaw foreign aid and forbid the United States Government from engaging in any business, professional, commercial, financial or industrial enterprise except as specified in the Constitution. There is rather convincing evidence that, while wiping out the onerous Federal income tax, the amendment would save the taxpayers more than $33 billion and still leave the Federal budget more than $600 million in the black.

By careful analysis of the latest complete information available to him, Stone has developed a set of statistics which tell the story vividly. In its own way, it is a frightening story. Based on official reports for the full year of 1954, the Federal Government is operating 500 Federal corporations for which no constitutional authority exists. They control 40 percent of the land area and 20 percent of the industrial capacity of the Nation. They operate at a loss of more than $10 billion a year, which must be made up through taxes.

Besides the people directly employed by the Federal corporations, another 1 million persons on the general Federal payroll devote their time exclusively to servicing the corporations. Their salaries amount to $4 billion a year, while the goods, facilities, and services they use add another $12 billion a year.

Two more items complete the rollcall of costs. Using an arbitrary figure of $50 billion as the resale price of the Federal corporations to private industry (the inventory is 4 times that), the application of this amount to the national debt would reduce interest payments on the debt by about $1,250,000,000 yearly. It would also knock off another $1,250,000,000 in amortization costs.

The total saving to the taxpayer by getting the Government out of business, where it has no call to be anyway, would be $28,500,000,000. By doing away with foreign-aid giveaways, the saving would be advanced to $33,169,000,000. In the year for which these figures applied, the total Federal income-tax collection was $32,495,000,000. Thus, without any income-tax collections at all, the Government would have been $674 million richer had it not been operating and servicing any of the questionable Government corporations in 1954. The sum would probably be even greater today. The saving would buy a lot of national defense without either deficit financing or additional taxes.

The appeal to the pocketbook of the proposed 23d amendment is tremendous. The appeal to national morality is equally strong. The Federal income tax is an iniquitous instrument which has been used for purposes never contemplated by the constitutional amendment which permitted it. The seizure of private wealth which it represents has grown to proportions which the framers of the original amendment regarded as too farfetched even to discuss as a possibility.

Since there is not much likelihood that the bureaucratic lobbies will allow the proposed amendment to originate in Congress, we commend it to sympathetic study by the State legislatures. Enough of them can put it before the people for ratification. It at least deserves that chance.

Assemblyman Vic Wallin Talks Sense About Awarding Scholarships

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALVIN E. O'KONSKI
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 25, 1958

Mr. O'KONSKI. Mr. Speaker, much has been said about helping to finance the education of qualified students. I believe a sensible approach has been outlined in a conversation with me by Assemblyman Vic Wallin, of Grand View, Wis.

Vic Wallin approaches the subject with thought that the welfare of all people is bettered by equality of educational opportunities. Equality is extended in our schools from the 1st grade through the 12th, but from then on, education is quite preferential, the preference being ability to pay.

Colleges and universities are financed mainly through taxation, gifts, and student fees. If our university is a fair example, then the student fees amount to about 10 percent of the total cost. The 90 percent financed from other sources can only have its reward by good use of the knowledge gained by the students in their many and varied fields of technical training. Because of higher education, the reward to everyone has been of great value. It is true, as in all groups, every so often there is that someone who uses the advantage of his higher education solely for his own selfish aims. He forgets that his advantage was made possible only because of men dedicated to education. He forgets that he learned by simply reading of the discoveries that required perhaps years and years of thinking research by others. He forgets that the taxpayer he is exploiting, paid the major cost of his advantage of higher learning.

But we can be thankful that the great large majority of those with higher education not only better their own standard, but also the standard of all, if facts bear this out as being true, then it seems reasonable to suppose that higher education should be made available to more students.

It seems quite apparent that the deterring factor of so many students not entering college, or taking specialized training, is financial. This is evidenced by the fact of scholarships provided, certain limited loans made available, special training provided by private industry, and so forth.

The potential of creative thinking is certainly not centered solely in the minds of those blessed with sufficient financial needs. But creative thinking, like a seed, develops in relation to the richness of the soil in which it is planted. Educational training is merely a special soil to develop that potential thinking that might otherwise lie dormant.

But the potential of a young mind is not a recognized security for a bank loan.

To make higher education totally free would not be advisable. Being practical, we know that all minds cannot absorb higher learning. With students paying part of the cost, it serves as a screening. But that cost should not be beyond the reach of a worthy student with sufficient initiative to be willing to obligate himself.

Many students with good minds have been desirous of furthering their education, but with no funds to back them, they must seek work, some with intention of saving money to get that higher learning. But time slips by, and likewise the desire for schooling. And if romance enters the picture, the financial impact further removes the possibility of schooling. How much has been lost? Who knows? If a young person can get a 20-year loan to build a home, doesn't it seem reasonable that an educational loan to a worthy student could be of equal value, or perhaps many, many times more?

The question is, Should and can loans be made to worthy students without sacrificing incentive, nor placing them in the class of charity? The writer believes such loans can be made—loans which are just as basic and just as American as any bank or other type loan.

That thought has been brought out by the personal experience of the writer, who had the opportunity to help three deserving students to help themselves. Two of the loans were small, though

highly important to the student. The writer merely served as endorser to a bank loan. This was done for two reasons. First, it made the student recognize he had an obligation to pay, one that could jeopardize his reputation if he failed, except for good and sufficient reason. Second, he knew he was paying for the use of that money. It took away the thought of charity. With a bit of friendly help, he was financing his own needs.

The third student required a larger loan. It was also a bank loan, secured by endorsement. But in this case the student was asked to take out an insurance policy as a loan protection, as well as being an aid to peace of mind.

All three students repaid their loans as agreed. All three today have positions of responsibility. They have not only bettered themselves, but the people they serve. All because they had an opportunity to help themselves.

Based on that experience, the following plan is suggested:

First. The student must have a required scholastic standing.

Second. The student must be of good moral character.

Third. The student could borrow the funds needed, in periods as needed.

Fourth. The student would take out a term-insurance policy, as a loan protection.

Fifth. The loan would bear interest after completion of the schooling.

Sixth. The loan would be repaid by 10 percent of the earnings of the student.

Now, let us evaluate the plan. The first requirement would better assure training to a qualified mind.

The second requirement would tend to reduce the moral risk of the loan.

Advancing the funds as needed would serve as guidance to the student, and better assure that the funds were only used for purpose advanced.

Term insurance can be had at nominal cost. Covering such things as death, permanent injury, and such other risks as may be determined by those in best position to know. Coverage extending only on the unpaid portion of loan.

Interest rate low, to cover operation cost only.

Repayment of loan based on 10 percent of earnings. A flat sum requirement might lead to default through no fault of the student. No one can tell the economic level of the future, nor the earning level of any profession. But just about anyone can live on 10 percent less than their earnings. This system would actually make the loan self-paying. If the education gained cannot increase the student's earning power by 10 percent, then the education gained has been wasted. A long-term educational requirement will require a larger loan, but the potential of earning power and repayment is also increased.

True, students that are minors, there may be a question of loan recovery by law in case of default. However, it seems doubtful that anyone gaining a higher position by reason of education, would risk same by exposure of default in paying a debt that actually gave him that position.

Under this plan, the funds supposedly would be perpetuated. The whole question would resolve on the honesty of the youth given the opportunity to help themselves. The writer has faith in the honesty of those earnestly seeking to better themselves.

Now comes the important question. Where would the loan funds come from? The Government? It could, but first it would seem advisable that a plan should have first proven its worth under our free-enterprise system.

There is a source of funds available that could well be used for such testing. Whether its ability, luck, a mixture of both, or something else, the fact remains that everyone doesn't make a million dollars. But many that do, give large sums for scholarships, for research, for charity, and so forth. They establish funds to promote and aid certain causes, in the form of foundations. These are all worthy.

But what greater research can there be, than finding a system to release the potential creative thinking now permitted to lie dormant because of the lack of funds, funds that would keep on working through repayment.

It would require more of course, but supposing a fund of only $1 million dollars were set up. The program would have to be limited? Perhaps limited to a given area, but primarily limited to its true purpose of loans only to those worthy students whose schooling would otherwise end.

Some might require a loan for only 1 year, or 2 years. Others may be full term of 4 years, or even longer if such course required. With the increased earning power, on the 10 percent basis, the loan could be repaid in a relatively few short years. A million dollar fund would not take care of a great multitude of students, but it would be well sufficient to measure results. And once proven, more funds would be forth-coming.

Certainly no student that is really desirous of higher education would object to borrowing money for that education, when he knows full well that his increased earnings alone would repay that loan in a reasonable time. And as he starts paying, that same money can be used for another deserving student.

We are generous in our loans for material things. Perhaps it is time we consider some loans to tap and develop the true source of our wealth. The Creator did not distribute the thinking minds on the basis of dollar possession.

But the lack of dollars at the time when of greatest worth, has kept far too many good-thinking minds from being developed to fuller use. A potential of knowledge lost to the world because thinking development lacks a loan value.

As of today, the far larger share of higher education is paid by others than the student. That cost is not based primarily on quality of minds trained, but rather on the student's ability to pay his lesser share. But even on that basis, higher education is paying huge dividends to all.

Therefore, why should we continue to hold solely to a dollar system that denies many qualified minds from developing its true potential, when we know the thinking minds have not been distributed on the dollar basis.

Research in the field of higher education to find a system of more equality of opportunity, seems to be both due and worthy.

Since the above was written, the papers carried a front-page headline that it had been proposed that the Government grant a yearly scholarship of $750, up to four years, to students with special mind ability. There is no desire to detract from the value of scholarships, but this seems much like rewarding a student for being born with a special talent. This brings to mind the Biblical story of the talents, where the reward was not based on the talent or talents possessed, but on the use of same.

Therefore, if such scholarship constituted a certificate of recognition, and carried a repayable loan value of same amount, the end result would be the same as far as educational opportunity is concerned, and this same fund could be used again and again for the same purpose of developing other gifted minds to fuller extent. It could well be a gain to all.

New Hampshire Industry in the Forefront To Promote Scientific Achievement

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PERKINS BASS
OF NEW HAMPSHIRE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 25, 1958

Mr. BASS of New Hampshire. Mr. Speaker, in this day of scientific advancement we are all anxious to pay tribute to those who are assisting in the field.

My good friend and neighbor, Mr. Horace D. Gilbert, is one of the many Americans doing his best to help our country.

The magazine article printed below is self-explanatory:

MINIATURIZATION AWARD ANNOUNCED

Plans to establish an annual miniaturization award which will recognize the greatest contribution by an individual or firm to the advancement of the concept of miniaturization have been announced by Horace D. Gilbert, president of Miniature Precision Bearings, Inc., Keene, N. H. An independent committee of miniaturization authorities representing industry, education, Government, and technical publications will administer the award.

In making known the award, Gilbert explained that "in recent years there have been spectacular improvements in the significant trend to miniaturization resulting in major advances for consumers, industry, and the military." The purpose of the award will be twofold: to honor the individual or firm who has made the greatest contribution toward these improvements; and to stimulate further activity within industry toward advancement of the concept of miniaturization. Entries are expected from a wide variety of product groups.

As an example in this breadth of miniaturization in industry, Gilbert noted that "min-

iaturized products can be found in the electronics, medical, musical, office equipment, and precision instrumentation fields, among a host of others."

Award entries are being judged on the following sets of criteria:

1. Products, components, or parts which show outstanding ingenuity in solving problems, make use of new design concepts and special materials and develop new type components or parts that extend the frontiers of miniaturization.

2. Individual companies or organizations which have broadened the horizons of miniaturization by creating a better understanding and use of the concept through education, research, engineering, and standardization.

Entries outlining the contributions toward the concept of miniaturization should be submitted to the awards committee, Miniature Precision Bearings, Inc., Precision Park, Keene, N. H.

Present plans call for the presentation of the award in the form of a piece of statuary at a dinner in New York next March.

Estonia Is Still on the Map

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES ROOSEVELT
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 25, 1958

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement on commemorating the 40th anniversary of the proclamation of independence of the Republic of Estonia:

ESTONIA IS STILL ON THE MAP

Maps are very important, but they never tell the human story behind the lines and colors. When one looks at a map of Europe today, he sees that the Baltic States are all the same color, usually red. They are red because they have been incorporated into the U. S. S. R. One of freedom's brightest beacons, Estonia, has been swallowed up by the Russian octopus.

Before 1940 a map of Europe would have shown a small, proud Estonia crowning the eastern shore of the Baltic Sea. Its people were an ethnically distinct group, proud of their history, dating from 3300 B. C., with an individual culture, a growing economy, and a love of independence that had survived a long succession of foreign rulers. Probably the single most important fact is that Estonia is a buffer state, a state caught between two larger powers.

Estonia had been independent from its early beginning until the 13th century. Then it found itself a pawn in the power politics of larger, aggressive neighbors, culminating in Russian rule in 1710.

Estonia, nonetheless, remained an outpost of Western culture, preserving its own spirit of independence and catching the fervor of 19th-century European nationalism to press its politically more backward rulers for reforms. With reforms painfully gained, the Estonian people were able to progress economically and culturally. The emancipation of peasants and the growth of an intellectual element were the firm basis for a national awakening. By the time of World War I Estonian nationalist movements in full force were seeking autonomy.

When the czar fell, Estonians gained from the Russian provisional government the permission to form an ethnic Estonian province under the authority of a popularly elected Estonian National Council which was to seek the status of an autonomous state in the Russian Republic. With the aid of the confusian in Russia itself, Estonia proceeded rapidly toward realizing their centuries-old dream of complete independence.

World War I broke upon the heads and hopes of Estonia and faced them with a new occupation by German troops who invaded Estonia in the wake of the retreating Bolsheviks. One day before Germany completed its operation, on February 24, 1918, the executive committee of Estonia proclaimed that "as of today Estonia within its historical and ethnic boundaries, is an independent, democratic republic, neutral in the present war."

Estonia's neutrality was respected as little by Germany as by Russia. The small Baltic state was faced with the difficult task of fighting both nations at once.

Success finally came to the valiant nation in 1920 when the U. S. S. R. signed a peace treaty renouncing all rights to Estonian territory. In 1932 a further guaranty was agreed upon, a nonaggression pact. Estonia was building its foundations of sovereignty upon the treacherous sands of Soviet paper promises.

World War II began for the successfully independent Estonia publicly with a declaration of neurality, privately by its secret consignment to Russia has a result of the infamous Ribbentrop-Molotov agreement.

Russia began immediately to push all its efforts toward the seizure of Estonia. Estonia was forced to sign a mutual assistance pact on the grounds that it could not guarantee Baltic security. Russia then presented an ultimatum on June 16, 1940; acceptance would mean military occupation. The people of Estonia, faced with overwhelming odds, grimly resigned themselves to their fate, their only hope that an international crime of such proportions would not go unpunished.

The Western World was quick to recognize the illegality and immorality of the Soviet behavior. Sumner Welles, American Under Secretary of State, said on July 23, 1940, that the independence and territorial integrity of the Baltic States were deliberately annihilated by devious processes. The United States has consistently refused to recognize the forcible annexation of Estonia. We realize that the Estonian people are a strong bulwark of anticommunism. We acknowledge the sufferings of these people who are steadfastly refusing to surrender their integrity, their patriotism, their religion, and their culture, even at the cost of their lives.

Some people have escaped from the horror that is Estonia today. They stand in the midst of the free world community and ask for our aid and sympathy. They know better than we the terrible price of freedom; they stand as burning examples of man's unquenchable desire for independence. They stand as reminders that there is still a part of the world living in darkness in this progressive 20th century.

Soil Bank: GOP Curve

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT W. HEMPHILL
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 25, 1958

Mr. HEMPHILL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Camden Chronicle of February 19, 1958:

SOIL BANK: GOP CURVE

The Soil Bank Act has turned out to be just about the biggest curve the Eisenhower administration has thrown at the country's farmers to date.

There are gross inequities which have been and are being practiced in the administration of the act, as hundreds of farmers in Kershaw County and across the Nation were promised the privilege of signing up for soil-bank payments and now have been turned down flatly.

This, needless to say, is in direct violation of a section of the Soil Bank Act, which states in words clear that all producers be given "a fair and equitable opportunity to participate in the acreage reserve program."

In nearly every instance the offices reported to farmers wanting to sign up acreage that no money is available, yet the Eisenhower administration insisted that the soil bank be continued this year.

The thing that really snows the farmer under is that the administration, in view of the above situation, has not, to date, offered a plan or even talked of one which would remedy the situation.

The Chronicle feels that the Government, since it insisted on the soil bank's continuation, has a moral obligation to the farmer, not to mention the right provided in the act itself.

Benjamin F. Fairless Receives Silver Quill Award of National Business Publications, Inc.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD H. REES
OF KANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 10, 1958

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include excerpts from the proceedings of the state of the Nation dinner of National Business Publications, Inc., at the Sheraton-Park Hotel in Washington, D. C., on January 31, at which Vice President RICHARD M. NIXON presented the 1957 Silver Quill Award of National Business Publications—highest tribute of the business press—to Benjamin F. Fairless, longtime head of United States Steel and now president of American Iron and Steel Institute, for distinguished service to the progress of Government and industry through unparalleled business leadership. In keeping with Silver Quill tradition, Senator HARRY F. BYRD, who was last year's recipient, served as chairman of the selection committee which unanimously named Mr. Fairless to receive the 1957 award.

The excerpts follow:

INTRODUCTORY REMARKS BY MASTER OF CEREMONIES RUSSELL C. JAENKE, EXECUTIVE VICE PRESIDENT, PENTON PUBLISHING CO., AND CHAIRMAN OF THE BOARD, NATIONAL BUSINESS PUBLICATIONS, INC.

It is always our hope that the state-of-the-Nation dinner may serve as a forecast of good things to come. At our head table there are leaders from government and industry who have graciously consented to briefly answer one specific question related to our future security. All have agreed to operate under a tight 3-minute rule.

We are also privileged by the presence of a group of distinguished journalists. They have likewise graciously agreed to ask the questions which are to be answered. I have the high honor of introducing this question-and-answer sequence which is themed "What Price Security?"

Inquiry by Roscoe Drummond, Washington columnist, New York Herald Tribune: Secretary Seaton, I believe all of us agree that supplies of water and electric power are indispensable to national security. At the same time, I believe all of us realize that, within recent memory, in various parts of the United States, there have been shortages of both and that the demands for both are continuing to grow at a terrific rate. Now, this is my question: Can you tell us what is being done to assure that we shall have plenty of water and power to meet all of our future needs?

Response by Fred A. Seaton, Secretary of the Interior: That is a very good question—maybe I better say a series of questions. The question of whether America will have just enough plain, ordinary water, in the next 25 years, could quite likely be the No. 1 domestic problem of this country. And, of course, whenever you talk about water you're talking about its corollary, which is electric power.

Now, I think that the Government of the United States is thoroughly aware of the twin problems. We recognize the fact that, by 1980 at the latest, the combined electrical industries of America—private, public, and Federal—will have to expend somewhere in the magnitude of hundreds of billions of dollars, in order to satisfy the electrical needs of the country. Translating that another way, it means that we shall have to triple the kilowatt production of America, at least by 1980, if not by 1975.

When you talk about water you have to realize that, in 1957, the industrial requirements for water equaled the agricultural requirements for water and that's the first time, in our history, that that has happened. We expect that, by no later than 1980, two-thirds of all the water requirements of the country will be soaked up by industrial appetite. In the last 4 years, the Government of the United States has increased the reservoir capacity of water in the United States by some millions of acre feet. We realize that that is only a start on the problem. I should like to hazard the guess tonight that the real and eventual answer to it is the successful solution of the problem of making saline and brackish water into potable water—in other words, taking the waters of the oceans and taking the brackish waters of the Middle West, the West, and some places in the East, and converting them so that, not only industry, but also human beings can use it.

That latter involves a very fascinating story. I think that scientists who are versed in the field will all admit that the world has come further in the direction of solving that problem, since 1953, than it has in the previous 150 years of human existence. We now have laboratory experiments in the Office of Saline Water of the Department of the Interior that indicate that we can convert sea water to human use for a cost of about 60 cents a thousand gallons. We are testing that out this next year in two pilot plants. If that is successful, we will have solved at least two-thirds of the problem of conversion, in the ratio of economical cost to human and to industrial use.

When we were in school, Roscoe, you and I, we were taught and we worried about the fact that it took 67,000 gallons of water to produce a ton of steel. Today, when you think in terms of the rayon industry, the synthetics in clothing and synthetic rubber, you are talking in terms of water used per ton that makes the 67,000 tons for steel look like something that came out of elementary school, which indeed it did.

I don't think there's any question but what the Government of the United States is on top of the job and I don't think there's any question but what the nations of the free world are all conversant with the problem and are all working together. And I should hazard the guess that, in the next 15 or 25 years, we shall have solved this problem of the saline and brackish water reduction. If that should happen, I should like to remind the ladies and gentlemen here tonight that that probably will become one of the greatest revolutions in all the history of industry in the world—from the time when history was first recorded—because you can almost dream forever about it.

If you could make all of Australia fruitful, if you could return the Middle East to the days of Babylon and Carthage before they were destroyed, and if you could make all of the land expanse of the United States and its possessions and territories fruitful, you would stop a lot of the problems of the world. The people wouldn't be hungry and you could move industry almost where you wanted to.

Today, the limit on the decentralization of industry is not so much the corporate investments that people have but the question whether industry can even have water. And that's perfectly true, if you realize that 1,200 communities in this country had a water shortage last year, and, particularly when you realize that some of our industrial concentrations in the East have run out of water. They can't find it in the streams; they can't find it in the ground. If we don't solve that problem, it doesn't make any difference what industry wants to do or what technology finds out it can do. Then you are concentrated to the areas where water is available.

Inquiry by Ned Brooks, news commentator, Three-Star Extra, NBC: Senator McClellan, throughout the Nation, people are shocked by recent disclosures of unethical practices by certain labor organizations and among certain union officials. From testimony before your select committee; from your own private store of related information—do you feel that such unbridled activities constitute a contributing factor to our present security predicament? In other words, Senator, have we concentrated too much on meeting the demands of labor for its individual worker, but not enough on labor meeting the demands of our economy in its expanding role as world leader?

Response by John L. McClellan of Arkansas, chairman, Senate Select Committee on Labor Activities: I believe you have asked two questions, or at least, you have asked one question in two parts. First, you asked: Do I feel that the improper labor practices revealed by this committee's investigations constitute a contributing factor to our present security predicament?

Well, now, our present security predicament involves many phases and many aspects. My answer, with proper qualifications, is in the affirmative. I do not see and I seriously doubt that such improper practices, as have been revealed, are a direct or, necessarily, a major contributing factor to what you term our security predicament. They could be, and they very likely are, an indirect factor, in that any practice in labor-management relations that tends to pollute the economic stream or to, in any way, weaken our economy would, in my judgment, definitely have some adverse impact upon our national strength and security.

With respect to you second question—I do not necessarily think that we have concentrated too much on meeting the demands of labor for its individual workers, but rather that we have done entirely too little toward the prescribing of standards of conduct and of ethics needed for the protection of the rights of the workingman and of management and of the general public. Also, we have done too little to prevent the exploitation by some criminal and disreputable elements that have infiltrated the labor movement. So far as I know, labor has met the demands of our economy in its expanding role as world leader. We have not experienced, so far as I can tell, any appreciable shortage in the personnel required to meet our production demands.

Inquiry by Robert T. Hartmann, chief, Washington Bureau, Los Angeles Times: Mr. Douglas, when I was a very small boy, I used to ride my bicycle out to Clover Field in Santa Monica to watch some of your first Douglas airplanes being flown. You have just come back, I believe, from watching your Thor intermediate rocket test flown in Cape Canaveral. As a pioneer, both in the air age and the space age, would you give us your views on two very controversial questions of the day. First, do you believe that we should rely on Government to spark our missile program or should the role of private enterprise be increased in the research, as well as the production end? And second, has your company ever been hampered by contracting with the various military services on a competitive basis and is this now slowing up our progress? Do you think that a single centralized Defense Department agency would be more efficient and economical?

Response by Donald W. Douglas, Sr., chairman, Douglas Aircraft Co.: You have touched on a subject very close to my heart. America was built on the foundation of free competitive private enterprise.

I do, indeed, believe that private enterprise should be encouraged in essential research of development and production for national defense. Our strength stems from our industrial, self-supporting enterprises, and not from official oligarchies. Private enterprise and individual initiative—the people, the dreamers and the doers—are the very essence of our resources.

We have the broad base of our entire industrial establishment, with all of its technological skill, management experience, and manufacturing plant capacity to anticipate and fulfill the requirements of our Armed Forces.

Private industry, as exemplified by the Nike and Thor projects, with which I am familiar, has demonstrated its ability to coordinate effectively the skill and resources of many different companies toward a common goal. This technique has given us some of our most important missile systems. Currently, it is being applied to some of the most advanced concepts, such as the Nike-Zeus antimissile system.

Private enterprise, in short, can do the job if it is given timely, clear-cut and firm decisions by the military, with the necessary, but only the necessary, amount of supervision by governmental agencies. Here, I am happy to add, I have been greatly encouraged, in recent weeks and days, by the fact that congressional climate and signals being called from the Pentagon on matters of defense reflect a refreshing climate of private enterprise philosophy.

This brings me to another part of your question. I do not believe that our company's proper functioning has been hampered by contracting with the military services on an independent, competitive basis. I believe that a certain amount of rivalry between the services is constructive.

It seems to me that the last part of your question concerns the current subject of reorganization of the Defense Department. Personally, I should like to see the Defense Department return to the size and system as it was in the days of Mr. Forrestal, the first Defense Secretary. Then, it was a small

policymaking and coordinating agency over the three services. The Army, Navy, and Air Force developed and procured their own weapons under the policy guidance only of the Defense Department.

If you give the existing departments authority to make the proper decisions, in the first place, and have the right men at their heads, many of our troubles will vanish.

A pyramid of committees and agencies is no substitute for men of vision, courage, and ability. We have such men in America. Let us give these men an opportunity to do the job. We've done it before and we can do it again.

Inquiry by Albert Clark, chief, Washington bureau, Wall Street Journal: Senator KNOWLAND, you have recently introduced legislation to amend existing labor laws for the purpose of providing additional protection for rank-and-file union members. Will you elaborate on the provisions of your proposal and how they could assist the Nation in securing its leadership in technology and productivity?

Response by WILLIAM F. KNOWLAND, of California, Senate minority leader: The workers bill of rights I have introduced in the Senate provides the following:

1. The election of union officials by secret ballot.

2. A recall provision so that members may replace union officials who misuse their positions of trust and responsibility.

3. Procedures for approval by a majority of union members on the question of calling or continuing strikes.

4. Registration and public disclosure requirements of union welfare funds.

5. Safeguards for members against unauthorized use of union funds or dues.

6. Protection for members against arbitrary or cohesive actions by union officials.

7. Limitation on trusteeships by national and international unions over local unions to not exceeding 1 year.

8. Penalties for cases involving management collusion with union officials against the interests of the union members and the public.

In my judgment, these provisions will help safeguard basic human rights of union members and give them a representative voice in the management of the affairs to which their salaries are contributed.

Our bill of rights for the working man and woman does not and should not constitute an indictment against all labor officials. Many of these individuals, past and present, have labored unceasingly in the best interests of their fellow man and the Nation. Unions have played in the past and will assume in the future an important role in the strengthening of our national economy. Unions will continue to grow in membership and importance. They must also grow, I believe, in responsibility to their members and to the American public.

The American way of life had its foundation fixed on maintaining the God-given dignity of man and the noble aspirations of free men in a free society. In order to assure the success of our purpose, we must always insist that with power must go responsibility. This concept cannot help but strengthen our leadership and our productivity.

Inquiry by Leslie E. Carpenter, Washington correspondent, Arkansas Gazette, Houston Post, Tulsa Tribune: Dr. Waterman, in our efforts for scientific supremacy in the space age, are we placing too much emphsis on an all-out numbers game? By that I mean would the national interest be better served if the Federal effort—the spending effort—were directed at quality rather than quantity? I wonder, for example, if an intensified effort to interest high-school students in science would produce more geniuses, or if it would only add to the total number of scientists without enriching the quality? Does it really matter that Russia is graduating a larger number of scientists than we, or is it the quality of a graduate that means the most? And, also, would national security benefit more by providing our scientists already qualified with larger research and development opportunities, rather than placing so great an emphasis on training more new scientists?

Response by Dr. Alan T. Waterman, director, National Science Foundation: Your question brings out essential elements in the situation. It would certainly be a great mistake to consider this an all-out numbers game. However, many of our boys and girls with high aptitude for science or other professional careers are not developing these talents adequately for this modern age. Thus, from among the top 25 percent of young high-school graduates, only about 6 of every 10 go on to college. It is, of course, true that, by intensified effort, one cannot produce high natural aptitude, but, by intensive training, one can develop such aptitudes to the fullest. Merely to increase the numbers of scientists and engineers will not only fail to solve the problem—it will complicate it.

Our emphasis must be on quality—quality in native ability, quality in training and quality in performance.

Quality in native ability we have in abundance, latent among our youth, from all walks of life. But, we must identify these young people early, give them every encouragement and opportunity to develop their aptitudes to the fullest—whatever these may be—for their own future and that of our society.

Quality in training for these young people we must insist upon. This means superior teaching and superior teachers, together with the equipment and materials they should have.

Quality in performance, in science and technology requires that we push forward the frontiers of science with all the vigor at our command. This means full support, both financial and moral, to our competent basic research scientists and engineers for their needs. This includes, especially, the construction of costly capital installations, such as those required for nuclear physics, astronomy and the exploration of outer space.

These goals are clear. But, above all, we must have the determination to achieve them. This will not be easy. In this, every organization, every citizen, every parent must realize his responsibilities and play an active role.

Inquiry by Marquis W. Childs, Washington correspondent, St. Louis Post-Dispatch: Mr. Moss, as you so well know—much has been said, both pro and con, about the adequacy of public information regarding the needs and developments of our defense establishment. You have been forceful in your statements about the withholding of news and my question is directed to that vital area of security. How realistic is the price we are forced to pay for a dubious security based on withholding information from the public, which must be partner to any effort to secure our future and the necessary financing? Also, Mr. Moss, is it not damaging to the unity of knowledge and action so essential to adequate preparedness to withhold information—then use it as a scare technique when appropriations are sought from Congress by the military?

Response by JOHN E. MOSS, of California, chairman, House Subcommittee on Government Information: You've correctly identified the article we buy when we withhold facts from the people—dubious security. The truth is, of course, that real security cannot possibly result from our being misinformed, or uninformed. The only result is dangerous ignorance, or worse—complacency.

The key to this question goes to the heart of our democratic process. Our system of self-government requires the people, through their representatives, to make the important policy decisions which guide our Nation's actions. To make such decisions intelligently, the people must know the facts, must be aware of the alternatives and must not be stampeded by misleading or incomplete information.

When the people don't know the truth, they cannot possible make the correct decisions. When that happens, it is only too easy for Government leaders to claim that only those on the inside can deal with the important problems of the day. The result of that situation is clearly spelled out in history—recent history, I might add. Whenever the people lose control over decision making, there are many only too willing to take over and run things.

That's the importance of full and complete information in a democracy, as I see it. Obviously, we pay a price that is too high—a price that destroys the market place—when the vital information needed to live and act intelligently in this modern world is withheld from the people.

Years ago, we used to be able to talk about long-range and short-range effects, but modern technology has compressed both time and effect into terribly short moments. Take your example—raising funds for defense appropriations. In the past years, an uninformed Congress and a complacent people—lulled into dubious security by suppression of facts—could talk economy and slash defense budgets without permanent damage. The next budget, the next Congress could act to restore the situation and the harm would be repaired.

But this is 1958, the era of sputnik and intercontinental missiles with atomic warheads. A wrong decision now could be fatal. We can no longer afford the luxury of mistakes. Our Nation must make its decisions promptly and correctly, because there may be no time tomorrow to recover from today's mistake. Instead, we are being spoon fed a few facts here, a few facts there, each accompanied by a request for money.

The people must know the truth—whether it is good or bad. The people must have the facts, must be told the whole story, to be prepared for the crucial decisions of this day. A leadership that fails to discharge this responsibility to its people—a responsibility to tell the full truth—is committing a tragic blunder that could well destroy everything we believe in.

Inquiry by William McGaffin, Washington correspondent, Chicago Daily News: Secretary Brucker, for hundreds of years, armies have traveled thousands of miles to fight for liberty at home and abroad. Now we are told that ours is a land-locked army; that the American Army has hardly a modicum of mobility with which to meet and master space-age attack. We also hear that any future war is going to be a pushbutton affair. So—Mr. Secretary—what we would like to know from you is: Who's going to guard the pushbuttons?

Response by Wilber M. Brucker, Secretary of the Army: I welcome that question. Two years ago, on this same occasion, my question was: "Is the Army obsolete?" Last year, my question was: "Is the Army outmoded in the atomic age?" This year: "Is the Army landlocked?" Well, we're making progress. Or, I might say, by Jupiter, we're holding our ground.

And now about mobility and the integrity of our national defense. I realize that I represent the Army, but it isn't fair for me to forget that there are others in this great national defense team of ours—the Navy, the Marines, and the Air Force, along with the Army, with which I am particularly familiar. What a great team it is. And how powerful and mighty that team is, working together.

With respect to this matter of the team, your Army is, of course, an indispensable part of it, but, together, it's an indestructible team. And the person who perhaps knows that best tonight is crafty Khrushchev. The deterrent strength that the United States has at this time is great. Without boastfulness, may I say to you that, with over 2½ million dedicated men and women under arms, and with over another million civilians in the services, it is a great force for our country.

Now, with respect to this business that you ask about—mobility—may I be pardoned to answer that just directly. What you mean is, can we move and get there in a hurry? Yes; in either a global or a limited war. Some think that the most likely is an atomic war with atomic equilibrium. That is not likely any more so than national suicide. So, the Russian effort will undoubtedly be to nibble away country by country by subversion or otherwise in order to take over.

The question comes, Are we ready to demonstrate our mobility to the world? Two examples quickly come to my mind.

We put on an operation a year a half ago called Operation Firm Link. You know that in Asia, at that time, the Chinese Communists and the Russians had been talking about Uncle Sam as the "paper tiger." You remember that phrase, certainly. Well what happened? It was necessary to demonstrate to the people of the area that we could do something; that we were not just a paper tiger but, at the same time, would not brandish the sword. We had to demonstrate quietly that the United States had the power. So, in the country of Thailand—at Bangkok, to be particular—this exercise called Operation Firm Link was conducted. Inside of a very few days, the Navy had its great power concentrated on Bangkok Harbor; the Air Force had its great planes flying in, the Marines came with the Navy, and our Army sent two battle groups from far-off Japan, by way of the Philippines, and flew them to Thailand. In the vicinity of the Bangkok Airport, the Army parachuted to earth. Then they marched through the city of Bangkok, dissipating forever the word "paper tiger" attached to the United States. The cheering tens of thousands who lined the streets were enough to carry the word around all of that part of the Asiatic world.

Again, quickly, as to operational mobility—over 2 years ago, by plane, we carried a regimental combat team located at Fort Campbell, Ky., and we flew them over to Tokyo. Using those same planes, we picked up a regimental combat team that had been on duty there and brought them back to Fort Bragg, N. C., in 10 short days. And we're going to do better than that.

So, when they talk about the Middle East and are we ready, or when they talk about some other place in the world—and I would not mention names, because that's not perhaps the thing to do—all I can say to good Americans is, here are two examples of what you can expect, if that occurs.

Now, I am mindful of the fact that the Army has a lot of other missions. The Army has the mission of ground defense against air attack. Involved in this is the anti-missile missile that Mr. Douglas just spoke about. What a great trust that is at this moment, in addition to all the rest, to develop a weapon which will destroy the incoming missiles going over 10,000 miles an hour before they hit. We're in the midst of that. We've been working 18 months on that development and we're now getting some of it in the hardware state. We're pushing fast. It will be the third generation of the Nike family along with the Nike Ajax and the Nike Hercules—the Nike Zeus. We're very proud to have this air-defense role.

But, ladies and gentlemen, it's not missiles and it isn't the anti-missile missile that's the ultimate weapon. Please don't misunderstand it. I listened carefully to the last part of that question. Ours will never be a push-button defense. No responsible military man will ever support that, because he knows that, in the last analysis, the ultimate weapon is man himself. It's dedicated young men like these who are up here tonight who will live for their country and fight and die for it if necessary. That's the quality plus that will keep America and the free world free.

Inquiry by Charles O. Herb, president, Society of Business Magazine Editors: Mr. Brundage, it is recalled that the President, in one of his 1952 speeches, is quoted as saying "The facts must be given to the American people; they must know our aims, the reasons for them, and the cost of attaining them." Therefore, if we are really getting set to engage the Nation in a total venture to assure our security, should the people not feel some concern regarding their ability to pay for the program, within the framework of our existing economic system?

Response by Percival F. Brundage, Director, Bureau of the Budget.—My answer is definitely yes. The people are showing that concern and they are more interested than I think they have been for years that they are getting what they need—the value for what we are spending. The President has already set forth, in the state of the Union the budget and the economic messages—a description of his programs, their purposes and what they will cost.

We must maintain a strong economic system to support the necessary programs—whatever programs are necessary, at home and abroad, which will contribute to our defense and that of the free world and continue to advance our standard of living. These programs take into account our total resources and they are many and varied and are well balanced in their aims and distributions. I am confident that the Congress and the people of the United States will support them.

ADDITIONAL REMARKS OF MASTER OF CEREMONIES RUSSELL C. JAENKE

We come now to another proud moment for the Business Press—the presentation of its silver quill award. You may be assured that there were numerous candidates of high degree recommended to the selection committee. But—in the ever-challenging area of business statesmanship—there could finally be but one name above all others.

It belongs to one whose deeds are already legend as a leader of industry. His is a rich record of no uncertain proportions and accomplishments. Let it therefore be clearly understood that it is we who are honored—beyond measure—in having the privilege of honoring him.

In truth—ladies and gentlemen—we are doubly honored and twice privileged. To make the quill presentation—we have back with us a man of conviction and action—a man beloved by all of us as a great patriot and good friend—a man who himself received our 1953 award.

Mr. Vice President, the Business Press is and always will be honored by your presence. We believe your annual return to our rostrum indicates a sincerity of interest and friendship which we intend to cherish and serve to our fullest ability.

We are delighted to have you here again to make the presentation—at this time—to another great American known to you and all of us simply as Ben.

REMARKS OF RICHARD M. NIXON, VICE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES, IN PRESENTING THE 1957 SILVER QUILL AWARD OF NATIONAL BUSINESS PUBLICATIONS, INC., TO MR. BENJAMIN F. FAIRLESS

Mr. President, distinguished guests, ladies and gentlemen—I have appeared many times in this room but never when the audience was one that had more influence. I have been talking to the man on my right and the man on my left and I learn more about this group, which is represented here, each time I come. But, when I realize that, represented in the Business Publications of America, there are 2,000 publications with a circulation of 40 million, I realize that this is the most powerful audience that has ever gathered in Washington, D. C.—and we are happy to be here with you tonight.

Now, your president said, very appropriately, I think, that this Silver Quill Award could not have been made to a man who deserved it more. As a matter of fact, there is only one thing inappropriate about the award and that is that it is 300 ounces of silver rather than gold—because the man we honor tonight is 1 who has had, as you know, a fabulous career and everything he's touched has turned to gold—almost everything, with 1 exception—which I will mention in a moment.

When the first song played was about Ohio, I suppose some of you wondered why. This man was born in Pigeon Run, Ohio, and all Ohio is proud of him, as is all of America—because he is the son of a coal miner and became the head of the largest corporation in the United States. He is a man who proved that it can happen in the United Staes of America and his whole life is one that makes us proud of the country we live in and of the American dream which we hope will always be with us. As a matter of fact, I was looking over his background. I have 4 pages here indicating the various organizations of which he is either president or trustee or director—17 major ones, each successful. As I said a moment ago, everything he has touched has turned to gold—except one. I notice that he is a director of the Pittsburgh Pirates. And may I say, Mr. Fairless, if you have any success with the Pittsburgh Pirates, come down to Washington—we need somebody for the Washington Senators.

Now, may I turn to a serious note, before making the presentation. When I was thinking tonight, as you were, about this man and his career and, as I listened to the various questions and the answers which were given to them here, I thought, as you must have thought, of the characteristics of our economy; of our society. And I thought, as you must have thought, that we have many problems today. Many of us, I suppose, might wish that we didn't have the problem of information about Government activities; the problem of an economy that, instead of always running level, goes up and down—although, in the long run, it goes up, as I will point out, in a moment. We perhaps wish that we didn't have the problems between labor and management in various segments of our society. And I think, perhaps, that all of us would recognize the truth of Thomas Jefferson's statement, when he said that there are those who prefer the calm and orderly processes of despotism to the boisterous turmoil of freedom. There are those who do, but there are not many of those of that type in the United States.

We have had problems and we have them today, but as we consider the past 50 years—the span of the working life, I should say, of our honored guest—I think we can realize the dynamism of our economy and the validity of our basic political and economic philosophy. In the industry which he proudly represents—50 years ago—the steelworker worked approximately 80 hours a week for approximately $20 a week. Today, he works one-half as long for 5 times as much, and in that 50 years, we have had 3 wars; we have had several recessions and, depending upon whether you call it depression or recession, 2 or 3 depressions. But, overall, as we look at the broad picture, we see that America has progressed, always forward, always upward, with a bet-

ter standard of living for our people. As we think of that progress, I think we recognize that it is due to a number of factors—to our form of government and the leadership we have had in Government; to our people; also to the leaders of management; the leaders of labor—to those in our economy who, working sometimes in competition with each other and sometimes cooperatively, have together produced the economic might of the United States. Mr. Fairless, of course, is one of those who has been in the forefront of that group.

We heard the song, Around the World in 80 Days. Mr. Fairless went around the world in 50 days and conducted an investigation for the President of the United States in the field of economic assistance to countries abroad.

Secretary Brucker said, a few moments ago, very properly, that, in the event of war, the ultimate decisive factor would probably not be missiles, but the man. He is certainly correct, if he talks of a hot war—a war that we may not have to fight. But our honored guest, today, in his 50 days around the world, reached another conclusion which we must also have in mind. We are engaged today in another type of war—one that has always been launched against us. It is a war in which the economy of the slave world has been pitted against the economy of the free world; one in which millions of people all over the world are trying to determine which way to turn—toward freedom or toward slavery. It is a war in which the leadership the United States enjoys is tremendously important because, if we show, in this country, that our system is an effective one and provides the good things of life for our own people; if we show, in our attitude toward other countries, that their best hope is in working with us—with what assistance we are able to give them—rather than working with the slave world; if this happens—then the hot war will never have to be fought, in order for the objective of world domination to be gained by those who oppose everything that we stand for.

Tonight, then, as we honor Ben Fairless, may I say we think of him as we should—as a leader of business, but we also—those of us who are here from Government—deeply appreciate, as all Americans do, the fact that he has given so much of his time and his energy for his Government and, particularly, in this service most recently rendered. I can think of no term with which to describe him more appropriately or more succinctly than to say that the man who receives the Silver Quill Award tonight is a statesman—a statesman of industry.

REMARKS OF MR. BENJAMIN F. FAIRLESS, LONG-TIME HEAD OF UNITED STATES STEEL AND NOW PRESIDENT OF AMERICAN IRON AND STEEL INSTITUTE, IN RECEIVING THE 1957 SILVER QUILL AWARD OF NATIONAL BUSINESS PUBLICATIONS, INC., JANUARY 30, 1958, WASHINGTON, D. C.

Thank you, Mr. Vice President.

Distinguished guests, ladies and gentlemen, your kindness to me has been so overwhelming that I hardly know what to say.

To be selected to receive the Silver Quill award is one of the highest and most welcome honors that has come to me in my professional life. And, to receive it from the hands of our country's capable and distinguished Vice President—a man for whom I have the highest personal regard—makes me feel very, very proud.

When Bob Harper wrote to tell me that I had been chosen by your award committee, I was naturally delighted. But, at the same time, I have to admit that I was also perplexed by certain doubts and misgivings which stubbornly persist.

Of course, I know that the award committee does a thorough job and checks on a thing like this pretty carefully. But, I can't help wondering if, when their ballots were counted, a clerical error didn't creep in somehow. The Silver Quill, after all, is a mighty big award for someone like myself who was frustrated in his life's ambition.

As some of you may know, I just got into the steel business by accident. What I really started out to be was a baseball player. And, as a matter of fact, some people apparently believe that I still am a baseball player. The other night, at a dinner in New York, a fellow referred to me as "that Pittsburgh Pirate"—with what degree of affection or confusion, I cannot say.

Unfortunately, I never got very far out of the sandlot league in our great American pastime. So, you can easily see how it would occur to me that, perhaps, somebody slipped up on tonight's award somewhere.

And, if that's how it happened, then I feel I should say a word of consolation to the conscientious members of the award committee. Gentlemen, I know and you know that there are many, many others far more worthy to receive the Silver Quill. But, I assure you that among all those you might have selected, you could not find anyone, anywhere, who appreciates it more. So, in the reassuring light of that rationalizing, I accept—with pleasure, with pride and with heartfelt gratitude—this very distinguished honor.

Tonight, I sincerely wish that I could turn the tables on you editors and publishers of the Nation's business press. If I could do so I would present to each one of you an award that I feel you deserve.

Each of you, to my mind, deserves recognition for the important work you perform in your 200 trade, technical and scientific journals. With clarity, judgment and deep insight you help those of us in business to understand better the complex issues that we face.

But, even more important than that, you help the American people to achieve a better understanding of business—its problems, its legitimate needs and hopes and the way in which our free enterprise system works to serve the best interests of our society.

Obviously, this is the kind of job that never ends. Just as obviously there is no other group that I know of that is more qualified to do it. And, I believe that this work for better understanding of our own system is one of the most compelling and challenging responsibilities of our time.

We face today a divided world. We have seen it stained by blood over the bitter issue that divides us. Two powerful forces—freedom and slavery—repel each other. Both have now split an fused the little world of the atom but, thus far, the larger world we both live in remains only split and confused.

Clearly, at such a time in such a world, we must not be and cannot be divided among ourselves. Lincoln warned us that a house in that shape cannot stand. We know that at present one of the foundations of the free structure of the world is the economic strength of America. And, our Nation's economic strength grows by a system of free enterprise as free men and women understand, support, and conduct it.

That strength thus far has been great enough to rally the Western nations of the world to the virtues of resistance and the values of freedom. We have been and, hopefully, will continue to be the encouragement not only of the West, but the entire world.

We do so, fundamentally, by offering the finest example of freedom's great practical as well as ethical worth. We may not have as yet a successful space satellite. But, we do have, in action, for all the world to see, a successful society of free people—who save, risk, and profit under an economic system which provides material and spiritual values and individual lives of dignity, opportunity, and unequaled comfort.

If that were not so one might wonder, then, why millions come to our side each year, and why millions more risk death to escape from the East to the free world. If it were not true we might believe that the barbed wire borders, the check points, guns, guards, and dogs were there to keep us out instead of doing what, in fact, they are doing—keeping the slaves in.

Thus, it seems to me that surely one of our greatest challenges—yours, mine, and every American's—is here in our own house. We should stand together to keep it strong. And, we should be working together to keep it growing not only for ourselves and our children but to help keep steadfast this great faith in freedom.

Not of our choice but by our very progress as a society, we have been thrust into leadership of the free nations. As leaders, we cannot permit confusion and division to misguide us. And, that is why you gentlemen, with your skill and wisdom in ways of making clear to the American people how our free enterprise system works and how it can continue to grow, do such an important and award-deserving job.

In recent months we have been split and confused over the temporary—and I emphasize temporary—dip in our rate of progress. We hear again of a cure for it that, strangely, sounds exactly like the treatment prescribed for a boom. It involves one of the discredited and bewhiskered economic arguments of Lord Keynes. And, it seems to me, that it is based on a serious lack of understanding of our system and the sound way true progress has been and can be achieved. The debate is now at that dangerous stage in which more heat than light is shed.

Certain labor leaders declare that the reason key industries are now operating below capacity is because of a lack of consumer purchasing power. This reason sounds so simple and the cure, bigger and bigger wage increases, so appealing that I suspect many persons want it to be true. But neither the simple sound nor the natural wish for more make it a valid reason.

If it were true, of course, then we would have a dandy remedy for any temporary downturn and a pat formula for all future progress. All we would have to do would be to double everyone's wages and then, under this concept, we would all be twice as well off. But, unfortunately, even in theory it doesn't work out that way.

I suppose that this isn't precisely the way an economist would look at it, but I think of our national wealth as being stored in a gigantic warehouse. Packed inside are all the goods, services, foods, and fiber we produce. The money we use is merely a receipt for what we produce and bring to this national warehouse.

At the other end—the shipping side—we bring our receipts, or money to exchange for other things we require. Now, if we double the amount of receipts and do nothing about the amount of goods, we have not added one bit to our national wealth. All that happens is that now we have twice as much money to buy the same amount of things. And, of course, in short order we pay twice as much as before.

Many Americans recognize and have experienced the truth of this very simple illustration. In labor's camp there are wise leaders today who understand perfectly that we cannot take out of our national warehouse more than we put in. They know, too, that it is what we can actually buy with our pay rather than the number of dollars we get that really counts.

Still, the consumer purchasing power theme is played, again and again, very cleverly and apparently very carefully timed in relation to forthcoming bargaining sessions. It is a beguiling as well as confusing melody and, I suppose, on the rank and file of labor it has the same lulling effect that the songs of sirens have on sailors. The results are the same, too.

Now, the minute anyone says something like this in a speech—as I have tonight—he

is immediately accused of being against wage increases and the labor unions. I wish to make it very clear that I am not opposed to either. In fact, I am emphatically for both. As to unionism, I could hardly feel otherwise. My father held a union card; my brother held one, also. I signed the first corporation-wide contract in the steel industry with the United Steelworkers of America. The late Phil Murray and I shook hands on it.

I am not, nor have I ever been against wage gains. And when I say "wage gains" I mean ones that will buy more. I think everybody should get more as it becomes possible to create more. But increases in general wage-rate levels to make real dollars and sense (spelled s-e-n-s-e) must bear a fair relationship to advances in national productivity. And, in the last 10 years they haven't. A 26-percent gain in industrial productivity has been more than absorbed by a 61-percent rise in wage rates.

Consumer purchasing power, reflecting the real income and the confidence of spenders, is one of the vital parts of a prosperous America. But it is a power that has to be earned to be effective. It cannot be assumed by attempting to take a share at the expense of somebody else. The difference between the 26-percent gain in output and the 61-percent gain in wages is illusion. It is a phony as far as increasing consumer purchasing power because, of course, it represents inflation.

While it sounds perfectly delightful to stuff more money into pay envelopes, it must be understood that, if new wealth or efficiency is not created, that money must come out of someone else's pocket, who is also a consumer. Total purchasing power in the market place is not raised by as much as a fraction in this way.

What any man earns in our system stems from the value of what he produces; and, therefore, a real increase in his earning power comes about as he increases his productive power. So the really puzzling question is how can a man become more productive?

Now, a human being is truly a marvel and at the same time something of a mess. He has the mind of a giant but the muscles of a pygmy. With his mind, his imagination and wondrous creative powers, he can write a book, paint a picture, or sculpt a statue. He may search and find in science the secrets of the universe. But when he had to depend solely on his muscles for his basic needs—his clothing, food, shelter, and comforts—he was a sorry specimen and lived a primitive life.

Of course, he no longer has to depend on his muscles. Over the years we have developed a great army of inanimate slaves which add productive power to each workingman. These are the machines and tools which, in our national warehouse, are the capital goods, the product of savings invested. They permit each man to turn out many times more than he could if he depended only on his muscles.

So the next question is, then, how do we get more of these aids to productive power? And the answer is, bluntly, from profits. Profits under our free system are not something we need apologize for because with profits we have the real key to more productive power and thus earning power and thus progress.

The new machinery and tools which enable a workingman to increase his output and which equip the new workers joining the labor force each year would not be available without profits. Whether they are used directly by being plowed back into the business or indirectly as an incentive to investors, profits start our forward motion in providing rising living standards.

The corollary argument to the consumer-purchasing-power theme is that wage increases can be subtracted from profits without price increases. In answer to this notion, the Saturday Evening Post recently carried a pertinent editorial using the steel industry as an example:

"Suppose the 1946 level of steel prices had been maintained through 1956. And suppose the industry had shipped what it actually did ship during that decade. Assume further that wage rates and other costs rose as they actually did during this 10-year period. Where would the steel industry stand today?

"Well, on the basis of official, published figures, it would be more than $21 billion in the red.

"The steel industry would have operated in the red in 9 out of the 10 years. Its losses in 1955 and 1956, taken together, would have been at least equal to the entire sum spent by the industry for its postwar expansion.

"Of course, none of this could have actually happened, since the whole industry would have been bankrupt long before it could have accumulated a deficit of this size. The shipments could never have been made since the plants which made the shipments possible could never have been built. Failure to recover costs would have prevented expansion.

"Steel prices, like any other prices, must reflect increases in the cost of doing business, including wages—or you go out of business."

To show up the absurdity of any significant wage increase coming out of profits you need only compare the size of a 5-percent increase in wages with total corporate profits. In the highest year on record, 1950, such a wage increase would take about 20 percent of all corporate profits before taxes.

A squeeze like that on profits would have three inevitable effects: It would stop investment cold, lower productivity, and increase unemployment. And that, I submit, is hardly the pattern of progress or the way to strengthen our economy.

The mystery is why anyone would think wages should come out of profits in the first place. The result is to pinch off a principal source of additions to productive power. And, since the only way we can hope to live better is if we produce more for our national warehouse, then the minute we take from profits we are, in effect, subtracting from living standards.

So, I think it is time we replace confusion with understanding of the real source of our economic strength. And the time is overripe for us to end the squabble over dividing what we have and get on about the business of multiplying more for the greatest number of our people.

For one thing, we can cease trying to get more by taking it from someone else. In particular, I mean trying to take from profits to put into wage envelopes. No one really gains in that attempt—least of all the workingman. As unemployment increases, production drops and progress halts. Instead of raising costs, prices, and the cost of living, let us rather raise productivity, progress, and the standard of living.

That is what we all want. A balanced overall movement forward with wages, profits, and productivity going up in and not out of step. And I am confident that this is well within our abilities, despite the marking time we may have to do this year as inventories are pared down.

Ahead of us is a new era—a space age as some call it. It will be a time of tremendous technological change. In my opinion we are just now at the doorstep of a new warehouse for America. One that can be filled with greater wealth, more new things from more new processes in the next 5 years than we have ever seen before in our history.

As the result of research and development financed by American industry because profits made it possible to do so, there is a great backlog of new ideas, theories, and principles building up in our Nation's laboratories. To translate them into new jobs, factories, machines, and finished products will require tremendous new investments.

Those investments, however, will not be forthcoming unless a real incentive—a prospect of profit—entices investment. And, unless those investments are made we will, indeed, slip behind the Russians. Not just in single, spectacular scientific achievements, but in the real race we are running and in which our free system far excels their slave system. I mean our success in providing better living standards and an opportunity for a better life for more people.

Let us admit and have done with it that the Russians have impressed the world. But, let us also recognize that they have done so with a policy of fear and an instrument of terror. I think we would much rather be what we are, the encouragement of a world yearning for freedom and for a better life in peace to enjoy useful progress.

Lincoln said it for us a long time ago. Speaking on Washington's birthday in 1861 at Independence Hall, he referred to the inner meaning of the Declaration of Independence as "giving liberty not alone to the people of this country but hope to the world for all future time."

That hope was never needed more than in the year 1958. We provide it as we stand together, adhere to and apply those economic principles which can make America stronger than ever in a greater age of progress than any so far known. For that goal and to keep alive that hope of all men for a free, undivided world at peace, we stand together—or fall.

Thank you.

Politics and Recession

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 10, 1958

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I commend to the attention of our colleagues the following article by Helen Hill Miller, which appeared in the New Republic magazine of February 10, 1958. In the article the writer points out the weak spots in our economy and the possible solutions and their effects. It is a stimulating analysis which should be read by all.

POLITICS AND RECESSION
(By Helen Hill Miller)

Within the past 3 weeks, the main alternatives for dealing with this recession in this election year have become visible. The President, in his state of the Union message, said: "There are solid grounds for confidence that economic growth will be resumed without an extended interruption"; his budget and his economic report are based on that view. From Capitol Hill, various Democratic Senators have made cause-and-cure speeches—one by Paul Douglas ended with a reference to hucksters of sugared rose water. The Joint Committee on the Economic Report has heard panels of private economists with backgrounds ranging from the National Industrial Conference Board to the AFL–CIO. Walter Reuther and Harlow Curtice have exchanged opening rounds preparatory to the auto industry's forthcoming wage negotiations. The Keyserling-oriented Conference on Economic Progress has issued Wages and the Public Interest,

charting the losses sustained when the economy operates at less than capacity. The Federal Reserve has said little, but again reduced the discount rate.

So the milling around at the starting gate is mostly over; very shortly, the horses will be off on the 1958 handicap. The race has one confusing aspect. Each owner is ready to prove that his entry is by Sputnik out of Full Employment. Yet each is a horse of a different color, and each jockey wears silks that are the traditional and identifiable symbols of a well-known stable.

Meanwhile, the railbirds, amateur and professional, are exchanging knowing and incompatible judgments on the condition of the track, how it got that way, and the likely qualities of the entries in negotiating this sort of going.

Those who say the track is faster than most people think suggest that this is in part an inventory recession, somewhat comparable to the two preceding dips. The economic report notes that in 1957's "final quarter inventories were being reduced, on balance, at an annual rate of $3 billion, or possibly more. * * *" These are the optimists; once shelves have been cleared new orders cause a pickup, temporary, perhaps, but still a pickup; it might come this spring.

A larger group, who believe that the track will prove fairly heavy, underline the importance of the capital-goods recession, citing the National Industrial Conference Board's estimate that "authorizations for new investment by the 1,000 biggest manufacturing companies were 31 percent less during even the third quarter of 1957 than they were during the corresponding quarter of 1956.

Certainly the impact exerted on the economy by the steep rise in expenditures for new plants and equipment, from $26.83 billion in 1954 to $37.03 billion in 1957, is now spent; the annual rate for such investment in the first quarter of 1958 is estimated at $35.52 billion, as compared with $36.89 billion a year before.

And the productive capacity which recent investment has put in place seems, for the time being, to have outrun the capacity of consumers to absorb its output in a number of important lines. The Detroit automobile man who said, "They've just got to buy the new models; we have so much money in them," may have a 'shock coming.

For even before industry stepped up its capital investment, consumers had been making major investments in their kinds of capital equipment: First, housing and then durables to fill the garage and equip the kitchen, the utility room, the TV-hi-fi corner. More and more, the market for these has become a replacement market.

The multitude of private decisions, by individuals and by corporation boards, which caused these changes in the condition of the track, are taken by the railbirds as the sun and the rain, with only general grumbling. But their comment on other factors in the running includes personal epithet directed at the track's management and those of its membership who also have entries in the 1958 handicap.

Tight money has not only been an economic fact of the last months, it has been a policy. For 2 years, the Federal Reserve has been a crusader against inflation; in putting on the brakes against a too-rapid rise, did it hold the pressure too long, and cause a slowdown? Does hindsight now prove that Reserve Board Chairman Martin should have seen the start of a recession in December 1956, when the Federal Reserve's index of industrial production hit a peak of 147?

Or are the current disabilities of the economy service connected? During the last half of 1957 was an important downward fillip given by the sudden $2 billion cutback in new orders for military hardware that came after Humphrey-Wilson-Eisenhower, with the debt limit in mind and budget balancing in view, clamped an expenditure ceiling on the Pentagon last midsummer?

Such questions bring the talk around to specific horses—which ones have what it takes, and how well will they be handled? To take three heavily backed favorites.

RESERVE CHAMPION

If monetary policy continues to be the front runner, will the Federal Reserve establish itself as a versatile horse, good when the track is fast, and good again when it is soggy? Its fanciers advance the following points for use in judging its conformation:

1. Last September, as soon as the change of Secretaries at the Treasury took effect, an informal committee composed of Treasury Secretary Anderson, Presidential Economic Adviser Hauge, Council of Economic Advisers Chairman Saulnier and Reserve Board Chairman Martin was formed for occasional meetings with the President. This gives administration members a 3-to-1 advantage in putting their views to Martin in the presence of the President. But it gives Martin:

(a) More frequent access to the President, with less speculation than when special appointments appeared on his calendar:

(b) A chance to approach simultaneously, and at times to find a mutually agreed meeting of minds, among a group whom he formerly had to see piecemeal;

(c) A mechanism which he can display to Congressman WRIGHT PATMAN, perennial easy money advocate and intrepid member of the House Banking and Currency Committee, in satisfaction of PATMAN's insistence that the Federal Reserve should be more responsive to the administration.

2. The Federal Reserve has obtained wide publicity for its change of direction last November when its often raised discount rate was showily cut; and in addition to its psychological impact, the switch saved the bond market at a time when the Treasury's head was bumping on the debt ceiling.

3. The reduction in margin requirements for stock market operations in January was made with even more attention to psychology: by coming as a surprise, it caused a market rally as an initial reaction; with more conditioning, Wall Street would have concluded that the Federal Reserve too was a prophet of gloom and doom.

4. Then there is the matter of the system's reserve requirements. Differentials now exist between central city, reserve city and country banks. Relaxation of these differentials would make available sizeable sources of credit now frozen as reserves. Federal Reserve Chairman Martin has stated at congressional hearings that the present system of reserves is outmoded. Agreement as to how and when to reach a different level is being sought within the system, and the American Bankers Association also has a committee taking a look.

The Federal Reserve now possesses the legal discretion to change the relations between the requirements for central city and Reserve city banks, but to reorganize the entire structure would necessitate congressional revision of the Federal Reserve Act. Normally, this might be difficult, but a proposal which would have a marked effect on greater credit availability could hardly fail to please Congressman PATMAN—and the credit feature might carry over the line other changes that in another context would have rougher going—among them an upgrading, salarywise and therefore in status and protocol, of the head of the Federal Reserve System to a position more on a par with the Secretary of the Treasury.

EXECUTIVE SUITE

Touters of the administration horse put great emphasis on sputnik's success as a sire. Congress is being asked to provide new obligational authority for major national-security purposes of $44.3 billion for fiscal year 1959 compared to an estimated $41 billion for fiscal 1958 and an enacted $41.3 billion for fiscal 1957. At the same time, a spurt of economic speed at the 1958 getaway is being arranged under existing authority; the lag which set new orders back to $7.9 billion during last July–December is being compensated by a push toward $13.4 billion worth between January and July 1958. These orders are bankable; and while the prime contractors will take a little while to get into production, they will hold on to their work force and start subcontractors working promptly. New order recipients are fairly concentrated—auto manufacturers have little to gain, and while aircraft companies do stand to gain through the missile program, the factories in which they make airplanes will not be much affected. But purchasing power will be put into circulation. At the same time, contracts for less spectacular items—standard textiles, for instance—used by the military can stimulate recovery by being bunched now instead of spread out over the year. Later on, the leveling out of such orders will again be deflationary, as will the civilian cutbacks recommended in the budget, but meanwhile the economy may pick up momentum again.

CAPITOL CLOAKROOM

Enthusiasts for horses from the Democratic stable, by contrast, stress past successes of colts from full employment. In Congress they may well raise certain budget items above the levels asked for by the President. Before the session is over, to the $3 billion expected to be approved for additional defense, perhaps as much as an extra billion may be voted into the economy for civilian measures—housing, reclamation, urban redevelopment and slum clearance, veterans, roads; it would be more if a school construction bill should pass.

Even more than in most races, the upcoming handicap will gain in interest as the finish line at next November's polls comes closer. By March, when the February figures on unemployment are published, the railbirds will be able to see how sticky the track really is, and perhaps hedge a bet or two. In January, nearly one-third of the major labor market areas in the country—45 of them, and the largest number since November 1954—were classified as having substantial unemployment. Last November, Secretary of Labor Mitchell began to warn of rising unemployment totals and last week he predicted that 4 to 4.5 million would be unemployed this month. Because of recent increases in the number of workers covered by unemployment insurance, the present all-time highs in claims are not comparable with previous recessions, but the figure of 3.4 million unemployed in December is expected to rise in February to a figure even higher than Secretary Mitchell allows. In addition to unemployment, there is increasing underemployment, with workers on involuntary short time; overtime has practically disappared, and average weekly hours in manufacturing were down to 39.3 in December as compared with 41.0 a year before. The newest unemployment, moreover, is among men in their prime working years. So the purchasing power of many wage earners is undergoing attrition.

The professional dopesters who have just testified before the Joint Economic Committee came up with a nearly unanimous opinion that while industrial investment will still maintain a high total, and consumer income will still continue strong, they do not see any firm factor inherent in the economy that is likely to push into resumed growth soon.

firm factor inherent in the economy that is likely to push into resumed growth soon.

If their judgment seems accurate as the finish line of the race comes near, the jockeys will have two options: They can use the spur of increased Government spending. Or they can lay on the whip of a tax cut. If they

use the spur, central direction can be given to the new spending, and those who view with alarm a growing deficit of civilian facilities—schools, roads, hospitals—at a time of rising population will prefer this form of stimulus. If they use the whip—an increase in tax exemption levels for individuals or their dependents, for instance—they will provide, uniformly across the country and in hands that will not hold it long, a quick access of purchasing power. Down the home stretch, the jockeys on the frontrunners will watch each other closely to see whether the race is to be completed without these forms of stimulus, or whether to match the effort as soon as some arm is raised, some heel is active.

Innuendo and Association Guilt

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. TIMOTHY P. SHEEHAN
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 24, 1958

Mr. SHEEHAN. Mr. Speaker, in his article entitled "Innuendo and Association Guilt" in the Washington Star of February 21, Mr. David Lawrence makes the point that never in the heyday of his anti-Communist crusade through congressional committee procedure did the late Senator McCarthy ever indulge in the amount of hearsay stuff, innuendo, and guilt by association which has characterized the hearings currently being held by the congressional subcommittee now investigating the affairs of the Federal Communications Commission.

The conduct of Dr. Bernard Schwartz, who dealt in gross overstatements and wild accusations, has been singularly free from criticism by the liberal elements in the country who were so united and determined to destroy Senator McCarthy. Apparently, these self-styled liberal elements rationalized two different concepts of conduct, one concept when it suits their philosophy, and another when it does not.

Mr. Lawrence's article follows:

INNUENDO AND ASSOCIATION GUILT—ALLEGED WRONGS OF MCCARTHY HEARINGS SEEN REVIVED, AND WITH LESS BASIS

They seem to be intent here on making a martyr of the late Senator McCarthy. For never in the heyday of his anti-Communist crusade through congressional committee procedures did he indulge in the amount of hearsay stuff, innuendo and guilt by association which has characterized the hearings currently being held by the congressional subcommittee now investigating the affairs of the Federal Communications Commission.

Someone writes a letter to someone else saying it might be a good idea to contact a Senator or a Presidential assistant or the office staff of the Vice President to get some influence brought to bear on the subject of the grant of a TV license. Someone else says he hears through a friend that another friend heard that maybe some relative of the President by marriage may have been importuned to help to exert influence. Promptly the headlines are filled with the innuendoes, and the public is led to believe there is guilt by association.

Few on the so-called liberal side—not even the various civil liberties organizations which are zealous defenders of individual rights when persons are seemingly accused unjustly of association with Communist fronts—are clamoring for a fair and orderly way of conducting the congressional hearing in question.

It's just too bad that the persons involved in the TV-license controversy were not accused of some sort of Communist connection. They would have had lots of defenders. The speechmaking would have been loud and long on the subject of the violation of personal liberties and the Bill of Rights.

To take refuge in an aphorism of the days of the McCarthy controversy, it isn't the "objective" of the House committee's current investigation which is to be criticized, but only the "methods" used.

Certainly, every corrupt influence should be exposed. Certainly, this is the job of a congressional committee in the public interest. Certainly the members of the Federal Communications Commission should not be subjected to pressure by anyone—either inside or outside Congress. But there is a right way and a wrong way to expose the improprieties whereby such pressure is exerted.

The right way, when stumbling on a name mentioned in a letter or in an executive session hearing, is to get hold of the person involved and get his side so it can be simultaneously presented to the public for what it's worth. Instead, there has been a lapse of several days between the time of the disclosure of some alleged connection or improper pressure and the establishment of the exact facts. The "leaking" to the press of staff memorandums prepared for a congressional committee has become a favorite device by which innocent persons are crucified.

If officials are to be held up to the public as charged with some wrongdoing, they should have an opportunity to confront those who make the charges and even to cross-examine them through counsel. This is supposed to have been the net result of the debate which arose in connection with the hearings conducted by the late Senator from Wisconsin.

But somehow, although there has been on the part of the general public an acceptance of the wisdom of such reforms, there is little sign that Congress, itself, has paid much attention to them. Every wrong allegedly committed in the McCarthy hearings has been committed over again in recent hearings but with even less basis for the charges than in the controversy over Communist activities and associations.

If it is wrong for Senators to visit members of an independent commission and to plead for their constituents, there is no law on the statute books and no rule of either House that says so. If a lawyer hired by an interested party can argue with a commissioner about a pending case, then a Senator can, too, and so can a Presidential assistant or anybody else—provided the Commissioners themselves do not adopt a rule or code declining to permit such contacts, which they really should do.

There is, of course, a conflict of interest problem that has not yet been cleared up. Should a Commissioner who is financially obligated to an attorney disqualify himself from the case or refuse to see the attorney? This is a matter of propriety. It does not mean that the commissioner is unable to deal with a case honestly on its merits. But judges on the bench have often disqualified themselves if they had any financial relationship with a client or his representatives.

Had the current inquiry been confined to a clarification of this point and of the doubtful right of Senators and House Members to discuss pending cases with members of independent commissions, it would have been a constructive thing. But to allow names to be bandied about in the press, without any more basis than has been uncovered thus far, is to put innocent persons unjustly on the defensive in the court of public opinion.

Titoism Serves Communist Purposes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK M. CLARK
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 25, 1958

Mr. CLARK. Mr. Speaker, a young Czech anti-Communist exile, Mr. George Brada, came from Munich, Germany, to visit the United States. Mr. Brada has been a critic of the policy lines which in the West tend to support Titoism and has condemned them as illusory and dangerous, urging instead active steps for abolishment of communism without war as they are formulated in the policy of liberation suggested by leading men in the United States Senate and Congress.

Ten years ago, on February 25, 1948, the communization of Czechoslovakia, and the enslavement of the Czech and Slovak peoples was completed. The Czech, Slovak, Hungarian, Carpatho-Ukrainian, and Sudeten German exile leaders believe that on this occasion, the attention of the free peoples should be called to the fate of these unhappy peoples and that the illusionary politics of the past which had brought only the perpetuation and strengthening of communism in the East, should be replaced by realistic and intelligent new policies.

Mr. Brada's article is self-explanatory. I enclose it in the following and recommend it to the attention of my colleagues:

TITOISM SERVES COMMUNIST PURPOSES

Harrison E. Salisbury, a New York Times correspondent, toured recently Communist Eastern Europe. He talked with chiefs of state, Communist Party leaders, diplomats, and plain people, and after his return he published in the New York Times a series of five articles, the last one on October 25, 1957, under titles like "Eastern Europe Is Now Seeking More Democratic Communism" or "Eastern Europe Seen as a Third Force."

Mr. Salisbury's ideas are, indeed, quite clear and unequivocal. In Mr. Salisbury's words:

"The average Serb or Croat * * * supports President Tito."

He also wrote the words:

"Kadar is a moderate man compared to the alternatives."

Mr. Salisbury condemned the following:

"The United States now has rudimentary programs for Yugoslavia and Poland, but the rest of the region is a policy of desert. No official can explain precisely what diplomatic nonrecognition of Albania, Bulgaria, and East Germany is supposed to achieve. Nor how nonrecognition of Premier Kadar is expected to help either Hungary or the United States."

Toward Communist states, Salisbury recommends "* * * an American program based on mutual self-interest that emphasizes friendship, interrelations, mutual interests, steadily strengthening contacts."

He salutes "* * * the courageous and creative action of the Ford and Rockefeller Foundations which moved into Poland after October and reestablished intellectual contact with the Poles while the State Department endlessly debated what, if anything, to do."

But the State Department has not yet made up its mind to give Poland meaningful economic aid, criticizes the New York Times correspondent.

Mr. Salisbury closes the series of his articles with pregnant words of clear suggestions:

"But to be effective United States influence must be exercised through channels where power actually exists—through the cultivation of friendly contacts with the Communist rulers, closer association with opinionmaking members of the intelligentsia, training and technical guidance of the new technological cadres. Soft, rather than hard, sell is clearly indicated."

These blunt and clear words are a classical expression of the plans of those who want friendship and cooperation with Eastern Communists. They will go into the history.

These words show also clearly why the entire theater with the Titoism and Gomulkism was staged by the Communists. It serves Communist purposes. It gives economic aid to Communist states, so that they can, undisturbed, build their sputniks; it paralyzes any real concrete policy of liberation, any real intelligent anti-Communist stand and any real intelligent behavior at all; it brings friendly contacts with the Communist rulers (and not with the enslaved peoples) and encourages international Communists in the entire world to further ambitious actions; and it alienates, makes apathetic, and paralyzes the peoples, whose sympathies are with the West, but who are left abandoned in their slavery by those who cultivate friendly contacts with their Communist slaveholders.

That is what the Communists and Harrison Salisbury desire.

It is a pity that this kind of propaganda—these, for free men, self-destructive and utterly unrealistic ideas—can be propagated officially in Europe where the articles of the New York Times are quoted practically as official American views. It is a pity and an inexcusable damage and one-sidedness helping the cause of communism, that, while the Chicago Tribune, the McCormick, and the Hearst press never appear in the American Houses, such stuff as the above mentioned is spread in Europe for official American funds.

Alarm and Concern Over Proposed Extension of Power Facilities of TVA

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 25, 1958

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following resolution passed by the executive committee of the Greater Wilkes-Barre Chamber of Commerce which expresses concern and alarm over the proposed extension of the power facilities of the Tennessee Valley Authority:

Whereas, the executive committee of the Greater Wilkes-Barre Chamber of Commerce is concerned and alarmed by the proposed extension of the power facilities of the TVA, particularly because the availability in the TVA area of cheap power (subsidized by all of the taxpayers in the United States) is making it extremely difficult for the Greater Wilkes-Barre area to compete with the TVA area in attracting and obtaining new industry; and

Whereas said executive committee feels that allowing the TVA to issue $750,000 of revenue bonds would place it beyond the effective control of Congress for many years to come: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the executive committee of the Greater Wilkes-Barre Chamber of Commerce is opposed to the passage of the Kerr and Davis bills, and hereby urges its Representative, the Honorable DANIEL J. FLOOD; and its Senators, the Honorable EDWARD MARTIN and JOSEPH CLARK, to oppose both of said measures when they come before the Congress for adoption.

Passed by unanimous vote of the executive committee of the Greater Wilkes-Barre Chamber of Commerce at the regular meeting held February 12, 1958.

EDMUND H. POGGI, JR.,
President.
JAMES CRAELEY,
Secretary.

Importance of Weapons Development in Our Times

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWIN B. DOOLEY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 25, 1958

Mr. DOOLEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include a speech delivered by Col. Denis Mulligan, of the firm of Powers & Mulligan, industrial consultants, Montclair, N. J., on the occasion of the annual meeting of the Aluminum Association held in New York City on January 31, 1958.

Colonel Mulligan is a distinguished lawyer with a record of service to his country both as a graduate of West Point and an early member of the Civil Aeronautics Board. His astute analysis of the significance of the Russian satellite, Sputnik I, and its impact on the people of the world, impresses me as being worthy of being reprinted in the RECORD:

IMPORTANCE OF WEAPONS DEVELOPMENT IN OUR TIMES

Today I shall express one man's views on the probable impact of weapons development on the relative military strength of our country and Russia during the next 3 to 5 years. As a reader of news and opinion I struggle, as you do, to grasp the importance of this subject to ourselves and our children.

Nearly 4 months ago weapons development became alive in the minds of our people as the man-made Russian satellite, Sputnik I, whirled around our planet Earth at a speed of 17,000 miles per hour. The press and radio have given much space and voice to to questions raised by Sputniks I and II on mass psychology, diplomacy, on economics and education. These remarks will be confined to their military significance.

My aim is to stimulate your thinking on the need for balanced judgment and action by the United States on weapons development in these parlous times.

I. RUSSIAN THREAT

You and I were born into an era of large-scale wars. At this period in our lives the world is divided into two opposing camps. With our allies, we lead one. Russia, with hers, leads the other. Before committing themselves, neutral nations watch to see which side is likely to prevail. Men of good will hope and pray that the differences between the two world leaders will be settled by peaceful means.

With no rattling of swords we must ponder grim facts:

The Government of Russia has declared its intention of bending our will to hers. Hitler made a like declaration. Few took him seriously until he took the world into a holocaust.

Russia's method of bending peoples and nations to her will is quite clear. Little more than a year ago the blood of Hungarian freedom fighters ran in the streets of Budapest. Her ambitions are like unto others who attempted world conquest. While none of them succeeded for more than a brief span, the undoing of their attempts was at awful cost to their victims.

Only recently has our public begun to be aware of Russia's submarine program, on which later I shall provide a few figures. Most revealing is its timing. Her propaganda for years has reviled our policy of containment aimed at her. Her submarine program set in motion long before our policy of containment, has one basic objective: that is to prevent the United States in time of war from going to the assistance of our allies or receiving assistance from them across our two oceans. Russia's submarine program is confirming proof that her main military target is the United States of America.

Our essential stake in this contest with a strong and self-declared enemy is the survival of thousands, perhaps millions of people, who would be sacrificed in the struggle if we do not deter our enemy from plunging the world into another global war.

In this precarious passage the policy of our Government is to maintain military power sufficient to deter Russia from risking a war that would destroy her Government, millions of her people, and much of her property values. We must maintain such adequate military power in the foreseeable future and keep our allies convinced that we are doing so, on a collaborative basis.

II. A FUNDAMENTAL OF WAR

From a cursory study of the fundamentals of war it is apparent that a nation should possess an adequate balance of assets that must be maintained if that nation is to win not separate battles, or campaigns, but the war. In modern war a primary asset is a nation's developed weapons and capacities to produce and reproduce them.

This asset standing alone, is not enough. Wisdom and the courage of men must accompany the use of weapons. Sound policy and leadership must govern the overall direction of successful military effort. Nations, like individuals, in war and peace, make gross mistakes. The past 16 years record striking examples of such mistakes.

One of these examples is taken from our own book. After his retirement as Chief of our Armed Forces in Europe, Gen. Lucius Clay addressed an audience in New York City. He dwelt on the Berlin airlift. It was an outstanding feat in air transportation. Deeper in its meaning for us was the reason for the feat. In the emergency leading up to it, manufactured by the Russians, General Clay had at his command in Europe only two United States infantry divisions ready to fight. Our allied support was no better. Thus, in the late forties we had allowed to deteriorate our military forces of 1945, the greatest ever assembled. Our boys wanted out, and the folks wanted them home. Nearly all of us must share the blame. We were blind to, or would not see, the Red danger, for which we have been paying so dearly and will continue to pay for years to come.

Another example poses a speculative but interesting question. What would be our present state if Russia had not precipitated the war in Korea in 1950? A not unreasonable answer is that by this day in January 1958, we would have become Russia's vassal,

and a badly punished vassal. Eight years ago our military power had begun to crumble and our arms were gathering dust in a number of areas. By springing the Korean adventure in mid-1950, Russia sprung our current military buildup. An incidental deduction from this fact is that we are not contending with an invincible enemy in matters of military policy and direction.

III. HISTORY OF WEAPONS

The story of weaponry is as old as man's history. Since the 20th century began the peoples of the West have been increasingly concerned with armament races. These races stem from the industrial revolution. That revolution was relatively young when the Napoleonic wars were fought. Our War Between the States was somewhat affected by it. Breech-loading cannons were used in 1863 at Gettysburg. Grant and Lee got some help from wired telegraphy but that is about all they got from telecommunications now represented in our wondrous system of telephone, radio, and television. By 1914 the industrial revolution had marked effect on military thinking and action. The machine-gun, not solely because of its capability, but because of its availability in quantity, caused the stalemate on the Western Front. This weapon created radical changes in tactics and closed the long chapter of maneuver of masses of troops in the open.

World War II turned in good measure on air power. Poland and France were quickly reduced to submission with the aid of German Stuka dive bombers. Aerial warfare grew in scope and fury until Japan capitulated a few days after the dropping of atomic bombs from B–29 bombers on two of her centers of population. To this group I need not elaborate on the many other weapons of complicated design and construction which were employed in World War II.

As the curtain fell on that war, science, technology, and military requirements had presented us with a new order of weapons. Humanity became aware of an awesome weapon, the atomic bomb, predecessor of the thermonuclear, or H-bomb. Development had begun on a faster means of carrying the A-bomb, jet powered aircraft, improvements in which have been rapid. The third we recognize in the V–2 rockets which the Germans fired against England 12 to 13 years ago.

Clearly identified in World War II was the new military-industry team, which must succeed together if modern wars are to be fought and won. From the production capacities of our factories flow the hardware weapons resulting from the research and development of our scientists and engineers. This growing dependence of the military on industry and science is accompanied by an ominous phenomenon—that of total war. Fifty years ago warfare was mainly the business of professionals. Now, as our forces at the front rely more and more on the home front, from which our weapons come, the enemy extends his targets to destroy the sources of our supply.

From any deliberation on weapons development and utility it appears that the emergence of effective weapons has been slow. The machine gun of 1914 had its roots in Dr. Gatling's gun patent of 1862. Massive use of combat planes in World War II came about 40 years after the Wright brothers' first man-carrying flying machine. Admittedly, by concentrating vast sums of money, facilities, and brains, we got the atomic bomb years in advance of normal processing. But there were years of study behind the first concrete step in that program.

There are the involvements of cycle time. An official of the Woolworth chain of stores has estimated that there is a lapse of 7 years between the time a new article is first considered by his company and its stocking on Woolworth counters. One of our foremost aircraft manufacturers last year estimated that a large jet-powered cargo airplane of a type familiar to his company would require 8 years from design to delivery of the first production model. In military usage, to the usual design-development-production cycle there is added another time lag due to service testing and proving and training of military personnel in its operation and maintenance, before a new weapon becomes operational for combat organizations. In World War II our AAF flew no aircraft in combat that was not under development before we entered that war. Based on these factors and other estimates, I doubt that we or Russia will have operational long-range missiles during the next 3 to 5 years.

IV. ESTIMATE OF PREVAILING SITUATION

From this background of the subject we can proceed to an appraisal of the existing situation.

Sputniks I and II enter and take the center of the stage. They have ignited our imagination and anxiety. Lineal descendants of the German V–2 rockets, they are a scientific and technological achievement of first magnitude. Their effects have been attested to by world opinion. They are very sobering in their implications for us and other anti-Russian nations because means may be developed to enable their successors to drop nuclear destruction on our centers of population.

Definitely, the sputniks are part of the Russian missile program. Our scientists and technicians have been deeply stirred by them. It has been computed that the thrust of the propulsion unit that launched Sputnik II was about double that of any propulsion unit we had under development at the time of its appearance.

Comments on the technical nature and operation of the sputniks will be rudimentary. They are creatures of the science of rocketry which to some extent was known to the Chinese after they discovered gunpowder in the 12th century. Application of rocketry in war has been halting and slow. The German V–2's are the best known prior example. Another is the bazooka, a recoilless rifle developed by our Army ordnance, which was effective against tanks in World War II. Our intercontinental ballistic missile (ICBM), very distant relative of our childhood roman candle, designed to range 5,000 miles, behaves like a bullet after it has left the muzzle of a gun. Thereafter, the ICBM is on its own. To hit its target, at the top of its trajectory it must pass through a tiny area in space at a precise velocity. To do so the rate of combustion of its propellant must be wellnigh perfect, as must be other elements in the operation of this missle. It is no simple trick.

In this area of military art and science there are many imponderables. Major powers do not abandon proven organizations nor proven weapons until events force such changes. Let us look at Russia. Her standing army today probably is as big as any in her history. Her Migs over Korea and subsequent disclosures show that she is not neglecting her air force. Her navy is the second largest in our 1958 world. She has commissioned approximately 500 submarines, most of them built since 1945. While Russia's naval record is not impressive, her new undersea fleet is something to conjure with. Listen to Admiral Rickover: "At the outbreak of World War II, Germany had 57 U–boats or only about one-tenth the number now possessed by the Soviets. Of these, only 22 were oceangoing submarines. Yet, before that war was over, the German submarine fleet killed over 40,000 men and sank 14 million tons of allied shipping." Russia has the A–bomb and the H–bomb. She has announced the firing of an intermediate ballistic missile, and the flight of the sputniks is proof of her advances in rocketry. This rough assessment of her military strength points up the need for continuing concern over our balance of forces and attention to our weapons development.

What is our position? Our Army, Navy, and Air Force—what have they been doing in weapons development?

Army's situation since 1945 has been trying. Our Government and public have supported greater appropriations for air power. Perhaps the next global war will be won in the early rounds by our Air Force and naval aviation. Meanwhile our Army with painful recollections of Korea, must be prepared to carry the brunt of the action in limited, or local wars. For greater mobility the Army is developing an aviation service with all that entails. It has modernized its armor, introduced atomic cannons, and has under development or in production missiles—from the Dart with a range of 2 miles to the Jupiter with a range of 1,500.

Since 1945 our Navy has been in a state of transformation. Nuclear bombing has doomed the battleship. The Navy's building program includes a number of huge aircraft carriers. Navy's combat aircraft now are jet propelled. Because of successful testing of the atomically powered submarine *Nautilus*, Navy is going forward with the building of a fleet of atomically powered subs. Five of these have been launched. There is indication that the Navy is planning or building nuclear-powered submarines from which to launch above or below the waves intermediate-range ballistic missiles with nuclear warheads. The Polaris missile is being developed for this purpose. It is only one of a number of missiles that the Navy has under development or in production.

The combat type equipment of our Air Force also has been transformed from piston to jet propulsion, and has been modernized in other respects. Our air defenses, in addition to the power of bombs, guns and rockets, are being strengthened by a worldwide alarm system composed of a network of radar and other electronic devices. Beginning in World War II and gaining momentum about 7 years ago, the Air Force has been engaged in the missile program. This program embraces small rockets affixed to aircraft for firing at other aircraft or at ground targets, the intermediate ballistic missile with range of approximately 1,500 miles, through the giant intercontinental ballistic missile with range of 5,000 miles or more. These ballistic missiles, like others in the program, are designed to carry nuclear warheads to their targets.

From this brief review it is apparent that we have virtually a new inventory of modern weapons. The design, development and production of this inventory is largely the work of many of the most reputable scientific institutions and strongest industrial organizations in our country.

This résumé reveals something not so obvious. Neither the United States nor Russia is relying on an ultimate weapon. Both have developed a balanced family of weapons. There never has been and probably never will be an ultimate military weapon.

V. CONCLUSIONS

The effects of the sputniks can be positive or negative. Much scare information has been publicized about them. They can prove very damaging if because of them we allow the enemy to panic us. In this interlude men alone, or in groups, will grab for power, personal or political, for business, for professional recognition. Our public is in a quandary. Our leadership is on the spot because of this latest development in weapons development. We have been in worse jams. A few hours after the first Japanese bomber appeared over Pearl Harbor, we had lost a large part of our Navy's surface strength. Within 24 hours we discovered we could not cooperate in aerial combat with our allies because we lacked certain radar equipment which was not available in quantity until months later. At that time we had pitifully

few combat aircraft with which to help ourselves or our allies. We came out of that trial with credit.

The sputniks have given us a jolt which can prove beneficial. Research and development efforts will be accelerated with short- and long-term gains for the general economy, as well as for the military. In material things our armament programs since 1940 have given us substantial dividends in expanded technology and productive capacities for peacetime living. In a laboratory not far from where I live men are laboring to generate and control extremely high temperatures for application of atomic fusion to civilian uses. Atomic fusion promises a superior type of energy for power production than does atomic fission. This undertaking had its genesis in the development of the H-bomb.

Our country now is engaged in a great armament race. May Providence guide us to the end of the course, and with humility may we seek His guidance. We should pace ourselves so that we shall retain our spiritual and material gains. The measures we take should not cause our dollar to rot. That would give to Russia a bloodless victory. Our defense organization and programs are under attack. They can stand some overhauling. Doubtless, the Congress before midsummer will enact legislation which will effect changes in our defense preparations. In any reorganization of the administration of our weapons development system our military should be permitted to share the authority because our military will be held responsible for the employment of our weapons. Nor are all of our problems born of clashing personalities and politics. We have some real ones in technological fields, such as in the rival schools of liquid versus solid propellents in the missile program.

To counter the sputniks we should have enough time if the job is comprehended and tackled with vision and vigor. The men in the Kremlin know much better than most Americans what has deterred them from taking the big gamble of hot war during the past several years. Ready to strike is our retaliation force of hundreds of well shaken-down B–47 bombers, manned by seasoned crews, distributed over bases, worldwide, a percentage of them constantly armed and in the air. Gradually B–52 bombers of greater load-carrying capacity and range are arriving at bases prepared for them. These bombers are carriers of the so-called special weapons, of which we have an ample store. By 1963 our long-range missiles are scheduled to become operational. In that event another chapter will begin to unfold.

SUMMATION

At this juncture in our lives we are confronted by a strong, self-declared and seemingly implacable enemy. To better insure our safety as individuals and collectively as a Nation, because of the monstrous weapons now within Russia's hands, we must plan intelligently and act resolutely in this field of weapons development.

Inconsistency of the Present Administration

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 24, 1958

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, it perhaps is not news that the administration fosters policies inconsistent with each other. However, I call to the attention of our colleagues one example of this inconsistency. The following editorial appeared in the New York Journal-American of February 20, 1958:

INCONSISTENCY

The administration seems to be working at cross-purposes with itself in its proposals on taxes and postal affairs.

President Eisenhower, in his state of the Union message, implored both labor and management to forego, or at least defer, demands for wage increases on one hand or actions to increase prices on the other, in order not to spread inflation.

Shortly afterward, the President declared it to be administration policy to avoid any increases in Federal taxes, which of course would add to living costs.

Now the administration has a bill in Congress to increase postal rates, or the price of mail service.

In actual effect, the administration wants to do exactly what it has asked business management not to do. And one consequence of any postal-rate increase would be unemployment in some fields of merchandising, when the administration already has an unemployment problem on its hands.

How does the administration explain or justify its inconsistency?

The administration ought to be consistent with itself and to consider the public, as it is asking both labor and business to do.

Ethical Practices Codes of the AFL–CIO

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HERBERT ZELENKO
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 25, 1958

Mr. ZELENKO. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to place into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a letter from AFL–CIO President George Meany to affiliated national and international unions dealing with observance of the ethical practices codes of the AFL–CIO. The letter is based on a resolution approved by the AFL–CIO executive council at its meeting in Miami Beach, Fla., on February 7, 1958:

To Presidents of Affiliated National and International unions.

DEAR SIR AND BROTHER: This letter is written to you pursuant to a resolution of the executive council concerning the observance of the ethical practices codes. These codes, you will remember, were adopted at various times during 1956 and 1957, and were reaffirmed by an overwhelming majority vote of our second constitutional convention at Atlantic City in December 1957.

The ethical practices codes are elements of the fundamental policy of the AFL–CIO. They implement the provisions of our constitution, with its requirement that the AFL–CIO and its affiliated unions steadfastly oppose corruption.

It is the purpose of this directive to call to the attention of all affiliates of the AFL–CIO that the ethical practices codes, as a matter of right and of constitutional policy, must be observed and enforced. As events during the past 2 years have indicated, the codes are both a symbol and a weapon in our common effort to keep the American labor movement clean and democratic.

The six ethical practices codes deal with "paper" locals (locals without members); health and welfare funds; racketeers, crooks, Communists and Fascists; investments and business interests of union officials; financial practices and proprietary activities of unions, minimum accounting and financial controls; and union democratic practices.

While substantial steps have been taken in recent months to bring about complete compliance with the codes, some unions, while not by any means ignoring the objectives and recommended procedures contained in the codes, have not yet taken steps to insure complete compliance.

Without going into the detailed requirements of the codes, the executive council has directed me to call to your particular attention code No. 6 dealing with democratic processes.

This code provides that each member of a union should have the right to full and free participation in union self-government. This should include the right: (a) To vote periodically for his local and national officers, either directly by referendum vote or through delegate bodies; (b) to honest elections; (c) to stand for and to hold office, subject only to fair qualifications uniformly imposed; (d) to voice his views as to the method which the union's affairs should be conducted.

It provides that each member of the union shall have the right to fair treatment in the application of union rules and law—in return for which the member must undertake to carry out the responsibilities of union citizenship.

The code provides that the convention, as the supreme governing body of the union, must be held at least every 4 years; and that the term of office for all union officials should not exceed 4 years.

It provides that officers must be elected, either through referendum vote or by vote of delegate bodies, under fair rules that contain adequate safeguards for honest and free elections.

It provides that conventions of the union should generally be open to the public, and that proceedings or accurate summaries should be available to the membership.

It provides that membership meetings of local unions must be held periodically, with proper notice of time and place.

It provides that, in order to insure democratic, responsible, and honest administration of trade unions, the AFL–CIO and its affiliated unions should have the power to institute disciplinary and corrective proceedings, including the power to institute trusteeships where necessary.

The executive council again wishes to emphasize, however, that the code specifically states that such power to institute trusteeship should be exercised sparingly and only in accordance with the provisions of the union's constitution, and autonomy should be restored promptly upon correction of the abuses requiring trusteeship.

The executive council and executive officers of the AFL–CIO recognize completely that the forms and procedures of union government do and should vary widely from one organization to another. But we recognize with equal clarity that the basic democratic rights of union members, as set forth in the ethical practices codes, must be guaranteed if our trade-union movement is to remain strong and capable of meeting the great challenges of the future.

It is the purpose of this directive to call to your attention the requirements for action contained in the ethical practices codes and to insure that your union is fully in compliance with this policy position of the AFL–CIO.

In compliance with the constitution of the AFL–CIO and the resolution adopted by the executive council at its midwinter meeting, the executive council calls upon your union

to take all applicable steps to assure complete compliance with the ethical practices codes by April 15, 1958. Extension of time will necessarily be permitted for those unions in which convention action is required under the terms of their own constitutions to take these steps.

I feel certain that in providing full compliance with the ethical practices codes, your trade-union organization will enhance its ability to perform its fundamental role: to serve the membership faithfully and effectively.

Fraternally yours,

GEORGE MEANY,
President.

Labor Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HERBERT ZELENKO
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 25, 1958

Mr. ZELENKO. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to place in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a statement by the AFL–CIO ethical practices committee on labor legislation which was adopted by the executive council at its meeting in Miami Beach, Fla., on February 7, 1958:

The ethical practices committee at the request of President Meany, has reviewed the different proposals for legislation relating or purporting to relate to improper activities in labor and management.

In studying these proposals, the ethical practices committee has been governed by the mandate of the recent constitutional convention of the AFL–CIO, which by its resolution on new labor laws:

1. Reaffirmed AFL–CIO support for the Douglas bill, S. 2888, to require full disclosure of welfare fund finances, whether these funds are administered by unions alone or by unions and employers together or by employers alone.

2. Declared no objection to legislation making public the reports unions are now required to file with the Department of Labor under the Taft-Hartley Act.

3. Directed the executive council to give continuing study to what legislation may be desirable to aid the labor movement in achieving its legitimate aspirations and authorize the council to support any such measures as it finds to be necessary and appropriate.

4. Instructed the council strongly to oppose all proposals which under the pretext of protecting workers from corruption seek in reality to weaken unions or to undermine their ability to fulfill their proper responsibilities.

All of the legislative proposals which have been offered thus far were, in substance, considered by the convention, in adopting the foregoing resolution. In light of this, the ethical practices committee believes that there is no basis or justification for any change, modification or amplification of the AFL–CIO position on these legislative proposals at this time.

The AFL–CIO should continue to strongly oppose legislative proposals which, in the name of protecting workers from improper activities, would undermine self-government within the labor movement or weaken labor unions as the collective bargaining representatives of employees.

The AFL–CIO should continue strongly to support the Douglas bill to require full disclosure of all welfare fund finances and the bill which has been offered to authorize the Secretary of Labor to make public the financial reports unions are now required to file under Taft-Hartley.

In recommending this policy for the AFL–CIO on these legislative proposals, the ethical practices committee at the same time, wishes to record its conviction that the AFL–CIO must continue in the future, as it has so effectively done in the past, to meet its responsibility for keeping its own house in order. Failure on our part to meet this responsibility can only result in governmental assumption of what are properly trade union functions.

Freedom and democracy are the essential attributes of our movement. Labor organization lacking these attributes, like Hitler's labor front, Franco's and Peron's syndicates, and Moscow's captive unions, are unions in name only. Authoritarian control imposed by government is contrary to the principles upon which our labor movement and our democratic institutions depend. Licensing of labor unions or steps in that direction, in the name of combating corruption, must be resolutely opposed by a free labor movement proud and worthy of its name.

One of the most effective ways of keeping our own house in order is compliance by all affiliates with the ethical practices codes. The recent constitutional convention of the AFL–CIO confirmed and adopted these codes. Further, the convention called upon each affiliated national and international union to take whatever steps are necessary within its own organization to comply with the provisions of the codes of ethical practices.

In light of this convention mandate, the committee recommends that with the authorization of the executive council, the president of the AFL–CIO should send a directive to all affiliates calling for compliance with the codes by an early date—April 15 is suggested. Of course, if compliance with any code provision by an affiliate requires convention action on its part, the compliance date for such provision should be the affiliate's next convention.

The ethical practices committee is aware that most affiliates of the AFL–CIO have always complied with the codes and require no directive to continue compliance. However, a directive such as we suggest would insure total compliance and also would have the salutary effect of pointing up the fact that the labor movement is vigilantly and effectively engaging in self-regulation.

Respectfully submitted.

ALBERT J. HAYES,
Chairman.
GEORGE M. HARRISON,
DAVID DUBINSKY.
JACOB S. POTOFSKY.
JOSEPH CURRAN.

The Courts and Insanity

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KENNETH B. KEATING
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 25, 1958

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, there are very real problems in Federal jurisdictions concerning the handling of defendants who claim they are insane. It is incumbent upon Congress to clarify the issues in this important area. As a first step, a questionnaire will be circulated by the House Judiciary Committee to elicit the views of judges, lawyers, psychiatrists, and penologists who have been actively concerned with this subject.

James Clayton, able reporter for the Washington Post, has penned a perceptive analysis of the knotty problems involving insanity and the courts. He has pointed up the complexities which face parties, attorneys, the bench, law-enforcement officials, and Congress in this field.

I am extremely hopeful the House Judiciary Committee after receiving answers to the questionnaire will undertake the complete survey of criminal insanity in Federal jurisdictions which I have proposed. Such a study can bring order out of the chaos Mr. Clayton outlines so well. In order that more people may have an opportunity to read this penetrating article, I am inserting it at this point in the RECORD, under leave previously granted:

COURTS TAKING NEW LOOK AT CRIME AND SANITY

(By James Clayton)

A profound battle, termed by some a revolt against the basic premise of the criminal law, is being fought these days in the district courthouse here. On its outcome rests, at the very least, the future of our prisons and our mental hospitals. At the most, its outcome could recast the entire philosophy of our criminal law.

Like most battles in the history of law, this one is being fought over a narrow question: When should a man charged with crime be released from responsibility for his acts because of mental disease? But the battle is larger and the stakes are greater than that.

Beyond this immediate issue loom the larger issues of society's basic concepts of criminal law. There is a challenge here to the very principles of retributive punishment and the philosophy which lies behind the theory of detention as a deterrent to crime.

There lurks, behind the relatively narrow confines of the Durham-rule debate, the even more startling question of whether or not most crime is not essentially the consequence of mental aberration. And beyond that is the corollary issue of whether, if this be so, mental hospitals instead of prisons may not be the answer to an infinitely larger percentage of our crime.

BASIC ISSUES SUBMERGED

These basic questions, however, seldom reach the frontline of this battle—perhaps because the participants feel that this is not the time or the place to argue basic issues; perhaps because they think the battle must be fought on narrower grounds before the basic questions are asked; perhaps because the details of the individual skirmishes drive the focus away from the primary questions.

No one argues in the district court or the United States court of appeals that we should or should not treat criminals as mental patients; that we should or should not build more hospitals instead of more jails. But these are the logical projections of the arguments which are advanced daily in courtroom conflicts among prosecutors, lawyers, psychiatrists, and judges over the responsibility of the individual for his crimes.

The daily skirmishes, then, become the scene of the battle. The great issues submerge, like the great bulk of an iceberg, and only the smaller, the more dramatic, the more personal problems emerge to haunt the public:

Can Dallas Williams, classed by psychiatrists as presently sane but dangerous, be confined to a mental hospital? Is Charles Jenkins, a man with a sociopathic personality disturbance, morally or criminally responsible for the robberies he committed? Should society execute Russell Carter, a disturbed, weakminded youth, for the murder

of a 15-year-old girl or should it treat him as being mentally ill?

THE ULTIMATE LOGIC

This battle, whether it be over the basic issue or over the more pressing one, just now, of criminal responsibility, is not a new battle and, therefore, perhaps not a revolutionary one. It began long ago, in some forgotten place, when some now-forgotten man first said that a criminal should not be punished because his mental condition was such that he could not be held responsible for what he did.

The problem then and the problem now is how society is to determine precisely when the condition occurs. The step, however, from this starting place to the ultimate end of this line of thought (i. e., that all crime is the result of mental troubles) is so great that any discussion of even the narrower issue takes on the appearance of a revolt.

Throughout history, changes in this field have come slowly because of the traditions of the criminal law. These traditions hold that a man is responsible for his crime as long as he is mentally able to form an intent to do wrong. They also hold that criminal law must protect society, punish the evildoer, deter others from crime, and rehabilitate the criminal.

THE REASONABLE CREATURE

The practice of excusing men from responsibility for crime because of a mental condition developed from the concept of criminal intent. Punishment should be imposed only on those who freely choose to do wrong, i. e., who are mentally capable of having an evil intent. No one seriously debates this concept. No one argues that a man who freely and deliberately chooses to do wrong should not be punished.

The argument arises over how society is to decide when one really can make a free choice to do wrong. For years, the courts have based this decision on a philosophy which holds that man is a creature of reason. This, the argument goes, is so because man, unlike an animal, knows through reason what is right and what is wrong. Because of reason, he can control his actions to conform with what he knows is right.

On the basis of this philosophy, the criminal law developed the rule that a defendant can be excused from crime if his mental processes are so deranged that he does not know the difference between right and wrong or, even if he does know the difference, he is unable to embrace the right. This rule was laid down by the House of Lords in England in 1843 in the case of Daniel M'Naghten. It has been widely copied elsewhere in the English-speaking world and is the standard rule in most American courts.

But as knowledge of the human mind developed, first philosophers and then psychiatrists began to doubt that man can control his actions solely by reason. Other parts of man's mind—bits called impulse, instinct and emotion—weigh heavily with or against reason when man decides what he will do.

If this is true, they argued, the exceptions from criminal responsibility must be expanded. If man's reason is not the sole governor of conduct, to punish him for a crime he could not help committing even if he knew it was wrong serves no purpose other than to deter others.

And, the argument goes, deterrence is a motivating factor in human conduct only if one accepts the theory that man acts primarily because of fear. Many philosophers now reject fear as a prime motivator in life, although others insist that it is.

Jurists, as well as philosophers, have long been aware of these conflicting schools of thought. Thurfman Arnold, when he was sitting on the court of appeals here in the mid-1940's, acknowledged this conflict and decided that it could be reconciled only by a major change in the public attitude toward criminal law.

Some accommodation was made, however. Many American courts, including our own here in Washington, adopted the irresistible impulse test as a companion of the M'Naghten rule. This held that a man can be excused if he committed a crime because of an urge so great that he could not resist.

To some judges and psychiatrists, the adoption of this rule marked a major step away from the old right-wrong theory in the criminal law. But to others, the force of the two rules combined still placed the emphasis upon right and wrong and the ability of man, by reason, to distinguish and to do the right.

To those who say that the irresistible-impulse rule was the break with the past, the court of appeals here took only a short, simple step, inevitable and evolutionary, when it adopted the Durham rule July 1, 1954. This group, led by Judge E. Barrett Prettyman, holds that the Durham rule merely extended the established rule to apply the defense to all acts which would not have been committed except for a mental disease. * * *"

In the Durham case, the court formally discarded the McNaghten and irresistible-impulse rules and adopted as the new test the rule that an accused is not criminally responsible if his unlawful act was the product of mental disease or mental defect.

The McNaghten rule, the court said, was inadequate because it was based on only one symptom of mental illness, the ability to tell right from wrong, and because it failed to take account of psychic realities and scientific knowledge. The irresistible-impulse test, the court wrote, failed to recognize any mental illness which is characterized more by brooding or reflection than by immediate action.

To two groups of thinkers who disagree sharply on the validity of the Durham rule, this was a revolutionary change. One group, headed by Judge Wilbur K. Miller, suggests that the Durham rule should be overturned. The other group, whose spokesman is the author of the Durham opinion, Judge David L. Bazelon, thinks that the decision was necessary to keep the law abreast of science. The courts can make such changes, this group argues, because insanity is a part of the common law and open to change by the courts unless Congress rules otherwise.

This, then, is the philosophy behind the quarrel over the Durham decision. Opponents of the new rule say it is designed to make an unneeded and invalid change in the philosophy of the criminal law. Its proponents either agree that it is designed to make a change and insist that the change is necessary, or argue that it does not modify the basic philosophy because that modification was made when the irresistible-impulse test was adopted.

What then, precisely, have the Durham rule and the 34 other opinions by the court of appeals since 1954 on the topic of insanity meant to the administration of justice in the District of Columbia?

First, the entire burden of determining when a defendant should be acquitted because of insanity has been shifted to the jury. Formerly, the judicial system shared part of that burden when it had the judge instruct the jury to return an acquittal because of insanity if the defendant did not know right from wrong, was unable to embrace the right or was moved by an irresistible impulse.

Now, the jury must acquit if the defendant committed the crime because of a mental illness. The trial judge can give it no help in determining when this situation exists.

Second, the Durham rule has broadened the scope of psychiatric evidence. Formerly, psychiatrists had to direct their testimony primarily to the right-wrong concept—a concept which many of them felt had no validity. Those who did not so confine their testimony were, in the words of Justice Felix Frankfurter, making "shams" out of the M'Naghten rules. Those rules, Frankfurter has said, "are very difficult for conscientious people and not difficult enough for people who say, 'We'll just juggle them.'" Now, most psychiatrists feel that no juggling is necessary because they may testify in their own way about the defendant's entire mental process.

Third, these opinions have increased the Government's burden in criminal trials where insanity is an issue. The Government must now prove not only that a man committed a crime but that any mental disease which he may have had did not cause him to do it. It is testimony on this negative causality which bothers the prosecutors.

United States Attorney Oliver Gasch says psychiatrists tell him that it is almost impossible to determine whether any mental illness did not produce any particular crime. This means, he says, that the Court has imposed an almost impossible burden on the Government. However, Dr. Winfred Overholser, superintendent of St. Elizabeths Hospital, says he believes that psychiatrists can testify on causality in most cases.

Fourth, the Durham rule has made the role of the psychiatrist both more and less important in these trials. On the whole, the court of appeals is giving less weight to the psychiatrists' opinions now than it did before but it is giving more weight to their facts. Accordingly, there exists a greater need for psychiatrists to explain to lawyers, judges and juries what they are talking about. Many psychiatrists have not yet recognized the need for such explanations or learned how to make them.

Fifth, the court of appeals is demanding a more sympathetic approach from prosecutors and trial judges toward cases in which the insanity issue is raised. It has insisted that every conceivable opportunity be given for a defendant to raise the defense of insanity. And it has resisted efforts by either the Government or the trial courts to hinder the defense or to undermine it by anything other than psychiatric testimony.

Around these five points, most of the criticism of the Durham rule and the court of appeals has centered. Prosecutors and judges argue that the appellate court is demanding more than psychiatry and juries can produce. Psychiatrists, they said, are not far enough advanced in their science to discuss fairly the connection between mental illness and crime and, furthermore, have not yet learned to communicate what they do know. And juries, these critics argue, are not equipped intellectually to handle the larger and more difficult problems now placed in their hands.

Supporters of the court of appeals and of its effort to adjust law to psychiatry will agree that psychiatry has not yet learned to communicate. They also are not sure that psychiatry is far enough advanced to meet the new requirements placed on it, but they insist that if it is not, this is the time for psychiatrists to admit their shortcomings and to tell what more they must have. Juries, these advocates insist, can understand the issues and make wise decisions if the prosecutors, psychiatrists, defense lawyers and judges will work to make them understand.

There are two more arguments used by critics of the Durham rule. One is that the increased number of acquittals by reason of insanity will end the deterrence value of criminal law. This, as noted earlier, is a fundamental criticism of the entire approach. Another is the fear that those so acquitted will soon be freed from mental hospitals to roam the streets again.

Congress stilled some of this criticism when it passed a law requiring that anyone ac-

quitted by reason of insanity be committed to a mental hospital until he regains his sanity and is no longer a threat to society. Dr. Overholser admits that this places a greater burden on his staff, but he thinks that a man released as cured after 5 years in a mental hospital is less likely to commit crimes than one released after 5 years punishment in prison.

Critics of the Durham rule also take comfort in the fact that the McNaghten and irresistible impulse tests have been discarded only here and in New Hampshire. They further note that every State court and every Federal court before which the Durham rule has been argued has rejected it.

They neglect to point out, however, that 2 of the 5 Federal courts which have turned down the rule said they were sympathetic but were unable to change the rule in their jurisdictions. Four State courts have rejected the rule out-of-hand, 2 have said merely that it isn't the law in their States, and 1 has said that it would like to adopt the new rule but is bound by the legislature not to.

From watching this argument and counterargument, one receives the distinct impression that much of the confusion now present in our courts comes either from an inability of lawyers, judges, and psychiatrists to grasp the problems before them or their refusal to admit that they have grasped them. The lawyers still ask the same questions they asked before the Durham decision; the psychiatrists still give the same answers. A pattern, once learned, is hard to break even when the appellate court insists that it must be broken.

A perfect example is the case of Charles N. Jenkins and that notorious term, the sociopathic personality disturbance. When Jenkins was on trial, 3 psychiatrists testified that he had this particular type of mental trouble (a type characterized by antisocial action and general meanness), but each classified it differently: 1 called it a disease, 1 a disorder, and 1 a defect.

Then the prosecutor and the defense lawyer fought over which category Jenkins should be in and which of the categories came within the Durham rule. After considerable confusion, which certainly made the jury's job no easier, the trial judge ruled that the trouble, whatever it was called, was a mental illness within the rules. The jury then convicted Jenkins, agreeing that the robbery he committed was not the product of this illness, whatever it was called.

The judge's ruling, apparently, was precisely the solution the court of appeals had in mind when it wrote, "Unexplained medical labels * * * are not enough." It later expanded this to say, "It is for the jury * * * to decide whether a given psychiatric diagnosis, if accepted, brings the accused within the legal definition of insanity."

Yet doctors, lawyers and judges still squabble over whether a sociopath has a mental disease. It was a key term up for discussion last Monday when a noted panel of two psychiatrists and two lawyers discussed the entire problem before a medical society.

But whether these men agreed with the court of appeals or not, they are bound by its ruling that it doesn't matter if a sociopath is termed a victim of a disease, a defect, a disorder or a pink cow. What does matter is the facts which led the doctors to that conclusion; the jury will then use those facts to decide if a mental illness sufficient to produce a crime was present.

It is, then, on these side issues that the battle is fought. Many who would support the Durham rule, if it stood alone, have joined the cry against it because of these complicating factors. Some of this criticism is brought about by a failure to comprehend the issues; some of it is brought about by a belief that the court of appeals is not, itself, playing fair with the rules.

This belief, one of the most serious charges possible because it is an attack on the intellectual honesty of the court, is based on the court's recent reversal of three convictions. In these cases, the court upset jury verdicts on the ground that a reasonable jury could not have reached the verdicts which those juries reached.

These reversals have raised the eyebrows of even some of the court's strongest supporters. They wonder if the appellate court is trying so hard to change the basic philosophy of criminal law that it is neglecting the very principle which it laid down in the Durham case of giving the jury the final determination of the sanity of defendants.

Thus, for these various reasons, many persons have joined to attack the Durham rule. There are those who disagree with the philosophy that treatment is more effective than punishment; they see the court of appeals, in its Durham rule and its application of the rule, as seeking to impose this philosophy. There are those who feel that the court of appeals is being intellectually dishonest when, in their view, it breaks its own rules because it disagrees with the results the rule produces. There are those who feel that the Durham rule itself is too vague to work successfully even though it is a step in the right direction.

All of these groups are working together to get a congressional investigation of the problem in hopes of obtaining clarifying legislation—clarifying in the sense that it backs their own particular view. Gasch has supported this move, some Congressmen are interested and Dr. John R. Cavanagh, one of the foremost anti-Durham psychiatrists, has added his weight.

Opposed publicly to such an investigation is Dr. Overholser, who says that legislation would only complicate by solidifying a rule in a changing field. The Durham rule's most eloquent supporters agree in private with Overholser. They fear that such hearings would confuse rather than clarify, would remove the argument from intellectual grounds to personal ones and would stir emotion rather than reason.

Sitting happily on the sidelines are many lawyers and psychiatrists. They would be pleased to return to the pre-Durham situation. Then, at least, they knew the rules. Now, they don't know them and they aren't too worried about trying to learn. Perhaps, they think, if the rule is ignored, it will just go away.

Space-Age Vehicles

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS L. ASHLEY
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 25, 1958

Mr. ASHLEY. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call to the attention of the House the newest contribution by American industry to the defensive strength of our country. Willys Motors, Inc., Toledo, Ohio, internationally known makers of military vehicles, particularly the famous universal Jeep, has now successfully developed for our military services a completely new concept of lightweight tactical vehicles. These flat-platform, 4-wheel-drive, 4-wheel-steer vehicles, can be rushed by air to any danger spot in the world. They require an absolute minimum of space to transport.

The authoritative trade publication, American Metal Market, gives details and specifications in an article published in its February 11 issue, which I submit for the RECORD:

[From the American Metal Market, February 11, 1958]

WILLYS DEVELOPING NEW FAMILY OF LIGHT SPACE-AGE VEHICLES

WASHINGTON.—Reflecting changing concepts of needs conforming to the jet and space age, particularly with an eye to possible defense transport requirements, an entire new family of lightweight tactical military vehicles is being developed by Willys Motors, Inc., it has been disclosed. The successors to the old World War II and Korean-war jeeps are emerging from the drawing boards, the engineering and design department, the mockup shop, and one is now coming off the assembly line at the Willys plant in Toledo.

The vehicle coming off the line is still earthbound in name—the mechanical mule—but its chief action at present is with the Army's famous 101st Airborne Division, the Screaming Eagles. This forerunner of the new Willys space-age tactical military vehicles is also being supplied to the United States Marine Corps.

This new family of vehicles with low silhouettes, high interchangeability of parts, improved payload-to-weight ratio, extreme ruggedness, and economical operation and maintenance will make current ¾-ton military vehicles obsolete.

All of the new Willys family of vehicles is tailored for airborne military operations of the future. They will have profound effects on the science of logistics and, indirectly, on tactics and strategy of any future war, the developers declare.

The adaptability and convertibility of these versatile vehicles ranges from that of missile launcher, recoilless rifle platform, and aircraft control tower to personnel carriers, frontline ambulance, and ammunition carriers.

The mule, as supplied to the military forces, weighs around 900 pounds, is able to carry 1,000 pounds, or more than its own weight, over the roughest of terrain, up to 60 percent grades, and at speeds up to 25 miles an hour.

Technically designated as the M–274 (half-ton weapons carrier), the platform is constructed of extruded magnesium, 95 by 48 inches, and lightweight metals are used wherever possible to reduce overall vehicle weight. It has a road clearance ranging from 11.5 inches under the motor to 12 inches at the rear under the axle.

III. More About Reuther—Old but Still Affirmative—The Reuthers as Students in Russia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
CLARE E. HOFFMAN
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 18, 1958

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, several times the ideas absorbed by Walter and Victor Reuther when they spent some 2 years in Russia have been inserted in the RECORD.

In view of the fact that, from shortly after his return down to the present day, Walter P. Reuther has been an advocate of violence and lawlessness, an article by George Todt in the Valley Times of California dated January 30, 1958, may be

helpful to some who are inclined to think that, because Walter does not drink, chew, smoke, or abuse his family, he is a good American.

GEORGE TODT'S OPINION—REUTHER WORDS REVEAL CHARACTER

"By their fruits ye shall know them." (MATTHEW vii: 20.)

The most revealing insight into the political and social philosophy of Walter Reuther has come to us in the form of a personal letter written when the gentleman was spending 18 months in the Soviet Union right after the depression.

He and his brother Victor were then engaged as instructors in the automobile plant at Gorki, close to Moscow. At that time the brothers were in close touch with Gladys and Mel Bishop of Detroit, a relationship which has since turned sour. Somehow one of the letters has turned up for publication in the Saturday Evening Post (August 14, 1948, issue) since then.

For reasons of his own, Mr. Reuther does not like to discuss the contents of this letter. Here is an exact copy of the important document which I copied from the Post. It can also be obtained by writing to Human Events (Editor Frank C. Hanighen, 1835 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.) and enclosing 20 cents in coin with your request.

It is precisely because of this potent letter, which Mr. Reuther fears Senator GOLDWATER will question him about in the forthcoming Senate rackets probe at which he has been invited to attend, that he is crying "foul" in advance—and this is the very reason he is now laboring desperately to have his interrogation carefully circumscribed so that he will not have to talk about this controversial and heretofore somewhat "hush-hush" matter.

Without further ado, allow me to give you a carefully copied replica of the excerpts of the Reuther letter published in the Post nearly 10 years ago. Then compare its philosophy with that contained in Senator GOLDWATER'S address which was quoted yesterday. After that, you can be guided by your own conscience. Here is the Reuther communication:

"DEAR MEL AND GLAD: Your letter of December 5 arrived here last week from Germany and was read with more than usual interest by Wal and I. It seemed ages since we have heard from you, and so you might well imagine with what joy we welcomed news from Detroit. It is precisely because you are equally anxious, I know, to receive word from the 'workers fatherland' that I am taking this first opportunity to answer you.

"What you have written concerning strikes and the general labor unrest in Detroit, plus what we have learned from other sources, makes us long to be back home with you in the frontlines of the struggle. However, the daily inspiration that is ours as we work side by side with our Russian comrades in the factory, the thought that we will forever end the exploitation of man by man, the thought that what we are building will be for the benefit and enjoyment of the working class, not only of Russia but of the entire world, is the compensation for the temporary absence from the struggle in the United States. And let no one tell you that we are not on the road to socialism in the United States. Let no one say that the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics are not on the road to security, enlightenment, and happiness.

"Mel, you know Wal and I were always strong for the Soviet Union. You know we were always ready to defend it against the lies of the reactionaries. Here the workers, through their militant leadership, the proletarian dictatorship, have not sold out to the owning class like the SP (Socialist Party) in Germany and like the Labor Party in England. Here they have against all odds, against famine, against internal strife and civil war, against capitalist invasion and isolation our comrades here have maintained power, they have won over the masses, they have transformed the Soviet Union into one of the great industrial nations of the world. They have laid the economic foundation for socialism, for a classless society. Mel, if you could be with us for just one day in our shop, you would realize the significance of the Soviet Union.

"Here (in Russia) are no bosses to drive fear into the workers. No one to drive them in mad speedups. Here the workers are in control. Even the shop superintendent has no more right in these meetings than any other worker. I have witnessed many times already when the superintendent spoke too long. The workers in the hall decided he had consumed enough time and the floor was then given to a lathe hand who told of his problems and offered suggestions. Imagine this at Ford or Briggs. This is what the outside world calls the ruthless dictatorship in Russia. I tell you, Mel, of all the countries we have thus far been in, we have never found such genuine proletarian democracy. It is unpolished and crude, but proletarian workers' democracy in every respect. The workers in England have more culture and polish when they speak at their meetings, but they have no power. I prefer the latter.

"In our factory, which is the largest and most modern in Europe, and we have seen them all, there are no pictures of Fords or Rockefellers and Mellon. No such parasites, but rather huge pictures of Lenin. Red banners with slogans 'Workers of the world—unite.' are draped across the craneways. Such a fine spirit of comradeship you have never before witnessed in your life. Superintendent, leaders and ordinary workers are all alike. If you saw your superintendent as he walks through the shop greeting workers with 'Hello, comrade,' you would not distinguish him from any other worker.

"Three nights ago we were invited to the clubhouse at Sosgor (Socialist City) to attend an evening of enjoyment given by the workers of the die shop. A division of the Red army was also present as guests. In all my life, Mel, I have never seen anything so inspiring. Mel, once a fellow has seen what is possible, where workers gain power, he no longer fights for an ideal, he fights for something which is real, something tangible. Imagine Mel, Henry Ford throwing a big party for his slaves.

"Mel, we are witnessing and experiencing great things in the U. S. S. R. We are seeing the most backward nation in the world being rapidly transformed into the most modern and scientific, with new concepts and new ideals coming into force. We are watching, daily, socialism being taken down from the books on the shelves and put into actual application. Who would not be inspired by such events?

"Let us know what is happening to the YPSL (Young Peoples Socialist League) and also the Social Problems Club. Carry on the fight for a Soviet America.

"VIC AND WAL."

Postal Disintegration

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BARRATT O'HARA
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 6, 1958

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I am extending my remarks to include an editorial in the February 1958 issue of the Postal Transport Journal which highlights the waste and inefficiency in the regional reorganization of the postal service under the present Postmaster General.

The editorial follows:

(By Wallace J. Legge)

On January 28, 1958, the Post Office Department announced, in a press release, the elimination of two levels of management in the regional structure. Although the National Postal Transport Association represents approximately 1,000 of the employees involved in the change, we were neither consulted nor advised. The first official word we received on the reorganization was the press release of January 28, which was sent to newspapers and magazines. This is a regrettable incident in labor-management relations and is contrary to assurances previously given by Department officials that National Postal Transport Association officers would be notified of pending changes affecting our members.

The latest reorganization of management eliminates 99 district transportation offices and 91 district operations offices. This means the dislocation of approximately 1,000 PTS employees alone, many of whom are in high salaried levels. Even if a considerable number of these people are placed in regions and stationary installations, it will mean that some of them will have to tear up established homes and move to regional headquarters. For others, it will mean reduction of salary and taking up new and unfamiliar assignments. Employees in other organizations who have sweat out opportunities for promotion may find these promotions postponed.

Considering the hardships involved, we question whether the discontinuance of district transportation offices will be efficient and economical enough to justify the dislocation of so many people.

At the risk of being repetitious, we point out again that when the Post Office Department created the 15 regions, staffed by high salaried officials, NPTA disputed Department claims of economy and efficiency. When the program was put into effect, postal officials claimed that decentralization would result in better postal service at less cost. Since that time there have been many changes in postal field operations, and as each change was announced, the Department claimed additional savings and improved postal service. For example, the consolidation of the Los Angeles PTS Terminal and the Los Angeles Post Office would save $400,000. The consolidation of districts in 1 region would result in savings of $180,000; and so on, ad nauseam.

Has postal service improved as a result of decentralization and the creation of 15 regional levels of management? We must accept public opinion for the answer. It is generally agreed that postal service has disintegrated during the past 5 years. The broad jokes and barbed criticism about postal service which appear in public print and are heard and seen over radio and television are reflections of public thinking. And, while it hurts us as employees we must wryly admit it is true. So, the first objective of the regional system, better postal service, has not been realized.

Has regionalization reduced postal costs? Vice President Lundeen has come up with some interesting figures based on a study of the 5-year operation of the regional system. Mr. Lundeen's findings show that as a result of decentralization, there are 546 fewer employees in the Department in Washington. But 6,679 people are employed in the regional setup, and some of these positions pay salaries as high as $14,800.

We can only conclude that decentralization has been a costly failure in terms of economy and service.

The solution to the problem is not the elimination of district transportation offices which operated efficiently and economically for decades prior to decentralization. We believe it is a serious mistake to discontinue this grass roots P. T. S. management. Only minute savings can be made through their elimination. And, we should keep in mind that many of the savings now being claimed by management through the elimination of district operation offices are costs they created when they established regions.

During the past 5 years, postal transportation clerks have suffered a continual decline in the standards of their craft because of the dilution of the PTS function. We submit that strengthening, rather than discontinuing, district transportation offices will result in improved postal service and a more economical operation.

Under the new reorganization, mobile service officers and field service officers will be performing the same function formerly allocated to the old chief clerks of the railway mail service. This function should remain with the district transportation managers. Given adequate manpower and authority, district transportation managers could insure the proper makeup and dispatch of mails by post offices and arrange for swift transportation and accurate distribution en route, thereby providing the most expeditious handling of mail from point of origin to destination.

American Merchant-Marine Policy Resolution of Mississippi Valley Association

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEONOR K. SULLIVAN
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 25, 1958

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, as a member of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, I am pleased to submit for inclusion in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a thought-provoking resolution on American merchant-marine policy adopted recently at St. Louis by the Mississippi Valley Association, as follows:

MISSISSIPPI VALLEY ASSOCIATION—MERCHANT-MARINE RESOLUTION FOR 1958

We pledge our active support to the promotion and maintenance of a strong, well-balanced privately owned and operated United States Merchant Marine to provide the shipping services essential to our industry, agriculture, and commerce in time of peace, capable of implementing our international policies and ready to serve our national security in time of war.

We strongly urge that United States industry voluntarily patronize American-flag ships in order to assist in developing and strengthening the American Merchant Fleet. We commend the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff for his forthright declaration of the continuing need for an American Merchant Marine for the defense of our Nation; and the maritime industry for its efforts to demonstrate that in addition to its defense role the industry makes a substantial contribution to the economic welfare of our country.

We reaffirm our support of the 50–50 law requiring that at least 50 percent of the cargoes generated by the United States Government should be transported in United States flag ships to the extent they are available at reasonable rates.

We reaffirm our support of the basic principles and procedures of the 1936 Merchant Marine Act and its program of Government support, based upon the principles of parity and of essential trade routes operated by American companies which are domiciled, owned, and controlled in the domestic areas which they serve.

We condemn certain practices of foreign nations, direct or indirect, which discriminate against American flag shipping, and we urge increased effort by the Department of State to seek their elimination.

We commend the efforts being made by industry and the administration, with congressional support, to begin the largest peacetime vessel replacement program in our history, and we urge adequate appropriations by the Federal Government so as to insure that, when combined with private investment, there will be sufficient funds to maintain an orderly and economic replacement schedule.

We recommend an expanded Government research program on ship design, ship propulsion, and port facilities so that the latest and best information will be available to various segments of the American merchant marine.

We recommend that, in the event of mobilization, the merchant marine be placed under the jurisdiction of the Maritime Administration so that the experience and knowledge of the management of privately owned steamship companies may be effectively utilized.

Declaration of Members of the German Federal Parliament

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALBERT H. BOSCH
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 18, 1958

Mr. BOSCH. Mr. Speaker, on the occasion of the 10th anniversary of the Communist seizure of Czechoslovakia which has affected the lives of Czechoslovaks, Sudeten Germans, and others, I bring to the attention of the Members the declaration of the German Federal Parliament on this subject:

BONN, GERMANY, *February 24, 1958.*

DECLARATION OF MEMBERS OF THE GERMAN FEDERAL PARLIAMENT OF SUDETEN GERMAN ORIGIN

On the 10th anniversary of the Communist takeover in Prague, we publicly state our firm belief that freedom and human dignity are inseparable. The expellation of the Sudeten Germans from their own ancestral homes was the prelude to the annihilation of democracy in Czechoslovakia. Where men can be expelled, freedom loses its home.

Fully conscious of the innumerable ties which linked our people to the Czech as well as the Slovak races, we greet those men and women of both nations fighting for the restoration of liberty. Passed-by events cannot justify an untimely perpetuation of old discords. We are convinced that the recognition of every nation's right to its ancestral home is preconditional for a permanent peace in Europe. We sincerely desire the reestablishment of freedom and self-determination for Czechs and Slovaks. For ourselves, we want nothing else.

Today, we solemnly repeat what we already declared in the charter of the German expellees: We renounce every idea of hate and retaliation. It is the sincere desire of the Germans to live in peace and harmony with all their neighbors. There is no German spirit of revenge, except in Soviet propaganda. A peacefully united Europe is the ideal of German youth. We expect the races of east central Europe to draw their own conclusions from the experiences they made and are making still with all sorts of dictatorships.

Never we shall put up with the present division of Europe. We shall continue to work toward a peaceful solution of this problem. It would be in the best interest of Soviet Russian policy to restore freedom to the east European races, like Britain did to the people of India. Just as the arbitrary separation of the two parts of Germany slows down the necessary process of general pacification, so the continuation of the present status for Poles, Czechs, Slovaks, and Magyars—nations under foreign yoke and dominion—aggravates international tensions. We appeal therefore to the Soviet leaders: Give that self-determination to the nations of Eastern Europe which you advocate in favor of the races of Asia and Africa.

We are convinced that the promotion of a liberal development in Czechoslovakia is a German interest. The German Bundestag has, by a declaration passed on June 23, 1950, taken the right of the Sudeten Germans to their ancestral homes under the custody of the entire German Nation. The freedom of the Czechs and Slovaks is preconditional to the restoration of this right.

In view of this declaration, we ask the German Federal Government to devote special attention to the situation of those Germans still living in Czechoslovakia. The Government in Prague has failed until now to show understanding with regard to the reunion of families—contrary to the Polish Government which appeared cooperative at least in this respect. Likewise, we recall that the improvement of the international relations between the Federal Republic and Czechoslovakia depends on whether the Prague Government will be inclined to comply at last with the laws of humanity by liberating the German prisoners still in Czech detention.

Signed by the Honorable Hans Schuetz, Member of Parliament; the Honorable Richard Reitzner, Member of Parliament.

Lithuania's Desperate Ordeal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KATHRYN E. GRANAHAN
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 25, 1958

Mrs. GRANAHAN. It had been my purpose to join on Thursday, February 13, in the tributes in the House to the people of Lithuania and their determination again to be free. Unfortunately, illness prevented my being here at that time.

Had I been in attendance, I would have made the following statement:

LITHUANIA'S DESPERATE ORDEAL

Mr. Speaker, the city in which my congressional district is located, the city of Philadelphia, is much like our capital City of Washington, D. C., in that it is a city built around the concept of freedom. On every side, we in Philadelphia have reminders in

brick and stone of the events which led to America's own freedom and of great men who helped to bring about our freedom. It is almost possible, while walking near Independence Hall and our other shrines of the Revolution, to see those events of so many years ago.

Consequently, we in Philadelphia are very much aware of the yearnings of all peoples in all countries where freedom is denied to enjoy the blessings of liberty as we enjoy them.

Each day, our hearts go out to those held captive by the yoke of communism in those nations behind the Iron Curtain, and we symphathize in their desperate ordeal and dedicate ourselves to do everything we can to speed the day when they will again be free. On this day, we feel particularly sorrowful for the people of Lithuania, as they recall other times in other eras of their history when they enjoyed freedom.

The enslavement of Lithuania is one of the worst crimes of the Soviet Union. God grant that deliverance comes soon.

Primary Election Principle Periled by Boss Control

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PETER F. MACK, JR.
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 24, 1958

Mr. MACK of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I wish to include the last of a series of editorials by V. Y. Dallman, editor of the Illinois State Register, on problems and responsibilities of party organizations. In this concluding and challenging editorial, Mr. Dalman states that, since public inaction and boss action have made the direct primary election system ineffectual, an entire new system must be devised. The immediate recourse is a writein campaign where necessary.

The article follows:

[From the Illinois State Register of January 28, 1958]

PRIMARY ELECTION PRINCIPLE PERILED BY BOSS CONTROL

The State Register has enjoyed this exploration into the field of popular opinion as relates to primary elections in Illinois.

We rejoice in the encouragement received from voters (not bosses) of both parties. We are very happy to say that here in Sangamon County, where Republicans have played the musical chairs game in the county courthouse for so many years, we have received many verbal messages of vigorous approval from Republicans as well as Democrats.

We regret that a supine Republican press, satisfied with official handouts and censored press releases, has no time for news that disturbs the equanimity of the powerful patronage bosses in the statehouse and courthouse. The old racket gains power.

At this very hour the evils of boss control of which we have written prevail to a greater degree than ever. Bravely, some Republican candidates are venturing to oppose the heavily entrenched patronage hierarchy deeprooted in local and State patronage. But those heroic souls are standing forth in a good cause. Win or lose they deserve applause.

Over on the Democratic side we see some evidence of an awakening. Some candidates symbolize independence from boss domination. We hope they win. We're for them, but they are in peril of being trapped in the bipartisan snares operated by State administration trappers who want to continue control of Sangamon County's offices.

We rejoice in the magnificent new spirit of independence that is welling up. Many people who have heretofore been disinterested have been aroused by our editorials. One powerful individual in public thought and action pointed out only yesterday that the primary election laws have placed the primary system directly in the hands of the bosses.

No understanding person can deny that startling challenge.

The State Register confesses that when we helped to destroy the old, boss-ridden convention system of selecting local, district, and State candidates, we thought the people would exercise their powers under the direct primary election system.

We regret that public inaction and boss action made those ideals ineffectual.

An entire new system must be devised. The immediate recourse is a write-in campaign where necessary.

Bosses will laugh at that idea, but it has the potentials of a protest.

As the two-party system has been wrecked by bipartisan deals, some observers suggest that in local and State elections candidates be presented on their merit rather than under party designations.

We love this exploration. We rejoice in finding so many kindred souls who are protesting against slatemakers and boss-control now at its greatest peak in the statehouse, and to a revolting, but somewhat lesser degree, in the courthouse.

A crusade is needed. We're enlisted for the duration.

Harry Had a Good Time

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM E. MINSHALL
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 9, 1958

Mr. MINSHALL. Mr. Speaker, I thought my colleagues would be interested in reading the following editorial that appeared in the February 24, 1958, issue of the Cleveland Plain Dealer:

HARRY HAD A GOOD TIME

The Democrats have every right to criticize the Republican administration, and also the inclination. But when they selected former President Harry S. Truman as the chief denouncer at their $100-a-plate dinner in Washington Saturday, they invited people to make some comparisons.

The business recession, of course, was the most joyful topic at the Democratic feast. Mr. Truman called it the Republican recession, and accused the Eisenhower administration of not doing anything about it. Well, it comes to mind that there was a similar business slump in 1949 and the early part of 1950. In fact, unemployment today is said to be higher than at any time since 1950.

Q. Who was President at that time?
A. Harry S. Truman.
Q. Did he call that a Democratic recession?
A. No.
Q. How did we get out of that recession?
A. The Korean war ended it.

One indication of the extent of the current recession is the drop in the industrial production index, as recorded by the Federal Reserve Board. It reached its peak in December 1956, when it stood at 147 percent of the 1947–49 average. Last month it was down to 133 percent, which is a distressing drop of 14 points. But it is still 33 percent above the 1947–49 average, when Mr. Truman was President.

Mr. Truman poked fun at the administration because it had trouble launching an earth satellite. He may have forgotten that last November Dr. Wernher von Braun, the leading American missile expert, was asked by the Associated Press how he accounted for Russia's apparent ability to outstrip the United States in reaching into space. He replied: "The main reason is that the United States had no ballistic-missile program worth mentioning between 1945 and 1951." Who was President then? You guessed it.

Mr. Truman also denounced the "crisis of confidence in our leadership abroad." It's a matter of opinion as to how much confidence there was in our leadership when Mr. Truman was President. It was then that the Reds took over China and that we got into the Korean mess. That was leadership?

Oh, well, Harry had a good time giving 'em hell, as he always does, and we are glad so many Democrats could afford to pay $100 to hear him, in spite of the "Republican recession."

Supporting Our Mutual-Security Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PATRICK J. HILLINGS
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 25, 1958

Mr. HILLINGS. Mr. Speaker, I think the necessity of supporting our mutual-security program is excellently detailed in an article by William Randolph Hearst, Jr., editor in chief, Hearst newspapers.

Mr. Hearst's thought-provoking analysis of this important subject follows:

Again this year President Eisenhower has asked Congress for $4 billion for the mutual-security program—oftentimes critically but erroneously referred to as our giveaway program.

It looks like he is going to have even more trouble getting Congress to ante up the desired sums this year because of our own money troubles here at home.

You may remember the United States Senate last year asked me—among others—to inspect and report our findings and opinions of the value of the tremendous amounts of taxpayers' money for mutual security in the various corners of the world each of us visited.

Regular readers of this newspaper may also remember that editorially we have been—to say the least—dubious, and often frankly critical, of the program in the past. The Senators must surely have known this when they appointed me, but they chose men whom they thought would call the shots as they saw them.

It is, therefore, relevant to today's peace that with the exception of specific detailed criticism of waste or excessive personnel, the Senate's 10 representatives who went into the field unanimously reported that the various military and economic investments had been and were necessary and approved the concept behind the program.

As concerns waste, United States Comptroller General Joseph Campbell told a closed session of the House Foreign Affairs Committee a couple of days ago that military aid has never been subject to systematic and continuous audit.

If this is so—and Mr. Campbell ought to know—it is the urgent duty of the administration and Pentagon to conduct such an

audit and make it known to the people. Waste must be eliminated. But it is in American self-interest not to confuse it with the value of the program itself. Let's not throw out the baby with the bath water.

In Editor's Report, of last August 25, when the issue was under debate, I wrote:

"My first point is that foreign aid is a misleading—sometimes erroneous—term. It suggests a giveaway or boondoggling waste of money you and I contribute to Government. Actually, as it works today, we are buying defense at bargain rates."

Of the $3,900,000,000 the President is asking from Congress, more than half, or $2,600,000,000, would be used for military aid, either direct or for defense support of friendly powers. Most would be direct, that is, $1,800,000,000 to our allies such as those in NATO, the Baghdad Pact nations, and SEATO (Southeast Asia Treaty Organization). Another $835 million would go to defense support of 12 nations, 70 percent of this to Korea, Nationalist China, Vietnam, and Turkey.

When I was in Turkey a few years ago, I learned that a Turkish soldier could be equipped, trained, fed, housed, and clothed for $200 a year. That is correct, $200 a year. The cost may have gone up a little since, but it is still infinitesimal compared to the cost of maintaining an American soldier.

Similarly, when the Hearst task force was on its world tour in the spring of 1956, we learned that the cost of equipping, training, feeding, housing, and clothing more than 20 divisions of ROK troops in South Korea was equivalent to the cost of maintaining 2 American divisions. If this cost has gone up, it is only by a minute fraction.

You don't have to be an Einstein to figure out that military aid is bargain-rate defense, whether given directly in the form of arms or indirectly to support the economy of nations which otherwise could not afford troops or modern weapons in the amounts needed for adequate defense of our vital world perimeter.

NIXON GIVES IMPRESSIVE FACTS

Vice President DICK NIXON, in a speech in Los Angeles this past week, added to the impressive data. He said it costs 5 times as much to maintain 1 American soldier for 1 year as it does a soldier of one of the allied nations on the perimiter of the Communist empire.

These are facts that back up the President's warning of the consequences that would threaten us if the mutual security program were wrecked. He listed such consequences as:

"A severe dislocation and basic impairment of free world power.

"A certain crumbling, under Sino-Soviet pressures, of our strategic overseas positions and a forcing of these positions progressively backward toward our own shores.

"A massive increase in our own defense budget, in amounts far exceeding mutual security appropriations, necessitating increases in taxes.

"A heavy increase in inductions of American youth into our armed forces.

"Ultimately, a beleaguered America, her freedoms limited by mounting defense costs, and almost alone in a world dominated by international communism."

This is just about the same warning that Adm. Arthur W. Radford, former chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, gave to the Senate Appropriations Committee last year.

So much for military aid, and I'll rest that phase of the case right here.

When you get into economic aid, for which the President is asking $1,300 million, the evidence is not nearly as clear, but in my opinion it remains vitally important.

Suppose I approach it this way:

In the long interview Frank Conniff, Bob Considine and I had with Nikita Khrushchev last November one point he emphasized was his absolute conviction that communism (socialism, he called it) was invincible and would inevitably conquer the world without the need for war.

In other words, he was counting on the weapons of economic penetration and subversion to make it easy to win.

These are not weapons merely in the figurative sense. In the Russian strategy they are weapons in a cold, hard literal sense; weapons of actual conquest.

RUSS AID MUST BE BIG

No one knows, of course, how much money Russia is spending to neutralize governments friendly to the United States (for example, the economic thrust of the Kremlin into Latin America); or how much it is spending to win over the allegiance of the so-called uncommitted nations (the economic thrust into Africa); or how much it is spending to turn into satellites nations that are tilted toward Russia and away from the West (Egypt, Syria, Yemen).

The amount must be tremendous. The Soviet Union is able to spend this money by depriving its people of essentials and comforts, by reneging on its bond issues—things that we would not and could not do here.

But that is not an excuse for forfeiting this life-and-death game. It is surely worth the effort to help nations out of the poverty that makes them susceptible to Soviet enticements, particularly since such aid is changing toward a loan basis, however "soft" those loans may be. And it is certainly to our advantage to help nations—which have shown themselves worthy of help—toward economic independence that would attract the interests of our private enterprise.

I wish to make it clear that I am not advocating blind acceptance by Congress of the President's program. Neither is he. I am not urging that it be voted without any survey or any cuts. Neither is he.

I am saying that the program ought to be considered item by item, nation by nation—thoroughly, fairly, and on the basis of what are the best interests of the United States in this battle for survival in which every American is engaged, whether he or she knows it or not.

Peerless Second District of Illinois

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BARRATT O'HARA

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 25, 1958

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, it is a secret that I have gone all out to share with my colleagues that the Second Congressional District of Illinois leads the Nation in dynamic challenge and in sheer richness of human quality, material achievement, and cultural attainment.

The Chicago Tribune, in its issue of February 24, 1958, starts a series of articles with the purpose of showing the attractiveness of the city of Chicago as a place to make one's home. Quite naturally it selected as the subject for the first story in the series an institution in the Second Congressional District, the Museum of Science and Industry, located a little more than a stone's throw from the Chicago office of the Second District's Congressman.

Mr. Speaker, with no thought of unnecessarily kindling the envy of my colleagues, but solely with the desire to contribute to their general education on the choicest of spots where man may make his home, I am extending my remarks to include the article in the Chicago Tribune of February 24, 1958, as follows:

(By Jacquelin Southerland)

It's fun to live in Chicago. It's an exciting mixture of the unusual, the exotic, the ordinary.

Walk a few blocks off your beaten path and you'll find yourself in a neighborhood where nobody speaks your language. Duck into a restaurant new to you and you'll find costumed Serbians singing their native songs or German chefs preparing frothy desserts as luscious as those that sleeping youngsters see in their dreams of candy land.

A FREE WORLD

It's probably the greatest inexpensive vacation land in the world—with free beaches, free baseball diamonds, free tennis courts, free parks, free fishing, free swimming, free ice skating, and free zoos.

There's the Adler Planetarium, where the skies roll above your head while astronomers explain the heavens—for 25 cents or less.

There are the science museum for free, the Chicago Natural History Museum, free some days, 25 cents on others, and golf courses at $1.50 or less.

LAND OF FUN

The Tribune proposes to prove to doubting Thomases that it's fun to live in Chicago, especially where family fun is concerned, and perhaps to open the eyes of longtime Chicago residents to the pleasures at their doorsteps.

The Tribune picked the science museum at 57th Street and Lake Shore Drive for the first story.

This museum is probably extremely misunderstood by people who have never seen it. Its full name—the Museum of Science and Industry—possibly has frightened away scores of non-science-, non-industry-minded citizens. The name reeks of test tubes and machines and sounds about as interesting as a book on income-tax regulations.

A BRIGHT SPOT

No one who has never toured it would ever guess it's one of the brightest recreation spots in town, both for families and for individuals.

Tourists who go because it's in their guide books, and therefore think they ought to go, end up playing and staying for hours. Reluctant kids dragged in by determined parents and teachers can't be dragged away.

Most of the 2,866,681 persons who visited it last year stayed 3 hours each. And motorized, mechanized Americans don't stand on their feet for 3 hours at a stretch unless they're powerfully interested.

Just what fascination does the museum have?

FAIRY TALES, TOO

It has Colleen Moore's fabulous doll house, a half-million-dollar fairy tale castle where the chandelier is made of diamonds and a weeping willow weeps real tears.

It has telephones that have you talking to yourself—so you can hear what you sound like. It has machines where you can test your own hearing.

It has a coal mine, where an elevator carries you down to waiting cars that rumble down the tracks of dark corridors to a mine where experienced miners show visitors how they take coal from the inside of the earth.

It has a real nickelodeon, grinding out movies of Mary Pickford and other early motion picture stars.

LIVING FOOD EXHIBIT

It has chickens hatching from eggs and baby ducks and pigs in the food for life exhibit.

It has the Harvester farm, a life-sized reproduction of a farm—with sound effects.

It has the story of human birth and a model kitchen for heart patients.

It has a real submarine, the German U-505, the first enemy war vessel captured in battle on the high seas since 1815.

It has exhibits of airplanes, automobiles, atoms, time, television, electricity, glass, metals, and more. For the hungry, it has a cafeteria and luncheonette.

The museum, in the words of one of its brochures, tells the story of how American industry and scientific research have helped to give the world the fullest life in recorded history.

But, better than that, it's fun.

The Teaneck Teen Commonsense Code

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK C. OSMERS, JR.
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 4, 1958

Mr. OSMERS. Mr. Speaker, in these days when our newspaper headlines herald the almost unbelievable accounts of teen-age violence, it is indeed comforting to know that there are citizens whose faith in youth prompts an unselfish desire to guide and help our teen-agers over the hurdles.

Such is the case with the Teaneck Committee for Mental Health of Teaneck, N. J., and its sponsoring organizations. The committee has published a well-illustrated and informative booklet titled "The Teaneck Teen Commonsense Conduct Code."

The code is the result of questionnaires answered by more than 4,000 teen-agers in the Teaneck public and parochial schools and consists primarily of a guiding set of principles.

The booklet discusses such things as allowances, dating, teen-age-family relationships, dress, and proper social behavior. It is not what parents think should be a teen-age code of behavior, but rather what the teen-agers themselves believe to be proper conduct in their relations with others.

In order that this fine code may reach the widest possible audience, I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

THE TEANECK TEEN COMMONSENSE CONDUCT CODE

FOR GRADES 7 THROUGH 12

The Teaneck teen commonsense conduct code is a set of guiding principles to be used by parents and teen-agers to aid in establishing a wholesome, happy social life for our youths in Teaneck.

Its purpose is to define and give a clear picture of what the majority of our teen-agers feel should be their guiding principles. Its object is to set a pattern that the majority of teen-agers have themselves agreed should be their code of behavior. It is not how parents should rear their children at home, but a guide for the teen-ager in relation to others.

The Teaneck teen commonsense conduct code was developed as a result of questionnaires answered by over 4,000 teen-agers in the Teaneck public and parochial schools. The code was sponsored by the Teaneck Committee for Mental Health with the cooperation of the Teaneck secondary public schools and the parochial schools.

FAMILY

The family is one of the most important factors influencing social conduct, both in the home and outside of the home. All of the facts mentioned in this conduct code are touched by the basic attitude found in the home. The solution to the following points are found exclusively in the home:

1. Emphasis on belief in God enhances respect and character.

2. Self-respect, through a wise choice of friends and personal responsibility, is essential for a good reputation.

3. Children should be responsible to their parents, and parents should be responsible for their children.

4. Family discussions are necessary to maintain good family cooperation.

5. Consulting parents in regard to home social activities is a good practice.

6. Using the bus for transportation during the daytime is considered a good idea. Parents should not be expected to supply all transportation.

7. An allowance is usually felt to be good and should be given in accordance with the means of the family and the needs of the teen-ager. Extra money can be earned by the teen-ager.

8. Dating during the week is a privilege. Therefore, teen-agers should cooperate fully with their parents concerning this situation.

"HOME AND CHILDREN

(By Edgar A. Guest)

"My father often used to say when children
he'd discuss:
'If ours are happier away, there's something
wrong with us.
I'd think it shame my lifetime through
if this should ever be:
They'd rather eat a neighbor's food than
stay with us for tea.'

"My father wasn't social wise; grave books
he'd never read.
He thought the mother should be home
to see her babies fed.
'It is a lifetime job,' said he, 'that parents
all assume.
I'd rather keep the children's love, than
keep a tidy room.

" 'I'd hate to think the neighbors gave what
often we deny;
Our cookies kept on topmost shelves and
theirs left handy by.
I'd think it shame if down the street lived
gentler folks than we,
Who made a home a happy place where
children liked to be.

" 'So have the cookies near at hand and
give these rooms to fun.
Let children all be happy here until the
day is done.
Let's keep this home with joy aglow and
free from fret and fuss;
For should they rather elsewhere be the
fault would lie with us.' "

SCHOOL

School plays an important part in the life of the average teen-ager. A person's character and outlook on life is partially developed in school. Therefore, the following opinions formed by you and your friends should help you in developing this outlook.

1. Dress and behave according to the standards set forth by the school.

2. Dress appropriately for school dances. Don't come as you are.

Function	Boy	Girl
Formal	Tuxedo (winter)—White jacket (summer).	Formal (flowers).
Semiformal	Suits and ties	Party dresses.
Informal	Sport clothes	Skirts and blouses or dresses.
Special	Dance committee will decide the type of dress that should be worn.	

3. Partners should be exchanged at dances.

4. The New Jersey law is as follows concerning fraternities and sororities:

"No secret fraternity or sorority shall be formed or maintained in any public school. The board of education of every school district shall adopt rules and regulations providing for the necessary disciplinary measures to enforce this section." Remember: It is against the law to break a law.

THE COMMUNITY

The community involves many things: streets, public places, and private property. Our township is the property of its residents and therefore its welfare and growth become the charge and responsibility of all.

1. Dress according to the occasion. Short shorts and halters should be avoided in public places. Bermuda shorts, slacks, or school clothes are considered suitable for the library, movies, and other public places.

2. Act in a suitable manner. Respect other people's property at all times.

3. Courtesy, orderliness, and consideration of others should be observed at all times in public places.

4. While driving, observe the following rules: respect the rights of others, obey the motor vehicle laws at all times and avoid overcrowding. Hitchhiking is dangerous and illegal. Share maintenance of the car with your parents.

5. Obey the rules and regulations at the Teaneck Recreation Center.

6. Quiet and orderliness should be observed in the library at all times.

7. Be considerate of others while in the movies. Maintain your self-respect and personal dignity.

SOCIAL

The teen-ager associates with other young people every day of his life. In his social attitudes, the teen-ager reflects his home environment and sense of responsibility to his community.

1. Parents should be at home to greet guests and should remain at home to act as chaperones.

2. Don't be a party crasher, wait for an invitation.

3. A boy should call for his date at the girl's home and should return his date to her home after the end of the evening.

4. Going steady is a practice of continuously dating and being in the company of the same person for any length of time. The tabulated results in the junior high and parochial schools showed the students to be overwhelmingly against the practice of going steady. A boy and girl going steady may find friendly companionship with each other, but it is suggested that it be in the company of other teen-agers. Since the whole question is highly controversial and personal it is suggested that it be discussed carefully with your parents.

5. State law prohibits the serving of alcoholic beverages to teen-agers in public places. Such drinks should not be served at teen-age gatherings.

6. Teen-agers should not smoke without parental knowledge and approval.

7. The teen-ager who shows a contempt for accepted social behavior should be ignored if he does not wish to become a part of the group.

8. Don't be a night owl, get home before dad starts hooting.

Hours for ending functions

Function	Junior high	Senior high
Formal	[1] 12:30	1:30
Informal	[1] 11:30	1:00
Home party	[1] 11:30	12:30
General dating	[1] 11:30	11:30–12:00

[1] Should be 1 hour earlier for 8th graders.

MYSELF

I want to live with myself and so
I want to be fit for myself to know.
I want to be able as days go by
Always to look myself straight in the eye.
I don't want to stand with the setting sun;
And hate myself for the things I've done.

I don't want to keep on the closet shelf
A lot of secrets about myself.
And fool myself as I come and go,
Into thinking that nobody else will know
The kind of person I really am;
I don't want to dress myself up in a sham.

I want to go out with my head erect,
I want to deserve all people's respect:
But here in the struggle for fame and self
I want to be able to like myself;
I don't want to look at myself and know
That I'm bluster and bluff and empty show.

I never can hide myself from me;
I see what others may never see;
I know what others may never know,
I never can fool myself, and so
Whatever happens, I want to be
Self-respecting and conscience free.

Printed as a service to parents and youth of Teaneck by the following sonsoring organizations that comprise the Teaneck Committee for mental health.

Alcoholics Anonymous; Bergen County Mental Health Association; Bergen County Pharmaceutical Association; Senior and Junior Court Anastasia 1041, Catholic Daughters of America; Educational Clinic of Teaneck High School; Fairleigh Dickinson University; Protestant Clergy Association; Saint Anastasia Church and Saint Anastasia P. T. A.; Teaneck-Bogota Council of Church Women; Teaneck College Club; Teaneck Golden Knot Girl Scouts, Inc.; Teaneck Jewish Community Center; Teaneck League of Women Voters; Teaneck P. T. A. Council; Teaneck Parent-Teacher Associations; Teaneck Public Library; Teaneck Recreation Department; Teaneck Section of the National Coucil of Jewish Women; Teaneck Woman's Club; Teaneck Youth Guidance Council; Cartoons by Dennis Rettew; Teaneck Board of Education, Teaneck Township. Approved for use by the Public Schools and the Parochial Schools of Teaneck, New Jersey.

How Much for India?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BURR P. HARRISON
OF VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 25, 1958

Mr. HARRISON of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, we need a full and frank disclosure of the prospective financial commitments of the United States to India. There are strong indications that current loan negotiations may well have the effect of obligating us, over and above the initial advances, to substantial but uncertain amounts in supplemental credits over an uncertain period of years. The public deserves to know the full extent to which we may be tied to India's economic programs—plans which seem to be both unstable and unrealistic. It is my understanding that present negotiations involve approximately $227 million in credits from the Export-Import Bank and the development loan fund and $65 million in surplus agricultural commodities.

Last week, in his foreign aid message, the President recommended that the development loan fund be set up as a Government corporation, thereby making it another semiautonomous disbursing agent for the United States dollars. Before the Congress takes this step, there should be a clear understanding of the extent to which we expect to make so-called soft-currency loans on a political basis rather than on a basis of financial soundness.

The Indian loan package is a prime example of a political loan. The proposition was given a cold look by the International Bank which recognized the shaky foundation of India's second 5-year plan—the plan for the advancement of which we now are planning to extend more than a quarter of a billion dollars in financial help.

If we are going to undertake the support of Nehru's economy by backing a plan which even many Indian observers regard as ill advised, we should understand that it is a political venture rather than a solid business proposition. We should also know that, once embarked, we shall be expected to continue support of the Indian plan—a matter of possibly a billion to two billion dollars in credits over the next few years. If we do not continue, we shall have to write off our initial political investment and face a resentful Indian Government and people. If we follow through, and the plan fails in its grandiose objective of revolutionizing the Indian economy, we shall be tied inevitably to its failure.

It might be well to recall that Mr. Benjamin Fairless, chairman of the President's study group on foreign aid, cautioned against adventures in the soft currencies, in which the lender inevitably becomes a major factor in the currency management of the borrower, acquires a substantial and largely unwanted interest in that currency and creates a climate in which forgiveness of the loan often seems the easiest course. This is the type of deal which so easily converts a loan into a gift, contrary to the stated intent of the legislation setting up the lending authority.

An experienced American engineer, observing the Indian plan in operation, has written home in this vein about our efforts to assist India:

One of the fundamental weaknesses of Indian plans is the omission of references to the necessity for changing the cultural path of society. You cannot superimpose a large industrial complex on a poverty-stricken agricultural country regardless of financial resources. Our money will be wasted until this is recognized. How long that will take is certainly a matter of several generations. Under our present policy we are merely postponing the final day of recovery and exerting very little, if any, effort to influence current planning or economic philosophies.

An Indian writer, in the Times of India, has written:

The only known factor about the plan is that it has an infinite capacity to grow irrespective of the availability of resources.

This writer, in detailing the expansion of the plan by the Indian Government has pointed out that India will have to go into heavy deficit financing to provide its domestic contribution to the costs. He writes:

Loans or deferred credits may take care of the foreign exchange component of these projects. But what of the rupee finance which may be expected to account for at least 50 percent of this outlay?

No thought is being given to this problem. There is an astonishing attitude of indifference. Reason and caution have fallen by the wayside in a reckless pursuit of splendor.

Very little has appeared in the American press about these Indian-loan negotiations. More should be made known, as the available evidence indicates we are to become the principal guarantor of not only dollar but also rupee deficits in a very flexible open-ended scheme of indeterminate total cost.

Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix, I include an interesting article which appeared in the Times of India on January 29, 1958:

A MANY SPLENDORED THING

(By B. G. Verghese)

The exuberance that not unnaturally marks the commencement of another year of the Republic, coupled with the prospects of loans and credits from the United States, Germany, and Japan has generated a wave of optimism about the plan. The defeatism of the intellectuals as Mr. Nehru describes it has been talked out. At Gauhati the congress resolved, as always, to lead the country to glory. And, exhilarated by this verbosity, the government has decided to enlarge the plan.

EVERGROWING

The only known factor about the plan is that it has an infinite capacity to grow irrespective of the availability of resources. It was announced some months ago that the financial outlay on the plan would have to be limited to Rs. 4,800 crores. The cost of the plan, however, is about Rs. 1,000 crores in excess of this. Instead of determining ways and means of reducing the overburden in an orderly manner, fresh commitments are being made in respect of projects not included in the plan at all.

The drug industry is to be expanded through an expansion of the Pimpri plant with the assistance of a United States firm and the establishment of intermediate and antibiotic manufacturing plants with West Germany (Bayers) and Soviet collaboration respectively. The Piet drug plant, which may cost about Rs. 21 crores was never contemplated. Then a raw film factory is to be established in Ooty with the assistance of the East German firm of Agfa at a cost of Rs. 8 crores. Negotiations are afoot for the construction of oil refineries at Gauhati and possibly Barauni with Soviet and Rumanian collaboration. All the projects are undoubtedly worthwhile in themselves and are to be taken up for execution largely because the necessary foreign credits are being made available.

There is not yet a sufficient awareness in the highest levels of the administration, de-

spite warnings from below, of the considerable external liability that the country is so readily piling up by way of repayment of loans and credits after 1961. The Government is busy mortgaging a good part of the third plan so that the splendor of the second might not be dimmed.

But apart from this, nearly half the outlay on these projects will have to be in terms of rupee finance and nobody seems concerned about where this is to come from. One suggestion made is that a sum of about Rs. 10–15 crores still available with the National Industrial Development Corp. for financing the modernization of the cotton textile industry might be diverted to meet the cost of the drug projects. But this is no more than robbing Peter to pay Paul.

A LARGE DOSE

The internal-resources position is by no means bright. It is estimated that the outlay during the first 2 years of the plan may total about Rs. 1,515 crores and that this will have been achieved by resort to a proportionately large dose of deficit financing of the order of Rs. 550 crores. Inflationary pressures have been held in check thus far on account of the fact that the large import surpluses of the past 2 years have been financed from out of the country's foreign exchange reserves, namely, the sterling balances and the Rs. 92-crore loan from the International Monetary Fund. This cushion has now been virtually exhausted and so it is imperative that the future financing of the plan must be predominantly noninflationary in character. In other words, the volume of deficit financing will have to be significantly curtailed while additional investment will have to be financed from out of additional savings, including taxation.

This is the problem of the 1958–59 budgets at the center and in the States. As far as the States are concerned they have benefited by the substantial transference of funds from the center recommended by the finance commission and have shown little enthusiasm for augmenting their tax revenues.

LESS ON DEFENSE

At the center, although the capital outlay on defense may be a little less than during the current year, nondevelopment expenditure may be expected to increase under other heads. The interim award of the pay commission alone will cost Rs. 12 crores in a full year. And the introduction of the metric system of weights may cost the exchequer another crore of rupees.

On the revenue side, there is little scope for additional direct taxation after last year's budget. The finance minister has himself said that a gifts tax may be all that might be expected during the rest of the plan period apart from marginal adjustments in tax structure. There may be some import and excise duties. On the other hand the record of loans and small savings has been poor. There is some hope that market borrowing may improve. But the outlook for savings is dismal. Against an annual target of Rs. 100 crores per annum, small savings totaled only Rs. 61 crores last year and a meager Rs. 32.4 crores during the first three quarters of the current year. This is a very poor performance at a time when savings are being extolled as the bulwark of the plan.

Viewed against this background, it is difficult to see how a budgeted-plan outlay of Rs. 950 crores for 1958–59 is going to be actually financed. Rupee expenditure, not foreign exchange, is the real problem. Yet, the plan is being enlarged.

If the plan lacked balance at the outset, it is now becoming definitely lopsided. A ceiling of Rs. 4,800 crores has been proclaimed, but it is evident that the industrial and mining programs included in the plan will account for nearly Rs. 250,300 crores more than originally envisaged. Irrigation and power projects outside the core are likely to be delayed and there may be some shortfall in respect of social services. In short, the process of rephasing is likely to increase the relative share of industry in the total investment under the plan. Commensurate transport capacity is not being developed.

The plan, as framed, provided Rs. 690 crores for large-scale industry and mining in the public sector. The commitments already made under this head within the compass of the core and outside, however, are estimated to cost Rs. 750 crores. Additional commitments in respect of projects relating to drugs, oil, fertilizers, machine tools, aluminum, and other schemes on the anvil are estimated to cost Rs. 193 crores. Loans or deferred credits may take care of the foreign exchange component of these projects. But what of the rupee finance which may be expected to account for at least 50 percent of this outlay?

No thought is being given to this problem. There is an astonishing attitude of indifference. Reason and caution have fallen by the wayside in a reckless pursuit of splendor.

CHANGE OF RESIDENCE

Senators, Representatives, and Delegates who have changed their residences will please give information thereof to the Government Printing Office, that their addresses may be correctly given in the RECORD.

PRICE OF THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

The Public Printer is authorized to furnish to subscribers the daily RECORD at $1.50 per month, payable in advance.

Remit by money order payable to Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D. C.

PRINTING OF CONGRESSIONAL RECORD EXTRACTS

It shall be lawful for the Public Printer to print and deliver upon the order of any Senator, Representative, or Delegate, extracts from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the person ordering the same paying the cost thereof (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 185, p. 1942).

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board, or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D. C., at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer plus 50 percent: *Provided*, That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized bookdealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by bookdealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. No sale shall be made on credit (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).

RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD is located in Statuary Hall, House wing, where Mr. Raymond F. Noyes is in attendance during the sessions of Congress to receive orders for subscriptions to the RECORD at $1.50 per month, and where single copies may also be purchased. Orders are also accepted for the printing of speeches in pamphlet form.

SENATORS WITH RESIDENCES IN WASHINGTON

OFFICE ADDRESS: Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.

[Streets northwest unless otherwise stated]

Vice President, Richard Nixon

Aiken, George D., *Vt.*—Carroll Arms
Allott, Gordon, *Colo.*—Cleveland House
Anderson, Clinton P., *N. Mex.*—6 Wesley Circle
Barrett, Frank A., *Wyo.*—The Woodner
Beall, J. Glenn, *Md.*
Bennett, Wallace F., *Utah*
Bible, Alan, *Nev.*
Bricker, John W., *Ohio*—The Mayflower
Bridges, Styles, *N. H.*
Bush, Prescott, *Conn.*
Butler, John Marshall, *Md.*
Byrd, Harry Flood, *Va.*—The Shoreham
Capehart, Homer E., *Ind.*—The Westchester
Carlson, Frank, *Kans.*—Sheraton-Park
Carroll, John A., *Colo.*
Case, Clifford P., *N. J.*
Case, Francis, *S. Dak.*—4635 Mass. Ave.
Chavez, Dennis, *N. Mex.*—3327 Cleveland Ave.
Church, Frank, *Idaho*
Clark, Joseph S., *Pa.*
Cooper, John Sherman, *Ky.*
Cotton, Norris, *N. H.*
Curtis, Carl T., *Nebr.*
Dirksen, Everett M., *Ill.*
Douglas, Paul H., *Ill.*
Dworshak, Henry C., *Idaho*
Eastland, James O., *Miss.*—5101 Macomb St.
Ellender, Allen J., *La.*
Ervin, Samuel J., Jr., *N. C.*
Flanders, Ralph E., *Vt.*
Frear, J. Allen, Jr., *Del.*
Fulbright, J. William, *Ark.*
Goldwater, Barry M., *Ariz.*
Gore, Albert, *Tenn.*
Green, Theodore Francis, *R. I.*—University Club
Hayden, Carl, *Ariz.*
Hennings, Thomas C., Jr., *Mo.*
Hickenlooper, Bourke B., *Iowa.*—5511 Cedar Parkway, Chevy Chase, Md.
Hill, Lister, *Ala.*
Hoblitzell, John D., Jr., *W. Va.*
Holland, Spessard L., *Fla.*—Sheraton-Park
Hruska, Roman L., *Nebr.*
Humphrey, Hubert H., *Minn.*
Ives, Irving M., *N. Y.*
Jackson, Henry M., *Wash.*
Javits, Jacob K., *N. Y.*
Jenner, William E., *Ind.*
Johnson, Lyndon B., *Tex.*
Johnston, Olin D., *S. C.*
Kefauver, Estes, *Tenn.*—4929 Hillbrook Lane
Kennedy, John F., *Mass.*
Kerr, Robert S., *Okla.*
Knowland, William F., *Calif.*
Kuchel, Thomas H., *Calif.*
Langer, William, *N. Dak.*—2101 Conn. Ave.
Lausche, Frank J., *Ohio*
Long, Russell B., *La.*
McClellan, John L., *Ark.*
McNamara, Pat, *Mich.*
Magnuson, Warren G., *Wash.*—The Shoreham
Malone, George W., *Nev.*—The Mayflower
Mansfield, Mike, *Mont.*
Martin, Edward, *Pa.*
Martin, Thos. E., *Iowa.*—4545 Conn. Ave.
Monroney, A. S. Mike, *Okla.*
Morse, Wayne, *Oreg.*—5020 Lowell St.
Morton, Thruston B., *Ky.*
Mundt, Karl E., *S. Dak.*—122 Schotts Court NE.
Murray, James E., *Mont.*—The Shoreham
Neuberger, Richard L., *Oreg.*
O'Mahoney, Joseph C., *Wyo.*—Sheraton-Park
Pastore, John O., *R. I.*
Payne, Frederick G., *Maine*
Potter, Charles E., *Mich.*
Proxmire, William E., *Wis.*
Purtell, William A., *Conn.*
Revercomb, Chapman, *W. Va.*
Robertson, A. Willis, *Va.*
Russell, Richard B., *Ga.*
Saltonstall, Leverett, *Mass.*—2320 Tracy Pl.
Schoeppel, Andrew F., *Kans.*
Scott, W. Kerr, *N. C.*
Smathers, George A., *Fla.*
Smith, H. Alexander, *N. J.*—Sheraton-Park
Smith, Margaret Chase, (Mrs.), *Maine.*
Sparkman, John J., *Ala.*—4928 Indian Lane
Stennis, John, *Miss.*
Symington, Stuart, *Mo.*
Talmadge, Herman E., *Ga.*
Thurmond, Strom, *S. C.*
Thye, Edward J., *Minn.*
Watkins, Arthur V., *Utah*
Wiley, Alexander, *Wis.*—2122 Mass. Ave.
Williams, John J., *Del.*
Yarborough, Ralph W., *Tex.*
Young, Milton R., *N. Dak.*—Quebec House So.

OFFICERS OF THE SENATE

Secretary—Felton M. Johnston.
Chief Clerk—Emery L. Frazier.
Sergeant at Arms—Joseph C. Duke.
Secretary for the Majority—Robert G. Baker.
Secretary for the Minority—J. Mark Trice.
Chaplain—Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D.

STANDING COMMITTEES OF THE SENATE

Committee on Agriculture and Forestry

Messrs. Ellender (chairman), Johnston of South Carolina, Holland, Eastland, Humphrey, Scott, Symington, Talmadge, Aiken, Young, Thye, Hickenlooper, Mundt, Williams, and Schoeppel.

Committee on Appropriations

Messrs. Hayden (chairman), Russell, Chavez, Ellender, Hill, McClellan, Robertson, Magnuson, Holland, Stennis, Johnson of Texas, Pastore, Bridges, Saltonstall, Young, Knowland, Thye, Mundt, Mrs. Smith of Maine, Messrs. Dworshak, Dirksen, Potter, and Ives.

Committee on Armed Services

Messrs. Russell (chairman), Byrd, Johnson of Texas, Kefauver, Stennis, Symington, Jackson, Ervin, Saltonstall, Bridges, Flanders, Mrs. Smith of Maine, Messrs. Case of South Dakota, Bush, and Barrett.

Committee on Banking and Currency

Messrs. Fulbright (chairman), Robertson, Sparkman, Frear, Douglas, Monroney, Clark, Proxmire, Capehart, Bricker, Bennett, Bush, Beall, Payne, and Case of New Jersey.

Committee on the District of Columbia

Messrs. Bible (chairman), Morse, Frear, Clark, Proxmire, Beall, Morton, Javits, and Hoblitzell.

Committee on Finance

Messrs. Byrd (chairman), Kerr, Frear, Long, Smathers, Anderson, Douglas, Gore, Martin of Pennsylvania, Williams, Flanders, Malone, Carlson, Bennett, and Jenner.

Committee on Foreign Relations

Messrs. Green (chairman), Fulbright, Sparkman, Humphrey, Mansfield, Morse, Long, Kennedy, Wiley, Smith of New Jersey, Hickenlooper, Langer, Knowland, Aiken, and Capehart.

Committee on Government Operations

Messrs. McClellan (chairman), Jackson, Symington, Ervin, Humphrey, Thurmond, Lausche, Mundt, Mrs. Smith of Maine, Messrs. Martin of Iowa, Curtis, Revercomb, and Capehart.

Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs

Messrs. Murray (chairman), Anderson, Jackson, O'Mahoney, Bible, Neuberger, Carroll, Church, Malone, Watkins, Dworshak, Kuchel, Barrett, Goldwater, and Allott.

Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce

Messrs. Magnuson (chairman), Pastore, Monroney, Smathers, Bible, Thurmond, Lausche, Yarborough, Bricker, Schoeppel, Butler, Potter, Purtell, Payne, and Cotton.

Committee on the Judiciary

Messrs. Eastland (chairman), Kefauver, Johnston of South Carolina, Hennings, McClellan, O'Mahoney, Ervin, Carroll, Wiley, Langer, Jenner, Watkins, Dirksen, Butler, and Hruska.

Committee on Labor and Public Welfare

Messrs. Hill (chairman), Murray, Kennedy, McNamara, Morse, Thurmond, Yarborough, Smith of New Jersey, Ives, Purtell, Goldwater, Allott, and Cooper.

Committee on Post Office and Civil Service

Messrs. Johnston of South Carolina (chairman), Monroney, Scott, Neuberger, Church, Yarborough, Proxmire, Carlson, Jenner, Langer, Martin of Iowa, Morton, and Hoblitzell.

Committee on Public Works

Messrs. Chavez (chairman), Kerr, Gore, McNamara, Neuberger, Scott, ———, Martin of Pennsylvania, Case of South Dakota, Kuchel, Cotton, Hruska, and Revercomb.

Committee on Rules and Administration

Messrs. Hennings (chairman), Hayden, Green, Mansfield, Talmadge, Curtis, Cooper, Javits, and Case of New Jersey.

UNITED STATES SUPREME COURT

Mr. Chief Justice Warren, of California, Hotel Sheraton-Park, Washington, D. C.
Mr. Justice Black, of Alabama, 619 S. Lee St., Alexandria, Va.
Mr. Justice Frankfurter, of Massachusetts, 3018 Dumbarton Ave.
Mr. Justice Douglas, of Washington, 4531 Hutchins Place.
Mr. Justice Burton, of Ohio, the Dodge.
Mr. Justice Clark, of Texas, 2101 Connecticut Ave.
Mr. Justice Harlan, of New York, 1677 31st St.
Mr. Justice Brennan, of New Jersey, 3037 Dumbarton Ave.
Mr. Justice Whittaker, of Missouri, 6920 32d St.

OFFICERS OF THE SUPREME COURT

Clerk—John T. Fey, 2931 Cathedral Ave.
Deputy Clerk—Edmund P. Cullinan, 4923 Reservoir Road.
Deputy Clerk—Richard J. Blanchard, 427 St. Lawrence Drive, Silver Spring, Md.
Marshal—T. Perry Lippitt, 6004 Corbin Road.
Reporter—Walter Wyatt, 1702 Kalmia Rd.
Librarian—Helen Newman, 126 3d St. SE.

UNITED STATES JUDICIAL CIRCUITS

JUSTICES ASSIGNED
TERRITORY EMBRACED

District of Columbia: Mr. Chief Justice Warren. District of Columbia.

First judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Frankfurter. Maine, Massachusetts, New Hampshire, Puerto Rico, Rhode Island.

Second judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Harlan. Connecticut, New York, Vermont.

Third judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Brennan. Delaware, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Virgin Islands.

Fourth judicial circuit: Mr. Chief Justice Warren. Maryland, North Carolina, South Carolina, Virginia, West Virginia.

Fifth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Black. Alabama, Canal Zone, Florida, Georgia, Louisiana, Mississippi, Texas.

Sixth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Burton. Kentucky, Michigan, Ohio, Tennessee.

Seventh judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Clark. Illinois, Indiana, Wisconsin.

Eighth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Whittaker. Arkansas, Iowa, Minnesota, Missouri, Nebraska, North Dakota, South Dakota.

Ninth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Douglas. Alaska, Arizona, California, Idaho, Montana, Nevada, Oregon, Washington, Guam, Hawaii.

Tenth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Whittaker. Colorado, Kansas, New Mexico, Oklahoma, Utah, Wyoming.

STANDING COMMITTEES OF THE HOUSE

Committee on Agriculture

Messrs. Cooley (chairman), Poage, Grant, Gathings, McMillan, Abernethy, Albert, Abbitt, Polk, Thompson of Texas, Jones of Missouri, Watts, Hagen, Johnson, Anfuso, Bass of Tennessee, Mrs. Knutson, Messrs. Jennings, Matthews, Hill, Hoeven, Simpson of Illinois, Dague, Harvey, Belcher, McIntire, Williams of New York, Harrison of Nebraska, Dixon, Smith of Kansas, Krueger, Teague of California, Tewes, Burns of Hawaii, Bartlett, Fernós-Isern, ———.

Committee on Appropriations

Messrs. Cannon (chairman), Mahon, Sheppard, Thomas, Kirwan, Norrell, Whitten, Andrews, Rooney, Gary, Fogarty, Sikes, Preston, Passman, Rabaut, Yates, Marshall, Riley, Sieminski, Evins, Shelley, Boland, Magnuson, Natcher, Flood, Denton, Steed, Alexander, Boyle, Santangelo, Taber, Wigglesworth, Jensen, H. Carl Andersen, Horan, Canfield, Fenton, Scrivner, Coudert, Clevenger, Wilson of Indiana, James, Ford, Miller of Maryland, Vursell, Ostertag, Bow, Budge, Jonas, and Laird.

Committee on Armed Services

Messrs. Vinson (chairman), Brooks of Louisiana, Kilday, Durham, Rivers, Philbin, Hébert, Winstead, Price, Fisher, Hardy, Green of Pennsylvania, Doyle, Miller of California, Bennett of Florida, Lankford, Huddleston, Byrne of Pennsylvania, Morris, Kitchin, Arends, Gavin, Norblad, Van Zandt, Patterson, Cunningham of Iowa, Bates, Hess, Devereux, O'Konski, Bray, Wilson of California, Osmers, Mrs. St. George, Messrs. Reece of Tennessee, Gubser, Becker, Burns of Hawaii, Bartlett, and Fernós-Isern.

Committee on Banking and Currency

Messrs. Spence (chairman), Brown of Georgia, Patman, Rains, Multer, Addonizio, Barrett, Mrs. Sullivan, Mr. Reuss, Mrs. Griffiths, Messrs. Ashley, Vanik, Healey, Rutherford, Coad, Anderson of Montana, Breeding, Talle, Kilburn, McDonough, Widnall, Betts, Mumma, McVey, Hiestand, Bass of New Hampshire, Seely-Brown, Siler, Henderson, and Chamberlain.

Committee on the District of Columbia

Messrs. McMillan (chairman), Harris, Abernethy, Smith of Virginia, Teague of Texas, Davis of Georgia, Morrison, Dawson of Illinois, Williams of Mississippi, Wier, Multer, Dowdy, Matthews, Mrs. Granahan, Messrs. Mitchell, Simpson of Illinois, O'Hara of Minnesota, Talle, Miller of Nebraska, Auchincloss, Allen of California, Kearns, Patterson, Broyhill, Hyde, and Holt.

Committee on Education and Labor

Messrs. Barden (chairman), Powell, Bailey, Perkins, Wier, Elliott, Landrum, Metcalf, Mrs. Green of Oregon, Messrs. Roosevelt, Zelenko, Thompson of New Jersey, Udall, Holland, Teller, McGovern, Dent, Gwinn, Kearns, Hoffman, Bosch, Holt, Rhodes of Arizona, Wainwright, Frelinghuysen, Nicholson, Ayres, Griffin, Haskell, and Lafore.

Committee on Foreign Affairs

Messrs. Gordon (chairman), Morgan, Carnahan, Zablocki, Burleson, Hays of Arkansas, Mrs. Kelly, Messrs. Hays of Ohio, Byrd, Selden, Pilcher, O'Hara of Illinois, Fountain, Fascell, Coffin, Farbstein, Saund, Chiperfield, Vorys, Mrs. Bolton, Messrs. Merrow, Judd, Fulton, Jackson, LeCompte, Radwan, Morano, Mrs. Church, Messrs. Adair, Prouty, Bentley, and Curtis of Massachusetts.

Committee on Government Operations

Messrs. Dawson of Illinois (chairman), Holifield, McCormack, Chudoff, Brooks of Texas, Fountain, Hardy, Blatnik, Jones of Alabama, Garmatz, Moss, Kilgore, Fascell, Mrs. Griffiths, Messrs. Reuss, Brooks of Louisiana, Mrs. Kee, Mrs. Granahan, Messrs. Hoffman, Riehlman, Mrs. Harden, Messrs. Brownson, Meader, Brown of Ohio, Lipscomb, Knox, Minshall, May, Michel, Mrs. Dwyer, ———.

Committee on House Administration

Messrs. Burleson (chairman), Byrd, Friedel, Ashmore, Hays of Ohio, Jones of Missouri, Rhodes of Pennsylvania, Lesinski, Smith of Mississippi, Long, Thompson of New Jersey, Abbitt, Elliott, Mrs. Green of Oregon, Messrs. LeCompte, Morano, Schenck, Carrigg, Harrison of Nebraska, Corbett, Bennett of Michigan, Hillings, Lipscomb, Halleck, and Ray.

Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs

Messrs. Engle (chairman), Aspinall, O'Brien of New York, Rogers of Texas, Mrs. Pfost, Messrs. Haley, Shuford, Powell, Edmondson, Metcalf, Christopher, Sisk, Udall, Diggs, Rutherford, Baring, Ullman, Miller of Nebraska, Saylor, Wharton, Berry, Dawson of Utah, Westland, Pillion, Hosmer, Rhodes of Arizona, Chenoweth, Utt, Thomson of Wyoming, Weaver, Collier, Burns of Hawaii, Bartlett, and Fernós-Isern.

Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce

Messrs. Harris (chairman), Williams of Mississippi, Mack of Illinois, Roberts, Moulder, Staggers, Dollinger, Rogers of Texas, Dies, Friedel, Flynt, Macdonald, Rhodes of Pennsylvania, Jarman, O'Brien of New York, Moss, Dingell, Loser, Wolverton, O'Hara of Minnesota, Hale, Heselton, Bennett of Michigan, Beamer, Springer, Bush, Schenck, Carrigg, Derounian, Younger, Avery, Alger, and Neal.

Committee on the Judiciary

Messrs. Celler (chairman), Walter, Lane, Feighan, Chelf, Willis, Rodino, Forrester, Rogers of Colorado, Donohue, Brooks of Texas, Tuck, Ashmore, Chudoff, Dowdy, Holtzman, Montoya, Whitener, Libonati, Keating, McCulloch, Hillings, Miller of New York, Taylor, Burdick, Robsion of Kentucky, Hyde, Poff, Cramer, Moore, Nimtz, and Smith of California.

Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries

Messrs. Bonner (chairman), Boykin, Garmatz, Robeson of Virginia, Mrs. Sullivan, Messrs. Thompson of Louisiana, Miller of California, Kluczynski, Zelenko, Clark, Ashley, Dingell, Rivers, Macdonald, Lennon, Young, Dellay, Tollefson, Allen of California, Sheehan, Van Pelt, Ray, Mailliard, Dorn of New York, Pelly, Cederberg, Baumhart, Gross, Curtin, McIntosh, Glenn, and Bartlett.

Committee on Post Office and Civil Service

Messrs. Murray (chairman), Morrison, Davis of Georgia, Lesinski, Robeson of Virginia, Mrs. Pfost, Mr. Holifield, Mrs. Granahan, Messrs. Beckworth, Porter, Young, Hemphill, Scott of North Carolina, Dellay, Rees of Kansas, Corbett, Gross, Mrs. Harden, Messrs. Cretella, Broyhill, Cederberg, Johansen, Wainwright, Cunningham of Nebraska, and Dennison.

Committee on Public Works

Messrs. Buckley (chairman), Fallon, Davis of Tennessee, Blatnik, Jones of Alabama, Dempsey, Smith of Mississippi, Kluczynski, Thompson of Louisiana, Mrs. Blitch, Messrs. Wright, Hull, Gray, Clark, Rogers of Florida, Edmondson, Kilgore, McFall, Brown of Missouri, McGregor, Auchincloss, Mack of Washington, Scudder, George, Scherer, Withrow, Cramer, Baldwin, Schwengel, Stauffer, Byrne of Illinois, Dooley, Broomfield, and Robison of New York.

Committee on Rules

Messrs. Smith of Virginia (chairman), Colmer, Madden, Delaney, Trimble, Thornberry, Bolling, O'Neill, Allen of Illinois, Brown of Ohio, Latham, and Scott of Pennsylvania.

Committee on Un-American Activities

Messrs. Walter (chairman), Moulder, Doyle, Willis, Tuck, Kearney, Jackson, Scherer, and McIntosh.

Committee on Veterans' Affairs

Messrs. Teague of Texas (chairman), Dorn of South Carolina, Mrs. Kee, Messrs. Long, Boykin, Aspinall, Shuford, Christopher, Diggs, Sisk, Haley, Baring, Whitener, Mitchell, ———, ———, Mrs. Rogers of Massachusetts, Messrs. Kearney, Ayres, Adair, Fino, Weaver, Saylor, Mrs. Dwyer, Messrs. Smith of California, Teague of California, ———.

Committee on Ways and Means

Messrs. Mills (chairman), Gregory, Forand, Eberharter, King, O'Brien of Illinois, Boggs, Keogh, Harrison of Virginia, Karsten, Herlong, McCarthy, Ikard, Machrowicz, Frazier, Reed, Jenkins, Simpson of Pennsylvania, Kean, Mason, Holmes, Byrnes of Wisconsin, Sadlak, Baker, and Curtis of Missouri.

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA CIRCUIT

(United States Courthouse, 3d and Constitution Ave.)

Office telephone	*Chief Judge*	*Residence telephone*
	Henry White Edgerton, Washington 1, D. C.	
Sterling 3-5700		Emerson 3-6017

Circuit Judges

E. Barrett Prettyman, Washington 1, D. C.	
Sterling 3-5700	Oliver 2-3263
Wilbur K. Miller, Washington 1, D. C.	
Sterling 3-5700	North 7-8109
David L. Bazelon, Washington 1, D. C.	
Sterling 3-5700	Emerson 2-5047
Charles Fahy, Washington 1, D. C.	
Sterling 3-5700	Emerson 3-6267
George T. Washington, Washington 1, D. C.	
Sterling 3-5700	Emerson 2-8653
John A. Danaher, Washington 1, D. C.	
Sterling 3-5700	Emerson 3-8315
Walter M. Bastian, Washington 1, D. C.	
Sterling 3-5700	Emerson 2-4343
Warren E. Burger, Washington 1, D. C.	
Sterling 3-5700	Jefferson 3-1347

COURT OF CUSTOMS AND PATENT APPEALS

(Internal Revenue Building. Phone, National 8-4696)

Chief Judge—Noble J. Johnson, of Indiana, 4318 Warren St.
Judge—Ambrose O'Connell, of New York, Hunting Towers, Alexandria, Va.
Judge—Eugene Worley, of Texas, 4745 32d St. North, Arlington, Va.
Judge—Giles S. Rich, of New York, 4949 Linnean Ave.
(Vacancy)

THE UNITED STATES COURT OF CLAIMS

(Pennsylvania Ave. and 17th St. Phone, District 7-0642)

Chief Judge—Marvin Jones, of Texas, University Club.
Judge—Benjamin H. Littleton, of Tennessee, 2737 Devonshire Place.
Judge—Samuel E. Whitaker, of Tennessee, 4921 Quebec St.
Judge—J. Warren Madden, of Pennsylvania, 300 East Broad St., Falls Church, Va.
Judge—Don. N. Laramore, of Indiana, 5017 Scarsdale Road, Sumner, Md.

EMERGENCY COURT OF APPEALS

Washington 1, D. C.

Chief Judge—Albert B. Maris, Philadelphia 7, Pa. (United States Circuit Judge for the Third Circuit.)
Judge—Calvert Magruder, Boston 9, Mass. (Chief Judge, United States Court of Appeals for the First Circuit.)
Judge—Thomas F. McAllister, Grand Rapids, Mich. (United States Circuit Judge for the Sixth Circuit.)
Judge—Bolitha J. Laws, Washington, D. C. (Chief Judge, United States District Court for the District of Columbia.)
(Vacancy)

UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGES

District of Columbia

(Washington 1, D. C.)

Chief Judge Bolitha J. Laws

Judges

F. Dickinson Letts	Edward A. Tamm
James W. Morris	Charles F. McLaughlin
David A. Pine	James R. Kirkland
Matthew F. McGuire	Burnita S. Matthews
Alexander Holtzoff	Luther W. Youngdahl
Richmond B. Keech	Joseph C. McGarraghy
Edward M. Curran	John J. Sirica

UNITED STATES COURT OF MILITARY APPEALS

(United States Court of Military Appeals Building, 5th and E Sts. NW.)
(Phone, Liberty 5-6700)

Chief Judge	Robert E. Quinn
Judge	George W. Latimer
Judge	Homer Ferguson
Commissioner	Richard L. Tedrow
Clerk	Alfred C. Proulx

REPRESENTATIVES WITH RESIDENCES IN WASHINGTON

OFFICE ADDRESS: House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

[Streets northwest unless otherwise stated]

Speaker, Sam Rayburn

Abbitt, Watkins M., *Va*.
Abernethy, Thomas G., 6278 29th St. *Miss*.
Adair, E. Ross, *Ind*.—4000 Mass. Ave.
Addonizio, Hugh J., *N. J*.
Albert, Carl, *Okla*.—5115 Allen Terrace
Alexander, Hugh Q., *N. C*.
Alger, Bruce, *Tex*.
Allen, John J., Jr., *Calif*.
Allen, Leo E., *Ill*.—University Club
Andersen, H. Carl, *Minn*.—4000 Mass. Ave.
Anderson, LeRoy H., *Mont*.—800 Crescent Dr., Alexandria, Va.
Andrews, George W., *Ala*.—3108 Cathedral Ave.
Anfuso, Victor L., *N. Y*.
Arends, Leslie C., *Ill*.—4815 Dexter St.
Ashley, Thomas L., *Ohio*.
Ashmore, Robert T., *S. C*.
Aspinall, Wayne N., *Colo*.—Arlington Towers, Arlington, Va.
Auchincloss, James C., *N. J*.—113 S. Lee St., Alexandria, Va.
Avery, William H., *Kans*.
Ayres, William H., *Ohio*.
Bailey, Cleveland M., *W. Va*.
Baker, Howard H., *Tenn*.
Baldwin, John F., Jr., *Calif*.
Barden, Graham A., *N. C*.—2601 Woodley Pl.
Baring, Walter S., *Nev*.
Barrett, William A., *Pa*.
Bass, Perkins, *N. H*.
Bass, Ross, *Tenn*.
Bates, William H., *Mass*.
Baumhart, A. D., Jr., *Ohio*.
Beamer, John V., *Ind*.—110 Maryland Ave. NE.
Becker, Frank J., *N. Y*.
Beckworth, Lindley, *Tex*.
Belcher, Page, *Okla*.
Bennett, Charles E., *Fla*.—1530 38th St. SE.
Bennett, John B., *Mich*.—5804 Bradley Blvd., Bethesda, Md.
Bentley, Alvin M., *Mich*.
Berry, E. Y., *S. Dak*.—118 Schotts Court NE.
Betts, Jackson E., *Ohio*.
Blatnik, John A., *Minn*.
Blitch, Iris Faircloth (Mrs.), *Ga*.
Boggs, Hale, *La*.
Boland, Edward P., *Mass*.
Bolling, Richard, *Mo*.—3409 Lowell St.
Bolton, Frances P. (Mrs.), *Ohio*—2301 Wyo. Ave.
Bonner, Herbert C., *N. C*.—Calvert-Woodley
Bosch, Albert H., *N. Y*.
Bow, Frank T., *Ohio*.—4301 Mass. Ave.
Boykin, Frank W., *Ala*.—The Washington
Boyle, Charles A., *Ill*.
Bray, William G., *Ind*.
Breeding, J. Floyd, *Kans*.
Brooks, Jack, *Tex*.
Brooks, Overton, *La*.—4413 46th St.
Broomfield, William S., *Mich*.
Brown, Charles H., *Mo*.—3606 Gunston Rd., Alexandria, Va.
Brown, Clarence J., *Ohio*.—Alban Towers
Brown, Paul, *Ga*.—Boston House
Brownson, Charles B., *Ind*.
Broyhill, Joel T., *Va*.
Buckley, Charles A., *N. Y*.
Budge, Hamer H., *Idaho*.
Burdick, Usher L., *N. Dak*.
Burleson, Omar, *Tex*.—2737 Devonshire Pl.
Bush, Alvin R., *Pa*.
Byrd, Robert C., *W. Va*.
Byrne, Emmet F., *Ill*.
Byrne, James A., *Pa*.
Byrnes, John W., *Wis*.—1215 25th St. So., Arlington, Va.
Canfield, Gordon, *N. J*.
Cannon, Clarence, *Mo*.
Carnahan, A. S. J., *Mo*.
Carrigg, Joseph L., *Pa*.
Cederberg, Elford A., *Mich*.
Celler, Emanuel, *N. Y*.—The Mayflower
Chamberlain, Charles E., *Mich*.
Chelf, Frank, *Ky*.
Chenoweth, J. Edgar, *Colo*.
Chiperfield, Robert B., *Ill*.—1713 House Office Building
Christopher, George H., *Mo*.
Church, Marguerite Stitt (Mrs.), *Ill*.—2122 Mass. Ave.
Clark, Frank M., *Pa*.—3735 Gunston Rd., Alexandria, Va.
Clevenger, Cliff, *Ohio*.—The Jefferson
Coad, Merwin, *Iowa*.
Coffin, Frank M., *Maine*.
Collier, Harold R., *Ill*.
Colmer, William M., *Miss*.
Cooley, Harold D., *N. C*.—2480 16th St.
Corbett, Robert J., *Pa*.
Coudert, Frederic R., Jr., *N. Y*.
Cramer, William C., *Fla*.—Hunting Towers, Alexandria, Va.
Cretella, Albert W., *Conn*.
Cunningham, Glenn, *Nebr*.
Cunningham, Paul, *Iowa*.
Curtin, Willard S., *Pa*.
Curtis, Laurence, *Mass*.—3314 O St.
Curtis, Thomas B., *Mo*.
Dague, Paul B., *Pa*.
Davis, Clifford, *Tenn*.—4611 Butterworth Pl.
Davis, James C., *Ga*.
Dawson, William A., *Utah*.
Dawson, William L., *Ill*.
Delaney, James J., *N. Y*.
Dellay, Vincent J., *N. J*.
Dempsey, John J., *N. Mex*.—2500 Q St.
Dennison, David S., Jr., *Ohio*.
Dent, John H., *Pa*.
Denton, Winfield K., *Ind*.
Derounian, Steven B., *N. Y*.
Devereux, James P. S., *Md*.
Dies, Martin, *Tex*.
Digga, Charles C., Jr., *Mich*.
Dingell, John D., *Mich*.
Dixon, Henry Aldous, *Utah*.—2826 Conn. Ave.
Dollinger, Isidore, *N. Y*.
Donohue, Harold D., *Mass*.
Dooley, Edwin B., *N. Y*.
Dorn, Francis E., *N. Y*.
Dorn, W. J. Bryan, *S. C*.
Dowdy, John, *Tex*.
Doyle, Clyde, *Calif*.—3877 30th St. N., Arlington, Va.
Durham, Carl T., *N. C*.—The Lee House
Dwyer, Florence P. (Mrs.), *N. J*.
Eberharter, Herman P., *Pa*.—3101 4th St. N., Arlington, Va.
Edmondson, Ed., *Okla*.
Elliott, Carl, *Ala*.
Engle, Clair, *Calif*.—3840 Lorcom Lane, Arlington, Va.
Everett, Robert A., *Tenn*.
Evins, Joe L., *Tenn*.—5044 Klingle St.
Fallon, George H., *Md*.
Farbstein, Leonard, *N. Y*.
Fascell, Dante B., *Fla*.
Feighan, Michael A., *Ohio*.
Fenton, Ivor D., *Pa*.—3725 Macomb St.
Fino, Paul A., *N. Y*.
Fisher, O. C., *Tex*.—Calvert-Woodley
Flood, Daniel J., *Pa*.—The Congressional
Flynt, John J., Jr., *Ga*.
Fogarty, John E., *R. I*.—3627 Chesapeake St.
Forand, Aime J., *R. I*.—4108 Dresden St., Kensington, Md.
Ford, Gerald R., Jr., *Mich*.—514 Crown View Dr., Alexandria, Va.
Forrester, E. L., *Ga*.
Fountain, L. H., *N. C*.—The Westchester
Frazier, James B., Jr., *Tenn*.—Fairfax Hotel
Frelinghuysen, Peter, Jr., *N. J*.—3014 N St.
Friedel, Samuel N., *Md*.
Fulton, James G., *Pa*.
Garmatz, Edward A., *Md*.
Gary, J. Vaughan, *Va*.
Gathings, E. C., *Ark*.—6377 31st Pl.
Gavin, Leon H., *Pa*.
George, Myron V., *Kans*.—3801 Rodman St.
Glenn, Milton W., *N. J*.—Arlington Towers, Arlington, Va.
Gordon, Thomas S., *Ill*.
Granahan, Kathryn E. (Mrs.), *Pa*.
Grant, George M., *Ala*.—4801 Conn. Ave.
Gray, Kenneth J., *Ill*.
Green, Edith (Mrs.), *Oreg*.
Green, William J., Jr., *Pa*.
Gregory, Noble J., *Ky*.—2401 Calvert St.
Griffin, Robert P., *Mich*.
Griffiths, Martha W. (Mrs.), *Mich*.
Gross, H. R., *Iowa*.
Gubser, Charles S., *Calif*.
Gwinn, Ralph W., *N. Y*.
Hagen, Harlan, *Calif*.
Hale, Robert, *Maine*.—2722 N St.
Haley, James A., *Fla*.
Halleck, Charles A., *Ind*.—4926 Upton St.
Harden, Cecil M. (Mrs.), *Ind*.—The Congressional
Hardy, Porter, Jr., *Va*.
Harris, Oren, *Ark*.—1627 Myrtle St.
Harrison, Burr P., *Va*.
Harrison, Robert D., *Nebr*.
Harvey, Ralph, *Ind*.—110 Maryland Ave. NE.
Haskell, Harry G., Jr., *Del*.
Hays, Brooks, *Ark*.—314 2d St. SE.
Hays, Wayne L., *Ohio*.—1323 Barger Drive, Falls Church, Va.
Healey, James C., *N. Y*.
Hébert, F. Edward, *La*.—26 Cockrell St., Alexandria, Va.
Hemphill, Robert W., *S. C*.
Henderson, John E., *Ohio*.
Herlong, A. S., Jr., *Fla*.
Heselton, John W., *Mass*.
Hess, William E., *Ohio*.
Hiestand, Edgar W., *Calif*.
Hill, William S., *Colo*.—110 Maryland Ave. NE.
Hillings, Patrick J., *Calif*.
Hoeven, Charles B., *Iowa*.—100 Maryland Ave. NE.
Hoffman, Clare E., *Mich*.—100 Maryland Ave. NE.
Holifield, Chet, *Calif*.
Holland, Elmer J., *Pa*.
Holmes, Hal, *Wash*.
Holt, Joe, *Calif*.
Holtzman, Lester, *N. Y*.
Horan, Walt, *Wash*.
Hosmer, Craig, *Calif*.
Huddleston, George, Jr., *Ala*.
Hull, W. R., Jr., *Mo*.
Hyde, DeWitt S., *Md*.
Ikard, Frank, *Tex*.
Jackson, Donald L., *Calif*.
James, Benjamin F., *Pa*.—200 C St. SE.
Jarman, John, *Okla*.
Jenkins, Thomas A., *Ohio*.—The Mayflower
Jennings, W. Pat, *Va*.
Jensen, Ben F., *Iowa*.—2120 16th St.
Johansen, August E., *Mich*.
Johnson, Lester R., *Wis*.—3816 Pope St. SE.
Jonas, Charles Raper, *N. C*.
Jones, Paul C., *Mo*.—1111 Army Navy Dr., Arlington, Va.
Jones, Robert E., *Ala*.
Judd, Walter H., *Minn*.—3083 Ordway St.
Karsten, Frank M., *Mo*.
Kean, Robert W., *N. J*.—2435 Kalorama Road
Kearney, B. W. (Pat), *N. Y*.
Kearns, Carroll D., *Pa*.—Sheraton-Park
Keating, Kenneth B., *N. Y*.—1612 34th St.
Kee, Elizabeth (Mrs.), *W. Va*.
Kelly, Edna F. (Mrs.), *N. Y*.
Keogh, Eugene J., *N. Y*.—The Mayflower
Kilburn, Clarence E., *N. Y*.—The Gen. Scott
Kilday, Paul J., *Tex*.—3507 Albemarle St.
Kilgore, Joe M., *Tex*.—4848 Upton St.
King, Cecil R., *Calif*.
Kirwan, Michael J., *Ohio*.
Kitchin, A. Paul, *N. C*.
Kluczynski, John C., *Ill*.
Knox, Victor A., *Mich*.
Knutson, Coya (Mrs.), *Minn*.
Krueger, Otto, *N. Dak*.—112 Schotts Court NE.

Lafore, John A., Jr., *Pa*.....
Laird, Melvin R., *Wis*.....
Landrum, Phil M., *Ga*.....
Lane, Thomas J., *Mass*.....
Lankford, Richard E., *Md*...
Latham, Henry J., *N. Y*.....
LeCompte, Karl M., *Iowa*...Sheraton-Park
Lennon, Alton, *N. C*.....
Lesinski, John, Jr., *Mich*....
Libonati, Roland V., *Ill*.....
Lipscomb, Glenard P., *Calif*..
Long, George S., *La*.....2136 31st St. SE.
Loser, J. Carlton, *Tenn*.....The Congressional
McCarthy, Eugene J., *Minn*..419 Raymond St., Chevy Chase, Md.
McCormack, John W., *Mass*..The Washington
McCulloch, Wm. M., *Ohio*...4000 Mass. Ave.
McDonough, Gordon L., *Calif*.
McFall, John J., *Calif*.....507 Robinson Ct., Alexandria, Va.
McGovern, George S., *S. Dak*.
McGregor, J. Harry, *Ohio*...The Westchester
McIntire, Clifford G., *Maine*.220 2d St. SE.
McIntosh, Robert J., *Mich*..
McMillan, John L., *S. C*.....1201 S. Barton St., Arlington, Va.
McVey, William E., *Ill*.....The Coronet
Macdonald, Torbert H., *Mass*.
Machrowicz, Thaddeus M., *Mich*.115 Dale Dr., Falls Church, Va.
Mack, Peter F., Jr., *Ill*.....
Mack, Russell V., *Wash*.....
Madden, Ray J., *Ind*.....
Magnuson, Don, *Wash*.....
Mahon, George H., *Tex*.....Alban Towers
Mailliard, William S., *Calif*..
Marshall, Fred, *Minn*.....
Martin, Joseph W., Jr., *Mass*.The Hay-Adams
Mason, Noah M., *Ill*.....The Baronet
Matthews, D. R. (Billy), *Fla*.
May, Edwin H., Jr., *Conn*...
Meader, George, *Mich*.....3360 Tennyson St.
Merrow, Chester E., *N. H*....
Metcalf, Lee, *Mont*.....
Michel, Robert H., *Ill*.....
Miller, A. L., *Nebr*.....2801 East-West Highway, Chevy Chase, Md.
Miller, Edward T., *Md*.....2901 Conn. Ave.
Miller, George P., *Calif*.....
Miller, William E., *N. Y*.....3708 Calvend Lane, Kensington, Md.
Mills, Wilbur D., *Ark*.....2701 Conn. Ave.
Minshall, William E., *Ohio*..8120 Kerry Lane, Chevy Chase, Md.
Mitchell, Erwin, *Ga*.....
Montoya, Joseph M., *N. Mex*..
Moore, Arch A., Jr., *W. Va*...
Morano, Albert P., *Conn*....
Morgan, Thomas E., *Pa*.....
Morris, Toby, *Okla*.....220 2d St. SE.
Morrison, James H., *La*.....4301 Mass. Ave.
Moss, John E., *Calif*.....204 Jefferson St., Alexandria, Va.
Moulder, Morgan M., *Mo*....
Multer, Abraham J., *N. Y*...
Mumma, Walter M., *Pa*.....The Coronet
Murray, Tom, *Tenn*.....
Natcher, William H., *Ky*....
Neal, Will E., *W. Va*.....
Nicholson, Donald W., *Mass*.
Nimtz, F. Jay, *Ind*.....
Norblad, Walter, *Oreg*.....
Norrell, W. F., *Ark*.....2301 Conn. Ave.
O'Brien, Leo W., *N. Y*.....
O'Brien, Thomas J., *Ill*.....The Hamilton
O'Hara, Barratt, *Ill*.....The Congressional
O'Hara, Joseph P., *Minn*....2813 31st St.
O'Konski, Alvin E., *Wis*.....4000 Mass. Ave.
O'Neill, Thos. P., Jr., *Mass*..
Osmers, Frank C., Jr., *N. J*..
Ostertag, Harold C., *N. Y*....100 Maryland Ave. NE.
Passman, Otto E., *La*.....
Patman, Wright, *Tex*.....117 Carroll St. SE.
Patterson, James T., *Conn*..
Pelly, Thomas M., *Wash*....
Perkins, Carl D., *Ky*.....
Pfost, Gracie (Mrs.), *Idaho*..
Philbin, Philip J., *Mass*.....
Pilcher, J. L., *Ga*.....
Pillion, John R., *N. Y*.....
Poage, W. R., *Tex*.....2309 Skyland Pl. SE.
Poff, Richard H., *Va*.....
Polk, James G., *Ohio*.....
Porter, Charles O., *Oreg*....
Powell, Adam C., Jr., *N. Y*...
Preston, Prince H., *Ga*.....
Price, Melvin, *Ill*.....
Prouty, Winston L., *Vt*.....
Rabaut, Louis C., *Mich*.....
Radwan, Edmund P., *N. Y*...
Rains, Albert, *Ala*.....
Ray, John H., *N. Y*.....
Rayburn, Sam, *Tex*.....
Reece, B. Carroll, *Tenn*.....
Reed, Daniel A., *N. Y*.....The Woodner
Rees, Edward H., *Kans*.....1801 16th St.
Reuss, Henry S., *Wis*.....6448 Brooks Lane
Rhodes, George M., *Pa*.....5603 24th Ave., Hillcrest Hgts.
Rhodes, John J., *Ariz*.....
Riehlman, R. Walter, *N. Y*..3210 Wis. Ave.
Riley, John J., *S. C*.....
Rivers, L. Mendel, *S. C*.....
Roberts, Kenneth A., *Ala*...6102 Cromwell Dr.
Robeson, Edward J., Jr., *Va*..
Robison, Howard W., *N. Y*...
Robsion, John M., Jr., *Ky*...1500 Delafield Pl.
Rodino, Peter W., Jr., *N. J*...
Rogers, Byron G., *Colo*.....
Rogers, Edith Nourse (Mrs.), *Mass*.The Shoreham
Rogers, Paul G., *Fla*.....Sheraton-Park
Rogers, Walter, *Tex*.....
Rooney, John J., *N. Y*.....
Roosevelt, James, *Calif*.....
Rutherford, J. T., *Tex*.....
Sadlak, Antoni N., *Conn*....
Santangelo, Alfred E., *N. Y*..
St. George, Katharine (Mrs.), *N. Y*.
Saund, D. S. (Judge), *Calif*..
Saylor, John P., *Pa*.....
Schenck, Paul F., *Ohio*.....3801 Conn. Ave., Apt. 307
Scherer, Gordon H., *Ohio*...
Schwengel, Fred, *Iowa*.....
Scott, Hugh, *Pa*.....
Scott, Ralph J., *N. C*.....
Scrivner, Errett P., *Kans*...2331 Cathedral Ave.
Scudder, Hubert B., *Calif*...4545 Conn. Ave.
Seely-Brown, Horace, Jr., *Conn*.
Selden, Armistead I., Jr., *Ala*.433 Valley Lane, Falls Church, Va.
Sheehan, Timothy P., *Ill*....203 C St. SE.
Shelley, John F., *Calif*.....
Sheppard, Harry R., *Calif*...
Shuford, George A., *N. C*....Calvert-Woodley
Sieminski, Alfred D., *N. J*...
Sikes, Robert L. F., *Fla*.....
Siler, Eugene, *Ky*.....
Simpson, Richard M., *Pa*...5205 Lawn Way, Chevy Chase, Md.
Simpson, Sid, *Ill*.....2100 Mass. Ave.
Sisk, B. F., *Calif*.....
Smith, Frank E., *Miss*.....
Smith, H. Allen, *Calif*.....
Smith, Howard W., *Va*.....204 W. Walnut St., Alexandria, Va.
Smith, Wint, *Kans*.....
Spence, Brent, *Ky*.....Sheraton-Park
Springer, William L., *Ill*....
Staggers, Harley O., *W. Va*..
Stauffer, S. Walter, *Pa*.....
Steed, Tom, *Okla*.....
Sullivan, Leonor K. (Mrs. John B.), *Mo*.
Taber, John, *N. Y*.....
Talle, Henry O., *Iowa*.....4613 Harrison St.
Taylor, Dean P., *N. Y*.....
Teague, Charles M., *Calif*...
Teague, Olin E., *Tex*.....6015 Mass. Ave.
Teller, Ludwig, *N. Y*.....Mayflower Hotel
Tewes, Donald E., *Wis*.....
Thomas, Albert, *Tex*.....2901 34th St.
Thompson, Clark W., *Tex*...Sheraton-Park
Thompson, Frank, Jr., *N. J*..
Thompson, T. A., *La*.....1600 Kenwood Av., Alexandria, Va.
Thomson, E. Keith, *Wyo*....
Thornberry, Homer, *Tex*....
Tollefson, Thor C., *Wash*...
Trimble, James W., *Ark*.....
Tuck, William M., *Va*.....
Udall, Stewart L., *Ariz*.....
Ullman, Al, *Oreg*.....
Utt, James B., *Calif*.....
Vanik, Charles A., *Ohio*.....
Van Pelt, William K., *Wis*...
Van Zandt, James E., *Pa*....Arlington Towers, Arlington, Va.
Vinson, Carl, *Ga*.....4 Primrose St., Chevy Chase, Md.
Vorys, John M., *Ohio*.....2032 Belmont Rd.
Vursell, Charles W., *Ill*....110 Maryland Ave NE.
Wainwright, Stuyvesant, *N. Y*.
Walter, Francis E., *Pa*.....
Watts, John C., *Ky*.....
Weaver, Phil, *Nebr*.....9408 Crosby Rd., Silver Spring, Md.
Westland, Jack, *Wash*.....
Wharton, J. Ernest, *N. Y*....
Whitener, Basil L., *N. C*.....
Whitten, Jamie L., *Miss*....5804 Nebraska Ave.
Widnall, William B., *N. J*...
Wier, Roy W., *Minn*.....
Wigglesworth, Richard B., *Mass*.3257 N St.
Williams, John Bell, *Miss*...1001 [illegible]th Road S., Arlington, Va.
Williams, William R., *N. Y*..1241 Pa. Ave. SE.
Willis, Edwin E., *La*.....
Wilson, Earl, *Ind*.....
Wilson, Robert C. (Bob), *Calif*.
Winstead, Arthur, *Miss*.....
Withrow, Gardner R., *Wis*...
Wolverton, Charles A., *N. J*..1336 HOB
Wright, Jim, *Tex*.....
Yates, Sidney R., *Ill*.....
Young, John, *Tex*.....
Younger, J. Arthur, *Calif*...4545 Conn. Ave.
Zablocki, Clement J., *Wis*...
Zelenko, Herbert, *N. Y*.....

DELEGATES

Bartlett, E. L. (Bob), *Alaska*.1718 33d Pl. SE.
Burns, John A., *Hawaii*.....

RESIDENT COMMISSIONER

Fernós-Isern, A., *P. R*.....2210 R St.

OFFICERS OF THE HOUSE

Clerk—Ralph R. Roberts.
Sergeant at Arms—Zeake W. Johnson, Jr.
Doorkeeper—William M. Miller, 1732 S St. SE.
Chaplain—Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D. D., 1421 Montague St.
Postmaster—H. H. Morris.

OFFICIAL REPORTERS OF DEBATE

SENATE

James W. Murphy, 7 Primrose St., Chevy Chase, Md.
John D. Rhodes, 3535 Williamsburg Lane.
Gregor Macpherson, 3111 44th St.
Herbert N. Budlong, Kurtz Rd., McLean, Va.
Charles J. Drescher, 3738 North 4th St., Arlington, Va.
Francis J. Attig, 3919 Livingston St.
Nicholas J. Cinciotta, 400 Williamsburg Dr., Silver Spring, Md.
Julian R. Serles, Jr., 4225 North 31st St., Arlington, Va.
Elmer L. Koons (assistant), 826 Aspen St.
Willard W. Pruett (clerk), 701 North Harrison St., Arlington, Va.
Placidino Zagami (clerk), 5805 10th Place, Chillum, Md.

HOUSE

W. L. Fenstermacher, 2929 Connecticut Ave.
Roy L. Whitman, 6101 16th St. NW.
F. S. Milberg, 3 Pooks Hill Rd., Bethesda, Md.
E. B. Clark, 604 Bennington Dr., Silver Spring, Md.
Frank E. Battaglia, 957 East-West Highway.
Claude S. Scheckel, 6 East Blackthorne St., Chevy Chase, Md.
Albert [illegible]neider, 5420 Connecticut Ave.
Sidney W. Williston (clerk), 1830 Longford Dr., Hyattsville, Md.
Bjarne J. Sigurdsen (assistant clerk), 1921 U Pl., SE.
James W. Lea (assistant clerk), 5055 Dixon St., Oxon Run Hills, Md.

Appendix

Address Delivered by Hon. Chapman Revercomb, of West Virginia, at Lincoln Memorial Dinner

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. CHAPMAN REVERCOMB

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, February 26, 1958

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the remarks I made at Wheeling, W. Va., on February 8, at the Lincoln memorial dinner held under the auspices of the executive committee and the Republican Women's Committee of Ohio County, W. Va.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

We are assembled here to honor the memory of a great American—a statesman whose wise and courageous leadership transcends political party lines.

We are gathered to pay tribute to the memory of Abraham Lincoln, who belongs to the peoples of all lands, wherever the spark of liberty and human freedom burns in the breasts of men.

In the last tragic moment of Lincoln's life it was said: "Now he belongs to the ages." Therefore, it is proper and fitting that we pay homage to a great leader who has been an inspiration not only to Americans but to all people.

I do not come here this evening to tell you that all is well in the world. It is not. We live in an era when international tensions are great. We live in the most rapidly changing age in history. We live in a period that gives rise to new and pressing problems.

However, let me remind you that we live in an age that presents great challenges—an age that offers mankind great hopes—hopes of peace, hopes of freedom from fear and want.

Lincoln met the problems of his time with courage and resoluteness, with calmness and compassion. If Lincoln were alive today, how would he view the perils and problems that confront the America that he loved?

Looking at the troubled Nation more than 100 years ago, Lincoln observed:

"We live in the midst of alarms; anxiety beclouds the future; we expect some new disaster with each newspaper we read."

He spoke those words in 1856—at a tragic time in history. The very survival of the Nation hung in the balance, and with it the world's greatest hope for liberty and equality.

We know from history that Lincoln did not panic. He spoke no words of bitterness or hatred. He was God fearing, but he was not afraid of the world's threats. His words of calm, clear appraisal rose above the babble of discordant, hysterical voices, and the message he uttered then has real meaning for us today. He said:

"The dogmas of the quiet past are inadequate to the stormy present. The occasion is piled high with difficulty, and we must rise with the occasion. As our case is new, so we must think anew, act anew."

And so Lincoln rode out the storms of his time. The Nation was given that "new breath of freedom" he prayed for so eloquently at the Gettysburg battlefield. With the flame undimmed, Lincoln passed on the torch of liberty and freedom which still inspires and lights the world.

Today we, too, live in the midst of alarms. Scientific discoveries, undreamed of a few years ago, have transformed our lives.

The free world is at grips with a slave world, just as freedom saved slavery in Lincoln's time. The fear of enslavement has become so strong that Russia's launching of the first earth satellite only a few months ago sent many of our people into a state of hysteria and confusion. Indeed, the whole world was apprehensive.

Lincoln never acted like this in the Nation's darkest tragedy. Sorely beset though he was on every hand, he remained calm, firm, clearheaded, and unafraid.

In the circumstances that have confronted this Nation in recent months, we can profit a great deal by one of Lincoln's favorite stories about the man who was riding along a backwoods trail and was caught in a storm.

"He kept plodding ahead until his horse gave out, and then it grew dark. He had only the lightning to show him the trail. The thunder was terrifying, and, when one bolt seemed to crash at his feet, he fell on his knees. 'Oh, Lord,' he prayed, 'if it be all the same to You, give us a little more light and a little less noise.' "

New scientific achievements have been much in the news of late. Russia's launching of the first uncontrolled earth satellite gave rise to fears everywhere.

But when we turn a little less noise and a little more light on sputnik we shall see that there are no reasons for fear and alarm. The Soviet satellite gave Russia a propaganda advantage, for the moment, in the cold war, to be sure. It was a blow to our prestigate and a shock to our complacency.

But tonight, as our own earth satellite orbits the earth, we know that scientific progress in America has not been at a standstill.

We know—and the world knows—that the sum total of this Nation's technological and productive capacity far exceeds that of Russia, and the launching of satellites has not altered America's defense capabilities.

But there are some valuable lessons to be gained from these achievements.

The Russian satellite, launched last October, filled the world with apprehension. The American satellite, on the other hand, has served as a powerful force to allay those fears.

Our Explorer satellite, in my judgment, can be used to mark the turning point in the cold war. The world knows that America will not attack any other Nation, however secure we insist on being. Our immediate objective, then, must be to capture the hearts and minds of men and utilize nuclear power to improve the lot of mankind.

The No. 1 objective of our Government must be to work for conditions that assure not only security, but also peace for us and the world. Some sound course must be found that will bring an end to the armaments race and usher in an era of international understanding. It has been proved time and again that war cannot do this, for out of each war arises a new division in the world.

Peace, then, is our No. 1 objective. And I say to you that the Eisenhower administration is firmly dedicated to that task. The proof of our success to that end may be stated simply: No American boys have died in battle since President Eisenhower was inaugurated.

If a political party—any political party—is to live it must be guided by high principles. It must meet the challenges of the times. It must prove capable of solving new problems as they arise.

Let us examine, then, the other problems we face, the other challenges we must meet.

Here, as I see it, are the other main objectives the National Government must seek to achieve.

1. A modern defense system that will give this Nation maximum security until effective disarmament agreements can be achieved.

2. A free and expanding economy—an economy capable of supporting our defense needs and at the same time providing for an ever-increasing standard of living for all Americans.

3. Freedom of the individual—freedom for his choice of religion, for his choice of occupation, and in his pursuit of happiness. For I need not remind you that it is this principle of individual freedom that has made this Nation the leader of the free world.

4. Equality of rights—a principle on which the Republican Party was founded, and which it has pursued throughout the years.

5. Government assistance in those areas where the people cannot help themselves. This applies to the aged, the infirm, the handicapped. We must never forget that the Government has a responsibility to care for those who cannot care for themselves.

Let us examine briefly the record of the Eisenhower administration and see just how these objectives are being met.

On the question of defense, the Nation is militarily strong—and it is growing stronger every day. The Soviet satellite has by no means canceled out our strategic air force, which will remain the greatest deterrent to attack for a long time to come. It has not canceled out our powerful fleet armed with a wide variety of missiles carrying nuclear weapons.

If attacked by any aggressor nation, we are in position to strike back from land, by sea, in the air, from all directions of the compass, and with overwhelming force.

Let me emphasize, however, that our strength is not in armaments alone.

Lincoln wisely knew that there was much more to national defense than military installations. In this regard, he said:

"The bulwark of our liberty and independence is not our frowning battlements, our bristling seacoasts. Our reliance is in the love of liberty which God has planted in us. Our defense is in the spirit which prizes liberty as the heritage of all men, in all lands, everywhere."

And we can all be thankful that President Eisenhower is equally dedicated to this high principle. In his state of the Union message, the President said:

"The world thinks of us as a country which is strong, but which will never start a war. The world also thinks of us as a land which has never enslaved anyone and which

is animated by humane ideals. This friendship, based on common ideals, is one of our greatest sources of strength."

Ladies and gentlemen, the Republican Party is dedicated to that objective. We have preserved peace for the last 5 years. And our goal now is and always must be to seek conditions in the world that will free people everywhere of the fears and horrors of living in an armed camp.

As for meeting the new problems unfolding in this great industrial age, a look at the record of the past 5 years reveals many remarkable accomplishments.

It is a record of a prosperous Nation with new high levels of employment, rising income, and increasing purchasing power.

It is a record of more jobs, better incomes, more homes, more leisure, and more recreation.

It is a record of increased productive capacity.

It is a record of renewed confidence by the people that the American way of life will be preserved.

When the Eisenhower administration took office in 1953, there was a proposed budget expenditure of nearly $78 billion for 1954.

There was a deficit of nearly $9½ billion for 1953, and a planned deficit of nearly $10 billion for 1954.

Continuing inflation had reduced the purchasing power of the dollar to 52 cents.

That is what the Eisenhower administration inherited. What did we do?

First we reduced and then entirely eliminated deficit spending. Fiscal year 1955 was the last year of deficits. Since then we have balanced the budget and retired some of the public debt.

At the same time, the American people were given a tax reduction, the largest in history, that has already saved our people nearly $25 billion in taxes.

The record of this administration's domestic policies reveals that more people own their own homes today than ever before. There are now nearly 30 million home-owners in America—an increase of 13 percent in only 4 years.

The largest industrial expansion in history has taken place. Business and industry have spent an all-time high of over $152 billion in new plants and equipment compared to $123 billion in the preceding 4 years.

The gross national product rose to an all-time high of $439 billion in 1957.

Personal income last year jumped to an annual rate of approximately $346 billion—another all-time record.

Last year an average of 65 million of our people were gainfully employed—an increase of 3,700,000 in only 4 years.

Average weekly earnings of factory workers are at a record high, with the average weekly pay now $83.20. In 1952, the average weekly pay was $69.23.

Trade unions have the largest membership in history, 18,477,190. Less time has been lost by strikes than at any period in the last decade.

Ladies and gentlemen, these are facts—and they will not be drowned out by the gloom and doom critics who would have us believe that America is woefully weak militarily and ready to collapse economically.

A business decline set in late last year, it is true—and there is no reason to ignore it. I am convinced, however, that this decline will be short lived. The same thing is happening now that happened in 1948 and again in 1953. We are in a period of readjustment, resulting from the vast expansion of the Nation's productive capacity. Most economists are predicting a business upturn by midyear, followed by a period of long, steady growth of the economy as American industry prepares to meet the needs of a growing Nation, increasing in population at the rate of over 3 million a year.

I say to you that the Republican Party is prepared to meet the challenges of this age. It is prepared to meet the problems of our times.

I do this, however, we must ourselves stand united. We must not allow minor difference of programs or policies to blind us to the great principles on which we are agreed and which are vital to the welfare of our State and Nation.

Not since Lincoln's time has the Republican Party faced a greater challenge, or a greater opportunity. We can meet that challenge if we carry home to the people the principles we espouse, and if we are prepared to make the same fight for those principles that Abraham Lincoln did.

Collective Security—Address by Hon. H. Alexander Smith, of New Jersey, Before Woodrow Wilson School of Public and International Affairs, Princeton University

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLIFFORD P. CASE

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, February 26, 1958

Mr. CASE of New Jersey. Mr. President, my senior colleague from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH], made a significant address before the Woodrow Wilson School of Public and International Affairs, Princeton, N. J., on February 24.

The senior Senator from New Jersey has made a thoughtful presentation of the nature of many world problems and the interreliance and interdependence of the free world in furthering the cause of freedom in the face of these obstacles. I know that it will be of great interest to my colleagues and to the country at large. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

COLLECTIVE SECURITY

(Address of Senator H. ALEXANDER SMITH, Woodrow Wilson School of Public and International Affairs, Princeton University, Princeton, February 24, 1958)

I am highly appreciative of the honor you do me in asking me to address you today. My subject is collective security, and certainly no more appropriate subject, in my judgment, could have been found for an audience in this distinguished school which takes it name after the father of the concept of collective security in American foreign policy.

And I would like to add a very personal note. When I was an undergraduate in Princeton some years ago, Woodrow Wilson was our favorite professor. This was by vote of many successive graduating classes. He was the inspiration to many of us to study law—especially constitutional law, and to feel the urge of public service. I recall well when Wilson made his speech, famous to all Princetonians—Princeton in the Nation's service. Princeton can well point with pride to our participation in World Wars I and II, and more recently to the post-war period—1945 to today. This record reflects the impact of Woodrow Wilson on the youth of America.

I

Early steps

The idea of collective security did not, of course, originate with Woodrow Wilson. But it was Wilson who first attempted to make it a cardinal point of American foreign policy. If he had succeeded, we would today live in a far different world.

In his last public words, spoken to a group of people gathered outside his house on Armistice Day 1923, Wilson delivered a reaffirmation of faith, tinged with bitterness. He said:

"I cannot refrain from saying it: I am not one of those who have the least anxiety about the triumph of the principles I have stood for. * * * That we shall prevail is as sure as that God reigns."

It took a Second World War, even ghastlier than the first, plus the evolution of the threat from Moscow—the seeds of which were laid during Wilson's administration—to convince the American people of the rightness of Wilson's position. Yet even now, I am not entirely sure, and the doubt is a little frightening, that we have fully learned the lessons of the intervening years.

II

The United Nations

A quarter century after the Senate turned down American participation in the League of Nations, it approved, by a vote of 89 to 2, American membership in the United Nations.

I was elected to the Senate in the fall of 1944; 1945 was my first full year. That year saw V–E Day and V–J Day and the setting up of the United Nations. The proudest moment of my early Senate career was my participataion in approval of membership in the U. N.

The U. N. has since surmounted the frustrations of repeated Soviet abuse of the veto power in the Security Council. Despite its handicaps, the U. N. has become an important force for peace and justice. This in itself is significant and is indicative of the tremendous urge throughout the world to make the U. N. work. If this urge had not existed, if the overwhelming preponderance of the world's people had not been determined that the U. N. must work, there is little doubt that it would long since have gone the lamented way of the League of Nations.

Another thrilling and inspiring experience that I personally enjoyed 8 years after my vote for the U. N., was my membership in the United States Delegation to the Assembly in the fall of 1954.

Far from withering away in impotence, the U. N. has done much to implement the principle of collective security. As examples, one need only cite its armed resistance to aggression in Korea and its intervention in Suez. The U. N. emergency force still helps to keep the peace in the Middle East and is the forerunner, I hope, of a permanent international police force.

III

Soviet obstruction

The U. N. can never be fully effective, of course, so long as one of its most powerful members shows such utter disregard and even contempt for its principles. The United States, therefore, has been forced to take additional measures in the interests of its own security. These additional measures, it needs to be emphasized, are supplementary to the U. N. and in no way conflict with the U. N. Charter. In fact, so far as these measures involve regional collective arrangements for defense, they are specifically contemplated by article 51 of the charter.

Now, for our purposes of discussion today, we may say—I hope without too much oversimplification—that our world, like Caesar's Gaul, is divided into three parts:

1. The Soviet bloc.
2. The 42 countries which are allied with the United States in formal collective defense treaties.
3. The remaining countries and territories which are neither dominated by the Soviet Union nor allied with the United States.

IV

Collective security alliances

I want to talk today particularly about these last two categories—our allies and the neutrals—about how they fit into a policy based on the principle of collective security, and about the relationship of our mutual security program to this policy.

First, let us consider the countries which are formally allied with us. In these days when it is popular to reexamine our position in the world, it is well to spend a moment in reexamining these alliances and asking again the old but always pertinent question, Do they serve our national interests?

These alliances are based on the simple, often repeated, and—I hope—well understood premise that we cannot live alone, whether we like it or not. I am sure this audience understands that, and I am not going to bore you with a tedious repetition of all the facts which underlie it. I do, however, want to emphasize just two points which seem to me to be of controlling significance:

First, Western Europe, with which we are allied through NATO, is the biggest repository of industrial capacity and technical and scientific skills outside the United States and the Soviet Union. At the time NATO was organized in 1949, it was argued that if Western Europe fell under Soviet domination, the Soviets would be raised to a par with the United States in the matter of industrial capacity and technical and scientific skills. Such has been the remarkable economic growth in both the Soviet Union and Western Europe in the meantime, that today it can be said that if Western Europe fell under Soviet domination, the Soviets would surpass the United States in these fields. To take a single key statistic, the production of steel in 1957 in the United States was 113,200,000 tons, in the other NATO countries it was 94,600,000 tons, and in the Soviet Union it was 56 million tons. Thus, NATO, including the United States, has a preponderance of 207,800,000 tons to 56 million tons. But if NATO production is subtracted from the United States and added to the Soviet Union, the advantage shifts to the Soviets: 150,600,000 tons to 113,200,000 tons. A policy of collective security as embodied in NATO has, therefore, become of increased importance to the United States. Nor is there any reason to expect this trend to be reversed; on the contrary, there is every reason to expect it to move even faster.

Second, southeast Asia and Latin America, with which we are allied through SEATO and the Rio Treaty, comprise two of the principal sources of the strategic and critical raw materials without which American industry could not operate a single day. We may be sure that our dependence on foreign sources of raw materials will continue to increase.

On both these counts, then, our alliances become more and more important to us, and it becomes less and less possible to imagine a world in which we stand alone.

Now, if we are to have alliances—and it is clear that there is no practical alternative—then it follows that it is in our interest that those alliances be strong. Therefore, as a part of our mutual security program, we supply military assistance to strengthen the armed forces of our allies, and we supply defense support assistance to strengthen the economic capability of our allies to maintain armed forces.

The preponderance of both military assistance and defense support goes to such countries as Korea, Taiwan, Vietnam, Pakistan, and Turkey. It is obvious that such countries could not begin, with their own resources, to maintain the defense forces which are necessary. We are faced, then, with three possible courses of action:

1. We can abandon our alliances and let our erstwhile allies get along as best they can by themselves. I have already given some reasons, and I am sure you can think of others, why this course would be disastrous.

2. We can undertake to do it all ourselves. This would be incredibly and unbearably expensive, in terms of manpower, money, and natural resources. It costs from 10 to 20 times as much to maintain an American soldier overseas as it costs to maintain a Turk or a Korean. This course likewise has political disadvantages abroad. One of the important political advantages of a policy of collective security is its collectiveness, its mutuality, the sense of working together as equals which it gives Americans, Turks, Koreans, and all the others. That would be lost if we tried to defend other people instead of helping them defend themselves.

3. We can do what we have been doing—that is, supply our allies with the critical margins of military and defense support assistance without which they could not maintain their present levels of military effort. This is the middle course between doing nothing, which would be fatal, and trying to do everything, which would be futile. It makes good sense to me, and I hope it makes good sense to you, too.

V

The neutral or uncommitted countries

Let us look now at the neutral or uncommitted countries. To begin with, let me say that I do not equate neutralism with procommunism, nor do I demand that countries stand up and be counted as for us or against us. I see a vast difference in a world with a neutral India, for example, and a world with a Communist India. Countries such as India and others which follow a policy of neutralism are only doing what their national interest, as they see it, dictates. It is well to recall, in this connection, that we Americans ourselves were neutral for as long as we could get away with it. It is also appropriate to recall the scriptural dictum that "he that is not against us is for us."

The fact that a country such as India chooses not to sign formal alliances does not, in my judgment, diminish the importance of India to the security of the United States. If India is threatened, we are threatened, and that is the essence of the concept of collective security.

In the case of countries in this category, however, a policy based on this concept cannot be implemented through military assistance and alliances. Sometimes, as in the case of the Eisenhower doctrine for the Middle East, it can be implemented—with the consent of the countries concerned—through a unilateral declaration on our part. More frequently, it can be implemented in major part only through assistance to the people of India and similar countries in creating the internal conditions that will enable the people to maintain their freedom, independence, and self-determination. This is the function of that aspect of our mutual-security program which deals with economic development loans and with technical assistance.

I would not for one minute downgrade the importance of our military-oriented programs, the results which they have achieved, or the importance of continuing them at a high level. But I do believe that the purely economic programs are assuming increased importance and that this trend is likely to continue.

In part, the reason for this is precisely that the military programs have been successful. As overt Communist aggression has been blocked in Europe and in the Far East, the expansive forces of international communism have looked for softer spots to probe and have been directed more and more to the uncommitted nations of Asia and Africa. And as the locale has shifted, so have the Communist tactics. A velvet glove has been drawn over the iron fist. The voice which once thundered threats of imminent ruin—and which occasionally still does when it talks to Europe—now addresses Asia and Africa in the dulcet notes of a cooing dove.

As a result of our firm stand through alliances such as NATO and through joint executive-legislative policy statements such as the Eisenhower doctrine, I am reasonably confident that we will not soon again be confronted with overt aggression from the Soviet bloc. But I am even more confident that the free world will be confronted for a long time to come with penetration, subversion, and threatened coups d'etat. This threat is more subtle, more complex, and in many ways more difficult to meet than the open military threat.

But it can be met, and our allies can help us meet it. Indeed, they have as big a stake in the matter as we do. The United States is expected to take the lead, and certainly the United States has more resources available to throw into the battle, but it is a great mistake to think of the battle as a peculiarly American one.

It may well be said that our military aid is the negative and defensive side of our mutual-security program, while the economic development loans and technical assistance are the positive and constructive side.

Here is another place where allies and a policy of collective security can pay dividends. The objective is to keep the neutral countries neutral—that is, to keep them out of the Soviet bloc—and the attainment of this objective is as important to our allies in NATO as it is to us. In fact, because of Western Europe's dependence on Middle Eastern oil supplies, it can be said that the security of the Middle East is of even greater immediate importance to Europe that it is to the United States.

VI

Multilateral activities in less developed countries

It strikes me that more could be done through existing international organizations to multilateralize the free world's approach to the problems of these areas. Much, of course, is being done already. Through the Colombo plan, the more developed countries of the Commonwealth plus Japan and the United States are aiding the less developed countries of South Asia. The United Nations has done much good work through its technical assistance program, and we can expect even more as a result of the action of the General Assembly last fall in making possible a threefold expansion in that program, up to a total of $100 million. The International Bank for Reconstruction and Development has made a substantial contribution, and the International Finance Corporation holds great promise. Some of the European countries are carrying on small programs of their own, as, for example, the Norwegian fisheries project in India.

Several interesting suggestions have recently been made toward broadening the activities of European nations in regard to economic development in Asia and Africa. Most of the plans so far proposed are variants of a suggestion for a NATO technical assistance and economic development program. NATO still has a good many problems of its own in Europe, and I am not sure that NATO, as such, is ready for elaborate economic activities in Asia and Africa. Maybe it would be better to start with a

few bilateral programs, coordinated perhaps through the North Atlantic Council or the Organization for European Economic Cooperation. The Germans and Italians are particularly interested in these possibilities and have a particular contribution to make, resulting from their own prosperity (especially in the case of Germany) and from their lack of recent colonial background.

Such programs would not only make a positive contribution to the problems all of us face in Asia and Africa; they would also result in a clearer recognition of the fact of increasing interdependence in the world. So long as any nation is insecure—tiny Jordan or enormous India—no nation is secure.

Programs of the kind I am talking about would also afford another important advantage in the skilled technicians which they would make available. It is significant that in the Soviet economic offensive in underdeveloped areas, various countries of the Soviet bloc participate according to their peculiar talents or resources. Thus Czech technicians might be used in one country, East German equipment in another, and Russians in a third. It seems to me that it would be useful if the West could pool its resources in something of the same manner, so that we might have Americans here, Germans there, French, or Italians, or British somewhere else.

VII

Interdependence and the free world

Now, although economic assistance, through the mutual-security program, through the U. N., or through other cooperative ventures of our allies, is an indispensable part of our policy of collective security, it is by no means the only thing we can or should do to strengthen the free world. Our foreign-trade policy has an important bearing on the general economic strength of our allies. Like many slogans, "trade, no aid" is of something less than universal application. It is difficult to envisage a world in which the foreign trade of, say, Korea or Vietnam had grown to the point to make possible the suspension of American aid. But it is, nevertheless, true that to the extent that world trade is expanded and particularly to the extent that other countries can earn more dollars through access to the American market, less outright aid will be required from the United States.

This is one reason why it is so important that Congress act favorably upon President Eisenhower's request for a 5-year extension of the Reciprocal Trade Act. But it is not the only reason. Although greater world trade has the effect of strengthening our allies and this in turn is good for us, greater world trade is also, on balance, of direct benefit to the United States. It not only creates new export markets for our farms and factories, it also provides more goods for our consumers.

Another thing we can do to strengthen our alliances is in the political field of recognizing and promoting the sense of mutuality of purpose as between ourselves and our allies. In all of our alliances, we are looked to for leadership to a degree which is quite striking, and we should meet the responsibility which history has thrust upon us. But we should remember that it is leadership which is expected of us—not dictatorship. We cannot tell other people what to do and expect them to do it; nor can we go off on unilateral adventures of our own and expect them to follow.

The way to avoid these pitfalls is through constant, close consultation with our allies. I think our record on this score is pretty good, especially in the North Atlantic Council of NATO, where there has been more real consultation, not only on our part but also on the part of the other members, in the last 12 months than for a long time previous. The record, as I say, is pretty good, but this is something which needs to be worked at every day. It is all a part of this age of interdependence.

After 40 years, one cannot yet say that we have achieved Wilson's goal of making the world safe for democracy. It may well take another 40 years. However, like Wilson, I have not the least anxiety about the triumph of the principles that he stood for then and that President Eisenhower and Secretary Dulles stand for now.

I think the American people are coming increasingly to understand this, and further to understand what is required of them in the form of short-term sacrifices for the sake of long-term gains.

VIII

Conclusions

This, then, might be described as a program of interdependence for the free world.

But while we strengthen our alliances, and while we help the uncommitted nations maintain their independence, we must also recognize that, over the long run, we must come to some kind of understanding with the misguided Russian people themselves. We must seek to replace international distrust with international confidence. I do not have time to explore this intricate problem in detail, but I do want to make particular mention of one bit of recent progress which is extremely encouraging and which I think will prove to be of increasing significance. This is the Lacy-Zaroubin agreement for increased cultural exchanges between the United States and the U. S. S. R. This agreement represents a new experimental approach in United States-Soviet relations and is important on two counts. First, it indicates that private conversations on the ambassadorial level can indeed make progress and bear fruit. At this time, these quiet lower level talks offer more promise than would a summit meeting held in the glare of worldwide publicity. Second, I can hardly overemphasize the importance of the exchange program provided for by the agreement. The exchange of persons is the best—maybe it is the only—way in which the American people and the Russian people can get to know and understand each other better. And that kind of knowledge and understanding must underlie any long-term accommodation between our two countries. This sort of accommodation may be far in the future, and in the meantime we must continue our other programs to build free-world strength.

For myself, I must confess that the more I reexamine these foreign-policy questions in the light of sputnik, which seems to be the cause of most of our soul-searching, the more I am forced to the conclusion that sputnik does not require us to do anything which we ought not to have done anyway. Sputnik does increase the urgency with which we should do it, but that is a matter of degree and not of basic policy. We must continue to steer our course between panic, on the one hand, and complacency on the other.

If we meet the problems head on, we will solve them. And in doing so, we will bring about the kind of world that Wilson dreamed of and that Eisenhower is striivng for.

In his state of the Union address, President Eisenhower concluded: "I am fully confident that the response of the Congress and of the American people will make this time of test a time of honor. Mankind then will see more clearly than ever that the future belongs, not to the concept of the regimented atheistic state, but to the people—the God-fearing, peace-loving people of the world."

In these few words, it seems to me, are summed up both the opportunity and the responsibiliy which we face.

Oregon Beef Candy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD L. NEUBERGER

OF OREGON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, February 26, 1958

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, on February 25 it was my privilege to serve as senatorial sponsor for the distribution of beef candy from Oregon to the tables in the Senate dining room, and to Members of the Senate at their offices. Many compliments have been received from my colleagues regarding this delicacy from the great Pacific Northwest.

Beef candy is the result of a process developed by Mr. and Mrs. Ed Coles, of Prineville, Oreg., on the high grazing plateau of the central portion of our lovely State. Dehydrated beef is the base for a delicious and nutritious sweetmeat.

Actual presentation of the beef candy from Oregon was under the personal auspices of some of my guests from Oregon: Mrs. David Campbell, of Bly; Mrs. Frank Obenchain, of Bly; Mrs. Henry C. Gerber, of Klamath Falls; Mrs. Julian Arrien, of Vale, and Miss Margaret Gerber, of Klamath Falls. They and their families were likewise my guests at luncheon in the Senate dining room.

Because many Senators have asked me about the actual ingredients and preparation of our beef candy, I ask unanimous consent that a statement from my office, dated February 25, 1958, be included in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Senators were treated to sweetmeats today when the Oregon Cow-Belles, auxiliary of the Oregon Cattlemen's Association, distributed high-protein beef candy on Capitol Hill.

Senator RICHARD L. NEUBERGER, of Oregon, arranged for the Cow-Belles to distribute the confection in Senate dining rooms as a means of publicizing a new potential market for beef products. The distribution was handled by Mrs. Dave Campbell, Bly, Oreg., president of the Cow-Belle delegation; Mrs. Frank Obenchain; Mrs. Henry C. Gerber, Klamath Falls; Mrs. Julian Arrien, Vale; Margaret Gerber, also of Klamath Falls. The Cow-Belles were accompanied by their husbands.

Mrs. Campbell disclosed that the beef candy was the result of a process developed by Mr. and Mrs. Ed Coles, of Prineville. The process combined dehydrated beef with sweets. Fresh beef contains approximately 17 percent protein and 60 to 65 percent moisture. By removing the moisture from the fresh beef, the resulting dehydrated beef as used in this candy contains approximately 56 percent protein, or about 3 times as much protein as in fresh beef. This candy contains 25 percent dehydrated beef, which makes an ounce of the product the approximate equivalent animal protein of three-fourths of an ounce of fresh beef. The high animal protein content of this candy not only assures quick but also lasting energy.

Before arrival of the Cow-Belles, Senator NEUBERGER had urged the Department of the Army to study inclusion of the high-protein product in military rations. The Army reported that the Quartermaster Corps tech-

nologists were familiar with this product and have in fact made some suggestions to the manufacturers on ingredients and formulations for its improvement and have tested some of the sample products.

The Oregon Senator was informed that Army food experts would follow development of the candy so that prompt application can be made if the need should arise.

Organ Recital by Jerald Hamilton

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. W. FULBRIGHT
OF ARKANSAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, February 26, 1958

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a criticism of Mr. Jerald Hamilton's performance in the Washington Cathedral.

Mr. Hamilton is a young organist from Kansas who received a Fulbright scholarship in 1954 to study in Paris. His success is but another evidence of the effectiveness of this program in offering opportunities to our young people as well as improving our relations wtih foreign countries.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Evening Star of February 3, 1958]

NEWS OF MUSIC—ORGANIST IS FETED

Talented young organist Jerald Hamilton was honored at a reception yesterday afternoon following his concert at the Washington Cathedral.

The reception was given at St. Alban's parish house, by the District of Columbia Branch of the National League of American Pen Women, which also sponsored the concert.

Mr. Hamilton is assistant professor of organ and theory at Washburn University in Topeka, Kans., and also is organist for Grace Cathedral in that city. He was a Fulbright scholar in 1954 and 1955 and studied under Andre Marchal in Paris.

A reception committee assisted Mrs. John Hobart Wallace, branch president.

HAMILTON IMPRESSIVE ON CATHEDRAL ORGAN

(By Irving Lowens, contributing critic)

Jerald Hamilton, organ, Washington Cathedral program: Prelude and fugue in E flat, Bach; Noel Etranger, d'Aquin; variations on My Young Life Hath an End, Sweelinck; chorale prelude, Deck Thyself, My Soul, With Gladness, Brahms; chorale prelude, Blessed Are Ye Faithful Souls Departed, Brahms; God Among Us, Messiaen.

Heard yesterday at the customary first-Sunday-of-the-month organ recital at the Washington Cathedral was an exceptionally impressive young artist, Jerald Hamilton, organist and choirmaster at Grace Cathedral in Topeka, Kans.

Mr. Hamilton's program, while not especially daring, was a musically solid one which was more than sufficient to test his mettle as both interpreter and virtuoso.

The largest work offered was the Bach E-flat prelude and and fugue usually nicknamed the St. Anne because of the resemblance of the first fugue subject to the familiar hymn tune of that name. This is a piece of blazing inspiration and uncommon grandeur, qualities which are all too often lost sight of as the ordinary organist scrambles after the notes.

Technical difficulties were nonexistent for Mr. Hamilton, however, and he succeeded in projecting the masterwork in the same spirit of luminous power in which it must have been conceived.

Mr. Hamilton followed the Bach with excellent readings of slighter works by d'Aquin, Sweelinck, and Brahms and closed his recital with one of those mystifying cryptic pieces by Olivier Messiaen—this one called God Among Us—which for some reason beyond this reviewer seem to enchant organists and organ buffs.

The Messiaen was, truth to tell, an overpowering affair, and Mr. Hamilton drove its hysterical utterances with considerable authority, but I'll take Bach (or even Sweelinck) any time.

The recital was sponsored by the District of Columbia Branch, National League of American Pen Women.

The Definition of a Bribe

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM E. PROXMIRE
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, February 26, 1958

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, the Capital Times in Madison, in its usual hard-hitting fashion, has called attention in a recent editorial to the tendency on the part of Washington officials to forget the importance of conforming to standards of absolute honesty.

The Capital Times says it is just about time that we recognize exactly what a bribe is. In a vigorous editorial on Monday, February 24, it speaks out on this subject.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that this editorial be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WHAT HAPPENED TO WORD "BRIBE"? WHY HAS IT BEEN BURIED?

"A price, gift, or favor bestowed or promised in order to pervert or corrupt a person in a position of trust, as an official."

The above definition of a bribe is one that can be found in any standard dictionary.

It is a good time to remind ourselves what the word "bribe" means. We seem to have lost the use of this word.

There was a time when the word was used to describe some of the things going on in Washington today. But the word has been lost. The Madison Avenue hucksters have coined new words to describe what is going on today.

What this country needs, if it is going to clean up the mess in Washington and generally restore some decent standards of public morality, is to begin calling a spade a spade.

We need to rediscover some of our good, forceful old words which have been buried. One of these is the word "bribery."

Salute to the Czech People

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
Hon. EVERETT McKINLEY DIRKSEN
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, February 26, 1958

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, a statement entitled "Salute to the Czech People."

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SALUTE TO THE CZECH PEOPLE

Towering over the Moldava in the once Golden City of Prague in Czechoslovakia stands a concrete statue of Josef Stalin. It is 120 feet high.

It is perhaps the largest monument to human slavery, oppression and dictatorship, ever erected by human hands. It is an impressive and ever present reminder of an arrogant, aggressive tyranny which has liquidated freedom wherever it has spread and which has extinguished the hopes of hundreds of millions of human beings who have become enmeshed in this poisonous web.

Only 10 short years ago, Czechoslovakia became the victim of this conspiratorial tyranny. Through treachery at home and the aid of Red Communist forces, directed from Moscow, the lamp of liberty and independence was snuffed out for a happy, liberty-loving people.

After the forces, which were generated in the crucible of World War I had tumbled so many monarchial despotisms in Europe, the brave young state of Czechoslovakia which had been established as a democracy, struggled ever so valiantly to preserve its newly won independence and make a truly positive contribution to stability and world peace.

Then came the Nazi wave to strangle that independence and place the iron heel of despotism upon the Czech people. At the end of World War II, the Republic of Czechoslovakia was restored, and a government which was administered by a coalition of independent political parties was established.

But the Communist cancer was at work. Slowly, silently, and relentlessly this destructive force operated through the police force, the Security Corps, and the Ministries of Finance and Agriculture.

In February of 1948—10 years ago this month—the new republic had been so weakened that the subversive Communist forces within and without compelled the surrender of the democratic elements in the republic and a new government under Communist domination was established. Every instrument for the safeguarding of individual rights—the press, the schools, the courts, the Parliament—were purged and became organs for totalitarian control. Thus was another bastion of liberty liquidated.

The loss was not quite total. The tragedy of Czechoslovakia awakened a prudent fear in the free world. Three months later, in May of 1948, Britain, France, Italy, Belgium, Holland, and Luxembourg signed a mutual-assistance pact for collective defense against Communist encroachment. Less than a year later, the North Atlantic Treaty Organization came into being, with the United States as a member.

Monstrous as the tregady of Czechoslovakia was, it generated a vigilance among free nations and a sense of concern in free men that must and will express itself in the

form of eternal hostility toward this brutal and degrading concept of communism. And there can be no easy conscience in the citadels of free men until at long last the thralldom of the Czech people has been ended and their right of self-determination and freedom has been restored.

On this the 10th anniversary of the blackout of Czech independence, let us salute the Czech people both here and in their ancestral home for the resolute and sacrificial struggle which they are waging in the noble cause of human freedom.

Need for Navaho Dam in New Mexico

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DENNIS CHAVEZ
OF NEW MEXICO
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, February 26, 1958

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that an editorial which appeared in the Albuquerque Journal of Sunday, February 23, 1958, entitled "Folly of Dam Delay," which has to do with reclamation and employment, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FOLLY OF DAM DELAY

With the Eisenhower administration planning public works projects to take up the employment slump, congressional pressure is building up to get the administration's slowdown order on reclamation projects relaxed.

Vital to New Mexico is obtaining $1.8 million appropriated by Congress for work on the Navaho Dam, an integral part of the Colorado River project. This money was diverted to the Flaming Gorge project by the Budget Bureau under the President's order against starting new projects as an economy measure.

Since that time, however, has come the so-called recession and the planning of new work projects, some of which, as in the instance of construction of new postoffice buildings and renovating of others, would, though desirable, contribute nothing to the development of the Nation's resources as in the case of the Colorado River projects.

No longer can economy be called an excuse for any delay on the Navaho project; no longer can those in the executive branch, or the Budget Bureau defend their position when there is an urge to provide jobs for the unemployed. Especially when a crew of engineers is on the ground, homes and offices have been provided for them, and they are prepared to start the Navaho construction. Otherwise, they will have to be transferred and a costly delay ensue.

It would also mean a delay on the Navaho reclamation project for which the Navaho Reservoir would furnish the water. This project would provide for the irrigation of 110,000 acres of Navaho wasteland, and contribute to the economy of Indians, the State, and the Nation.

The Navaho Reservoir is also the key to the San Juan-Chama diversion project which would divert the surplus water to the Rio Grande for the benefit of Albuquerque, and the existing irrigation projects on the Rio Grande.

When all these things are taken into consideration, it is utterly ridiculous to retain the slowdown order on Colorado River projects which the administration recommended and was given a great share of credit in passage by Congress.

More credit would be forthcoming in pushing these projects toward completion in the present unemployment emergency, and thus speeding up development of our water resources by permanent works that would contribute to the economy of the West.

We were surprised during the visit of Republican Minority Leader MARTIN here to address a Lincoln Day dinner when he said he had never heard of the Navaho Dam. But the executive department and the Budget Bureau have. And MARTIN and the others will hear more of it as pressure comes in Congress for rescinding of the slow order on reclamation projects. It's time for the executive department to back out gracefully from the economy order on approved reclamation projects.

River Tolls?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN SHERMAN COOPER
OF KENTUCKY
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, February 26, 1958

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that an editorial entitled "River Tolls?" appearing in the February 3 edition of the Cincinnati (Ohio) Enquirer be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD. This editorial opposes the suggestions which have been made that charges be imposed upon the use of our Nation's waterways.

I am sure that there will be discussion of this matter later, in the appropriate committees, and perhaps in the Senate itself. I did want to submit the editorial for the RECORD, and indicate the concern in Kentucky and Ohio—in fact, the concern in the entire Ohio Valley region—over the proposal.

I recall the early, and continuing, interest of the Cincinnati Enquirer and of its editor, Mr. Glen Thompson, who was at one time its representative in Washington and who was instrumental in bringing about the construction of new locks and dams in the Ohio River Valley, which have meant so much to the development of that area.

I support the purpose of the editorial, which opposes the imposition of charges for the use of our Nation's waterways.

I am quite aware of the plight in which the railroads find themselves. I hope legislation will be enacted which will give relief to our railroads. At the same time, I do not want to see burdens placed upon another great form of transportation, namely, river transportation.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RIVER TOLLS?

Although Congress at this session may hear some further argument for imposition of user charges—tolls—on river freight, the case for such a basic change probably is weaker even than when river tolls first were proposed several years ago.

A very large part of the total barge trade on the Ohio-Mississippi system, for example, is in fuels, both coal and petroleum. Neither is mainly competitive with rail movement. If tolls made it uneconomic to haul crude petroleum from the Gulf to points on the Ohio, most of that petroleum probably would be moved by pipeline, or in some cases by ocean tanker and pipeline, not by rail.

In the case of West Virginia and Kentucky coal, the very large increase in its use results from establishment of great steam powerplants along the Ohio. And, with modern methods of delivering electric power several hundreds of miles at high voltage with little loss, the tendency is to move generating stations back toward the coal mines, not toward consuming centers. So, if river tolls made the barging of coal uneconomic, the trade would not go mainly to railroads. The powerplants would be built, increasingly, at the coal mines.

In any case, it is not good public policy to change the rules in the middle of the game. Many great industries, such as steel, aluminum, and oil refining, have been established along the Ohio in order to take full advantage of the economics and convenience of barge freighting. It would be inequitable to impose toll charges that in many cases would increase transport costs by 25 to 50 percent.

The steel industry traditionally has been concentrated in the area between Pittsburgh and Chicago, and between the Ohio and the Great Lakes. In recent years, it has spread to the east coast and the west coast, especially as overseas sources of iron ore have been opened up. If the movement of ore and coal on our inland waterways were subjected to tolls, we might see this migration of the steel industry to the two seaboards greatly accelerated. That would be a paralyzing blow to the now thriving economy of the Ohio Valley and Great Lakes region.

General Electric Co. Abandonment of Fair Trade

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM E. PROXMIRE
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, February 26, 1958

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, this morning's New York Times reported that the General Electric Co. will abandon its leadership of fair trade. The impact of this decision on small business in Wisconsin and throughout America can hardly be overestimated. I invite the attention of Senators to the New York Times article analyzing the consequences of this decision by General Electric, particularly the necessity for national legislation in behalf of small business.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that this article be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A JOLT TO FAIR TRADE—AN ANALYSIS OF WHERE THE PRACTICE STANDS, NOW THAT GENERAL ELECTRIC HAS QUIT IT

(By Alfred R. Zipser)

Consternation will strike fair-trading businessmen today when they learn that their most powerful ally has deserted to the free-pricing camp.

Abandonment of the principle by the General Electric Co. may make many feel that time is running out for fair trade. This is the system, backed by laws in 32 States, that permits manufacturers to fix and enforce minimum legal retail prices on their products.

General Electric's defection follows a number of fair-trade defeats in State courts in the last few years. Advocates of the principle feel that effective State administration is doubtful and are pressing for a national fair-trade law. Such a Federal statute has been prepared by the National Association of Retail Druggists and was recently introduced in the House of Representatives by OREN D. HARRIS, Democrat, of Arkansas.

The bill, an amendment to the Federal Trade Commission Act, would charge the Commission with enforcing fair-trade prices. Under it, manufacturers anywhere in this country or its Territorial possessions, could stop price cutters and collect damages from them.

With General Electric gone, the ranks of the fair traders still include makers of drugs and cosmetics, hardware, and tobacco, among others. If the Sunbeam Corp., General Electric's big rival in the small-appliance field and another stanch fair trader, shifts to free pricing, a speedy end to all fair trading of these products is almost certain.

DEPRESSION MEASURE

Fair trade was born in the depression of the thirties, although many manufacturers had gone into court long before that to enforce retail prices on their products. During the slump, the Millard Tydings Act was passed. This exempted manufacturers from the antitrust laws with regard to retail price fixing where State laws permitted it.

Most States passed legislation setting floors on store prices. This was done to protect small-business men, thousands of whom were going out of business at the time, from cut-price competition from giant retailers with superior buying power and ability to take losses on some goods.

Vermont, Texas, Missouri, and the District of Columbia never passed fair-trade laws. All other States had them until 1951, when the United States Supreme Court declared the Millard Tydings Act unconstitutional for goods moving in interstate commerce and automatically voided fair trade everywhere.

A price war on former fair-trade items raged in New York and elsewhere in the summer of 1951. The next year the McGuire Act permitted States to set up fair-trade laws again.

COURTS ROUGH ON PRACTICE

But since then, courts in 11 States have made fair trade unenforceable, by declaring the controversial nonsigner clause unconstitutional. This permits a manufacturer to force all retailers in a fair-trade State to observe prices he has fixed in a contract with at least one retailer in that State.

Without the nonsigner clause, retailers who don't sign simply cut prices merrily and fair trade within the State is dead.

Nebraska and Virginia, by action of their high courts, have thrown all fair-trade legislation out the window.

Also, the Supreme Court has decided that there is nothing to prevent a store in an area without fair trade from advertising and selling by mail at cut prices, products that are price-fixed in fair-trade areas.

The fair-trade faction is far from through. The 32 States with fully effective laws (including nonsigner clauses) include such populous and rich areas as New York, Pennsylvania, and California.

New England's Interest in the Mutual-Security Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. LEVERETT SALTONSTALL

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, February 26, 1958

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article by Tom W. Gerber on New England's interest in our mutual-security program which appeared in the Boston Sunday Herald, February 23, 1958.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Boston Sunday Herald of February 23, 1958]

NEW ENGLAND HAS $270 MILLION STAKE IN MUTUAL SECURITY OUTLAY

(By Tom W. Gerber)

WASHINGTON, February 22.—New England has a $270 million stake in the Nation's mutual-security program.

This is the approximate amount the Government pays to New England firms for products sent overseas to help United States allies in defense and economic recovery.

Despite this whopping sum spent in New England alone, few persons recognize that more than 75 percent of mutual-security funds are spent in the United States.

President Eisenhower only this week asked Congress for $3.9 billion to be spent in the free world's defense-against-communism campaign.

And the President anticipated the annual roar of protest from opponents of the program, both in Congress and elsewhere. He said:

"I am conscious of the feeling of some that desirable developments should be accomplished in this country before funds are used for development abroad."

His recognition of this attitude indicates a widespread misunderstanding of where mutual-security funds are spent.

And for the New England area, the mutual-security program is a bargain-basement buy.

For the $3.9 billion the President requested, New England's tax share would be about $195 million.

BASED ON TAXES

This figure is based on the fact that New England contributes slightly more than 5 percent of the Nation's tax revenues.

Thus the mutual-security program, established 10 years ago to help foreign nations, actually is a $75 million bargain for the regional economy.

These figures stem from a little-noticed study conducted last year by the nonpartisan National Planning Association at the request of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee.

The study was titled "The Foreign Aid Programs and the United States Economy."

And it shot full of holes the widely accepted thesis that foreign aid was, in effect, money down the rathole.

Among other things, the study showed that the mutual-security program was directly or indirectly responsible for nearly 24,000 jobs in the 6-State region.

Nearly half of these were in Massachusetts, the manufacturing center of New England. The Bay State's share in mutual-security funds spent in New England was in the vicinity of $120 million, or almost half the regional total.

RANKED NINTH

Massachusetts was the ninth-ranking State in the Nation in this regard. States with a larger stake in the mutual-security program were Ohio, Pennsylvania, New York, California, and others with a preponderance of heavy industry.

Despite these huge Government outlays to domestic industry and agriculture under the mutual-security program, impressions persist that the United States Government simply hands a fat check to recipient nations.

"The very opposite is true," the President said on this point.

Here is how the mechanics of the program work:

1. The two governments—the United States and the recipient nation—agree on the scope of the program.

2. They then enter into further agreements on specifically what the dollars will be spent for.

3. The recipient nation then calls for worldwide competitive bidding on contracts to supply the materials called for in the detailed contract.

4. The International Cooperation Administration, which administers the mutual-security program, says an average of 78 percent of these contracts go to United States firms.

5. The winning bidder is paid directly by the United States Government when he delivers the goods. No money changes hands between the United States and the recipient nation.

Thus, if Congress passed President Eisenhower's requested amount for mutual security, United States industry would get a $3 billion workload.

INDIRECT BENEFITS

And not all of the domestic benefits of mutual security are direct. The NPA study of 1955 mutual-security expenditures said:

"Those industries which produce items for foreign aid utilize the products and other services of other industries in order to make their finished goods."

The NPA study indicated that New England firms produce about 7 percent of the products shipped abroad under the mutual-security program.

President Eisenhower, in his message to Congress, was even more succinct in describing the alternatives to the mutual-security program.

He foresaw:

"Ultimately a beleaguered America, her freedoms limited by mounting defense costs, and almost alone in a world dominated by international communism."

Both Massachusetts Senators—SALTONSTALL and KENNEDY—favor the mutual-security program and likely will support it.

Senator SALTONSTALL, in fact, probably will lead the administration's fight for the full $3.9 billion in his role on the Senate Appropriations Committee.

Senator KENNEDY probably will back the bill from his post on the Senate Foreign Relations Committee.

BRIDGES HOSTILE

But Senator SALTONSTALL'S GOP senior on the Senate Appropriations Committee, Senator STYLES BRIDGES, Republican, of New Hampshire, has misgivings about one facet of the program.

In a statement today, Senator BRIDGES sharply criticized the $98 million in the 1958 mutual-security program credits for aid to Poland.

The President's $3.9 billion request is for fiscal 1959, which begins in July. BRIDGES' criticism of aid to Communist-dominated

Poland was considered a forerunner of opposition to come.

"I am as critical of, and as much opposed to, the extension of foreign aid to the Communist regime in Poland as I am to its being extended to the Communist regime in Yugoslavia," he said.

Winner of Cherry Pie Baking Contest

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN J. SPARKMAN
OF ALABAMA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, February 26, 1958

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, in the hustle and bustle of these times in the consideration of missiles, earth satellites, and similar things sometimes we are prone to overlook some of the good old qualities of homemaking.

Last week a young lady from my home town of Huntsville, Ala., was selected as the nationwide winner of the Cherry Pie Baking Contest. This young lady, Barbara Chisholm, a junior in the Butler High School, of Huntsville, Ala., has been a visitor to Washington yesterday and today, along with Mrs. Mary Burkhardt, her home economics teacher.

We are very proud of this honor that Barbara has brought to Huntsville.

In the Huntsville (Ala.) Times of February 21 the story was told of Barbara's winning.

I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, to have this news item printed in the Appendix of the RECORD along with an editorial from the Huntsville Times.

There being no objection, the article and editorial were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DEFEATING 197,000 OTHERS—BARBARA CHISHOLM BAKES WAY TO NATIONAL CROWN

Butler High School's Barbara Chisholm brought the national spotlight on herself, her school, and Huntsville in a new way yesterday afternoon.

From more than 197,000 entrants from the 48 States, Canada, Hawaii, and Alaska, Barbara was chosen as National Cherry Pie Baking Contest winner. She was the second Butler student to win the honor in 5 years. In 1953 Maxine Walker took the national honors in the contest.

Barbara appeared astonished at the decision, crying out, "Oh, no." Tears of joy filled her eyes as she said: "I thought my pie was good but not that good," the Associated Press reported from Chicago.

When Barbara arrived in Chicago earlier this week for the final baking competition she said:

"If hoping and wishing will enable me to make the best cherry pie, then there is no doubt in my mind that I can bake the best cherry pie."

On Tuesday, 16-year-old Barbara will present the proof of the pie to a dignitary in Washington, D. C.

This morning she took more bows on the Dave Garroway show Today on NBC television. She left a sample of her culinary skill with Garroway and his cast.

It was reported that more than 5,000 students from Michigan alone competed in the contest. Barbara was the only entry from Alabama, representing Butler High and Alabama.

Barbara told Garroway this morning she had baked about 75 cherry pies since entering the local contest in December. Contestants were also asked to bake an original cherry dessert as a warmup for the finals.

The excitement of Barbara's national success has carried to her family, teachers, and friends.

Her mother, Mrs. G. H. Chisholm, watched nervously this morning as her daughter appeared on TV. The announcement that her daughter had won really shook me up, she told the Times.

Proud Principal J. Homer Crim said, "I am always proud of our students, that is our greatest pay." Out of all the entrants, "It's good to have the No. 1 of the Nation," he added.

The first winner, Maxine Walker, is now a member of the science faculty at Butler. Her engagement to be married was announced recently.

The 1958 winner is accompanied by Mrs. Mary Burkhardt, home economics teacher at Butler. Mrs. Burkhardt also sponsored Miss Walker in 1953.

In other years Butler High has placed 3 runners-up and 1 regional winner in the contest, sponsored by the National Cherry Growers Association.

Other winners were Shirley Sanders, southern regional winner in 1952; Evelyn Dailey, southern regional runner-up in 1954, and Wanda Renegar, southern regional runner-up in 1956.

Chamber of commerce official Dan Boone said this morning that plans were being made to honor Barbara on her return. No definite plans have been made yet.

The contest was sponsored by the National Red Cherry Institute, a trade promotional organization. Barbara's prize was a $500 college scholarship, an electric range and all expenses paid for her trip to New York and Washington.

Barbara, who is 5 feet 6 and now weighs 125 pounds, said her secret in cherry pie baking is the use of cream in the crust and tossing the crust mixture lightly with a fork before the dough is shaped.

She used frozen red tart cherries in the filling.

She told newsmen she hasn't done much cooking at home except the cherry pies and that her boy friend, Howard Gentle Jr., 17, hasn't yet tasted one of her creations but he will now.

She said she plans to use the scholarship to continue her education in home economics at Auburn after graduation from S. R. Butler High School.

She summed up her feelings about her victory in these words:

"It's the most."

CONGRATULATIONS

It's no mean honor that has come to Barbara Chisholm of Butler High School, who yesterday won the national cherry pie baking contest.

She won over 49 girls and a lone boy from the 48 States of the Union.

These state winners prevailed over more than 197,000 contestants across the land.

In addition to the great honor and publicity, she will receive a $500 college scholarship, an electric range and an educational trip to New York City and Washington.

Congratulations to her; to her teacher, Mrs. Mary Burkhardt; to Prof. Homer Crim and all the faculty and students of Butler High School. They deserve them.

"Wild Bill" of the Plains

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ESTES KEFAUVER
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, February 26, 1958

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article from Coronet magazine for February 1958, regarding one of our beloved fellow colleagues, Senator WILLIAM LANGER. I found the article interesting, and I think that most of my colleagues will also.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

"WILD BILL" OF THE PLAINS

(By Irwin Ross)

WILLIAM "WILD BILL" LANGER, the senior Republican Senator from North Dakota, has earned the reputation of being the oddest member of that august body of United States lawmakers.

When Winston Churchill was expected to visit the United States in 1952, for instance, the Senator, who has an old isolationist's suspicion of the British, promptly dispatched a telegram asking the pastor of the famed Old North Church in Boston to hang two lanterns in his belfry—to warn the citizenry in the same fashion that Paul Revere had been alerted in 1776. "Believe our fellow countrymen should be equally warned and alerted today," wired an alarmed LANGER.

A year ago, just as a Senate committee meeting was about to begin, "WILD BILL" announced to his colleagues that a song had recently been written about North Dakota. He proceeded to sing it to a rapt audience. Then he asked Senator ESTES KEFAUVER if he cared to render the Tennessee Waltz. KEFAUVER declined.

His colleagues never know quite what to expect of "WILD BILL." In the Senate since 1941, he has left the disconcerting impress of a personality that is at once imprudent, gaily irresponsible, arrogant, kindly, and high minded.

He has many critics, few enemies, some admirers and no followers in the Senate.

Physically, the 71-year-old LANGER is a hulking, shaggy, gray-haired man with a large nose, bushy eyebrows and deep-set eyes. When aroused by a pointed question or implied rebuke, he still pounds his desk with an enormous fist and emits a bellow of annoyance.

LANGER'S eccentricities are as famous as his tirades on the Senate floor. He never smokes or drinks, but has a passion for chewing cigars in their cellophane wrappers. He is beguilingly absent minded and never embarrassed when caught in the act of strolling out of the Senate cloakroom with a colleague's overcoat, which has led to the remark, "He wears no man's collar, but any man's overcoat."

Though a lifelong Republican LANGER is like no other Republican who bears the label. In domestic affairs, he votes with the liberal wing of the Democratic party; in foreign affairs, he votes neither with the Democrats nor with the modern Republicans, having a thorough disdain for all the international commitments this country has assumed since World War I.

He voted against lend-lease, against selective service, against the reciprocal trade agreements. He was 1 of 2 Senators to vote against the United Nations. He opposed all foreign aid appropriations except UNRRA.

Such views, while more extreme than those of many of his constituents, have always appealed to the predominantly isolationist sentiment in his home State. So does his liberalism in domestic politics and his anachronistic railing against Wall Street and big money. For the wheat farmers, always suspicious of eastern bankers, have never forgotten the beating they took in the depression.

The key to Langer, in short, is that he is an old-fashioned agrarian radical. But no label really fits him. An agrarian radical he may be, but he has also frequently sided with union labor—he opposed the Taft-Hartley Act, for example—a cause hardly dear to a farmer's heart. Similarly, he has always been strong for civil rights, and equally impassioned in defense of the filibuster—a unique combination of views in the United States Senate.

"I'm for the filibuster 100 percent," he says. "Why? This is the only place left in the world for untrammeled debate. You limit debate on a civil-rights law, and you may find the big business lobby trying to pass a law against the farmers."

Langer's contradictions hardly trouble his constituents. In 1952 they reelected him with his largest majority ever. His basic strength is that they regard him as representing their interests—corporately and individually. He is indefatigible in doing favors for them—interceding with Government bureaus, helping with a pension problem, staving off a deportation.

Typical of the man was the way he got into the Dixon-Yates investigation, which became one of the major Democratic battle cries during the first Eisenhower administration. The bizarre operations of the Senatorial seniority system, after the 1952 Republican sweep, had made LANGER chairman of the Judiciary Committee—an appalling development to orthodox Republicans. LANGER also made himself chairman of the Antimonopoly Subcommittee of the full committee and hired as counsel an energetic, liberal lawyer named Sidney Davis.

He asked Davis, "What do you think will be the toughest lobby to tackle?"

"The power lobby," said Davis.

"Well, let's fight them," said LANGER.

The Senate Rules Committee, however, disagreed with LANGER's judgment and withdrew its $75,000 grant when it discovered what he was up to. Whereupon LANGER put Davis on his personal staff and cheerfully carried on without any funds at all.

Before long, Davis had come across the administration's project to have the Messrs. Dixon and Yates build a privately owned powerplant in the TVA area and thus undercut that monument to public power. The subsequent outcry went on for months, and ultimately the Dixon-Yates plan was killed. It was a major defeat for the administration, in which LANGER gloried.

Part of the LANGER legend is the enormous resourcefulness of the man. Back when he was North Dakota's attorney general, he was a brash young man eager to make a reputation as a crusader. The city of Minot was a tough, wide-open town, and he decided to give it a real cleaning. He went there incognito, accompanied by 51 private detectives disguised as workingmen.

In 3 weeks, they gathered all the necessary evidence. LANGER then staged a trial raid and discovered that as soon as his men entered a house of prostitution, all the other joints in town were alerted by phone.

The next night, when his big raid was scheduled, LANGER marched up to the telephone exchange with three armed men and took possession. The telephone company's lawyer then got another armed band and laid siege to the building. By the time LANGER was thrown out, the raids were over and 156 people had been arrested.

In his moment of triumph, LANGER found himself under arrest by city police on a charge of inciting a riot. Acquitted, he was promptly rearrested for illegally seizing the telephone lines. Once again he won his freedom and left town a hero to all the solid citizens.

Nothing in LANGER's early life foreshadowed the flamboyance of his mature career. He was born on a farm in Cass County, N. D., on September 30, 1886. He attended a country school, then grade and high school in nearby Casselton. At the age of 15 he worked on a neighbor's farm; and boasts in the Congressional Directory that as a result of his ability to handle large crews of men he was appointed foreman.

But his real achievements were scholastic. He graduated from high school at 16; 2 years later he had gotten through the law school of the University of North Dakota and passed the bar exams.

He was too young to practice, however, and so his parents packed him off to Columbia University, where he enrolled as an undergraduate—a surprising reversal of the normal academic routine.

After graduation, LANGER was offered a job by a well-known New York law firm, but preferred to return to North Dakota. He started practicing in Mandan and was soon up to his neck in politics. In 1914, he was elected State's Attorney for Morton County, 2 years later he became Attorney General for the State. In 1918, he married Lydia Cary, a girl he had met at a concert in New York; they subsequently had four daughters.

LANGER's early political career coincided with the rise to power of North Dakota's Non-Partisan League, a militant organization, founded by Socialists and others, which proceeded to capture the Republican Party. The League's program was considerably to the left for the times and designed to free the wheat farmers from the economic squeeze imposed by the private millers.

BILL LANGER, though himself hardly an oppressed farm boy and never a Socialist, became a League firebrand. In 1920, he was defeated for Governor.

For the next 12 years he held no elective office. Then in the early thirties, when half the State's farmers were on relief, he revivified the old Nonpartisan League and in 1932 was elected Governor.

His tenure in office was stormy. To his impoverished constituents, he was a hero; to the moneyed interests, a threat. He established an old-age pension system, declared a moratorium on farm mortgages, embargoed wheat shipments from the State until the price was pushed from 49 cents to 72 cents a bushel, and was boisterously high-handed in defending the underdog.

Oddly, despite his long record as a progressive Republican, LANGER was no friend of the New Deal. The New Dealers, on their side, openly distrusted him. Federal investigators came up with accusations that LANGER and his followers were putting pressure on employees in Federal relief agencies to subscribe to the Leader, the Nonpartisan League weekly. The Governor was thereupon brought to trial in Federal court, convicted and sentenced to 18 months in jail.

This was the low point in the LANGER career. He appealed the verdict, but meantime was removed as Governor by the State supreme court. Moreover, he was also not permitted to practice law and had to borrow money to live on.

When his case finally reached the United States circuit court of appeals, the conviction was reversed. A second trial resulted in a hung jury. The third acquitted him.

Thoroughly rejuvenated by this brush with political death, the following year LANGER again ran for governor and was reelected.

In 1940, he made his first try for the Senate and won easily. But before he could take his seat, a group of opponents petitioned the Senate to exclude him on grounds of election fraud and other corruption. The Senate allowed LANGER to take his seat provisionally, while the Committee on Privileges and Elections investigated his case.

The probe dragged on for months, and in the end the committee voted 13 to 3 to unseat him. (Every Republican voted against him.)

LANGER was saved, eventually, by the oratorical skill of redoubtable Republicans like Senators Tobey and Taft who argued, in sum, that it was unfair to throw out a man after the voters had examined the same charges in many elections yet always returned him to office. The full Senate reversed its committee and kept "WILD BILL" in his seat.

He has been there ever since—a thorn in the side of the Republicans and a source of endless perplexity to the Democrats. And he has solid accomplishments to his credit—notably improvements in the operation of Federal penitentiaries and an upward revision, some years ago, in the pay scales of postal employees. To lawyers seeking help for underprivileged clients, he is regarded as the softest touch on Capitol Hill.

On occasion, his lack of discrimination has brought LANGER vigorous criticism—as when he held up the deportation of alien Nazis by putting in private bills; and when he spoke at an alleged Communist-front meeting in behalf of Morton Sobell, who was convicted in the Rosenberg spy case.

"I didn't appear in behalf of Morton Sobell," LANGER explains. "I appeared to help him raise money for his defense. Sobell has the right to appeal to a higher court."

But what about appearing on an alleged Communist platform? LANGER shrugged amiably. "It was the principle that counted."

No other Senator could get away with so quixotic an attitude. But LANGER's towering eccentricity seems to beget forgiveness—or indifference.

A final question in regard to LANGER is inevitable: Why does he remain a Republican?

His answer is blandly decisive: "I believe that I'm one of the best Republicans in the Senate."

Clergy Urges Support for Foreign Aid

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

Hon. EVERETT McKINLEY DIRKSEN

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, February 26, 1958

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, this being Brotherhood Week, I think it is interesting to note an article in the past Friday morning's Washington Post stating that religious leaders of four major faiths—Protestant, Catholic, Jewish, and Eastern Orthodox—urge support of the administration's $3.9 billion foreign-aid program. I ask unanimous consent that this article be inserted at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CLERGY URGES SUPPORT FOR FOREIGN AID

Religious leaders of four major faiths—Protestant, Catholic, Jewish, and Eastern

Orthodox—yesterday urged support of the administration's $3.9 billion foreign-aid program.

The statement was issued through the Foundation for Religious Action in the Social and Civil Order, of which the Reverend Charles W. Lowry is chairman. The Reverend Edward R. Elson, minister at the National Presbyterian Church here, is cochairman.

"For the United States to discontinue or cripple its mutual-security program would please the Communists more than any one thing I can think of," said the Reverend Norman Vincent Peale, minister of the Marble Collegiate Church, New York City.

Rabbi Norman Gerstenfeld, minister of the Washington Hebrew Congregation, said foreign aid "is not only good religion but enlightened self-interest."

The Reverend James L. Vizzard, S. J., vice president of the National Catholic Rural Life Conference, said "all people of informed Christian conscience recognize in the mutual-security program our Nation's answer to a religious and moral imperative."

Two Eastern Orthodox clergymen of Washington, the Reverend Demetrios Kalaris and the Reverend John Tavlarides, said that "in the interest of man's welfare and the manifestation of our Christian charity, special support should be given the policies of foreign aid of the United States."

Continuing Rise of Consumer Prices

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM E. PROXMIRE
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, February 26, 1958

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, the New York Times reported this morning that the Consumer Price Index for January not only reached a new high, but rose more sharply last month than in any month since July 1956. That is more than a year and a half. I call particular attention to a paragraph in this article which states that "even though special factors helped account for the food price increase, today's statistics indicated that the recession has had no impact yet in bringing their rise to a halt."

Mr. President, I think this article constitutes a solid argument against increasing postage rates to 5 cents for first-class users.

I ask unanimous consent that this article be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CONSUMER PRICES RISE TO A RECORD DESPITE RECESSION—INDEX IS UP SIX-TENTHS OF 1 PERCENT TO 122.3 AS FOOD LEADS ADVANCE—BUYING POWER DROPS

(By Edwin L. Dale, Jr.)

WASHINGTON, February 25.—Consumer prices rose sharply to another record in January despite the business recession, the Bureau of Labor Statistics reported today.

The United States Consumer Price Index for January was 122.3 compared with 121.6 in December. The base of 100 equals the price average for the years 1947–49. The rise from last December amounted to six-tenths of 1 percent and was the steepest since July 1956 when the increase was seven-tenths of 1 percent.

Sharply higher food prices, led by fruits, vegetables and meats, accounted for four-fifths of the January increase. But there was also a net rise in the prices of all other goods and services, despite January white sales, declining prices of new cars, and a slight dip in apparel.

BAN MAY BE LIFTED

Thus, even though special factors helped account for the food price increase, today's statistics indicated that the recession has had no impact yet in reducing consumer prices overall, or even in bringing their rise to a halt. Wholesale prices, except for raw industrial items, also have not fallen.

In another development today, Senator WILLIAM F. KNOWLAND, Republican of California, disclosed that the administration was considering lifting its ban on new reclamation projects. The ban was imposed in President Eisenhower's budget and has already aroused Republican ire in Congress.

Senator KNOWLAND talked to reporters after the regular Tuesday meeting of legislative leaders at the White House. He said the Secretary of the Interior, Fred A. Seaton, was present at the meeting and had been requested to review the reclamation picture and make a report.

A special analysis in the budget revealed that the Bureau of Reclamation had only $300 million worth of projects planned to the point where contracts could be let quickly, though planning for $2 billion more worth of projects was in process.

BUYING POWER DROPS

On the price front, Commissioner Ewan Clague of the Bureau of Labor Statistics said the next couple of months don't promise much in the way of lower prices. However, he said he believed that by summer and fall a combination of seasonal movements in food prices and pressures stemming from the recession would bring prices down somewhat.

The January price increase meant automatic wage increases of 2 or 3 cents an hour for 1,350,000 workers with escalator wage contracts, most of them in the automobile industry.

The price increase, together with a further reduction in the average workweek for factory workers, meant another sharp dip in the buying power of the average factory worker's weekly paycheck. The index of real earnings fell 2 percent to 118.5, compared to 124.3 a year ago.

The freeze in Florida was the main cause of the big increase in fruit and vegetable prices in January, Mr. Clague explained. He attributed the rise in meat prices to lower marketings of cattle and hogs. Both reflected reductions in supply rather than increases in demand, he noted.

Elsewhere, price increases were recorded for gas and electric utilities, rents, fuel oil, sporting goods, newspapers, group hospitalization, hospital rates, face cream, toothpaste, barbers, beauty shops and automobile insurance. Some of these increases were limited to individual cities, but still affected the nationwide index.

Lower prices were recorded for eggs, home furnishings, apparel and new and used cars. The home furnishings decline included price reductions for household textiles, vacuum cleaners, washing machines, toasters and some furniture.

Despite the drop in new-car prices as dealers widened discounts from list prices, the buyer still paid about 2 percent more for a new car in January than a year ago. This was because of a 4-percent increase in the factory list prices of the 1958 models.

Since the current wave of consumer price inflation began in April 1956, prices have risen from 114.7 on the index to last month's 122.3. Over the 21-month period they have risen every month but 3, and in 2 of those they remained stable.

Mr. Clague stressed that the Consumer Price Index was a lagging economic indicator and that it reflected basic business conditions only belatedly. He said he expected consumers ultimately to benefit from wholesale price reductions in such items as rubber, copper, lead, zinc, hides, and wool.

The index measures price changes in a fixed market basket of goods and services usually bought by city families of moderate incomes.

PRICES AT RECORD HERE

Bad growing weather for foodstuffs and a continued rise in the prices of many services during January combined to send the New York City Consumer Price Index to a record level after 5 months of relative stability.

The January index was 120, or 20 percent above the 1947–49 level, Robert R. Behlow, regional director of the United States Labor Department's Bureau of Labor Statistics, announced. This was a rise of 1.1 percent from the 118.7 level of December 1957. It was the largest since the 1.2-percent increase of July 1952.

Transportation costs remained unchanged. Apparel prices, overall, declined three-tenths percent here. All other groups contributed to some degree to the rise. But the principal push came from the food group, the prices of which rose 2.4 percent overall here.

Fruit and vegetable prices rose 13.1 percent in January. Fresh green beans more than doubled in price soaring 24 cents a pound. Tomatoes were up 9 cents a pound. Oranges rose 6 cents a dozen, frozen orange juice more than 5 cents a 6-ounce can. Lettuce rose 3 cents a head. Bananas rose 1.5 cents a pound.

Meats and poultry also rose in price. These price rises included chickens, up 1.5 cents a pound; leg of lamb, 5 cents; pork chops, 3.5 cents; ham, 5 cents; round steak, 3 cents; bacon, 2.5 cents; and veal cutlets, 7 cents.

Price decreases were shown for sheets, women's coats, men's shoes, and new automobiles.

United States

	Index for January 1958	Percentage change from—		Point change from December 1957
		December 1957	January 1957	
All items	122.3	+0.6	+3.5	+0.7
Food	118.2	+1.8	+4.8	+2.1
Housing	127.1	+.1	+2.7	+.1
Apparel	106.9	−.7	+.5	−.7
Transportation	138.7	−.1	+3.8	−.2
Medical care	141.7	−.6	+4.7	+.9
Personal care	127.8	+.6	+4.7	+.8
Reading, recreation	116.6	+1.7	+6.1	+2.0
Other goods, services	127.0	+.2	+2.6	+.2

Is Recession Talk Healthy?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN J. SPARKMAN
OF ALABAMA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, February 26, 1958

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, many divergent views are expressed by the economists these days regarding the current recession. I believe there is one thing upon which they all agree and that is that there is a recession.

It was noticeable that in the hearings before the Joint Economic Committee, with the exception of a few of the Government officials, all of the witnesses talked freely about the recession and had no reluctance in referring to it as a recession.

We are told by a great many people that we should not talk about it. Some take the attitude that even to admit that there is a recession is dangerous. Personally, Mr. President, I see no need of becoming panicky, but I believe we ought to be willing to look at the facts in the case and accept them for what they are. When we do this, we should resolve to take every step necessary to stop the present downslide in our economy. I believe it can be done if we act timely and forthrightly.

One of the best economic writers is Sylvia Porter. She has been quite realistic in her discussion of this recession. In yesterday's Washington Evening Star she wrote a column entitled "Is Recession Talk Healthy?" It is a sensible column. I commend it to the reading of every Senator. Therefore, I ask unanimous consent to have it printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

IS RECESSION TALK HEALTHY?

(By Sylvia Porter)

Never has a business downturn been so widely advertised or elaborately documentated as this decline of 1957–58.

I have been thumbing through newspapers published during previous important business setbacks—the collapse of 1929–33, the slump of 1937–38, the mild recessions of 1948–49 and 1953–54.

Certainly, stories were printed about drops in production, employment, sales in those periods. But the publicity about the previous slides was picayune in comparison with the publicity now being given to the business statistics.

News about this recession is prominently publicized every day. Jobless figures hit the front pages, are not buried in the back sections. Cities in distress are listed in detail. Retail sales are charted weekly. Production decreases are headlined. So it goes.

We know we are going through a general business retreat, that we have been experiencing one for months, that it is the responsibility of Government to do all it can to cut it short.

THEORIES ON PUBLICITY

Is the wide advertising about the recession healthy? Is the publicizing of the facts good or bad for the economy?

These are hardly superficial questions. There is a large group—including professional as well as amateur economists and public-relations men—which insists advertising of the recession is unhealthy, publicizing of the facts is bad.

This group argues even mention of the word "recession," frightens businessmen into pulling back on plans, scares consumers into reducing buying. This group insists the bad news in itself will intensify bad news.

I am not a member of this group. I believe the advertising is healthy, the publicizing of the facts is good for the economy. Here's why:

1. Because we know the facts, there is no danger that a sudden shock will smash confidence. We have been informed about the decline, we are aware of its proportions and there is no threat of panic.

One reason the violent depression of 1929–33 went so far and lasted so long was that we didn't have the facts. In 1929, we had nothing approaching our present statistics on incomes, production, installment debts. In 1929, figures on unemployment were wild guesses. In 1929, the Consumer Price Index was computed only twice a year, came out so late that it was valuable only as a record of what had happened long before.

HOOVER RECALLED

Thus, President Hoover could assure us prosperity was just around the corner—even though millions were jobless, going bankrupt, losing their homes. We didn't know what was happening until the situation became chaotic. Then the shock was devastating and the panic was on.

2. Because we know the facts, we are in a position to demand action to cushion the drop and to take action to revive business.

The knowledge of recession is behind the rising clamor for antislump tax cuts, major public-works programs, expanded jobless benefits, constructive foreign trade policy. In prewar days, we couldn't formulate antirecession programs because we didn't have facts on which to base the programs.

3. No one can fool the man out of a job or the man losing sales or the neighbor and families of this man anyway. It's futile—in fact, it's downright dangerous—to try.

It is my firm conviction that our awareness and our determination to cushion the recessions of 1948–49 and 1953–54 helped keep them mild. It is my firm conviction that our awareness and determination to act will help us handle this decline properly, too.

Farm Conditions

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. WILLIAM LANGER

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, February 26, 1958

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the GTA Daily Radio Roundup, prepared by the Farmers Union Grain Terminal Association, February 10 through February 13, 1958.

There being no objection, the matters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

GTA DAILY RADIO ROUNDUP, FEBRUARY 10, 1958

The family farm—is it in trouble? What can be done to help save it? GTA has been working to get the answers for a long time. Through the GTA Family Farm Survey, facts and figures have been gathered on more than 4,000 family farm operations typical in the GTA area. These findings cover 7 full years of farming—1950 through 1956. They've shown farmers in trouble, in all too many cases forced to throw in the towel and quit farming. Further, GTA has been pointing out time and again the fact that farmers cannot depend on the free market, to get prices they can survive on. Better farm programs are needed. That has been the position of this grain cooperative, owned by the farmers themselves.

Now, it's heartening to see others coming to lend a helping hand, and to get this story of the plight of farm families across to the people in the towns and cities. More and more people, for instance, are reading and talking about that series of articles in the Minneapolis Tribune, describing what is happening to our small towns, and the Main Streets, where cash registers don't ring like they used to, because farmers are going broke, and fewer and fewer are around to trade in these towns.

And, we'd recommend also that you read what Prof. Phil Raup, an agricultural economist at the University of Minnesota has to say about these schemes to move farmers off the land wholesale, as a way to solve all our farm problems and our food problems. We'll tell you more about that later in another broadcast.

Right now, we want to mention a book that can help give some sensible answers to some serious farm questions. The book goes on sale today. It's called, Farm Prices—Myth and Reality. The author is Dr. Willard W. Cochrane, professor of agricultural economics at the University of Minnesota. Professor Cochrane explodes the great myth of the so-called self-sufficient farmer. He labels as just a myth the theory that if agriculture is left alone it will stabilize at some desirable level.

In his book, he comments that the free-market approach to reducing farm surpluses seems to appeal particularly to economic logicians and others who aren't affected by the free market. He includes such people as publishers of newspapers enjoying local monopolies and chairmen of boards of corporations producing monopolistic products.

This is one book that every member of Congress ought to have and read and understand. Maybe it would be a good book for each of the 10 candidates who are running for Congress in tomorrow's special election in Minnesota. It's the First District, you know—a farm area, and a good one, in the southeastern part of the State. These candidates—Republicans—who are trying to repudiate Secretary Benson and Democrats, who say that the only way to repudiate Benson is to repudiate Republicans—all of these candidates ought to read Dr. Cochrane's book. And, especially the two who win in the primaries and make the runoff on February 19.

We'll certainly try to send a copy of Farm Prices—Myth and Reality at least to the two winners as a special gift of the farmers. It's important, because the whole Nation is watching now to see how the Republicans and Secretary Benson and the Democrats will get along with farmers in the fall elections.

The thousands of farmers who own GTA and make these broadcasts possible thank you for listening. This is GTA, the co-op way.

GTA DAILY RADIO ROUNDUP, FEBRUARY 11, 1958

Can the farm problem be solved by pushing a certain number of farmers off the land and into jobs in the cities? You've all heard this advanced as a cure-all for what ails agriculture. Latest and most prominent source was a businessmen's group that calls itself the Committee for Economic Development—or CED, for short.

Last December CED put out a report with widespread coverage by the press, and it recommended, in a nutshell, that price supports be dropped below disaster levels and so-called marginal farmers be resettled in city jobs. The survivors were then to enjoy prosperity. Is this a good idea? Carl Rowan, a reporter of the Minneapolis Tribune, has written a series of articles on the plight of farm families and how the loss of farm purchasing power is hurting Main Street. In the course of his interviews, he's brought up this question of whether getting rid of farmers is the happy answer to the farm dilemma that its advocates claim it is.

First, Rowan talked to people out in the country, and he reported that he found the proposal "not overly popular in our farming areas." Rural people, he said, called the idea everything from a "dangerous step for

the Nation's economy" to a "prize suggestion" that farmers be "moved to more rewarding jobs that don't exist." A look at unemployment figures from big cities will help tie down that point.

What does a country editor think of the idea? Rowan quotes the Springfield Advance-Press as saying that if the farmer loses his support program "in an economy where everyone in one way or another is subsidized" then thousands of factories, shops, and stores will have to close in both big cities and small towns, with unemployment the reward for both workers and farmers.

Then, Rowan talked to a University of Minnesota professor of agricultural economics, Dr. Philip M. Raup. He asked, what about this assumption that the farm problem will solve itself once the land is free of marginal farmers? Raup replied that this may turn out to be the most tragic kind of wishful thinking. Raup went on: "We have several counties which are not wealthy enough now to provide adequate services. What will it be like when they plow under the little farmer? "They are going to find that they are also plowing under some little businesses, some little towns, some little governments, and so forth."

Furthermore, Professor Raup says, it is a big mistake to assume that managerial ability is the sole test determining the survival of a farmer. He says many other factors enter in, over which the farmer may have little or no control, and which push toward success or failure.

We haven't time on today's program, but if you'll tune in tomorrow, we'll outline the factors which Professor Raup says have so much influence on family farm survival. And thanks for listening to GTA—the co-op way.

GTA DAILY RADIO ROUNDUP, FEBRUARY 12, 1958

Some of the problems facing the family farms and Main Streets of America have been forcefully presented by writer Carl Rowan in a series of Minneapolis Tribune articles. To find some answers to the rural problems, Rowan then talked with Dr. Philip Raup, professor of agricultural economics at the University of Minnesota. Raup said that just being a good manager today doesn't assure a farmer of success. The spread between profit and loss is so small, the farm situation so crucial, that the accident of family status can even be the key factor, Raup explained. He gave the example of one farmer on a half section who may lose money, while the farmer on the adjacent half section shows a fair profit.

But, what the books don't show is that the farmer with the profit happens to have two teen-age sons, a ready-made source of free labor, while the farmer who loses money may have two daughters, or sons who are away from home, and thus not available for labor. And, when you add a minor "accident" like this to differences in managerial ability, credit supply, or the accident of location, it becomes clearer that farm mortality is not a matter of survival of the fittest. Too many other things enter into the picture. Raup added that the real tragedy of our rural areas may be the fact that so many people have resigned themselves meekly to the notion that what is happening is inevitable.

Reporter Rowan seconded this statement. He said he found the feeling of inevitability to be widespread, even in some of the towns where business development corporations have been formed to attract industries. Raup made the point that this meek resignation to the inevitable is disastrous. The result, he said, is that we get decay by default. But, he emphasized that, "We can do something about it. The question is, What are we going to do about it?"

He lashed out at the idea that the answer is simply moving a certain portion of people off the land. This talk, he said, is based on the assumption that income will be divided among fewer people who will produce less, thus solving the surplus problem and raising the level of family income. "The error here is that the land factor is neglected," Raup explained. "We have no reason to believe that technological progress will stop, so if the land is still there, we may find fewer farmers producing more, not less. In that case, the surpluses will continue and income will remain low."

To help the family farm, Raup wants to see a rural credit system that doesn't belong to the horse-and-buggy age. And, he deplores having "suitcase" farmers who are helping drive land prices up. He said he was referring to doctors, lawyers, and merchants who are taking advantage of their superior credit position to invade the field of farming. Raup wound up his discussion with reporter Rowan by saying that, "No matter what, we ought not to be bashful in talking about ways of getting farm income up."

That's the real need—to get farm income up. It's the chief objective of GTA, the co-op way.

GTA DAILY RADIO ROUNDUP, FEBRUARY 13, 1958

Last year, President Eisenhower's farm at Gettysburg, Pa., got Federal payments under various farm programs totaling up to about $4,000. The President has a good farm there, nationally famous, and his farm manager qualified portions of the land under the soil bank, and so forth. But, it does serve as an example, to point up some flaws in present farm laws, which allow, in many cases, payments larger than the entire net income of most family farms. The latest GTA family farm survey, for example, shows that the average family farm in this area had a net income in 1956 of only $3,000, before taxes.

A columnist for the St. Louis Post-Dispatch commented on payments like these recently. He observed that this $4,000 of net income paid to a nonworking farm was more net income than was earned by 90 percent of America's working farmers last year. Now, this writer asserts that farms like the one at Gettysburg are in no sense working farms, because they are not operated to earn a living for their owners. A hobby, or a pleasant place to live, yes. Or perhaps as an investment, or in certain cases for the purpose of establishing tax losses. He says there are thousands of these farms operated in the country today. And, he maintains that there is something wrong with a program that enables nonworking farmers to collect more money from Government for literally doing nothing, than working farmers with their life's capital invested and putting in a 50- to 70-hour week are able to earn from their entire operation.

He goes on to point out the big investment required to farm and the many hours of labor it takes. Says he is talking about that group of family-sized farmers who produce a big part of our food supply—doing it with investments, on the average, of $50,000 or more in land, equipment, and livestock. These are farms, he adds, that require from 300 to 600 man-days of labor per year. Let no one call this kind of farmer "marginal," declared this writer.

He summed it up this way: "When we say that a farmer operating a business of this size and kind is marginal, that he is not fully employed, that he should go to town and get a job and run his farm on the side, or that he ought to give his farm to some big operator who can run it efficiently, we are plainly talking through our hats." But, he adds, "This is the kind of talk we hear on all sides today, no little of it coming from the Department of Agriculture, various economists, and at least one large farm organization that has come to represent big farmers."

We, of course, agree wholeheartedly with this writer for a big city newspaper. He's got an appreciation of the fact that the farm family deserves a lot better break than it's been getting for its contribution to the Nation's welfare. His views deserve the attention of Senators and Congressmen, particularly, for it's up to them to write the laws to give the needed help to America's working farmers.

Changing Agriculture in the United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES W. TRIMBLE
OF ARKANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 26, 1958

Mr. TRIMBLE. Mr. Speaker, on February 3, 1958, Dr. Lippert S. Ellis, dean of the College of Agriculture, University of Arkansas, made an inspiring and instructive address to the Association of Southern Agricultural Workers, at Little Rock, Ark.

This address has so much value that I want to insert it in the RECORD as a part of my remarks.

CHANGING AGRICULTURE IN THE UNITED STATES [1]—AN ADDRESS BY LIPPERT S. ELLIS, DEAN AND DIRECTOR, COLLEGE OF AGRICULTURE AND HOME ECONOMICS, UNIVERSITY OF ARKANSAS

Farming in the United States represents an important factor in the Nation's economy. But this business of farming is made up of many small, competing units. A recognition of these two fundamental facts is essential to an appreciation for the importance of agriculture to our total economy and for an understanding of the problems facing a rapidly changing industry.

Realized gross farm income in 1956 was over $34 billion. Compare this with the income of General Motors Corp., our largest industrial enterprise, that had sales of a little less than $11 billion in 1956. Agriculture, including production, processing, and marketing of farm commodities, accounts for approximately 40 percent of the total disposable income of the United States. The Bureau of Labor Statistics of the United States Department of Commerce has estimated that 41.1 percent of the disposable income of United States consumers is spent for food and clothing.[2] Another 4.1 percent is spent for tobacco and alcoholic beverages which have their origin in agriculture.[3] Without question, this agricultural industry of ours is an important factor in the economic life of our country. This is entirely aside from the fact that it is from the land and those who manage it that we secure most of those things that make up our food and clothing.

Agriculture, taken as a whole, is a significant factor in the economic life of this country. But the agriculture of this country is made up of relatively small, competing units. As a matter of fact, there are about 4.8 million of them. This means that the bargaining power of agriculture is relatively low compared with that of big business and organized labor. This is one of the funda-

---

Footnotes at end of speech.

mental problems facing the agricultural industry.

A CHANGING AGRICULTURE

The significance of the business of farming to the welfare of this country is well understood by members of this association. The changes which have been taking place in agriculture are likewise well known to those present here this morning. There is evidence, however, that the farm problem is not well understood by many urban dwellers. A step toward an understanding of the farm problem is an appreciation of the changes which have taken place within the industry in recent years.

These changes have not even been recognized by some. The real significance of some of the changes has not been appreciated by others. It seems appropriate, therefore, that we at this convention give some thought to the changes which have taken place. But we should not stop there. We need to consider the problems which a rapidly changing agriculture faces in its relations with other elements in our society. Hence the general theme Public Relations for a Changing Agriculture for this conference.

It is intended that my paper today will serve as a background for Dr. Miller's presentation tomorrow. I want to list some of the changes and touch on their significance. Dr. Miller will deal more specifically with the question of public relations.

FARM POPULATION AND RURAL INFLUENCE

One of the most obvious and yet most significant changes on the American agricultural scene is that of population. While total United States population has increased from 106 million in 1920 to 172 million in 1957, farm population has declined from 31.4 million to 20 million during the same period. Farm population now accounts for 12 percent of our total population.

At the time of the first census in 1790, the farm population accounted for 80 percent of our total population. In appraising the current situation, we need to remember that the shift of population from the farm to industries, the trades, and the services has been going on for a long time. However, the rate increased tremendously in the years after 1940. Between 1940 and 1957 farm population declined from 30 million to the present 20 million.

At this point it is well to pause and remind ourselves of the influence which the predominately rural population has had upon the development of this country. Dr. B. W. Allin has described the American creed as a blend of three principal dynamics, namely, belief in enterprises, belief in democracy, and belief in technology. Dr. Allin goes on to say, "The social and economic institution in America that provided the fertile seedbed for the growth of the American Creed was family enterprise in an environment of abundant opportunity, and the family farm was the most widespread application of family enterprise. * * * Responsibility for management encouraged independence of thought as well as deference and respect for the opinions of others."[4]

This influence has been reflected in many ways. It is seen in the rural-reared leadership found in all aspects of our society. It is seen in the early activity of organized farmers in securing regulatory controls to curb monopolies and to regulate freight rates, to the end that a greater share of the national income be returned to farmers. An example of early political effectiveness of farmers was the railway legislation or granger laws of the 1870's. These laws eventually resulted in the Interstate Commerce Commission. Farmers have exerted and still are exerting political influence. Some believe such influence will diminish as farm population continues to decline. This need not necessarily be the case. The extent of political influence to be exerted by farm people will depend more upon how farmers use their potential than upon mere numbers. Farmer influence will depend upon the type of organizations he develops and upon the type of men and women he chooses to place in position of leadership. It will depend upon the character of the lobbies these organizations maintain at the national level. It will depend upon how well the membership of organized groups are informed both politically and economically. Dr. Allin has pointed out that "1 politically and economically alert farmer is worth 100 of the other kind and that their number can grow much faster than the total number of people on farms is declining."[5]

This places a very special responsibility on farm organizations to see to it that their members are well informed. The extent of agricultural influence will depend in no small measure on how effective the industry is in informing the general public with respect to its problems and its position in the general economy of the country.

FARM LABOR FORCE AND AGRICULTURAL EFFICIENCY

At the same time that farm population was declining, the labor force on farms quite naturally declined, also. The number of workers on farms declined gradually from 13.5 million in 1910 to 9.5 million in 1940. Since 1940 the decline has been very rapid, reaching 5.8 million in 1957. The farm labor force now represents 9 percent of the national labor force.[6]

Industries and the services have continued to absorb the manpower released from agriculture. But we all know how farm production has continued to climb. Actually, farm production has increased an average of 2 percent per year, a rate somewhat higher than the rate of increase in total population. In other words, the efficiency of the American farmer has continued to rise. The output per man-hour of farm labor has nearly doubled in the past 15 years. The end of this upward trend in the production per farm worker is not in sight.

The increase in the output per farmworker is likely to continue as long as farm managers are free to make use of the new technology which is being made available through research and education. For this reason, caution should be used in formulating farm programs which interfere with the managerial responsibility of the farm operator. In addition to the use of technical information, the increase in output per farmworker is the result of the substitution of mechanical energy for human labor; an increase in the use of capital; an increase in the size of farm; and an increase in the competence and importance of management.

The average farmworker today produces as much in one hour as he did in two hours in 1940. It required three hours for him to produce the same amount in 1910. The vast expansion in demand following the outbreak of war in Europe, with the accompanying favorable prices, accounted for the rapid increase in productivity after 1940. Rising prices and incomes enabled many farmers to adopt new techniques which they were not able to afford in the years during the depression. The important point for consumers to remember is that the farmers of the United States have continued to increase their efficiency and that the benefits have been passed on to consumers.

SIZE OF FARM INCREASING

The increase in the productivity of agriculture in this country has been accompanied by a decreasing number of farms and an increase in the average size of farm. The total number of farms declined from 6.4 million in 1910 to 6.1 million in 1940. This was a decrease of 300,000 in 30 years. But during the 14 years after 1940 the number of farms decreased 1.3 million down to 4.8 million in 1954.[7] The size of farm has risen from an average of 138 acres in 1910 to 242 acres in 1954. For those who are attempting to understand the farm problem, note should be taken of the fact that the number of farms and the number of persons living on farms have been declining at a rapid rate since 1940. These are not new phenomena peculiar to the agricultural situation of the 1950's, but the rate has increased greatly since 1940.

But these figures and comparisons do not reveal the true problem facing the agricultural industry of this country. A breakdown of the farms by type will come nearer revealing the underlying problem represented in the number and size of our farms. Of the total of about 4.8 million farms, there are about 2.1 million commercial farms that sold products valued at more than $2,500. These account for 91 percent of the value of farm products marketed in the United States. In other words, about 44 percent of our farms sold products equal to 91 percent of the value of all farm products produced and marketed in the United States. The problem for this group of 2.1 million commercial farmers is how to secure bargaining power in an economic society dominated largely by big business and big labor.[8]

But what of the other 56 percent or 2.7 million farms? Of them, 0.9 million can be classed as residential farms, occupied by retired persons who are not dependent upon the income from the farm for their livelihood or by persons having a business in town but who prefer to live in the country. These farms accounted for 0.26 percent of the market value of farm products. They do not constitute a serious factor in the overall farm problem except as the produce from them may represent a competitive factor in the market.

Of the remaining 1.8 million farms, about 1.2 million are operated by full-time operators and about 0.6 million by part-time operators. In general, these are the small, undercapitalized farms that have not been able to take advantage of modern technology or to make use of laborsaving equipment. This 37 percent of our farms produced less than 9 percent of the farm products going to market. The problem for this group of 1.8 million farmers and their families is one of adjustment.[9]

For those of us in the South, it should be noted that there is a heavy concentration of these small, low-income farms in the southeastern part of the country. Other smaller concentrations are found in the north central lakes' region and in the extreme northwestern part of the country.[10]

DIVISION OF RETAIL FOOD DOLLAR

Well, there are many other aspects of this changing agriculture that need to be recognized by the general consuming public. All of them cannot be discussed in the limited time available on this occasion.

Consumers, I know, are concerned with the high price of all commodities, including those in their food budget. Consumers need to know that the farmer is receiving less of the food dollar now than he did several years ago. For example, in 1945 the farm share of the retail food dollar was 53 cents. In 1951 it was 49 cents. The farmer's share of the food dollar has continued to decline since that time, and in 1957, it was 39 cents.[11] The marketing margin in 1957 of 61 cents represented additional services such as transporting, packaging, processing, and other items representing built-in maid services. It also included the higher labor costs in these items. Prices of food products at the farm have not been responsible for the high prices at the retail level.[12]

Footnotes at end of speech.

Footnotes at end of speech.

Footnotes at end of speech.

PURCHASING POWER OF FACTORY LABOR

The purchasing power of an average hour of factory labor has increased with reference to most food products since 1939. In that year the income from an average hour of factory labor would purchase 8 loaves of bread. On a basis of records for the first 8 months of 1957, an hour of factory labor would purchase 11 loaves of bread. An average hour of factory labor during the first 8 months of 1957 would purchase more beefsteak, milk, butter, bacon, eggs, potatoes, oranges, and other farm commodities than could be purchased with the income from an hour of factory labor in 1939.[10]

COST-PRICE SQUEEZE

While a larger share of the retail food dollar has been going for marketing services, and while the food-purchasing power of factory wages has been increasing, farmers have been caught in a cost-price squeeze that has become almost unbearable for large numbers of them. The index of prices received by farmers declined between 1951 and 1955. In 1951 it was 302. By the first quarter of 1956, the index had fallen to 228, but by the third quarter of 1957 some recovery had been made and the index stood at 246. During the same period, the cost squeeze was on. The index of prices paid by farmers stood at 282 in 1951 but with some variation continued to increase until the index was 301 on January 15, 1958. At that time the estimated parity ratio was 82, down from 107 in 1951.

A complete analysis of the nature and effect of the cost-price squeeze on various groups of producers would be impossible in this paper. Any one generalization will not hold true under all circumstances. The prices received by farmers for different commodities have varied greatly. Likewise, the prices of various cost items have varied greatly. However, the cost-prize squeeze has been and still is very real for large numbers of producers. For some it has meant disaster.

But adjustments have been taking place. Some of them have already been mentioned. Since 1940 there has been an average annual loss from the farms of nearly 600,000 persons. Income of farm people from nonfarm sources has been rising steadily since 1935, until now approximately one-third of the total farm income is from non-farm sources. This merely represents an attempt to adjust to the problem created by the cost-price squeeze. Farmers have substituted mechanical equipment for labor. They have increased the size of their farms in order to make more effective use of equipment. They have made use of technical information made available through research and education. These and other means have been taken by farm operators to adjust to the cost-price squeeze with which they have been plagued since 1952. The most efficient operators have benefited by the adjustments, but so have all consumers.

SUMMARY

I have commented very briefly on some of the changes which have been taking place within the agricultural industry in this country. It is to be hoped that the farm problem will be better understood by the general public as time passes.

We have noted the declining farm population, the increase in mechanization, the trend toward larger farms, the increasing importance of the management factor in modern farming, along with the expanding use of agricultural technology.

The consuming public needs to recognize that, along with all of these changes, the efficiency of the American farmer has increased greatly. The consumer has been the beneficiary of that increased efficiency. The consuming public needs to recognize that the prices received by farmers have not been responsible for the prices which have been asked at the retail level.

Also, the consumer needs to appreciate the severe problem facing farmers since 1952 in the cost-price squeeze. While the farmer has been faced with generally declining prices and increasing costs, he has received a declining proportion of the dollar paid for food at the retail level. Consumers need to recognize that an hour of non-farm labor will generally buy more food now than it would a few years ago.

This picture of agricultural change in the United States leads one to the inevitable conclusion that there is a need for:

1. A realistic public-relations program that will interpret agriculture to the public in general.

2. For agricultural groups to work together to achieve a sound national program for agriculture that will give farmers adequate bargaining power in an economic society dominated by big business and big labor.

3. Recognition on the part of organized groups that the strength of agriculture today lies, not solely in the number of farm votes, but in the extent to which the membership of organized groups is well informed and able to speak intelligently on farm problems.

Those of us in agriculture need to accept our full share of responsibility. Only then can we expect the sympathetic understanding of the general public that is needed by agriculture.

Finally, may I add a footnote for the special benefit of those of us who are in the business of training the agricultural scientists of tomorrow? There is a real challenge in this changing agricultural situation for those of us who are engaged in educational work, primarily in our land-grant institutions. We need to take a sharp look at what we are offering the agricultural students of today in our college curriculums. We need to ask ourselves if our course offerings are meeting the needs of the agricultural student who is concerned with a highly scientific and highly mechanized industry that must be operated on sound business principles. It is abundantly clear that farming must be conducted on sound business principles if it is to return a satisfactory living and life.

---

[1] Presidential address at the opening general session of the 55th annual convention, Association of Southern Agricultural Workers, Little Rock, Ark., February 3, 1958.

[2] These include fish, not usually considered an agricultural product, and synthetics.

[3] The Consumer Price Index, U. S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of Labor Statistics, Mimeograph, January 1953, p. 9.

[4] Bushrod W. Allin, Rural Influences on the American Politico-Economic System, address before the Graduate School, U. S. Department of Agriculture, Washington, D. C., April 16, 1957.

[5] Ibid.

[6] The trend is shown in the following figures:

Year	Number employed		Percent employed in agriculture
	Total United States	Agriculture	
1910	37,370,794	11,891,767	31.0
1920	42,433,535	11,448,770	27.0
1930	48,829,920	10,471,998	21.4
1940	56,030,000	9,540,000	17.0
1950	64,599,000	7,607,000	11.6
1957	64,873,000	5,817,000	9.0

Source: Labor Force, Bureau of the Census, U. S. Department of Commerce, Washington, D. C.

[7] Source: Census of 1954. Bureau of the Census, U. S. Department of Commerce, Washington, D. C.

[8] One approach to this is through Government control of production. Another would be through cooperative effort by farmers themselves.

[9] This will mean different adjustments for different farmers. For some it means additional acres in order to have an efficient farm unit. For others it may mean additional capital in the form of livestock, equipment, or other means of production in order to operate on an efficient basis. For still others it may mean employment outside of agriculture.

[10] Source: Development of Agriculture's Human Resources, a report on problems of low-income farmers, prepared for the Secretary of Agriculture, U. S. Department of Agriculture, Washington, D. C., April 1955.

[11] The Marketing and Transportation Situation, January 1958, table I, p. 5, Agricultural Marketing Service, U. S. Department of Agriculture, Washington, D. C.

[12] For example, the wheat in a 20-cent loaf of bread is worth 2½ cents; the cotton in a $4 cotton shirt is worth 25 cents. See The Marketing and Transportation Situation, January 1958, table 22, p. 44, Agricultural Marketing Service, U. S. Department of Agriculture, Washington, D. C.

[13] The comparisons are as follows:

Item	Unit	1939	1957
Steak	Pound	1.8	2.2
Milk	Pint	10.4	16.7
Butter	Pound	1.9	2.8
Bacon	Pound	2.0	2.9
Eggs	Dozen	2.0	3.9
Potatoes	Pound	25.3	30.0
Oranges	Dozen	2.2	4.7

Source: Agricultural Marketing Service, U. S. Department of Agriculture, Washington, D. C.

Footnotes at end of speech.

United States-Soviet Cultural and Educational Exchanges

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. W. FULBRIGHT
OF ARKANSAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, February 26, 1958

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article by George W. Oakes entitled "Exchange Holds Bright Promise." This article appeared in the Washington Star, on February 9, 1958, and is a very interesting and informative discussion of the operation of the exchange programs in which this country participates.

I feel sure my colleagues will be interested in reading this article, which points out the value of the exchange program in spreading good will and understanding between citizens of foreign countries and citizens of the United States.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Sunday Star of February 9, 1958]

EXCHANGE HOLDS BRIGHT PROMISE

(By George W. Oakes)

The new United States-Soviet agreement on cultural and educational exchanges finds this country with 10 years experience in international exchange programs.

And if the experience is any indication, the agreement will be one cold-war activity from which both sides benefit. For it is almost certain to bring about a beter understanding between the Russian and American people, which can only be to the good.

From the point of view of the East-West competition, the agreement indicates that both parties acknowledge that military and economic strength are not the only weapons. Intellectual and social attainments, the knowledge of which can be spread only through the exchange of opinion-forming individuals, are important, too.

It is clear that the United States and Russia are now competing for global intellectual leadership, with the rest of the world's peoples, the committed and the uncommitted, an interested audience. This gives exchange programs, both between the two nations and with other nations, special meaning.

Just what has been our experience in international exchange over the past 10 years?

SIX THOUSAND A YEAR

The State Department's current exchange activity falls into two main categories: The Fulbright program for teachers, lecturers, research scholars and graduate students, and the leader-specialist program for influential individuals and experts in particular fields.

Six thousand persons a year are currently involved—two-thirds are foreigners coming to the United States from more than 80 countries and the rest are Americans going abroad. In the last 10 years 50,000 exchanges have taken place—36,000 foreigners and 14,000 Americans.

The Fulbright academic program operates as a series of binational efforts between the United States and the participating foreign countries. Joint educational commissions pick 4,000 out of 40,000 applicants and direct their course of study, and academic supervision is in the hands of the Board of Foreign Scholarships appointed by the President from among America's leading educators. Under its direction more than 5,000 private American citizens assist in the program's operation.

Through contractual arrangements with the Institute of International Education and other privately financed organizations, the foreign visitor is able to receive a visiting professorship or fellowship offered by an American university or research institution. Thus the Government's main expense is to cover the cost of transportation.

This meshing of public and private funds has been so successful that it is estimated that more than $10 million of private money here and abroad has been attracted to the academic exchange activity. The actual costs of conducting the academic exchanges, involving currently about 2,700 foreigners and 1,750 Americans, is only about $9.5 million, aside from governmental overhead.

SELECTION IS IMPORTANT

Out of some 40,000 foreign students now in the United States, slightly less than 3,000 are Government sponsored. In contrast to the vast majority who study independently in the United States, the Fulbright program offers the advantage of selecting individuals with specific qualifications who can effectively utilize their American experience when they go home. For example, many courses in American studies have been established abroad as a result of the program.

A recent survey has shown that, on the whole, Government-sponsored foreign students have tended to do better than those here under private grants. This is because the official visitor is usually chosen as the result of competition and because his planned curriculum offers a considerable advantage.

Although many American teachers who have gone abroad for tours of duty in foreign schools have been outstanding in their fields, some competent observers of the academic program believe that often the calibre of foreign professors and teachers visiting the United States has been higher.

FINANCIAL REASONS

There are reasons for this. For one thing it is often difficult to make it financially attractive for an outstanding American scholar to leave his universnity for a year abroad. A professor who accepts a foreign academic assignment may be $2,000 a year out of pocket, because the Government does not pay the cost of dependents' travel or his continuing stateside expenses.

Although such financial sacrifices will often be made for a European post, qualified Americans are less keen to go to Asia, Africa, or Latin America. On the other hand, nearly every topflight academic figure from all parts of the world wants the chance to visit the United States.

Just a few teen-age exchanges occur, and some educators believe that this part of the academic program should be expanded on the theory that an American experience would make a lasting impression on students of high-school age whose ideas have not become too fixed.

The leader-specialist program, concentrating on the exchange of influential adults, is generally agreed to be a marked success.

Ten years ago last month, President Truman signed the Smith-Mundt Act originating this exchange of opinion-formers. Today some 800 leaders, such as Government officials, top figures in education, religion, and labor, editors, parliamentarians, and others visit this country for 60 days each. Also, 200 specialists in fields like public administration, law, public health, and communications spend 4 to 5 months studying their professional interests in the United States. American specialists go abroad for 6 months and establish health clinics or organize recreational facilities.

Three present Prime Ministers visited the United States under the leader program before they assumed office. Gaillard of France, Eghbal of Iran, and Karamanlis of Greece.

These influential tourists, on their return home, pour forth their impressions through speeches, books, articles, and personal discussions. One Japanese journalist not long ago gave 100 lectures after his American tour.

More important, they absorb a feel that is bound to influence their future thinking on all matters affecting this country. As one of them put it, "the fact that I have freedom of movement to see and do almost anything at Government expense except spend the whole time on Miami Beach is most impressive."

AID TO UNDERSTANDING

Not too long ago a Danish editor spent some time in Little Rock and for the first time really began to appreciate what a complicated problem school integration is in a southern community.

Soviet propagandists have used United States race difficulties effectively, yet when influential foreigners see the situation for themselves they have, on the whole, been impressed by the progress being made and find that conditions are much better than they had expected. This result in itself may justify the $5 million spent to bring leaders and specialists to this country.

These are frequently expressed views—in many cases correcting previous misconceptions—that have been expressed by visitors:

That the United States has a genuine culture and deep interest in cultural affairs.

That Americans work hard—especially women in the home despite all the electrical appliances.

That family life and religious life are strong in America.

That Americans are hospitable.

PRIVATE SPONSORS HELP

In more than 1,000 American communities, private sponsors contribute time and hospitality to the entertainment of foreign visitors brought here under the leader-specialist program. And the hosts find that they benefit as much from this contact as the visitor. Groups planning the foreign visitors' tours have been continually impressed by the genuine enthusiasm that exists all over the country for the program. It permits the average citizen to participate personally in foreign affairs.

Here are the suggestions of a particularly qualified individual, an admitted enthusiast, who for many years played a vital role in both the academic and leader-specialist programs:

Stress quality rather than numbers in the exchanges.

Conduct greater research into the backgrounds of exchangees and more intensive followup after the foreigner has returned home.

Although the State Department has requested the same amount of money in the new budget as it now spends on the exchange program—$20.8 million—additional funds would enable more exchanges, especially from the increasingly vital areas of Asia and Africa, to have an American experience. Most supporters agree that the program should be increased perhaps 50 percent over the next few years.

The $20.8 million in the new budget includes $282,000 to finance visits by 35 persons from Communist bloc countries to this country and by 31 Americans to those countries. Under this program, 15 Americans would go to Russia and 15 Russians would come here.

Financing of exchanges under the agreement has not been worked out, since there is no good estimate of how many people will be involved or to what extent the Government will have to foot the bill. It may be that Congress will be asked for additional funds for the new program.

The Federal-Aid Highway Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. EMMET F. BYRNE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 26, 1958

Mr. BYRNE of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, last month I had the privilege of attending the third annual convention of the National Crushed Limestone Institute at the Hotel Statler here in Washington, D. C. One of the addresses given at the convention concerns the Federal-aid highway program. It was delivered by Mr. James L. Shotwell of the Bureau of Public Roads. As a member of the Public Works Committee, I am deeply interested in our road program and I think it timely and appropriate to call this fine address to the attention of other Members of the House. I appreciate consent to have Mr. Shotwell's address reprinted in the RECORD.

The address follows:

THE FEDERAL-AID HIGHWAY PROGRAM

(Address by James L. Shotwell, assistant to the Deputy Assistant Commissioner, Office of Engineering, U. S. Bureau of Public Roads, at the third annual convention of the National Crushed Limestone Institute, Inc., Washington, D. C., January 24, 1958)

Mr. Mount, members of the National Crushed Limestone Institute, and distinguished guests, I am very happy to be here with you in the morning period. My only regret is that Highway Administrator Tallamy could not come. He was also very

sorry he could not be here, but he is on a very heavy program now. As you've noticed in the papers, the Senate Committee on Roads has been holding hearings for the past 2 weeks; the House committee starts next week on the highway-program hearings, and this morning Mr. Tallamy is discussing the highway programs with the President and the Cabinet.

I enjoyed the film, Mr. Mount, that your institute produced. Probably, I should give a little credit to the ARBA, even though General Prentiss left—Captain Curtis is still in here. I have been looking forward to seeing that film and I think it presents our problem very well. You will notice that in the beginning it mentions the accident rate. That is one thing that all in the highway field are very much concerned about today. We want to design our highways and make them as safe as possible for traffic. The yardstick that we use is the number of fatalities per hundred million vehicle miles of travel. And I hope you will remember that, as it is said, "The fatality rate on freeways is only one-half of that as on our regular highways, without the control of access."

There has been a recent study which has put a price tag on the cost of these accidents. They compared two similar highway facilities—and I say similar because they were in the same general area—but one had control of access, and the other did not have control of access. That is the respect where they were not similar. They handle the same volume of traffic—about 30,000 vehicles per day. Both of them were four-lane divided highways. The cost of accidents per year, per mile, on the facility without the control of access was $82,000. The cost of accidents per year, per mile, on the facility with controlled access was $19,000. Now then, what does that mean to us? Putting it in other terms, if we figure the life of a highway is 20 years, and we know it is much longer, we can afford to spend over a million and one-quarter dollars per mile for control of access and still save the highway user money. So you can see why we are very much concerned about this accident problem, and there is one thing that the Interstate System will have, and that is control of access.

The part of the movie in connection with the hearing is also very interesting to me. And when you go back to your homes, all of you will probably have an opportunity to appear before one of these hearings before our highway program is finished. We hope that you will, in working through your group, make an unbiased evaluation as to the proposed highway project, consider the good that it will do for the entire community, and work for it. We find that quite often the opposition to proposed facilities is organized and far more vocal than those in favor of them. Those in favor of the highway just take it for granted that it is going to come, while those that are against it get out and work hard. So, when you are in favor of it, we hope that you will work hard.

We had several very interesting hearings in New York State recently; one of them, Mr. Newsom, in connection with the highway going through a highly rural section. It cut off the back ends of quite a few of the farms. The State then faced damages for the areas that are isolated and, as shown in the movie, they can trade with the adjacent farmers. But the opposition was terrific that night. The hearings went on for several hours. The farmers got up and testified about the very high prices for the value of their ground per acre and everyone was amazed. Near the end of the hearings, an unknown individual got up from the back and said that he was not involved in this particular project, but he certainly was glad that he had attended the hearings that night. He said that he had just been appointed to the board of assessors and they were getting ready to have a new assessment and had no idea that those farms were that valuable. Of course, they all arose as one and wanted it stricken from the record, but it had already been taken down by the tape recorder. In that one instance, though, I would like to say that the State studied other alternates and located the highway down in the valley. And the State engineer, working with the representative from the State department of agriculture, went out and contacted each of the farmers, explained the problem, and when they had a new hearing, the opposition to it was negligible. They were glad to have it there. In fact, I was told that the only ones who opposed the location down in the valley were the farmers up on the hill who were going to be left alone and allowed to continue farming there. They were very much disappointed that they weren't going to be able to sell their ground to the State.

I am not supposed to talk about that—I'm supposed to talk about our program—so, I have a few statistics here that I would like to give you this morning. As you know, our program now is a year and one-half old; and the progress made by the States has been very gratifying. Construction has proceeded according to our expectations, and the highway trust fund receipts are running close to their earlier estimates. Between July 1, 1956, and December 31, 1957, obligations for Federal aid totaled $3.6 billion. Trust fund receipts exceeded $2.5 billion. Also, during the first 18 months of the program, 3,175 miles of construction had been advertised, put under way, or completed at an estimated cost of $1.7 billion. Preliminary engineering and right-of-way acquisitions authorized in these same periods amounted to $1.2 billion. At the end of last year, there was $1 billion worth of work in program status which is the initial step in launching the Federal-aid project. At this time there was a total of $4 billion of Federal-aid work in program status, of which $3.3 billion was Federal-aid funds. At the end of last year, there remained $1.5 billion of Federal-aid funds apportioned to the States that were not yet programed to specific projects.

Now, even though the overall progress for the program has been good, all States have not responded uniformly in expanding their interstate program. On December 31, 1957, there were 8 States still obligating their 1957 funds, 33 States were using their 1958 funds, and 8 States were into their 1959 funds. For the country as a whole, an amount equivalent to 72 percent of the 1958 funds had been obligated. Now the 1956 highway bill also included a provision to permit the States to go ahead with their interstate construction—even ahead of allocation of Federal funds. That was, if they had sufficient money of their own. That was termed advanced construction interstate. There is one State that is already proceeding on that basis.

Now, title I of the 1956 Highway Act authorized Federal-aid interstate funds for the next 13 years. However, title II, or the revenue portion of this act, includes a section which will not permit apportionments of the fund unless the money will be available in the highway trust fund. The 1956 act authorized $2.2 billion for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1960. But initial estimates indicate that the full amount will not be available, and probably only around $1.8 billion will be apportioned for the Interstate System for that fiscal year.

As a whole, the State highway departments, the construction industries and material suppliers have demonstrated their ability to gear their operations to the schedule of construction for the Interstate System. I have a few charts here that I'll show you in a moment.

The 1956 Highway Act required the State highway departments and the Bureau of Public Roads to make several very important reports or studies, and report to the Congress. One referred to by Mr. Newsom this morning was the section 108 (d) study, which is an estimate of the cost of completing the Interstate System. The purpose of this estimate is to establish factors for allocations of the funds for fiscal years ending June 30, 1960, 1961, and 1962. Now, this report has already been submitted to the Congress and, as mentioned earlier, it exceeds the previous estimate which was made in 1954 and 1955 by approximately $10 billion. This increased cost is attributed to several factors. One of these is the estimate of traffic for 1975, which is now higher than it was estimated several years ago. Increased traffic, of course, will require additional traffic lanes, which will represent increased costs. Another factor is the additional traffic lanes, which will represent innow and was not estimated in 1954. And then the third factor is the general increase in construction costs. The estimate was based as of July 1, 1956.

Now I'd like to take a couple of moments to show you several of the charts which indicate the progress of the program. This chart shows the progress of the Federal-aid highway program, including all types of funds. While this is not an accumulative chart, it shows the volume of work which has been obligated during the past 12 months. You will notice how along here in mid-1956 we were working at a little over $800 million, whereas the chart shows that now we are way up here over $2.4 billion. These arrows indicate the schedule, so you see this increased volume of work here is getting along just about at the estimated schedule.

This is a similar chart showing the primary, secondary, and urban funds combined. There is a little lag right here, but we anticipate that will be recovered before the end of the fiscal year. The third chart is for the interstate funds. I would like to call to your attention as to how we were working in through here with about $175 million or so a few years ago. A tremendous increase is shown and now, as of December 31, we have a schedule that was not anticipated until the end of the year. This volume, running at about $1.7 billion, covers not only construction but engineering and acquisition of right-of-way, and includes a considerable amount for right-of-way, which is of course one of several of things that you have to take care of.

Now, here is one other that I would like to show you. The top line shows the authorization as proposed in title I of the 1956 Highway Act. As I pointed out, these funds cannot be apportioned to the States unless there is sufficient money in the highway trust fund. So the broken lines indicate the estimate of allocation that would be made in future years. In 1960, instead of being around $2.2 billion, it appears that it will be around $1.6 billion. For 1961 it might drop even a bit more. But notice that there is a steady increase from there on. So, in the last years of the program where the initial estimates indicated that the volume of the construction would be going down, it will probably continue up for several years beyond the 1969 period.

Briefly, that is the progress of the program. I am so happy to have been here with you this morning. Thanks a lot, Mr. President.

Bond Speculators Profit

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 19, 1958

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I comment to the attention of our colleagues the following article which tells the story of big profits to speculators in bonds as a result of the Federal Reserve Board's switch from a tight-money policy. The article appeared in U. S. News & World Report of December 27, 1957:

BOOM IN BONDS: SOME INVESTORS REAPED BIG PROFITS OVERNIGHT

Bonds, out of favor only a few weeks ago, now are riding a new crest of popularity.

With business turning down, people want an investment of the soundest sort.

Result: A spectacular rise in bond prices.

Now, though some experts are suspecting that most of the rise is over, that stocks might be a better buy at this time.

One group of investors has struck it rich in recent days. These are the investors who had bought bonds in the months before November 14.

That was the day the Federal Reserve System shifted away from a policy of tight money. Borrowing began to get easier and cheaper. The market for bonds zoomed upward.

Almost overnight an investor who had bought a long-term Government bond for $890 found his bond was worth $910, for a $20 profit. The same bond now is worth $951—up $61 in a month. Some other Government bonds are up even more.

There was a quick boom, too, in many issues of utility and corporation bonds. People who had scorned bonds only a short time before scrambled to buy, once officials had flashed the signal that money was to be made cheaper.

The accompanying table gives you an idea of what has hapened in the market for bonds of various kinds. The price changes shown are described by bond dealers as the most dramatic shift we've ever seen in the market, and a once-in-a-lifetime experience.

Result for some Wall Street speculators who bought bonds on small margins has been a doubling of their money—the money they actually put up in cash.

This rise in bond prices has occurred at a time when prices of stocks have been tumbling, many to new 1957 lows. Bad news for stockholders—a slowdown in business—has become good news for bondholders, who benefited when the Government decided that more and cheaper money was needed to stem recession.

Exception, railroads: Even in the midst of a boom in bond popularity, not all issues shared in the price rise. Railroads, many in trouble, continued in some cases to go lower. Some toll roads that have not been doing so well also drifted on down. But most bonds joined the most buoyant rise in the memory of the average bond dealer and investment banker.

Look, for example, at what happened to some individual issues.

A huge issue of American Telephone & Telegraph bonds had been selling very slowly at an offering price of 101⅜. On November 14, two-thirds of the issue was still unsold. But, when the bond market opened November 15, after the money-policy switch, investors rushed to buy. The issue was cleaned out immediately, and jumped in price to 104, then to 108.

Said a New York bond dealer: "It's the happiest day I've known in 20 years."

At 4:30 p. m., the afternoon of November 14, dealers still held two-thirds of the $39 million issue of bonds of the New York Port Authority. Then when the news of easier money came the account was closed out in 1 hour.

Holders of scores of bond issues benefited, at least on paper.

For example, the 4⅞ percent bonds of San Diego Gas, issued at par in October, now bring 108½—up $85 for a bond of $1,000 par value.

Pacific Telephone & Telegraph's 2¾ percent bonds of 1985 have risen from 73⅝ on September 25 to 82 recently—up 11 percent.

High-grade municipal bonds, tax-free, have risen 3 to 6 percent in price.

Yields: down. As bond prices rise, of course, the yields to be expected by new purchasers go down.

Take long-term Government bonds, for example. Average yield on those was 3.58 percent on November 12. Latest official calculation shows it at 3.44—and it's slipped somewhat since.

Treasury securities maturing in 3 to 5 years offered an average yield of nearly 4 percent, if bought early in November, but little more than 3 percent, if bought recently.

It's the surest investments, however, that people are buying, now that business has turned down. Yields actually have risen on some of the more speculative bonds.

Kansas Turnpike 3⅜-percent bonds of 1994 have gone from a yield of 4.90 percent to 5.25 percent. New York Central 4-percent bonds of 1998 sell at a price that means a yield of 8.01 percent, against 6.75 earlier.

WHAT'S NEXT?

If you ask bond dealers and investment bankers what bond prices will do in weeks and months ahead, you get a variety of answers. But the consensus points to caution.

A New York dealer puts it this way: "If business really declines seriously, bond prices will go higher. If we have only a mild downturn, you can make a real case for selling bonds now and buying stocks. Personally, I suspect the Federal Reserve Board is surprised—and not to happy—that the bond-market reaction has been as spectacular as it has. I'm not at all sure officials will take any added steps to make money cheaper."

He adds: "This may be a good time to get into the stock market. There are a lot of bargains, especially in industries that are affected by the downturn in business."

And a bond expert for a large dealer says that "the recovery of bond prices has already outrun the basic recession facts and, in Government securities, this recovery may have been overdone."

But not all dealers agree with that view. One says, "The trend to higher bond prices will go on until a new recovery in business becomes headline news, and I don't look for that to happen before mid-1958."

Another bond expert notes: "It looks like we will have somewhat lower interest rates. There is a big flow of institutional money buying bonds. It looks like there will be a big decline in the demand for credit next year. There will be a fight again to get money invested. Prices from the long-range standpoint don't look too high."

From this standpoint, the outlook suggests that, with low interest rates, bond prices will stay at present levels at least, and may go higher.

It's agreed, however, that further rises in bond prices will depend on the speed of the business downslide, and on Federal Reserve action to apply brakes.

What happens to bonds when money eases—prices and yields of some recently issued bonds

	Price when first issued	Price now [1]	Yield when first issued	Yield now [1]
			Percent	*Percent*
U. S. Government, 4 percent, 1969	$100.00	$105.88	4.00	3.59
U. S. Government, 3¼ percent, 1974	100.00	104.63	3.88	3.51
Michigan Bell Telephone, 4¾ percent, 1992	101.72	108.00	4.65	4.31
Consolidated Natural Gas, 5 percent, 1982	102.00	108.00	4.86	4.47
Wisconsin Telephone, 4½ percent, 1992	101.25	107.50	4.43	4.09
Ohio Power, 4⅞ percent, 1987	100.87	105.25	4.82	4.55
American Telephone & Telegraph, 5 percent, 1983	101.46	108.00	4.90	4.47
Pacific Gas & Electric, 5 percent, 1989	100.80	110.00	4.95	4.41
Northern Natural Gas, 4⅛ percent, 1977	100.00	105.50	4.63	4.21
Columbia Gas, 5 percent, 1982	100.00	104.50	5.00	4.69
Jersey Central Power & Light, 5 percent, 1987	101.56	107.50	4.90	4.53
Essex County, N. J., 3.10 percent, 1973	100.63	103.20	3.05	2.85
Los Angeles Department of Water and Power, 3½ percent, 1977	101.52	104.68	3.40	3.19
Maryland State Roads, 3.40 percent, 1972	99.50	102.95	3.44	3.15
Boston, Mass., 3½ percent, 1975	99.34	105.44	3.55	3.10
Chicago Park District, 3½ percent, 1971	101.66	103.90	3.35	3.15
Chicago Water Revenue, 4 percent, 1977	101.38	109.41	3.90	3.35
Pittsburgh, Pa., 3¼ percent, 1975	100.00	104.15	3.25	2.95
Port of New York Authority, 3¾ percent, 1987	99.50	103.50	3.77	3.56

[1] Dec. 16, 1957.

Brotherhood of the White Folk

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD L. NEUBERGER
OF OREGON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, February 26, 1958

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, some of us forget that there are problems of integration in the North as well as in the South. In some of our criticism of the South, we occasionally overlook the mote in our own eye. For that reason, I think it would be appropriate to include in the Appendix of the RECORD an effective and thoughtful editorial from the Salem (Oreg.) Statesman of February 18, 1958, written by Marguerite W. Wright, associate editor of that daily newspaper, under the title of "Brotherhood of the White Folk." I ask unanimous consent for that purpose.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BROTHERHOOD OF THE WHITE FOLK

Salem hasn't had any lynchings—no howling mob of vigilantes on the courthouse lawn. Our schools are unsegregated, and there have been no stabbings or rapes on the playgrounds.

The billboard boasting that Salem's population was about 99.44 percent pure white native American is at least 10 years gone

from the downtown building where it once looked down on passers-by.

A nonwhite or foreign-born citizen here can get transportation, a meal and a place to sleep, even buy a house and vote.

That's what we like to hear during this Brotherhood Week, sponsored by the National Conference of Christians and Jews to draw attention to its year-round crusade against bigotry and for creation of a climate of opinion leading to better cooperation among men of good will.

But wait. Underneath, latent, there are still live foci of the infection that kept know-nothingism and the Ku Klux Klan active in this area a generation or two ago—the same infection that has made race relations the most crucial moral issue not just in the South but all over the United States today.

Education for brotherhood should be a preventive measure. Why wait to promote good race relations until after latent misunderstanding and bad feeling erupt in ugly scenes?

It could happen here. Salem is trying to attract new industry. Industrialization attracts new residents. Most of them will come from other areas of the Nation where, perhaps, civic responsibility is not at the same high level we now find here. Some of them may be colored escapees from the South. More likely, many newcomers will be another breed of southerner: the white Protestants of early American, Anglo-Saxon stock.

An article in the current issue of Harper's magazine shows that in Chicago, for example, the toughest integration problem has nothing to do with Negroes. It involves the migrants from the South who are usually poor, proud, primitive, prejudiced, fond of liquor, and fast with a knife.

In Salem we might well look ahead to the same sort of integration and race relations problem that Midwestern cities are now struggling to solve. A legislative migrant study interim committee already has been set up, after prodding by the Oregon Council of Churches. It may point to concrete steps the State and cities can take. Meanwhile, a good way to begin is to make sure that all the flattering things Brotherhood Week speakers will tell us this week are so firmly established that no influx of the great unwashed and unenlightened will revive some of the least pleasant parts of Salem's own past.

Secretary Benson

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
Hon. EVERETT McKINLEY DIRKSEN
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, February 26, 1958

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD an article entitled "Secretary Benson's Fate," which appeared in the Chicago Sunday Tribune on February 23, 1958.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Chicago Sunday Tribune of February 23, 1958]

SECRETARY BENSON'S FATE

A new demand for the resignation of Secretary of Agriculture Ezra Taft Benson has been made by a group of House Republicans. When he refused to quit, they said they would carry their case to President Eisenhower.

The trouble with Secretary Benson is that he believes what is morally right is also politically right. Most politicians give lip service to this theory, but Mr. Benson really believes it and acts on it. As a result, he has been an easy target for all the left-wingers, demagogs, and crackpots who make a living out of organizing protest movements among the farmers.

The latest demand for his resignation comes chiefly from dairy farming districts, which are sore about his order to reduce price supports on dairy products on April 1. This resentment appears to have been a factor in the near defeat of the Republican candidate in a recent Minnesota special election.

Dissatisfaction of the dairy farmers has been fired up by the left-wing National Farmers Union, which is fairly strong in Minnesota and Wisconsin. The legal counsel of the union is Charles Brannan, a former Democratic Secretary of Agriculture who is touting a new nostrum for the farm problem called the production-payment system.

In Iowa many farmers are kept in a jittery state by steady feedings of anti-Benson propaganda by a Des Moines newspaper and a farm magazine. Illinois and Indiana farmers, we are glad to say, are keeping their heads.

The strangest thing about the agitation against Secretary Benson is that even the leading agitators admit that his departure from Washington would not remove the farmers' troubles or bring an end to the farm policies which he advocates. There is no rational explanation for the campaign against him. Probably he is hated because he is too honest to preach that prosperity for farmers can be legislated, or that there is a quick and easy way to repair the damage done to agriculture by unwise Government action.

Some of the House Members who are crying for the Secretary's head have strictly selfish motives. They see their seats in Congress disappearing as the rural population declines, and they know that a further decline will be necessary if agriculture is to be restored to health. A Congressman does not like to vote for the liquidation of his own constituents.

There is some danger that the clamor of the anti-Benson Congressmen will be mistaken for the voice of all American farmers. Many of them are becoming increasingly unhappy with Government controls and subsidies and are not impressed by the mumbo-jumbo of the Democratic Party's witch doctors.

The Farm Journal, which has 3.4 million subscribers all over the country and is considered the leading farm magazine, recently polled its readers on what they wanted from the Government. Three out of five farmers who voted in the poll asked the Government to cut back on the farm programs or eliminate them. A surprising 50.1 percent voted that the Government should get clear out of farming.

Two out of five who voted in the poll were not sure what they wanted. Some favor price controls or supports; some want production payments and controls; some want conservation payments to retire land completely; some want the two-price plan; some want higher supports and fewer acres to plant, and some want lower support and more acres to plant.

Trying to satisfy all these groups is Mr. Benson's job, and of course the task is impossible. President Eisenhower has done well to resist the pressure to get rid of him. Now that the heat on the President is increasing he must not overlook the fact that if he fires Mr. Benson, the Republicans are likely to lose more votes among the 88 percent of the people who are consumers of farm products than they stand to gain among the 12 percent who are producers. The consumers are getting tired of supporting farm programs that have cost almost $25 billion in 25 years, without solving anything.

Moreover, if the Republican Party's chances in the November election are so feeble that it must stoop to betrayal of an honorable man it is time to make a reappraisal of all the party's policies and principles.

The American Merchant Marine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WARREN G. MAGNUSON
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, February 26, 1958

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement which I have prepared dealing with the American merchant marine.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

As my colleagues in the Senate know, I have frequently made known my views on the American merchant marine, with stress on its great economic importance in domestic and world trade and its value as this Nation's fourth arm of defense.

Our continuing role as a maritime leader in the free world is due in large part to the support our American-flag fleet has received under authority of the Merchant Marine Act of 1936. Our globe-encircling cargo fleet has been able to survive, and continues as one of our strongest links to the free world through support by Government assistance in the form of parity payments to offset low-cost foreign competition.

I bring this to your attention today because of a recent article in Barron's, a national business and financial weekly, which I believe misinterprets the policies and denies the soundness of the 1936 act. The article tends to confuse the reader as to the straight course the act is steering to assure our country economic prosperity and defensive strength through an adequate merchant marine.

The article was entitled "Faulty Compass—The United States Needs a New Shipping Policy." In referring to the National Maritime Union (AFL–CIO), it stated that the NMU long has been riding buoyantly on a sea of Federal subsidy. To keep both captain and crew afloat in recent years has cost the taxpayer heavily. I say this is not so. Statistics compiled for me by the Committee of American Steamship Lines, representing the 14 subsidized lines, show that during the 10-year period from 1946 through 1955, 85 percent of net operating subsidy costs paid out by the Government have been offset by Federal income taxes paid in by the shipping companies and their employees, including the members of the seamen's unions. And this does not take into account the tax returns, and the economic benefits to the many industries, and their thousands of employees, which service the subsidized vessels, keep them in repair, et cetera.

What a small price to pay for a ticket to survival. Gen. Nathan F. Twining, chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, has summed up that importance very clearly. He has said that in case of a surprise and devastating nuclear attack that might knock out land transportation the merchant marine's availability to ply the great high-

way of the seas with strategic materials and foodstuffs might well be the one source of free world strength to pluck victory from chaos.

The Barron's article also stated that, and I quote, "The Government, acting through the Maritime Administration, gradually has extended its control over the (shipping) industry." Again, this is not a correct statement. An underlying theme of the 1936 act was that this important industry was to be built on private enterprise—and there has been no change to the contrary. What it adds up to is a unique Government-industry partnership. In essence, the Government is paying for a service. The 14 contract lines, to qualify for subsidy payments, must travel the 34 essential trade routes that are part of the partnership bargain, on regular schedules, thus assuring our country's products, industrial and agricultural, free and regular access to the markets of all the world.

The United States has become an island in a world made painfully small by swishing earth satellites and long-range guided missiles. These 34 trade routes have proven to be the very lifelines in and out of this country when it comes to taking homemade products overseas and returning with vital raw materials and other goods our country lacks. Our regular and dependable liner service on these routes has helped develop trade for major coastal areas. Not only have United States-flag carriers contributed to this but their service has forced competing foreign-flag ships to offer improved services. American-flag service on essential trade routes has had a stabilizing effect on freight rate structures, with enormous savings to importers and exporters, particularly in periods of national emergency. Development of ports on all coasts has benefited farmers, industry and transportation services generally, including domestic and other segments of the oceangoing merchant marine.

The facts throw a more accurate light on the situation than the lines in the Barron's article that say, "The trouble is that Congress has been steering by a faulty compass, the Merchant Marine Act of 1936 as amended;" and later stating: "handouts from Washington have kept the Stars and Stripes waving over certain so-called essential water routes." Such extravagant language adds nothing to honest consideration of maritime policy.

A further statement, or, rather, misstatement, in the article is to the effect that the Maritime Administration is proposing to expand the cost of the subsidy program and that there will be, and I quote, "A great and useless drain on the public purse."

It might be said that this useless drain doesn't add up to a drip when one is truly knowledgeable as to how these subsidies work. Subsidies awarded contract lines simply help make up the difference between high American costs and low-wage foreign competition. The operating and construction differential subsidies requests made by the President in his budget message to Congress are to provide that equalizer. Admittedly, 80 percent of the operating differential goes to equalize the pay of ship crews. All of the construction subsidy payments go to the shipyards. This is a product of our superior living standard. We must have these subsidies or scrap our fleet in favor of having our country's products carried under foreign flag. This would not only knock the props from under the $5.3 billion economic contribution annually made by the merchant marine, but would force us to rely on foreign cargo fleets in time of war, which history has proved to be a reef-strewn course to follow.

Barron's also surprises me with the statement that "shipping subsidies, whether for construction or operation, have not served the national interest." Again a realistic record of the lines operating under operating subsidy agreements will refute this. It is impressive. Here are some of their achievements.

1. They represent a combined net worth of $558.7 million in 1955 compared with less than $79 million in 1937. Thus the 1938 act, and prudent management, have strengthened the industry as was intended.

2. A fleet of 504 highly competitive vessels are engaged today in cargo and passenger services from all major United States ports, providing some 35,000 seafaring jobs, roughly half the total on United States ships.

3. A record of 16,509 voyages sailed in the 10-year period, 1947–56, with combined mileage equal to 8,000 trips around the Equator.

4. Contractual commitments to build about 200 new ships over the next 10 to 12 years.

Subsidy as a fleet preservation measure becomes even more important when one looks toward Russia. The Reds are fast building up their merchant marine and the Soviet economic offensive has moved into high gear. The recent Afro-Asian People's Solidarity Conference in Cairo clearly indicates the direction of future Soviet bloc economic effort.

At the end of 1957, the State Department issued a statement about Russia's economic penetration, which said, in part: "In the last two and a half years the Soviet bloc has made agreements with 10 underdeveloped nations to provide them with $1.5 billion in economic aid. * * * United States economic aid to the 10 countries over the same period is estimated at $900,000. * * *"

Barron's points out that, as time goes on, subsidy costs will mount sharply, adding: "For at the urging—and with the financial support—of the Maritime Administration, the major United States shipping lines all have embarked on a massive replacement of their fleets. The Government, of course, will foot part of the bill directly." What Barron's did not stress is that the major investment will be by private enterprise.

What the Barron's article also ignored completely was the enormous advantage accruing to our Government in the event of war or sudden emergency, from the fact that these subsidized vessels represent a fleet in being—they will be available to the military at once, in time of urgent need.

In World War II victory was delayed many months, and casualties undoubtedly greatly increased, because we lacked cargo vessels and passenger ships to service our far-flung battle stations. Every merchant vessel now in active service—every cargo and passenger vessel constructed under the current vessel-replacement program which the Barron's article disparages, will be so much added insurance that the United States will have available in the future an adequate number of potential military auxiliaries for any need.

And the Government will get these vessels at peacetime cost, depreciated—not at fantastic wartime costs, as was the case in World Wars I and II.

The long-range ship replacement program which all of us—Congress, the administration, and industry—have worked so hard to develop is termed by Barron's as massive replacement. Evidently Barron's is outraged by the size of the program but this is just what we need. The 1936 act states that all ships of the contract lines must be replaced by new vessels at the end of 20 years. Most of the subsidized fleet's ships were built during World War II and are fast approaching the 20-year age. If the lines waited until the closing months of this agreement there would be such a race and scramble to build ships that our yards could not handle the orders and there would result what is commonly known as block obsolescense. Incidentally, it is worthy to note that there were 1,569 freighters under construction last year in foreign nations. Not one was being built in the United States. In contrast, the President's budget only proposes the building of 17 or 18 new ships.

Barron's concluded that, "For what ails American shipping is not too little Government, but too much. For the good of its merchant marine and its own best interests, the United States would do well to change helmsmen and try a different tack." Prior to the 1936 act our maritime policy suffered from too many helmsmen and too frequent changes of course.

Any other tack than the one we are now on might well prove disastrous. Subsidy is a form of insurance. Because of it, America is able to maintain an efficient fleet of dry-cargo freighters and passenger ships to carry out national policies of trade and defense—policies reaffirmed by this administration. Without it our high standard of living and high costs of doing business would literally drive our merchant marine off the high seas.

The Reciprocal Trade Issue

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HERMAN E. TALMADGE
OF GEORGIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, February 26, 1958

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, one of the important issues which will be considered by Congress at this session is the proposed extension of the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act.

An astute analysis of that question and its ramifications was written recently by Hon. Donald Comer, of Birmingham, Ala., chairman of the executive committee of Avondale Mills, in a letter to the editor of the New York Times. I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, that the letter be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

I also ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, that there be printed, along with Mr. Comer's letter, a list of the revisions in the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act proposed and supported by the American Cotton Manufacturers Institute, Inc.

There being no objection, the letter and list were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The EDITOR,
The New York Times,
New York, N. Y.

DEAR SIR: The Sunday February 16 New York Times headlined a news item "Big Trade Debate Opens Tomorrow." Their Monday paper editorially supports the administration's position.

This is in connection with the President's request for a 5-year extension of the miscalled reciprocal trade agreement. We are informed that five members of the Cabinet are to appear as his witnesses at the congressional committee hearings—Secretary of State, Secretary of Commerce, Secretary of Agriculture, Secretary of Labor and Secretary of Defense. In addition to these there will also be junior officers of these several departments. These are termed "liberalists." The opponents of this legislation as administered are labeled "protectionists."

On February 15, 1955, when this legislation was renewed at the request of the President, he wrote Congressman JOSEPH MARTIN of Massachusetts, it would be so administered as to hurt no American industry and

called attention to a protective clause. This escape clause gave an injured industry the right to prove its case before the Tariff Commission.

The fishing industry of New England complained that they were suffering from imports of cheap fish from Iceland. They proved their case before the Tariff Commission but the President refused to carry out the recommendations of the Tariff Commission. His refusal might have been influenced by the fact that we were seeking air bases in Iceland at that time.

Mr. Henry Kearns, the Assistant Secretary of Commerce, recently addressed the Synthetic Organic Chemical Manufacturers Association in New York City and he is quoted in the New York Daily News Record as saying that it was the responsibility of the Government to consider the effects of tariffs and quotas upon the country as a whole. There seems to be a departure here from the President's promise that no American industry would be hurt.

In discussing the impact of imports on domestic textiles, Mr. Kearns conceded that, "There have been great entries into specific areas, but it is difficult to attribute all economic ills to the tariff program." Admitting that there are other causes for some of our economic ills certainly doesn't justify the addition of another backbreaking cause with a threat of an increase of that invasion. He also seeks to minimize our complaint by referring to the fact that while we imported $646 million in textiles, we exported $668 million. There are over a thousand individual units in our industry, all of them sharply competitive and making I don't know how many different kinds of fabrics. But if the West Point Manufacturing Co., which makes heavy industrial duck, can find a market for conveyor belting to be used in loading nitrates in Chile, bananas in Colombia, and iron ore in Venezuela, etc., there is certainly no reason why Avondale Mills, which makes tissue ginghams, should have to balance these West Point exports by imports of Japanese ginghams. Just because Louisiana and Arkansas export rice to Cuba is certainly no reason why Idaho and Maine should have to accept imports of potatoes.

The textile industry's demand for protection in their home market against foreign imports from countries where wages are so far below our own, and as in the case of Asia, where living standards are so different, have been called greedy by some of our critics. Here is a short answer to that. We pay the American standard wages, the highest in the world. Our hours, ages of our employees, and our minimum wage are all fixed by our Government. The price of our raw material—cotton is fixed by our Government—and at a price that is known as a parity price to the cotton farmer. Under this arrangement up until now, the cotton farmer has raised more cotton than the American mills used, and since the American price was much higher than the world price, millions of bales accumulated. Last year the Government began disposing of this cotton to foreign countries at world prices and so we had Japanese buying American cotton, the same that we buy, at 6 cents less than we paid for it and manufacturing it into the same cloth patterns that we make, with labor costs one-tenth of ours and with machines equal to ours in every way. The loss of 6 cents per pound between what the Government paid the farmer and sold it to Japan for, becomes an additional Government expense for which our industry shares the tax. These goods from Japan, and there could be additional quotas from Asian countries, are only copies of our goods. They have nothing of style or quality to add. The only reason why they are here is because they are cheaper, cheaper because they are made of cheaper cotton by cheaper labor than our own.

We do not consider ourselves greedy or high protectionists, when we ask that these differences be equalized by a fair tariff and before considering the question of quotas, and we think until then that the findings before the Tariff Commission should be final.

Mr. Kearns said it was the responsibility of the Government to consider the effects of tariffs on the country as a whole. If he includes Congress and the Supreme Court in that statement, of course we all agree. He is arguing for the executive, the right to kill one industry by imports in order that another industry may be built up to export. If the Congress wants to hold such a threat over American industry, that's one thing, but they certainly shouldn't delegate such authority. Who does Mr. Kearns propose to be such an all-powerful arbiter? And, certainly, he doesn't come before Congress with such a suggestion with authority from the President because the President in the very beginning promised that no American industry would be injured.

We believe in reciprocal trade. We believe in selling the other countries what we have in overabundance that they need, and taking in pay what they have in overabundance that we need—and there could be some three-way trading, too. It doesn't have to be bilateral. We are concerned about a foreign market for our cotton. Our cotton farmers are asked to support this Government program because Japan buys some of our cotton. In answer, I'd like to refer to an article which I wrote for Liberty magazine in 1936 in which I said "When Japan buys our cotton, whether she turns it into gun cotton and shoots bombs at us, or whether she makes it into cloth and ships it to us, there will be casualties in either case." Of course, there was no thought of Pearl Harbor in 1941. I was only thinking of our closed mills because of these Japanese imports. Concern for the cotton farmer and his foreign customers was so well expressed by the president of Avondale Mills, Mr. J. Craig Smith, in a recent issue of the Cotton Trade Journal, of Memphis, Tenn., and I am enclosing a copy of his statement.

I am under the impression that under our present trading that the other countries only take from us what they need, while we take from them what we do not need. Those on the other side of this argument, speaking of our needs across our border, will always refer to copper, nickel, tin, iron ore, rubber and coffee, but Japanese cotton goods are never mentioned, although when trading time comes we find our industry, and that of our garment manufacturing friends, traded off for Japanese and Hong Kong goods and garments, of which we already have an overabundance, and we are told to stop whining.

The Secretary of Labor publishes the statistics of the unemployed, but the figures fail to include that part of the million textile workers who are working 4 days and 3 days of the week. But the statistics of corporate earnings continually show the poor financial operating result of our industry—the industry which, during the last war, Secretary Knox called second only to the steel industry in our national defense. When some member of our industry tries to find a glimmer of hope, he is just singing in the rain.

We would like to help the President build a bridge of goodwill between Japan and America, but we do not see how serious damage to an American industry can accomplish this. I have made three trips to Japan and I would like to see an increase of tourist travel to beautiful Japan and its friendly people encouraged. Let's know each other better, and tourist dollars can help build that bridge.

Very truly yours,

DONALD COMER,
Chairman of the Executive Committee, Avondale Mills, Birmingham, Ala.

[From Textile Information Service of February 21, 1958]

The textile industry is in favor of changes in the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act which will achieve these objectives:

Restore effective congressional control over trade policy.

Require bilateral trade agreements, separately negotiated without using the machinery of any international agency.

Withhold additional authority for the further reduction of tariff rates but remove present ceiling on allowable increases.

Require public disclosure of Tariff Commission findings in connection with peril-point proceedings after completion of agreement negotiations.

Require the Tariff Commission in peril-point proceedings to take into account the differences in production costs, the productive capacity of the exporting country, the adequacy of the United States productive capacity for the commodity concerned, the nature of the commodity—whether it is strategic or not—and the employment impact on the United States labor force.

Require Tariff Commission findings in escape-clause cases to be final unless disapproved by Congress, and require importers to prove that any increase in imports which reduces domestic production or tends to depress the normal growth of domestic production is not injurious if relief is to be denied domestic industry.

Establish as a major criterion of policy the maintenance of tariffs sufficient to equalize United States and foreign raw material costs and to equalize foreign labor costs with United States minimum-wage requirements.

Make physical and tariff quotas recognized instruments of United States policy.

Establish a multicolumn tariff distinguishing between imports from Iron Curtain countries, discriminating countries, favored-nation countries, and preferential countries.

Provide for mandatory review of tariff classifications and rates every 3 years to determine readjustments needed because of technological and price-level changes.

Establish the principle of differential rates in connection with the degree of processing involved.

Elimination of State Department domination of trade policy.

Require the use of private citizens who are bona fide representatives of United States producers on United States trade agreement negotiating teams.

Herbert Hoover at Valley Forge

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL B. DAGUE
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 25, 1958

Mr. DAGUE. Mr. Speaker, my home county is a proud county of a proud State, Chester County, Pa. It is the oldest rural county in Pennsylvania and all of its land titles date back to William Penn. It has many places of historic greatness and because it originally embraced an area now occupied by 23 other counties it continues to lay rightful claim to many historic spots outside its present confines. One of these hallowed shrines is Valley Forge.

Each year on Washington's Birthday in commemoration not only of the birth of the Father of Our Country but also as reminder of the great heritage we have in the ordeal endured by the ragged Con-

tinentals in the winter of 1777-78, a great and increasingly influential organization known as Freedom's Foundation—which has its headquarters at Valley Forge—holds its Awards Day when recognition is made of those who have contributed in some manner toward keeping alive and on the ascendency those principles and that fortitude which are synonymous with Valley Forge.

This year the foundation's highest award—its George Washington Medal—was bestowed upon America's most distinguished living American, Herbert Hoover, who came to Valley Forge to receive the decoration and took the occasion to deliver a timely address, at the conclusion of which he pointed that he had delivered identically the same speech on the same spot 27 years previously at a time when America was faced with a grave economic crisis. Mr. Hoover pointed out that that was a period of anxiety and discouragement.

"But," he said, "we rallied to a period of greatness as we will again today."

Anyone who heard Mr. Hoover at Valley Forge last Saturday and then later in the day heard the tirade of vilification that came from another former President of the United States here in Washington could not help but make a comparison and conclude that training and associations leave their marks.

More About Reuther, IV—Walter Reuther's Friends Do Not Like a Look at His Record

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
CLARE E. HOFFMAN
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 18, 1958

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, now that the McClellan committee of the Senate, which has exposed the activities of other violators of the law, has let it be known that it expects to give the public a view of Walter P. Reuther, the reaction of Reuther and some of his friends might be helpful. To that end, read the article by George Todt which was published in the Valley Times of California on January 31, 1958:

WHAT STRUCK REUTHER SO TELLINGLY?

"Anger is momentary madness, so control your passion or it will control you."—Horace, Epistles.

What was it that Senator BARRY GOLDWATER said at the Republican dinner in Detroit on January 20 which so unbalanced Walter Reuther that he momentarily became hysterical and screamed childish imprecations steeped in vicious personal abuse at the young Arizonan?

Why did the usually outwardly calm labor dictator suddenly lose his former poise and degenerate quickly into a nervous, ranting, rabble-rouser who was reduced to hurling rank epithets, personalities, and malicious spleen at his accuser?

And, finally, when will Mr. Reuther actually answer up to the devastating charges Senator GOLDWATER made concerning his unlawful, unpatriotic, and un-American attempt to usurp a great political party in our country to carry out his socialistic political aims?

In previous articles I have given you an insight into the ideological backgrounds of these two protagonists through their own words. Today I am going to give my readers the real reason why Mr. Reuther had no recourse to answer Senator GOLDWATER recently in anything except terms of slanderous personal abuse—but no facts on the line. For the Senator had Mr. Reuther dead in his sights. In truth, he had no ready answer forthcoming. So he reacted in the only way he knew how—he tried to becloud the issue with his malignant and totally unjust diatribes.

What Senator GOLDWATER said which got into Mr. Reuther's craw so much that he caved in and lost himself in momentary madness is to be found, in its entirety, on page 506 of the Appendix contained in the United States CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of January 23 of this year. I commend its reading to every patriotic Democrat and Republican in our Nation today. It tells the story of how Marxist Social Laborites in America, boring steady from within, captured a great political party in the State of Michigan. It is a grisly tale of Hitlerite violence and duress.

Here are a few excerpts from Senator GOLDWATER'S address which will give us some quick insights into the sickening picture:

"In 1950, I understand the traditional Democrats made a last vain attempt to take back their party from the CIO politicians of your State (Michigan).

"The Calkins investigation (NOTE.—This document, written by a CIO expert named Calkins, tells the growth of CIO union power inside the Democratic Party of Michigan, and how the seizure of this party machinery was first decided upon and how it was carried out) shows how this last attempt was smashed by equipping each of the Wayne County district conventions with small squads of men ready to use force to prevent the regular Democrats from regaining power.

"The leader of the armed squad which took over the Democrat convention in the 15th District told Calkins he was equipped with 6 men, 20 clubs and 2 pistols.

"As the terrorists completed their final outrages on the dying remnants of the old party, George Fitzgerald, Democrat national committeeman, said, and I quote his comments to the newspapers: 'I have just watched socialism take over the Democratic Party by Communist processes.'

"Mrs. Nellie Riley, former Democrat national convention delegate, warned, and again I quote: 'Socialists are in complete charge of the Democratic Party machinery.'

"The Democrat national committeeman subsequently refused to attend the State convention of his own party, saying he refused to attend a convention the delegates to which had been picked, and I quote his statement to the newspaper: 'With storm troopers guarding the doors and the chairman presiding with a baseball bat.'"

Now this is only a small sample of what may be read in Senator GOLDWATER'S well-documented address which is filled with facts, not hysteria. It is too bad that the same cannot be said concerning Mr. Reuther's rude and churlish outburst aimed at the courageous Senator.

There are two categories of thoughtful citizens in these United States who should rush to the nearest library and get their hands on the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD without delay to view Mr. GOLDWATER'S remarkable speech for themselves—or write to the Senator for a copy of it.

These two groups, for whom first priority should be reserved, are (1) the real Democrats and (2) patriotic American societies and individuals.

Every traditional Jeffersonian-type Democrat ought to know what Mr. Reuther's crypto-Socialist COPE political machine has done to muscle in on the regular party organization—and how the latter lost out to the socialistic CIO forces in Michigan. It could happen here?

And the American patriots ought to read Senator GOLDWATER'S exposé of Mr. Reuther and the COPE machine—and quickly thereafter bury the hatchet among themselves. If these people cannot learn to stop bickering over the unimportant issues of the moment in order to concentrate on the one great overriding issue of the day in the United States of America—then it's really later than we think.

California Teamwork

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PATRICK J. HILLINGS
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 26, 1958

Mr. HILLINGS. Mr. Speaker, I don't believe the remarkable demonstration of teamwork within the California congressional delegation over the years should pass unnoticed.

The California congressional delegation, which is composed of representatives of both political parties, is the only delegation in Congress to meet on a relatively regular basis to handle nonpartisan problems that frequently confront our rapidly growing State and require attention at the congressional level.

This teamwork has not only produced unity on these matters within the delegation of 30 members and two senators but also has provided a spirit of good fellowship and cooperation.

The end result has been that the delegation, meeting on a bipartisan basis, has tackled and solved nonpartisan problems that could not possibly have handled if left to individual representatives and senators.

I think probably the best and most recent demonstration of this teamwork resulted in the assignment of considerable new ship construction work to private yards at San Pedro, San Diego, and San Francisco.

Working together for the assignment of new ship construction to California yards, practically dormant since World War II, were Republicans and Democrats. I think, if history is traced, the award of contracts to the yards at San Pedro, San Diego and San Francisco culminates almost 10 years of effort by our representatives and senators.

After World War II, you will recall, our California shipyards virtually died on the vine for lack of work after meeting a tremendous challenge by turning out hundreds of oceangoing vessels for our wartime commerce, and troop transport.

Credit for persuading the Maritime Administration and the appropriate committees of Congress to revive major ship construction in California yards can appropriately be given to Senators WILLIAM F. KNOWLAND and THOMAS H. KUCHEL, and Representatives JOHN ALLEN, Oakland Republican; GEORGE MILLER, Ala-

meda Democrat; WILLIAM MAILLIARD, San Francisco Republican; JOHN SHELLEY, San Francisco Democrat; BOB WILSON, San Diego Republican; CRAIG HOSMER, Long Beach Republican; CECIL KING, Los Angeles Democrat, to name a few.

I might add there was considerable support lent to this group by inland representatives and there should be special mention given to GORDON MCDONOUGH, Los Angeles Republican, and Representative HARRY SHEPPARD, Yucaipa Democrat.

They are, respectively, chairman and vice chairman of the bipartisan delegation and they probably are the two most cooperative people in Congress to work with when a specific nonpartisan problem comes up that requires delegation attention and support.

Statement of C. C. Walther Concerning Extension of Trade Agreements Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HALE BOGGS
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 13, 1958

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement filed by C. C. Walther, president, Walther Bros. Co., Inc., Walther Paint Co., Inc.:

The Honorable WILBUR D. MILLS,
Chairman, House Ways and Means Committee, United States Congress, Washington, D. C.:

My name is Curtis C. Walther, president of Walther Bros. Co., Inc., and Walther Paint Co., Inc., of New Orleans, La. I have been a resident of New Orleans since 1920, being a native-born Louisianian. Living in this important port city of the United States, I, early in my business career became interested in foreign trade.

I was one of the original organizers of International House and was president of that organization for the years 1951–52. I am a past president of the Chamber of Commerce of the New Orleans area, having served two terms in 1949–50. I was one of the organizers of the International Trade Mart of New Orleans and presently a member of it's board of directors. I am presently president of the Foreign Policy Association of New Orleans, and was chairman of the Mississippi Valley World Trade Council for the years 1955–56.

During my presidency of International House, I headed trade missions of business men and women to Guatemala, Mexico, Colombia, and Cuba, and in the year 1954 headed the International House Trade and Travel Mission to seven European countries, where we visited international trade fairs in Milan, Italy, Hanover, Germany, Brussels, Belgium, and London, England. On all of these trips our group program was arranged officially by the heads of foreign trade departments of these foreign countries, which brought us into direct contact with our counterparts in those countries. Forums and panel discussions were the order of the day, which gave us a most comprehensive insight into the problems that beset those who engage in foreign commerce.

On the basis of my personal experience that resulted from manifold contacts as outlined in part in the foregoing paragraph, I have formulated a basic conclusion that motivated my request for permission to file a statement, namely; if we are to have world peace, we must have world trade. If we are to have world trade, we must eliminate as many trade barriers as possible.

I sincerely request that your committee approve the extension of the Trade Agreements Act for a period of at least 5 years and continuing authority for a tariff reduction of not less than 25 percent.

1. The Trade Agreements Act is the legislative basis for United States trade policy for the past 24 years. The United States as the leader of the free world and the Nation with the largest volume of international trade obviously exerts the greatest influence on the course of the world trade and on the trade policies followed by the other nations. For the past 10 or 12 years United States leadership has been decisive in maintaining so large a part of world trade in private hands and in steadily reducing, on a worldwide scale, tariff and other artificial barriers to the international exchange of goods. We have made substantial progress toward world multilateral trade and convertibility of currencies which are major United States foreign economic policy objectives. A failure on our part to continue this legislation in an adequate form could only cause us to lose our leadership and gravely jeopardize the progress already made in these directions. It could spark a chain of events which would reverse the process of expanding world trade and lead to the development of mutually exclusive regional blocs economically insulated from each other and from the United States. Such regional trading areas are already forming. The direction in which they develop and whether, by increasing trading opportunities on a world basis, they realize the full potential benefits of the larger free market area they are designed to comprise, depends heavily on United States action on this extension of the Trade Agreements Act.

2. Expanding exports and imports are essential to an expanding United States economy. Our continued economic development, our increasingly high standard of living, our greater productivity all depend upon higher volumes of trade. Four and a half million people, or 7 percent of our labor force, are directly or indirectly employed in this two-way trade. About 9 percent of our movable goods are exported; this includes 11 percent of our machine tools, 26 percent of our mining and construction equipment, about one-fifth of our agricultural production. We cannot maintain or increase these exports unless imports increase. It is only through pursuit of a liberal trade policy on our part that our trading partners can themselves pursue such a policy; aside from our foreign aid and foreign investment it is only through increasing exports to us that other countries can earn the dollar to pay for our exports. The United States is a low-cost producer of a tremendous variety of products, in great demand around the world. The major limitation on our export sales is the dollars these countries can earn. Tariffs protecting our less efficient and generally low wage industries directly limit potential exports of our efficient, high wage industries and work to prevent the kind of specialization on an international scale that has served us so well domestically in greater productivity and efficiency. With larger imports we would make perhaps fewer bicycles, less velveteen, less decorated chinaware, or glassware—but more electronic equipment, construction and mining machinery, transport equipment. Our highly productive industries would expand and, as more dollars were available to other nations, this would extend to a wide range of consumers' goods for which we are still the lowest cost producers in the world. These greater exports would lead automatically to greater United States imports of noncompetitive raw materials or components, to the benefit of both sides.

3. We need at least 5-year extension of the Trade Agreements Act to provide a minimum of stability in our foreign trade. One of the major problems in the forward planning so necessary in the conduct of any business has been the uncertainty caused by the successive expirations of the Trade Agreements Act and the questions raised each time about its renewal. This is damaging to confidence in the continuity of a liberal policy on our part and seriously inhibits full realization of the benefits such a policy can bring forth, both to ourselves and to the rest of the world.

(4) The 6 European countries—France, Germany, Italy, Belgium, Netherlands and Luxembourg—have now ratified the treaties which will set up, over a period of 12 to 15 years, a common market free of tariffs and quotas for the products of 160 million people. The first phase of this operation will take place in the next 4 to 6 years, during which period tariffs among the 6 will be reduced by 30 percent, and a common tariff at a level of the average of present tariffs will be established against all outside countries. We consider this development a major step in the right direction—the greater specialization, the increase in productivity brought about by large-scale production in this wider market area can only result in higher living standards for all of the 6 countries. It can mean greater two-way trade between the area and the United States provided we are able, through the extension of this Trade Agreements Act, to negotiate a reduction in the level of the average European tariff to be maintained against us. Our mutual trade can certainly increase as it has always done as countries increase their developments and raise their standards of living; but if we give notice, by failure to pass this legislation in meaningful form, that we are not prepared to maintain our liberal trade policy, there is the considerable danger that the direction which the 6 nations take in their development will be away from closer economic relations with us and toward the kind of closed trading system so disastrous to our goals of freer worldwide multilateral trade. It could lead to the kind of bilateralism and regionalism against which we have exerted our influence for many years. It could lead increasingly to our mutual economic isolation and reduction of our very considerable mutual trade instead of its increase as both of our economies demand.

There is no real solution as many have maintained, in greater United States investment in plant and equipment inside the common market area in order to supply that market tariff free. Remittance of earnings in dollars and repatriation of capital will depend on European dollar earnings through increased exports of the area to the United States, and this can only be accomplished through a reciprocal reduction of tariffs.

5. Extension of the Trade Agreements Act is particularly important in view of the current business downturn. There can be no doubt that the recent decline in our exports has been a basic contributing factor in that downturn.

For the sake of our economy, for the preservation of United States jobs which depend on exports, we need now the boost that passage of this legislation would give to our rate of business activity by removing the uncertainty, the crisis of confidence among our foreign customers that our trade policy is in danger of going backward. We cannot afford the kind of a downward spiral in our foreign trade that failure to extend this act would entail. Its inevitable consequence would be further pressure on our

employment, our investment in plant and equipment and our economic activity.

6. Above all extension of the Trade Agreements Act is essential to free world unity and security. All nations in this world of mutual dependence, rely for their economic strength to foreign markets for their exports and to foreign sources of raw materials and other essentials for their imports. No alliance, political or military can be strong unless it is supported by common economic ties and full faith by each in the cooperative effort of all. In the face of the new Soviet economic offensive—the new challenge to the United States in the field of trade, issued by the Kremlin—these ties and these opportunities become more crucial than ever to the security. A large part of the world is at stake. If we default we may lose, for our principles of freedom and of competition, much of that world. The drive for economic development, for higher standards of living is irresistible everywhere, and will be satisfied either within the traditions of freedom or by forced growth at the tragic sacrifice of the individual, characteristic of the Soviet system. This extension of the Trade Agreements Act will be a central factor in the choice the world makes as to the direction it will go.

Curbing the Supreme Court

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HERMAN E. TALMADGE
OF GEORGIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, February 26, 1958

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Curbing Supreme Court," from the February 22, 1958, issue of the Augusta (Ga.) Chronicle.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CURBING SUPREME COURT

There should be full and free discussion in the Senate of the Jenner bill—S. 2646—to limit appellate jurisdiction of the United States Supreme Court.

The bill has been offered as a means of curbing a recent tendency in the court to assume powers that are not authorized by the Constitution of the United States. It sets up five categories in which the Court shall have no jurisdiction, these being cases involving activities of congressional committees, action to protect the Nation from subversion in the executive department among its employees, State legislation or action to control subversive activities within the State, action by boards of education to control subversive activities of teachers, and action of States or boards of bar examiners in relation to admission of individuals to the practice of the law.

These specific recommendations are not the result of ideas dreamed up in a fanciful mind. They hit at certain practices of the Supreme Court whose rulings in specific cases have created a wave of uneasiness throughout the country.

Great care must be exercised, however, in effecting changes that involve fundamental rights of the individual, which, it must be conceded, could be endangered by unwise legislation depriving the Supreme Court of its assigned role as the arbiter of law in the Nation. It is this difficult question that makes it hard to draw a line beyond which the Court shall not pass.

It must be realized, however, that the courts of the country cannot be permtited to transform themselves into legislative bodies, nor can the Supreme Court assume the power to nullify congressional action at will. Their function is to interpret the law as enacted by Congress. Congress remains the paramount agency for making the laws by which this country is governed. Once a law is made the Court has no authority to reverse such a law—except on the ground that it violates the Constitution of the United States.

The Constitution is the fundamental law of the land. Neither Congress nor the Supreme Court has the right or the power to nullify the provisions of the Constitution, which can be amended only by a two-thirds vote of all the States.

The function of the Supreme Court is to guard that Constitution against all encroachments, from any and all sources.

Recently, however, arrogant decrees of the Supreme Court have galvanized honest Members of Congress into a realization that the Court itself is actually destroying fundamental provisions in the Constitution by which the rights of the people and the security of the Nation are guaranteed.

In order to undo the damage already done Congress will have to summon up supreme courage to deal with the current situation in a manner that will reestablish Congress as the Nation's lawmaking body.

The Jenner bill is an effort to achieve such a restoration of congressional powers. It may need some modifications to make certain that proposed limitations on the powers of the Court will not act also as a limitation of the right of the people to appeal to high authority, but there is no question at all about the need for restoring the Supreme Court to its original function as protector of the Constitution rather than a legislative body.

General Harrison's Statement Before the Armed Services Subcommittee

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 26, 1958

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include therein a most impressive, penetrating, timely, and able statement by my friend, Maj. Gen. William H. Harrison, Jr., president of the National Guard Association of the United States, and outstanding leader of the National Guard in my own State of Massachusetts.

It was my privilege to attend the meeting of the Subcommittee on Armed Services before which General Harrison gave this brilliant testimony and am in strong approval of and in agreement with his statement.

I think that he not only touched upon the crux of the present unenviable and dangerous position of the National Guard, due to reduced appropriations, but he also made a complete explanation of the readiness of the Guard to cope with emergency problems, arising from its dual role in the first line of our defense and as a ready force during public emergencies and disasters.

I most earnestly urge that the Congress take immediate action to insure that the National Guard shall be kept at an authorized strength of 400,000 men, exclusive of the 6-month trainees, and I hope that we can secure favorable results on this vital problem in the near future so that the Guard can continue its service without crippling and destructive reductions:

STATEMENT OF MAJ. GEN. WILLIAM H. HARRISON, JR., PRESIDENT OF THE NATIONAL GUARD ASSOCIATION OF THE UNITED STATES, BEFORE SUBCOMMITTEE NO. 1, COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, it is an honor for me to appear before this committee as the representative of almost half a million volunteer citizen-soldiers and airmen who are members of the National Guard of the States, Territories, the District of Columbia, and the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico.

We are aware of your great responsibility concerning the security of our Nation. In the exercise of that responsibility you have had presented to you certain proposed programs and policies for the common defense which vitally affect the Reserve components of the Army, and in particular this country's largest and most effective Ready Reserve force—the Army National Guard. Upon your deliberations and recommendations may well depend the lives of millions of our citizens and the future well-being and independence of these United States. You are entitled to, and must have, all possible information bearing upon these matters.

Mr. Chairman, the National Guard is strongly in favor of every program designed to weld the economic, scientific, and military potential of this country into a more effective instrument for national survival. However, while the attention of the Nation is focused on the fantastic pushbutton weapons of the future and the increased emphasis placed upon their development, we seriously question the wisdom of downgrading, slashing, and reducing the effectiveness of our existing conventional forces, both active and reserve—the men and organizations which constitute our shield of survival now. This doubt is shared by many Members of Congress. We can and must maintain a sufficient balance in our forces to prevent the enemy from gaining a decision in an area and with a force of his own choosing.

While our enemy maintains overwhelming land forces, vast air fleets, and extensive naval armadas; while he continues to incite local disturbances on the periphery of the free world; and while our national policy dictates the use of countermeasures after the first blow has fallen, we must be prepared to meet and grapple with him, notwithstanding the type and character of his attack or the locale in which it commences. In other words, we must be prepared to press the nuclear button, if necessary, and equally prepared to transport, equip, and supply the conventional forces required to cope with so-called brush-fire actions.

The opinion expressed by many in high places at the close of World War II, that the atomic bomb precluded the struggle of land-massed arms, had scarcely echoed before we were engaged in such a struggle in Korea. Our failure to adequately prepare for that action caused the needless and extravagant sacrifice of young Americans. Subsequently, we have tensely watched the explosions in Indochina, the Israeli-Egyptian war, the Suez Canal incident, the fight in Greece, the French and Spanish-Moroccan disturbances,

and the smoldering flames on Formosa and in the Middle East.

Sputniks I and II caused us to redouble our efforts to regain technical and scientific leadership. The widely distributed pictures of the Russian Army parading in Moscow's Red Square on October 5, disclosing extensive advances in weapons and equipment, are not calculated to soothe our national pride. Our vaunted technical superiority in weapons, equipment, and techniques, upon which has been based the slashing reductions in our forces, may no longer stand the scrutiny of close examinaton in the light of these revelations.

An integral part of our balanced force is the Reserve force, and in particular the Army National Guard. Conscious of the need for a strong Reserve and for a plan which would provide equity of military obligation, President Eisenhower, in 1953, assured the country that he would seek to strengthen our national defense by building a 2-million-man Ready Reserve. The Defense Department subsequently called for 2,900,000 men in the Ready Reserve and 2 million more in the Standby Reserve. I need not remind you gentlemen, most of who sat through the extensive hearings on the Reserve Forces Act of 1955, that time and again, under questioning, leaders of the Defense Establishment reiterated that (1) a 2,900,000-man Ready Reserve was a service requirement which had the approval of the services, the Joint Chiefs of Staff, the Secretary of Defense, the National Security Council, and the President; (2) the proposed plan was a long-range plan; and (3) that if the proposed plan was not adopted the entire national defense would have to be reoriented.

The Reserve Forces Act of 1955, embodying a majority of the features called for by the Defense Department, was subsequently enacted, and the Army undertook a multi-million-dollar publicity and advertising campaign to sell its features to the country at large. The immediate results were far from satisfactory.

Nevertheless, early in 1957 the Army announced that the 6 months active duty training requirement in that act was being extended to the Army National Guard. After considerable discussion before this committee, there was developed a memorandum of understanding, which modified the period of obligated service required under the act and specifically set the strength of the Army National Guard at 400,000 officers and men. Both the President and spokesmen for the Army announced that major reliance was placed on the existence of a strong, ready Army National Guard, and the Secretary of the Army guaranteed to do everything in his power to insure that the strength of 400,000 would be maintained. It was categorically stated then, and again later, that the Army would accept every man sent to it for the 6 months training, and at the time the States wanted to send them.

Notwithstanding these assurances and the splendid support rendered by Mr. Brucker, the Secretary of the Army, when the Congress was considering appropriations for the support of the Army National Guard for fiscal year 1958, officials in the Office of the Secretary of Defense blocked the inclusion of funds for the support of thousands of volunteers for the 6-month training program.

Almost immediately, the Department of Defense imposed a strict limitation on funding, and it became necessary to fix quotas on the number of nonprior servicemen who could be enlisted to enter the 6 months' training program in fiscal 1958.

The limited appropriations caused us to "borrow from Peter to pay Paul" with respect to putting young guardsmen into the 6 months' training program during the current fiscal year. We have been permitted, under monthly quotas, to enlist only a few thousand youths to start training within 120 days. Concurrently, we have had to enlist and stockpile high-school students and others who could be deferred from entering training until next July 1. The result was graphically illustrated in a chart displayed by the Chief of the National Guard Bureau, which indicated that those on board prior to July 1 must be funded in the 6 months' program out of fiscal 1959 appropriations. The chart projected only approximately 4,000 new 6-month trainees in fiscal 1959, or less than 1 per Army National Guard unit. In other words, from the standpoint of funds, most of next year's crop has been already harvested.

Efforts have been increased to obtain the enlistment of veterans, and so-called obligors—those who have performed 2 years of active service and who have a remaining obligation to participate in Reserve training. You have already heard testimony to the effect that only about 65 percent of the returning obligors are being involuntarily assigned to Army Reserve units, and only about 73 percent of those are actually attending the prescribed training assemblies. Such a procedure cannot be termed an equitable one. Experience in the States indicates that of the total number of obligors referred by name to the Guard the vast majority cannot be contacted because of incorrect addresses. The geographical location of many precludes their availability. Others express unwillingness to participate, have too much rank for available vacancies, or possess the wrong MOS. Less than 25 percent are ultimately enrolled.

Great stress has been placed on the utilization of obligors. This is a matter which is worthy of detailed consideration, and which members of this committee noted during the testimony delivered this past Monday. All are aware of the furor created by the recall and use of prior servicemen during the Korean conflict. Most of you remember the plea of President Eisenhower who had this to say on July 23, 1953, and I quote:

"I am confident that it is the will of this Nation that the responsibilities for its defense should be shared as equally as possible by all of its citizens.

"And yet, as our veterans of Korea return home they find themselves under legal compulsion to shoulder a 6-year Reserve obligation. Our only effective military Reserve under this present system is—and apparently will remain—composed almost wholly of men who have already served the Nation in the Korean war, World War II, or both.

"I also find that under the present system thousands of our young men have not yet assumed any military obligation to our country. Men who have not been inducted for Korea not only escape the ordeals of that conflict, they also undertake no reserve obligation.

"Thus our system requires our soldier of today also to carry the future national defense burden ahead of the man who has received no training, has done no service, and has assumed no reserve obligation.

"These inequities appear to me to directly contravene some of the most basic principles of our society."

Under the existing system, and as programed for the future, more and more emphasis is being placed upon the continuing military obligation of men who have already performed 2 or more years of active military service, and fewer and fewer opportunities are being afforded for young men without prior service to volunteer for active duty training, followed by a period of reserve training. Thus, the inequities of which the President spoke are being perpetuated and aggravated.

Pentagon sources have been quoted to the effect that the enactment of the new pay bill may make unnecessary the continuation of the draft. Under such circumstances obligors will no longer be available.

Today we have an Army National Guard at a higher state of readiness than was ever deemed possible a few short years ago, and its readiness is constantly and effectively being increased.

The Army National Guard is organized into more than 5,400 combat and combat-support units, located in more than 2,500 separate communities—a dispersal calculated to minimize the effect of any all-out nuclear onslaught. This factor alone might prove the difference between life and death for millions of our citizens in the initial stages of any nuclear war.

It is engaged in an active air defense mission, on an around-the-clock basis, and its units are now being trained to take over Nike-Ajax launching sites.

Inspections conducted by officers of the Active Army, assigned by various Army commanders during field training last summer, attest to the state of training of National Guard organizations. Seventy-five percent of 5,454 Army National Guard units inspected were given ratings of very satisfactory or better. Units awarded superior ratings totaled 12.1 percent, and 32.3 percent received ratings of excellent.

To conduct more advanced type training and make full use of equipment available for training, an increasing number of Army National Guard units are performing weekend outdoor training sessions in lieu of night training in the armory. This gives twice the amount of training time at no increase in cost.

A total of 4,165 officers and 3,924 enlisted men attended courses conducted at Army service schools during fiscal year 1957. Such participation would be greater if more funds were provided. A total of 41,769 Army National Guard men are presently enrolled in extension courses provided by these schools.

The past 2 years have seen an expansion of the National Guard's officer-candidate program. This expansion was undertaken to assure a continuing flow of qualified, properly schooled second lieutenants in guard organizations. The program provides for attendance at Regular Army officer-candidate courses, special National Guard officer-candidate courses conducted at the Infantry School, Fort Benning, and the Artillery and Missile School at Fort Sill. In addition, 34 States and the District of Columbia are conducting officer-candidate schools.

To qualify for promotion to the next higher grade an Army National Guard officer must successfully complete an appropriate course at an Army service school or an extension course commensurate with his grade.

The States, unassisted, have constructed and maintained hundreds of armories and other facilities, with hundreds of millions of dollars; other millions have been invested in facilities under a Federal-State program.

Because of the existence of long-experienced State military departments, the National Guard saves untold millions of dollars which would otherwise be required for the maintenance of wholly Federal Reserve forces.

The Army National Guard imposes a minimum support requirement upon the Active Army. It plans and conducts its own convoys of more than 400,000 men, up to distances of hundreds of miles to and from field-training sites; it performs its own administration, feeding, and general housekeeping, and conducts effective field-type training.

Despite limitation, restrictions, quotas, conversions, reorganizations, and redesignation, the Army National Guard today is still the largest and most effective Ready Reserve force in the arsenal of this Nation.

It is paradoxical and confusing that the more we reduce our forces the stronger we

are supposed to get. This is a dangerous philosophy and one which requires careful scrutiny. In this respect, we are greatly disturbed by proposed plans of the Army as disclosed to this committee. We fail to see wisdom or economy in any plan which arbitrarily directs the inactivation and destruction of Army National Guard divisions for which a requirement exists in the overall structure. Nevertheless, testmony before this committee included no reasons, valid or otherwise, for such projected action. We suggest that such a plan is not motivated alone by the desire for efficiency. Moreover, we seriously doubt that any war plan directs the inactivation of Army National Guard divisions. We do not take issue with the war plan as such, but we state categorically that if the total number of Reserve forces divisions must be reduced, economy and sound planning dictate the establishment of reasonable criteria for evaluating all Reserve forces divisions, to the end that those determined to be least effective be removed.

Such factors as strength, equipment, facilities, state of training, ratio of numbers of officers to enlisted men, unit and field training attendance, administration, supply, community support, potential, and others, appear to be a reasonable yardstick against which organizations may be measured.

The National Guard Association strongly urges that while this Nation vigorously pursues its nuclear and scientific programs, concurrent attention be directed to the maintenance and increased effectiveness of our existing conventional Active and Reserve forces, in order to provide adequate security under any and all circumstances.

Specifically, we recommend that—

1. The strength of the Active Army be maintained at 925,000;

2. The strength of the Reserve forces of the Army be maintained at 700,000;

3. The strength of the Army National Guard be maintained at 400,000;

4. The 6-month active duty training program be expanded to assure an adequate source of nonprior service volunteers to maintain the Army National Guard at 400,000;

5. Sufficient funds be included in the appropriations for fiscal 1959 to support the foregoing prescribed strengths;

6. Language concerning Army National Guard strength and Army Reserve strength be made uniform in respect to the inclusion or exclusion of the 6-month trainees;

7. The committee direct the Army to proceed with development of plans for a revised Reserve Forces troop basis, coordinated with the States and Territories through the National Guard Bureau and coordinated with the Army Reserve; and

8. That prior to implementation of any such revised troop basis it be submitted to this committee for final approval.

The guard is aware that conversion of its existing organizations to the pentomic concept will generate reductions in numbers of units. It is eager to initiate this conversion in order that it may have the powerpacked, mobile type of organizations needed to fight effectively, to survive on the atomic battlefield, and to provide a balanced force. Reorganization and conversion is an old story to the Army National Guard, but only participation in the planning stages will permit the orderly development of mutually satisfactory solutions to this desirable program.

Finally, it is our fervent desire to be able to support the Army as it should be supported, and to have a program of sufficient stability to enable the Army National Guard to perform its historic and legal mission as an integral part of the first line of defense of this Nation.

Houses for Tomorrow: Precut, Prefabricated

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES O. PORTER
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 13, 1958

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, there will come a day when the houses we live in will never be built on the site, any more than we would think about building an automobile in a machine shop. My congressional district is the leading lumber producer among the 435 districts. Our Douglas-fir is the source of building lumber of the highest quality. Great influxes of population are expected on the west coast, so it is natural that persons like my friends Alison Wysong and George Seelye, as leaders on an industrial committee in Springfield, Oreg., take the leadership in the promotion of mass production of housing.

The following story from the Springfield News for February 6 is an excellent account of the progress being made in this important field:

UNIVERSITY OF OREGON SCHOOL OF ARCHITECTURE SUGGESTS PRECUT, PREFAB HOUSE PLAN FOR LOCAL PRODUCTION, PLUS IDEA FOR SPECIAL SITE TREATMENT

The first recommendation for Springfield to provide a major boost for its own lumber manufacturing economy to come from the University of Oregon School of Architecture by way of the Springfield Committee for Industrial Promotion, is a plan for mass production of precut, prefabricated houses that would provide site and housing project development as part of a package deal.

Wallace Hayden, professor of architecture, and Allison Wysong, industrial committee secretary, unveiled the first housing project model Wednesday afternoon at the Municipal Power office. The suggestion will be reviewed in detail next Wednesday night, February 12, at a meeting of the Springfield committee at the public library.

Wysong and George Seelye showed the model to Governor Robert Holmes at Salem on Monday and reported he was "greatly pleased" and said the project fits in with the industrial-development program he has been advocating. The school of architecture is working with the Springfield committee at the Governor's request.

The houses proposed by the school of architecture could be produced by the local corporation, the pieces coming from efficient use of standard dimension materials, then cut, numbered, and packaged for delivery to the site. Plans are in the making for 1- and 2-story single-family houses, plus 2, 3, or 4 apartment structures, Hayden said. The service would be available either to someone who wanted to buy a house for do-it-yourself construction or a developer who wanted to erect a dozen or hundreds of houses. "America needs houses in quantity. Springfield needs more manhours per thousand board feet of timber. This may be a solution," said Professor Hayden.

Basically, the plan recognizes that land use and house use cannot be separated, Prof. Hayden said. The "idea service" that would go with each house would fit it to a lot or a project.

Wysong and Prof. Hayden said the plan to be submitted to the committee includes formation of a local company, with stock sold locally and with local management, to go into the house manufacturing business, providing the houses on a competitive basis and offering extra services designed to make for long-time consumer enjoyment of the project. The plan takes into consideration the fact that present rectangular street layouts often do not fully utilize sites for their best potentials. "We realize," Prof. Hayden said, "that the housing problem from a national point of view, can only be solved by tract development." He said developments should no longer be a single unit duplicated many times, but instead providing enough ranges in space to fit different family sizes, incomes, and preference. A tract, the professor stated, is no longer limited to minimum survival, but may be beautifully developed.

The plan envisions a step toward solution of the neighborhood community problem, the professor said, providing as it does, a model of a neighborhood, a unit designed for the neighborhood. The Springfield firm would, he pointed out, provide a layout service, actually an idea factory, providing for such differences as terrain, different appearance, difference in requirements—it is something that has never been done—a whole service.

Every house, he continued, would have the same advantages in exposure, privacy, sheltered terraces, wind protection, access to children's play areas and public services, and each site would be approached by a neighborhood traffic way, zoned free from through traffic.

He described the tract plan also as a complete project service, with individual units keyed and matched to a pattern known to the producer. Each house would be designed for a particular size and shape of lot and yet each would be cut in the Springfield plant.

The University of Oregon students are continuing their studies on space requirements, utilization of good but reject material (people in the know use reject box car siding for much building) and like subjects. Wysong and Prof. Hayden look forward to an extremely interesting meeting of the local committee next Wednesday night.

Dateline 1980

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN STENNIS
OF MISSISSIPPI
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, February 26, 1958

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed, in the Appendix of the RECORD, Mrs. Lucy Somerville Howorth's stimulating and thought-provoking article, entitled "Dateline 1980," published in the February 1958 issue of the General Federation Clubwoman. Judge Howorth has done more than uphold the high literary standards of this magazine, in her penetrating analysis of some of America's future problems, if cretain trends continue to develop for the next two decades.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DATELINE 1980

(By Lucy Somerville Howorth, national consultant, women's archives, Radcliffe College)

Robert Frost recently said that "the beauty of life lies in struggle and change and taking tough decisions." Mrs. Clubwoman, 1980, will have known that kind of beauty. She will have been confronted by many changing social factors, eight of which I have selected as of particular significance to women's organizations. They are outlined below:

1. There will be 4 persons for every 3 today. In 1957 United States population was 171 million, in 1980 it will be 215 million. This estimate is well under that of most authorities. To grasp its meaning, imagine one additional person in every home and two more in many. Pressure from this growing population is already being felt. A student of the subject, Robert C. Cook has stated, "sheer numbers wil restrict our mobility and completely change our life, compressing our society and culture into molds utterly inconceivable to us now."

2. The trend toward early marriages will continue. Strong social pressures on boys and girls to marry will continue. This trend, which began about the time of World War II has prevailed through one generation and is continuing into the next, consequently some of the adjustments to it have been made. The full effect of this development on the social structure has not yet been felt. One of the problems—and a most poignant one—is the age old problem of the girls who help their boy husbands to educate themselves to go up in the world and then cannot follow, having sacrificed their own education for their husbands.

3. The 4-day workweek will be general. There is agreement that this will happen. Most women are opposed; in 1957 a gallup poll reported 67 percent voted "no" and a trendex poll showed a majority against. Men are more doubtful. The question most men ask is "what to do with the time?" Women sourly comment "What can we do with a man underfoot 3 days in row?" (A comforting thought, perhaps, the days probably wouldn't be "in a row.") Women see no reduction in homework. Aristotle, yes Aristotle, 384–322 B. C., said: "The proper use of leisure is the test of the educated man." Twenty-five years ago the proper use of leisure was a measure only of the leisure class. In 1980 most adults will have to find "what to do with the time." The abuse of leisure may present a critical moral problem.

4. Families will continue to be moderately large. This would seem obvious, if the population is to grow. But it isn't. Population could grow from immigration, lowered death rate, or concentration of many births in a segment of the population. Instead the growth will be diffused throughout the population. This means, for one thing, a tendency for club leadership to be concentrated in older-age groups.

5. The movement of women will continue to paid jobs outside the home. This trend seemingly is inconsistent with the shorter workweek; nevertheless the two will develop concurrently. In November 1957 the Census Bureau reported that every year for the last 10 another half million women have taken jobs outside the home. It is a well-known fact that in every type of social order, women have been economic producers. In some societies they have been almost the only producers. In the United States, the story of the flow of women's work from the home to the factory is familiar. Most women currently entering the labor force are married and past 35. The average American woman can expect to be in the labor force during some period of her life. Unfortunately, there is no evident trend toward higher pay or higher positions for any appreciable percentage of women. In 1980, as in 1957, it will be news when a woman wins a top position.

6. Families will move with greater frequency. As industry and Government continue to decentralize, a trend accelerated by sputnik, transfers of employees will increase. There may appear to be a conflict here with the earlier statement that population growth will restrict mobility. The mobility there referred to is movement for pleasure, to get away from things by seeking a new environment. Here we are considering mobility as the Army and Navy have always known it. This factor presents many problems to organizations.

7. College education will be predominantly coeducational. This trend is clearly apparent. The older and more famous women's colleges are in no danger. There will always be a place for them, as for the private men's colleges. Smaller and less well-established women's colleges and State institutions for women face mergers, reorganization and extinction. In the past, leadership in organizations has come largely from graduates of women's colleges. They must now begin to look elsewhere for leaders.

8. Women will continue to live longer than men. This is a sad fact, that has happened in this century. There is nothing in sight to close this gap. The 4-day week should, but unwise use of leisure may well cancel possible benefits. It is estimated that by 1980 there will be 3,750,000 more women than men in the United States, most of them widows past 60.

These factors are not what I would choose to have happen, nor what I would advocate. They are what students of social forces say will happen. It rests with the people of the United States—and particularly the organized women—to turn these developments to mean a good society.

Mr. David Warren

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER ROGERS
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 25, 1958

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I have the sad duty to advise this body of the passing of one of Texas' and the Nation's most illustrious sons. I was deeply moved when I received the sad news that Mr. David Warren had passed on. A fine citizen and an outstanding newspaper man has been removed from our midst and countless friends mourn his passing.

Mr. Warren was born in Missouri, and was a graduate of the University of Missouri School of Journalism. His newspaper career began in Texas in 1918 as a reporter on the staff of the Amarillo Daily News and the Daily Panhandle, later becoming managing editor and serving in that capacity until 1926 when he founded the Borger News-Herald. He was chairman of the Panhandle banks and for many years publisher of the Panhandle Herald and Borger News-Herald which he sold in recent years. He also controlled a string of newspapers in the Panhandle of Texas and eastern New Mexico, but had disposed of these to give more time to his personal affairs.

He had served as president of the Texas Press Association and the Panhandle Press Association, and for many years was on the board of regents of the University of Texas. He was honored many times in Texas and in his native State of Missouri. He received the distinguished service award of the University of Missouri Alumni Association in 1956, and previously, the Missouri honor award for distinguished service in journalism was bestowed upon him. He was president of the Missouri Journalism Association in 1954–55, and his most recent recognition was a plaque naming him honorary member of the Missouri State Historical Society, 1 of only 11 to receive that honor.

Warren was a life member of the Texas State Historical Society and had been president of the Panhandle-Plains Historical Society. The American Association for State and Local History in 1950 presented him with the association's award of merit in ceremonies held at the University of Texas. Gov. Price Daniel appointed him member of the governor's committee to make plans for the observance of the 75th anniversary of the University of Texas. His life was a full and generous one, marked with success all along the way.

Among the newspaper tributes to his life and memory ran the theme that was his outstanding characteristic—and that was, that he was a Christian gentleman whose life was motivated by the highest principles. Always an idealist, always working for a better America, he never paused to rest on his laurels.

But Dave left his own monument—a dedicated Christian life founded on character, integrity and ability. He never hesitated to stand up for what he thought was right. Personally, I held a deep respect and affection for him and feel I have lost a good friend. I shall miss him very much and will always revere his memory. May I say to Mrs. Warren and the family that although these words of mine cannot ease their grief or be of much comfort, I extend my deepest sympathy in their sorrow and great loss.

Jewish Memorial Hospital

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HERBERT ZELENKO
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 26, 1958

Mr. ZELENKO. Mr. Speaker, it is a great pleasure to report on a communal achievement in the heart of the congressional district that I represent, an achievement that deserves to be known by my colleagues in Congress and by humanitarian-minded men and women throughout the country.

Recently the metropolitan newspapers of New York City and the medical publications of the country carried the following news story about a pioneering achievement of Jewish Memorial Hospital, Broadway at 196th Street, New York, of which, incidentally, I am also a trustee:

The dental service of the Jewish Memorial Hospital, under the direction of Dr. Julius M. Goldberg, announces a completely integrated clinical program for the dental treatment of mentally and physically handicapped children now in effect at the hospital located at Broadway and 196th Street. This program, the first of its kind in the Borough of Manhattan, is under the supervision of Dr. Jerry J. Adelson, chief of the pedodontics service of Jewish Memorial Hospital's dental clinic. Dr. Adelson is also the president of the Dental Guidance Council for Cerebral Palsy.

The program provides for the full dental needs of handicapped children under comparative routine procedures as well as a special operating unit for those who must be treated with general anesthesia.

This unit has been functioning for the past year for children of the Handicapped Children's Clinic of Columbia University College of Dental and Oral Surgery, headed by Dr. Solomon H. Rosenstein.

The program includes training courses in dentistry for the handicapped child, given by Dr. Adelson at Jewish Memorial Hospital both for members of the hospital dental staff and for the postgraduate pedodontics students of Columbia University College of Dental and Oral Surgery.

"This service," Dr. Goldberg said, "is intended for handicapped children of the low-income groups with dental requirements that cannot be treated normally without these special clinical provisions.

"Heretofore, such children have suffered an inadequacy of care due to their physical or mental handicap. It is the purpose of this clinic to help these children with the latest in dental skill and equipment."

Jesse H. Barkin, president of the board of trustees of Jewish Memorial Hospital, hailed the new clinic as "another step in the hospital's expanded program as a community institution serving the growing population of Washington Heights, Inwood, Riverdale, and West Bronx."

This account is only another example of the work of a volunteer institution that for over 50 years has been serving the people of its community in their health and medical needs and contributing increasingly new and important values to the well-being of thousands upon thousands.

Nor is this the only development in which Jewish Memorial Hospital has pioneered. Its record is an extraordinary one. For years it has been conducting research in leukemia, work that is still being carried on in the hospital's research laboratory building, largely through the generous aid of still another volunteer organization, the Marcia Slater Society.

Jewish Memorial Hospital has also pioneered in educational programs stressing freedom from fear of hospitals and in a program inviting the youth of the community to the hospital so that they might know firsthand how a hospital works and be inspired to public service.

It was this hospital, too, which developed an arts and crafts program for the children of the mothers who were attending the outpatient department.

And these are only a few aspects of a long and honorable history.

Jewish Memorial Hospital was founded in 1905 by representative New York citizens who felt the urge to do something for the welfare of the community and the well-being of their fellow men. From a small institution, the hospital has developed until it now has over 200 beds and bassinets, with expansion plans approved by the Hospital Council of Greater New York to add 140 more beds based upon the population growth and reasonably estimated needs.

In the course of its history it has secured approval of all of the important hospital and medical associations and has attained a distinctive reputation for its high standards, its unsurpassed administration, its fine medical staff, and its dedicated board of trustees, a group of philanthropically minded citizens.

Research at the hospital has included important work: Work on the Rh blood factor—a dramatic achievement some years ago was a complete blood transfer to save a new-born baby; on leukemia—you may recall the Louis boy story, a Sing-Sing prisoner who offered himself for experimentation to save the life of 6-year-old Marcia Slater and who was later pardoned for this deed.

Research at Jewish Memorial Hospital expanded to such a point in recent years that it was necessary to add a new wing to the present hospital building. When the new research laboratory was dedicated, it provided an occasion for community celebration and for tributes from outstanding Americans.

Directing and carrying on the work of the institution is a medical board of first rank, a director and administration that cannot be surpassed, and a board of trustees of extraordinary men and women constituting one of the finest service groups in the city of New York.

It is gratifying to report on the progress of the hospital on the eve of its 53d annual dinner which will take place at the Waldorf-Astoria Hotel grand ballroom on Saturday evening, March 29.

I wish my colleagues could be with me that evening to see one of the flowers of American freedom and volunteer service in full bloom: an institution sustained by men and women of good will and of compassion for humanity; an institution that is an adornment to the greatest of American cities and to all Americans.

Communists in Korea

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STEVEN B. DEROUNIAN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 26, 1958

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, remembering the 37 broken promises of the Soviet Government, out of a total of 40 agreements made at top-level conferences over the past 15 years, I request that there be placed in the RECORD the following editorial which appears in the February 20 issue of the Long Island Daily Press:

HEADS WE WIN, TAILS YOU LOSE

The announcement that Red China will withdraw its troops from North Korea is designed to put the United States on the spot.

The joint communique by Chinese Premier Chou En-lai and North Korean President Kim Il-sung says the first phase of the withdrawal will be completed by April 30. It adds that the remainder of the troops will be out before the end of the year.

The Red leaders claim this is proof of their sincere desire for peaceful reunification of the divided country. They say that if the United States and its allies have any sincerity they would likewise withdraw.

That makes good propaganda, from their point of view. But what of the facts?

The Chinese have about 350,000 troops in North Korea. They only have to pull them back across the Yalu River to be within the letter of their announcement. They'd still be in ready striking position. They have rebuilt the North Korean Army and given it new weapons.

We have only two divisions in South Korea—plus the few token forces of our allies.

We have no place to move our troops but far, far away. It would have to be to Hawaii or the States.

Japan is out; all but a few of our troops have departed from there under Japanese pressure. Okinawa is overcrowded by one Marine division.

While we may take a propaganda lashing, how about just telling Chou and Kim: "That's fine. Pull out the troops. We will when we're certain the political problem is settled and we can expect a free, united Korea."

We also might remind them that the United Nations—which the Chinese Reds want so eagerly to join—branded the Chinese Communists as the aggressors in Korea back in 1951.

All that the Chinese Communists and their North Korean stooges are saying is: "Heads we win, tails you lose."

Salary Increases for Federal Classified and Postal Workers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT C. BYRD
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 26, 1958

Mr. BYRD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include a statement which I made yesterday to the House Committee on Post Office and Civil Service. My statement was in support of salary increases for Federal classified and postal workers. I was pleased to note that, following the submittal of my statement yesterday, the House committee voted to give a pay boost to these deserving public servants.

My statement follows:

A STATEMENT IN SUPPORT OF SALARY INCREASES FOR FEDERAL CLASSIFIED AND POSTAL WORKERS

Mr. Chairman, I am grateful for this opportunity to appear before your distinguished committee to express my support of legislation for proper adjustments in the basic compensation rates of the employees of the Federal Government, before us today. As we refuse Federal employees the right to bargain for their wages and working conditions, they must depend upon the fair play of Con-

gress to maintain their equitable position in the economy.

The challenge of Soviet scientific achievements has reawakened America to the necessity of having the ablest and the best trained personnel in our Federal service, working for our national preservation. In recent years we have witnessed a marked deterioration in the prestige of our civil service. Government personnel directors can testify to the serious difficulties they have faced in recruiting trained personnel for Government jobs. The Federal agencies have been unable to compete with the alluring offers from private industry.

In addition, the civil service has been losing valuable, skilled employees through the enticements of higher-paid positions elsewhere. Turnover rates as high as 25 percent among highly trained employees have been cited. In the interests of our national welfare and the retention of a high caliber civil service, we must authorize immediate and substantial pay increases for our Federal classified and postal employees; so that they can regain lost ground in our expanding economy.

The continued and accelerated upward spiral in the cost of living have left Federal employees bearing the brunt of the inflation. The cost of living has far outdistanced the meager increases in the Federal pay rates. We have had a more than 6 percent rise in the cost of living since the last Federal pay raise in 1955. The pressure of the never ending treadmill of trying to purchase the necessary goods and services for their families and themselves with dollars of declining relative value has led many Federal employees to take secondary jobs or to have their wives go back to work.

Recent surveys indicate that for a family of four to maintain a modest, but adequate standard of living, their annual income must be at least between $4,700 and $5,000. Yet, the median wage for Federal classified employees is $4,075 and for postal workers it is $4,410. In other words, more than half of our Federal civil servants are receiving substandard wages. This is a disturbing situation which calls for immediate action.

Over the past decade while workers in private industry, with the assistance of their unions, have considerably improved their conditions, both in wages and in added fringe benefits, Government employees, precluded from the advantages of collective bargaining, have steadily lost ground. Federal workers have been given only 1 general wage increase of 7½ percent for classified employees and 6 percent for postal workers in the last 6 years, while many workers in the business world have been getting annual wage boosts commensurate with their increased productivity and the rise in the cost of living.

In the 3 years since the Federal employees received their last pay raise, wages in manufacturing have gone up 14 percent, in wholesaling 13 percent, and in mining they're up 21 percent. One has only to compare the changes in real income of Government employees with various other occupational groups over a 17-year period from 1939 through 1956 to realize how poorly the civil service has fared in our growing economy. Bituminous coal miners have enjoyed the largest increase in real income of 107 percent. But other groups have also prospered; lumber workers up 73 percent; textile workers up 64 percent; chemical workers up 58 percent, meatpackers up 47 percent; even schoolteachers are up 36 percent and retail clerks up 24 percent, to mention only a few. And where do we find the Federal Government workers?—at the bottom of the list with a modest 14-percent increase in their real income. To raise Government salaries to the pre-World War II status would require a pay raise of at least 25 percent, a much greater figure than anyone is proposing.

The disparity in wage increases and real take-home pay is not confined to a comparison of Federal employees with other occupational groups. Even within the Government service this disparity extends to the relationship of classified employees' salaries and the earnings of nearly 700,000 Federal employees whose rates of compensation are not set by the Congress, but rather are based upon the prevailing wage rates in the communities where they are employed. These Federal wage-board workers have received repeated upward adjustments which have kept their wages in line with the cost of living, but which have also placed them far ahead of their fellow classified employees in terms of increased income. The Department of the Navy reports that its wage-board employees have received pay raises totaling 25.8 percent since 1951, while the postal workers have had to settle for 6 percent and the Federal classified employees 7½ percent. Numerous situations have been created where classified supervisors are paid lower salaries than the wage-board workers they supervise. If this condition is allowed to continue, we will witness a further decline in the morale of our Federal service, which we can't afford in these perilous times.

Today the median salary in the 927,822-man classified service is $4,075 compared with that of the wage-board employees of $4,597. This is quite the reverse of the picture in 1950 when the classified service salary median was $3,225 as against the wage board's $3,099. These figures clearly illustrate the unjustified inequities in our Federal pay system. We in Congress are now faced with the responsibility of removing these detrimental inequities before they endanger the whole quality of our civil service.

In American industry it is a common practice to measure wages on the basis of adequate compensation for work performed. This is the principle behind the whole system of incentive wages. Postmaster General Summerfield has testified that the productivity of postal workers has increased 17 percent over the past 6 years. The administration seems to recognize the fairness of rewarding employees for extra productivity in private industry, but it has wanted to deny any increase to postal workers on the same grounds. By 1959 it is estimated that the average pieces per clerk man-year will have risen 6 percent over the 1955 figure and the cost of living has risen by another 5 percent. Are the postal workers to continue to labor diligently without any incentives or rewards, and see their real wages decreasing? This, it seems to me, would be contrary to the principles of our American economic system.

Of course, most Government activities do not lend themselves to productivity measurements. But it would be absurd to claim that Federal employees are not entitled to productivity increases just because the work they perform cannot be measured in terms of pieces completed per hour or some other exact productivity measurement.

Our economy-minded friends in both Houses argued last year that we could not afford to grant Federal pay increases; because the cost would add to the already huge Federal expenditures and precipitate an increase in the Federal debt limit. I favor Government economy wherever possible, but I say to these colleagues we can't afford not to authorize some upward adjustments in our Federal pay scales. It would be faulty business logic and false economy to allow a slow deterioration of our Government service in the name of economy. The replacement costs of training new, skilled employees would far outweigh the savings gained from not giving a pay raise. The Hoover Commission reports that it costs $3,000 to recruit and train a new Federal employee.

Another argument propounded by opponents to a Federal pay increase was that these raises would start an inflationary chain reaction. This appears to be a case of confusing cause and effect. Actually, the Federal employees have become the special victims of the inflation. Why should this one small segment of our economy be singled out to hold the line in the fight against inflation, by foregoing justified salary increases, in the face of the complete failure of the administration's efforts to restrain price increases in other segments of the economy?

We are confronted here with the almost unbelievable spectacle of the richest country in the world today keeping a majority of its Federal employees on what is subsistence pay or less. To authorize a pay increase would only by remedying an inequality.

Postal and classified pay legislation must be considered on its own merits and not tied to the endorsement of postal rate increases. It would be unfair to continue to make the postal employees and other Federal employees the whipping boys for the administration's inability to get congressional approval for its proposed higher postal charges. Loyal civil servants should not be made to absorb the costs of our growing postal deficits.

National self-interest requires us to improve the wages of our postal employees and other Federal employees and to return them to an equitable position in our economy. I know I need not belabor the importance of our civil service to the workings of our whole society. In recent years, the Federal Government has grown to have such a vital role in the economy and in the preservation of our way of life. It is essential that our Government be manned by the most capable and best trained of our citizens. We cannot hope to entice qualified personnel into Government service with our present inadequate pay scales. It would be sheer folly to let this pressing problem go unsolved any longer. I, therefore, Mr. Chairman, hope that your committee will take action immediately to favorably report legislation to the House so as to enable that body to vote for a salary increase which these public servants so richly deserve.

Pulp and Paper Industry in the State of Maine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLIFFORD G. McINTIRE
OF MAINE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 26, 1958

Mr. McINTIRE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I wish to include an article from the February 23, 1958, issue of the Portland Press-Herald.

As the article concerned so vividly points out, the paper-pulp industry performs as a dynamic economic factor in the State of Maine. This industry has a unique disposition for employing modern methods of production and for instituting innovations as a consequence of technological developments. This tendency combined with sound management promotes expansion of industry and success in operation.

The paper-pulp industry of Maine is an industrial complex that effectively blends together the three ingredients basic to economics—land, labor, and capital. And as it is an industry that contributes much to the State of Maine, so is it a vital element in our national economy.

[From the Portland Press-Herald of February 23, 1958]

MAINE FINANCE

(By Harold J. Boyle)

The paper-pulp industry is the biggest thing in the Maine economy. It accounts for about 29 percent of all the industrial activity in the value of its product. It has an annual payroll of around $81 million paid to 17,421 workers who averaged $4,664 apiece in the latest year for which wages are available.

SHARE

What happens to the $400 million this Maine industry takes in every year? How much of it stays in Maine and who gets it? One Maine paper manufacturer, S. D. Warren, at Cumberland Mills, answers that question in its 1957 annual report. It breaks down on a single-dollar basis the $58,286,000 it received last year in exchange for the 166,167 tons of paper and pulp products it sold all over the United States.

Here's the way this company traces the 100 cents in the average dollar it collected for all its production last year:

Cost of materials it had to buy (pulpwood, chemicals for turning the wood into pulp, China clay, and other products needed to make paper), 33 cents.

Wages, 31 cents.

Other mill expenses (power, steam, repairs, pensions, city taxes), 20 cents.

Headquarters expenses (advertising, bond interest, selling expenses, etc.), 6 cents.

Federal income taxes, 5 cents.

Dividends to stockholders, 3 cents.

Kept in business for future improvement and expansion, 2 cents.

LABOR

The same distribution of the Maine paper dollar would hold for most other companies manufacturing paper pulp in this State. It takes about 33 cents of every dollar to pay for the woodpulp and other materials to make the paper. The employees get another 31 cents for their part in making the paper. The third largest expense—20 cents of every dollar—is for electricity to operate the mills, repairs on the high-speed machines used in modern paper mills, city of Westbrook realty taxes, etc. Those 3 expense items—materials, wages and power, taxes, etc.—take 84 cents of every dollar. Uncle Sam collects 5 cents in Federal income taxes, stockholders get 3 cents, and the company holds onto 2 cents to spend for new machinery, etc.

A safe guess is that at least 65 cents of every one of those paper-company dollars circulate in Maine. Employees get 33 cents, the owners of the wood purchased every year receive probably another 25 cents. The city of Westbrook collects $425,000 in realty taxes. The paper industry, as these figures show, generates a large measure of prosperity in Maine.

Mutual Security

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWIN H. MAY, JR.

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 26, 1958

Mr. MAY. Mr. Speaker, the mutual security debate in Congress is now officially underway. The citizens of the United States will have the opportunity through their elected Representatives to express their opinions in the months ahead.

The very significant conference on Foreign Aspects of United States National Security was a resounding success here in the Nation's Capital. The people will now have more of an opportunity to get the complete facts on the case in question.

As a new Member of Congress who has always been vitally interested in international affairs, and one who has supported our mutual-security program this past year, I find to some extent the forthcoming debate somewhat unfortunate. It is hard to believe that the true facts of the case are not more thoroughly understood by the people. Any Congressmen who decry the mutual-security program, I am sure feel they are representing the people in their respective districts. It is not easy to have people understand a program overseas for waging peace as it is to understand the necessity of a particular public-works project nearby. In my opinion, individual leadership on the part of the Members of Congress should supplement the high quality of bipartisan leadership exhibited by President Eisenhower and other Republican and Democratic leaders.

Significant facts so eloquently and forcefully stressed by the President last night should be reasserted again and again to the people throughout the land. The President's statements pointed out that the aid program is as urgent as the missile program. He further repudiated the fortress America concept, stating:

We might as well try to find peace by building another Chinese wall. * * * Our hope for permanent security and peace today is not in fortifications and walls. * * * It is in the hearts and minds and unity of purpose of the people whose ideals we share throughout the free world. The program has thwarted the Communist hope of encircling and isolating us by taking over vulnerable smaller countries, through aggression or subversion * * * the urgency of the times and the opportunity before us calls for greatness of spirit transcending all party considerations.

Many other factors could be mentioned—such as the recovery of Europe and the saving of Greece, Iran and South Vietnam from Communist domination.

As one Member who was honored to be with a congressional committee investigating phases of the mutual-security program in Europe last fall, I became increasingly impressed with the necessity of extending the mutual security program. We all want the most efficient and economical program in this area of waging peace. There have been mistakes which obviously occur even in our most reliable businesses in America. However, the inescapable conclusion is that the net overall effect of our investment has been good. We all hope the day will some time arrive where more of these funds can be diverted to domestic use; however, while our eye is for efficiency and economy at all levels of the Federal Government, we must look beyond to the important objectives of long-range security for our children and the future of America. Russia is unrelenting in its aggressive imperialism by military and economic means. Not to recognize this on the part of Congress and the people would be as the President stated so well last night—"pennywise economy and above all, outright refusal to look at the world as it really is."

Liberty and Security

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANCIS E. WALTER

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 26, 1958

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Standard-Times of New Bedford, Mass.:

LIBERTY AND SECURITY

The American Civil Liberties Union, in its 112-page annual report, has several interesting comments on national security. It suggests, for example, that the Federal Government can attract needed talent for its increasing defense needs only if its security system insures civil liberties.

The report says United States security is a twofold problem that involves keeping the wrong people out of Government service in such a way as to get the right people into it. The best men, it continued, can't be got and kept if they feel they are being scrutinized as potential traitors.

These are vague generalizations and difficult to assess; a definition of terms might help, including a determination of what right and wrong people are.

The ACLU does get specific, however. Patrick Murphy Malin, executive director, remarks that public opinion has matured considerably in its understanding of which measures do—and which do not—really serve national security.

The report then mentions the studied seriousness of recent Supreme Court decisions and of the Commission on Government Security and contrasts them with the hysteria and near terror of only a few years ago.

American Communists and sympathizers "now are a tiny and puny crew," Mr. Malin concludes, and "the police job necessary to internal security can concentrate on the relatively few and relatively conspicuous agents sent in from abroad."

It would be tragic if any greater number of Americans accepted the views of Mr. Malin and the ACLU. The recent Supreme Court decisions to which the report refers have virtually brought to a halt State and Federal prosecution of top-level Communists in this country by wrecking the Smith Act and preventing States from prosecuting in sedition cases. In addition, there have been innumerable Supreme Court decisions involving persons identified with communism, in which lower-court findings were reversed and the efforts of the law-enforcement agencies concerned were negated.

To suggest, moreover, that Communist agents are relatively few in number is absurd. Mr. Malin has no idea how many there are, nor has anyone else outside the Red conspiracy. To describe them as relatively conspicuous is foolhardy. The Red spies who have done the greatest damage to this country escaped detection until their principal tasks were accomplished.

J. Edgar Hoover, Director of the FBI, has declared, "Let no one for a moment allow himself to be lulled into believing that the

Red network ceased to exist with the Rosenbergs. On the contrary, the espionage attacks against our institutions continue unabated."

The ACLU may not concede that Mr. Hoover is better informed on the subject of national security than Mr. Malin, but most Americans think so.

Mileage Allowance for Rural Letter Carriers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. USHER L. BURDICK
OF NORTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 26, 1958

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Speaker, the present mileage allowance of 9 cents per mile paid to rural letter carriers for use of their privately owned vehicles to deliver the mail was established in 1951. During the 7 years since that 9 cents per mile rate was set, all costs of operation, maintenance, and replacement have risen sharply. These rising costs are well known by all of us who own and drive automobiles. The problem has been more acute to the rural carrier, however, due to the weather and road conditions he endures and the numerous stops to render a full mail service to the American rural public.

Our individual experience with the difference in driving costs between 1951 and 1958 should be all that would be necessary as proof that the increased costs are a real and positive fact. They have not only greatly increased but are progressively moving higher each year.

The rural carriers of this country comprise a devoted group of employees on the public payroll who are rendering a valuable and indispensable service to rural America. In my State of North Dakota, 621 carriers on 6 days of every week make the daily round to deliver the mail including letters, newspapers, and parcel post, and in addition provide every postal service to each and every family right at their mailbox. The more than 30,000 miles of rural delivery route in the State of North Dakota causes these carriers to travel every day on all kinds of roads and often under weather conditions, particularly in the winter, which requires the use of special equipment. These factors take a toll on wear and tear of equipment, increase gasoline consumption, and cause maintenance costs to soar.

The testimony of Mr. Ray L. Hulick, president of the National Rural Letter Carriers' Association, graphically illustrates the extent to which these costs have risen. Tabulation of cost accounting sheets of rural carriers as submitted to the Internal Revenue Department, as well as the cost accounting appearing in the 1957 report of our Postmaster General, clearly indicate that the present cost of equipment maintenance to these rural carriers is in excess of 11 cents per mile.

Under these conditions, the rural carrier is required to personally absorb a portion of the operating cost of his vehicle while performing a duty to which he is obligated. Such conditions impose a financial loss on a Government employee without just cause. This is certainly not intended and should not be condoned by our legislative body.

Trade and Aid

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWIN H. MAY, JR.
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 26, 1958

Mr. MAY. Mr. Speaker, I wish to commend to the attention of my colleagues an excellent editorial which appeared in the New Britain Herald of February 22.

The editor of the Herald has placed the mutual security and trade agreements programs in their proper perspective. It should do much to add to understanding on the part of the public of these two vitally necessary programs.

TRADE AND AID

The two words "trade" and "aid" have been bandied about by all sorts of people from world statesmen to ordinary politicians and from relatively unknown experts to better known personages who are not so expert. These two words obviously must be of some importance to have so many people talking about them.

As an insight into the importance of these words let's examine what three persons had to say about them recently. We have picked three persons who should be well known to New Britain area residents—President Eisenhower, John Davis Lodge, former Connecticut Governor and present Ambassador to Spain, and Prof. Albert E. Burke, who is scheduled to give his second talk before the YMCA foremen's night group next week on resources and foreign policy.

Of the three men, Professor Burke made the clearest explanation. This is probably due to the fact that he has devoted his life to teaching and lecturing. He stresses the importance of trade over aid. This is what he contends:

The United States lacks 68 natural resources in sufficient amounts to keep our industries rolling at today's rapid pace. We are desperately dependent on other nations for these raw materials. As a result our economic system is dominated by countries outside the United States. Russia operates an economic as well as a political bloc; therefore, it is independent of the rest of the world. Resources flow freely in the Communist bloc without trade barriers. "If we do not find a way to unite the free world economically, we will go down," Professor Burke concluded in the first of his talks to the foremen.

Ambassador Lodge, in a speech Thursday at the opening session of the American Bar Association's meeting in Atlanta, backed up what Professor Burke said and added to it the factor of security. This, in part, is what he said:

"We live increasingly in an interdependent world, a world in which political boundaries no longer coincide with economic frontiers. Indeed, our security and our prosperity depend upon the security, the stability, and the unity of our allies. Their security and continued stability depend, in turn, in large measure, on economic conditions. Their unity can hardly be achieved without American economic aid." He made a plea for congressional support of both the mutual security and the trade agreements programs.

President Eisenhower made a dramatic appeal on Wednesday for an appropriation of $3.9 billion for foreign aid under the mutual security program. He has also asked for renewal of the reciprocal trade program.

Professor Burke and Ambassador Lodge have both shown why the President's requests are vital. One cannot help but wonder, however, if the word "trade" has not been neglected in comparison to its counterpart, "aid."

Technology Transforms the Farm

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 26, 1958

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am inserting in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an editorial which appeared in the Kansas City Star of Sunday, February 9, 1958, entitled "Technology Transforms the Farm." This interesting editorial discloses many of the significant changes that have taken place in agriculture since World War II. It has real merit. I commend its reading to my colleagues:

TECHNOLOGY TRANSFORMS THE FARM

When President Eisenhower sent his special farm message to Congress recently he said agriculture was experiencing a "veritable revolution in productivity." The rapid changes, he explained, were largely the result of a breakthrough in science and technology.

What has happened to agriculture? You have only to look back a little to get a general idea of the situation. Farming has changed so much in recent years that the impact, with all its ramifications, has even authorities on agriculture puzzled. The layman comes to conclusions that are based far too often on inadequate facts.

The misunderstanding itself is a contributing factor to the perennial agriculture problem, both on and off the farm.

Roy Battles, of Washington, an official of the National Grange, recently commented that the impact of the technological revolution on agriculture is so great that it cannot be fully appraised until far more information is gathered. By the time this information is obtained it will be out of date.

But cold figures do tell part of the story. Since 1910 farmers have doubled their total output in the United States, tripled their output per man-hour and now are operating their farms with a third less manpower. Most of the big progress in productivity, however, has come since 1940. Output per man-hour on the farm has doubled since that year.

In 1910, the farm population made up 31.9 percent of the total in the United States; today it makes up only 12 percent. Percentagewise, the farm population has declined throughout the period, but the big drop in actual farm population has come since 1940.

In Kansas and Missouri, the farm population hasn't declined at the national rate. Almost one-fourth of each State's population still lives on the farm. Still these States, too, have experienced a big shift to the cities. When you drive back to the old home community, you see farmhouse after house standing vacant and empty little rural schools. The people just aren't there any more.

But the land is there.

The people who are farming that land in larger units are getting bigger harvests than ever before, more production per acre, more meat per unit of livestock. Even with Government acreage controls, total farm output last year equaled the previous all-time high.

One man does what two could do in 1940 through the use of new machinery, better seeds (hybrid corn, hybrid sorghums), fertilizer, hormones that increase beef output, antibiotics that make growing animals more healthy, chemicals that kill weeds, pesticides that save crops from insects and drying devices that permit harvest of wet crops. Why should there be greater employment in agriculture? There doesn't seem to be any reason for more farmworkers despite the political tears that are shed over the declining farm population.

With fewer people on farms, the Nation has agricultural surpluses. This is the one fact best known across the land. It is the basis of the farm-price problem. Less well publicized is the fact that the market for farm produce has increased immensely. Since 1900, the total population of the United States has doubled. Simple arithmetic would indicate that we are consuming twice as much food.

Right now, the cattle on feed are double the count of 1930. Significantly, the Nation is eating all the beef produced.

The same holds true for many other products, but not all. Despite the growing population, farmers can increase production faster than the rising need. Wherever that is done we have surplus troubles.

One factor of the farm-population decline bears on the general economy. If production per man had not increased, we wouldn't, nor couldn't have many of the devices which are part of modern-day living. People couldn't buy and the labor supply couldn't produce as many radios, TV sets, refrigerators, and air conditioners. A century ago, a worker on the farm produced enough for himself and three others. Today he provides for 20 others.

President Eisenhower said that the changes in agriculture during contemporary man's lifetime have been greater than all the changes in the previous 2,000 years.

There really have been three revolutions. The first, about a century ago, came when farmers began to put their implements on wheels, utilizing horsepower. Then in the era just before, during and after World War I power farming developed. The technological revolution came with World War II.

Since 1940, the output per man-hour with meat animals has increased 25 percent; milk cows, 59 percent; poultry, 106 percent; hay and forage crops, 137 percent; feed grains, 349 percent.

The farm population decrease and production increase are not the only great changes in agriculture. Contract and integrated farming are becoming a way of farm business. Under contract farming, the farmer, feed dealer and processor enter into agreements on sale prices, feed used and quality of product to be produced. In integrated farming, all the operations are controlled by one man, usually the processor or feed dealer. The farmer, in effect, works for a salary or wage. In either case the farmer has more assurance of a certain income from his efforts. But in return for his insurance against loss, he also loses the opportunity to take advantage of rising prices to make much larger profits.

It is estimated that 80 to 90 percent of the broiler business and almost all of the vegetable and canning business is now operated under the integrated type of farming. Contract farming is just now being introduced into swine and cattle feeding operations.

Needless to say farmers are watching this development with concern. Some are opposed to the idea; others hope it offers the opportunity for stability in farm income.

The changes in agriculture are not all confined to the farm. The great packing industry was built around terminal markets with adequate rail facilities. Then came better highways, trucks and great shifts in population.

In many cases it was cheaper to build new packing facilities nearer the centers of production than to modernize old plants. The result has been a wider distribution of the packing industry. There is more competition in the meatpacking industry today than ever before. Yet a committee of the American National Cattlemen's Association recently reported that only 30 percent of the business is handled by the 4 major packers.

The change in retail markets also is involved in the agricultural revolution. The supermarkets can assert an influence which was not possible for the thousands of smaller grocery stores that they have replaced.

The standardization of products in the supermarkets, where the housewife is in the habit of buying by the package, influences processors and producers, too. Research proceeds rapidly toward the development of new tenderizing agents for meat. Market experts predict that the time is not far away when all meat will be tenderized at the packing plant and put up in packages of various weights. The housewife will pick up packaged 1-pound steaks or 5-pound roasts of identical quality, just as she now selects a 1-pound package of white flour or a 5-pound package of cornmeal.

The change in agriculture has affected farmers' buying habits. Surveys now show that there is little difference between the purchases of farmers and city people. Farmers still raise some of their own food, but for their modern homes they need and use all the devices that are found in urban residences.

Nearly all farm homes now have electricity. Most farmers have cars, radios, television sets, and refrigerators. They live on good roads. Their children dress the same as city children and go to modern consolidated schools.

In the best of the good old days small farms would not have supported this type of living. On the other hand, farmers today need more money to cover actual farm operations—cash for gasoline, machinery, fertilizer, pesticides. Thus the high cost of things farmers need in their business has become a major part of the farm problem.

Yes, the changes have been tremendous and as yet there is no halt. Ten or fifteen years from now we may look back again and find that further progress has equaled anything we have yet known.

Certainly all indications for the future point to fewer farmers on bigger acreages. The farmers will be better equipped than ever to keep pace with the technological revolution in agriculture. Fewer in number and with larger capabilities, they may be able to cooperate in some kind of a program to gain bargaining power in the market place, something they haven't yet achieved under Government programs.

If this comes about, agriculture may be more nearly equal to industry and labor as a major factor in the economy.

Mr. Truman

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWIN H. MAY, JR.

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 26, 1958

Mr. MAY. Mr. Speaker, on Saturday evening February 22, former President of the United States Harry S. Truman gave vent to inexcusable partisan spleen before a $100-a-plate dinner held by the Democrat Party in Washington, D. C.

As usual, he resorted to his vicious fusillade of half-truths and misleading innuendos. It was certainly in poor taste, if nothing else, for a speech of this nature to be given by a former United States President on the birthday of George Washington.

The following editorial, which appeared in the Hartford Courant on February 25, demonstrates quite clearly the effect that Mr. Truman's speech had upon thinking people.

[From the Hartford Courant of February 25, 1958]

MR. TRUMAN MAKES A PARTISAN ATTACK

Over the weekend former President Harry S. Truman, whose reputation for being able to give 'em hell, holds up better than does his accuracy, made one of the more violently partisan attacks of even his career. At a memorial dinner honoring George Washington, reputed never to have told a lie, Mr. Truman made a great many statements that were half truths and outright falsehoods. There is a certain amount of latitude in politics. But Mr. Truman went way into the area that must be labeled demagoguery.

Much of what he said is demonstrably false. He taunted Republicans on unemployment, while his own administration was bailed out of an unemployment period worse than the present one only by the Korean war. On July 16, 1949, the Courant carried this headline: "Connecticut Stands Sixth in Jobless." The story went on to tell that 13 percent of the State's labor force was out of work. If the partisan Mr. Truman had gone back further, he would have found that when Mr. Roosevelt was first elected there were approximately 11.5 million unemployed in the country. Two years later this had risen to 13.2 million. And not once during the 10-year period until 1940 did unemployment—with a vastly smaller labor force than today—drop below 10 million. That was the prosperity Mr. Truman professed to see under Democratic aegis.

It would be futile to try to answer Mr. Truman point by point. The Republicans, he said, are against cleaning up polluted streams. They are against slum clearance. Yet our streams in Connecticut were never in better shape than they are today. And the redevelopment programs now in progress in New Haven, Hartford, and dozens of other communities give the lie to Mr. Truman on slum clearance.

The speech was, in short, a rag-bag full of unsupported statements and farfetched conclusions. If one were to adopt Mr. Truman's reasoning there would be some interesting parallels. For example, Mr. Truman says all Republican illusions end in economic disaster—as in 1873, 1893, and 1929. To which Republicans can with equal justice retort that all Democratic illusions seem to result in war; under Wilson in 1918, under Roosevelt in 1941, and under Mr. Truman himself in 1950. If this is an oversimplification, so is Mr. Truman's statement.

There is little to be gained by trying to oppose Mr. Truman in an art that he has perfected over many years in politics. But as Republican National Chairman Meade Alcorn says, this was one of Mr. Truman's weaker speeches because of its very intemperance. Mr. Truman told his listeners what they wanted to hear. But it would have been more in keeping with the high office he has held if he had hewed a little more closely than he did to the line of truth. Except for thick-and-thin partisans, a balanced view of the facts is more persuasive than the exuberance of giving hell to political enemies.

A Week in Washington Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MERWIN COAD
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 26, 1958

Mr. COAD. Mr. Speaker, for the past 4 years the Iowa Citizenship Clearing House, in cooperation with the Democratic and Republican State Central Committees, has sponsored a Week in Washington program, which provides for expense-paid visits for selected professors and students from our colleges and universities.

Each year, outstanding young men and women are selected from throughout Iowa to spend a week in Washington as my house and office guests. Each group consists of 1 Democrat and 1 Republican, who have been selected on the basis of scholastic standing, leadership qualities, and interest and ability in the field of political science. The program is designed to intimately acquaint these future Iowa leaders with the actual operation of our national Government. Last week two college professors participated in this program. The following is a letter from Professor C. E. Gilmour from Grinnell College, which typifies the type of response this program receives from those who are privileged to participate in the week's activities:

Hon. MERWIN COAD,
United States Representative,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN COAD: You will recall, upon several occasions during the past week, I expressed verbally my appreciation of the opportunity afforded by you and the Iowa Citizenship Clearing House to participate in the Week in Washington program for professors. I wish here to revise and extend my remarks for the record.

I feel that the past week was, by far, more productive, in terms of learning results, than any other comparable period in my rather extended study career. I learned more about more important things with more ease and in less time than at any time in my college or graduate training. I am most grateful for this experience.

In the 4 years since the Week in Washington program was inaugurated, I have always vigorously encouraged students to participate. However, I am now better equipped to recruit participants, being able to speak from actual program participation.

My enthusiasm for the program is hard to contain. It offers much that cannot come from textbook or teacher. It gives the participant a real sense of the reality of democracy at work. One cannot help but be impressed with the unique and precious heritage that is ours. And one cannot ignore the obvious fact that this rich heritage will be retained, refined, and extended only if each of us is as mindful of the responsibilities of citizenship as of its privileges.

I earnestly feel that if every college student would be given the experience I had with you last week, the objective of the parent Citizenship Clearing House, to encourage on the part of college students and graduates more effective participation in politics, would be achieved to a much greater degree.

I suggest, therefore, that you might well attempt to have this program expanded in Iowa, through the cooperation of more Iowa Congressmen. I shall suggest that the Iowa Citizenship Clearing House make a similar effort. Further, I shall suggest that an effort be made by the parent Citizenship Clearing House to have this feature, now unique to Iowa, become common for the other State and regional clearinghouse programs.

Sincerely yours,

C. EDWIN GILMOUR.

Farmers and the Space-Age Budget

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MERWIN COAD
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 26, 1958

Mr. COAD. Mr. Speaker, in Life magazine, January 27, 1958, appeared an editorial entitled "Farmers and the Space-Age Budget." This was an editorial which promoted the Benson farm proposal of lowering supports on agricultural commodities to as low as 60 percent of parity. The editorial also makes reference to figures which are grossly inconsistent with the facts.

It is my happy pleasure to present for insertion in the RECORD a reply to the Life editorial appearing in the Hardin County (Iowa) Times on February 11, 1958.

The editorials from Life and the Hardin County Times follow:

[From Life magazine of January 27, 1958]

FARMERS AND THE SPACE-AGE BUDGET

Are Americans politically capable of the mild sacrifices called for in the President's 1959 "space budget"? The first test is the new farm program, presented to Congress last week. It appears that Congress is prepared to flunk it.

Federal farm expenditures come to a huge $5 billion a year, mostly subsidies. The new Eisenhower-Benson program would cut this by a mere $300 million or so. It reduces the permissible floor under subsidies for 6 basic crops and dairy products from 75 percent to 60 percent of parity. It gives Secretary Benson more discretion in setting support levels and acreage allotments. It is a cautious toughening of the established Benson aim—to cut back our farm surpluses by gradually reintroducing a free price system.

These surpluses still pile up, not only because of the subsidies but also because of the scientific revolution in agriculture, which the President called "irreversible and continuing." The Benson policy hasn't made much inroad on the surpluses because it has been too cautious to keep up with this revolution. The new program is a partial effort to catch up. It is full of compromises and euphemisms. The 2 million marginal farmers whom the revolution has passed by, and who would be much better off in industrial jobs, are given incentive both to keep and to leave their farms, so that the administration can be accused of "blatant liquidation of agriculture" on the one hand and of encouraging inefficiency on the other. Moreover, the increased surplus dumping provisions alarm our allies and contradict our foreign policy.

Nevertheless, Benson is trying to inch this mountain of old vested interests forward toward the day when subsidies can taper off and an efficient, modern United States agriculture can be self-supporting in a reasonably free market.

Congressmen from farm States immediately greeted the Benson program with defiant catcalls. They heckled his opening testimony unmercifully and all but called him a liar. It looks like a battle resulting in veto, stalemate, and stopgap. It means no progress whatever on our No. 1 unsolved national economic problem, the farm revolution.

This is not pretty. It implies that United States politics, perhaps democracy itself, isn't equal to the obvious demands of a technological age whose gears have already shifted into the age of astronautics. The farm problem is complex enough without the further complication of sectional greed and inertia. The administration program is moderate enough, indeed too moderate. We urge every Congressman who is capable of a national viewpoint to support the guts of Benson's program. The repute of our political system is at stake.

IOWA FALLS, IOWA, *February 13, 1957.*

MR. HENRY LUCE,
Life Magazine, New York City.

DEAR HENRY: We hope you won't mind this bit of informality, but we just wanted to have a little buddy-buddy talk with you about the editorial in your January 27 issue, which is reprinted on this page. Our circulation is a little shy of yours, but we're right out here in the thick of this farm thing, and we're just a little astounded at some of your statements.

Frankly we kind of think you've laid an egg in this editorial.

Do you mind if we just run through it here together?

For instance, in this second paragraph you say that "Federal farm expenditures come to a huge $5 billion per year. Mostly subsidies."

Now, there's nothing particularly wrong with that statement, Henry, except that it just doesn't happen to be true. The President made that same mistake here a month or so ago, and the air was full of corrections and apologies for a week afterward. You should subscribe to a wire service for your editorial writers so that they could keep up on things like that. The facts are available. We get them out here right along.

You see, Henry, the so-called farm budget that you speak of is the overall budget for the Department of Agriculture. And that includes a multitude of services, a big part of which (from a strictly cost standpoint) are consumer services or benefits.

Let's run through a few. There's a good big $100 million or so for school-lunch programs. Do you consider that item for the benefit of farmers? Or for some you folks there in New York City, too? Then there's the maintenance and improvement of our forest resources in this country. That's all included in this farm budget. I'm sure that you would consider that expenditure in the total national interest, rather than as a farm subsidy. Too, Henry, there are such items in that budget as the Federal inspection of meat in the packing plants. That would seem almost a strictly consumer benefit, wouldn't it?

There's a good big item in that budget for the disposition of foodstuff abroad. Is that a farm subsidy or is it foreign aid?

And then of a strictly different nature, there's such loan programs as provided for the REA program. They run to several hundred million dollars, Henry. They are big. But it just makes us plain mad, out here in the country, where we have been repaying those loans—ahead of schedule, and with interest—to have them referred to as farm subsidies. When you pay off a note, with interest, do you feel as though you had been subsidized? We don't.

In short, Henry, if you will take the time to check up on this matter you will find

that the $5 billion farm budget is mostly not subsidies, at least not that get to the farmer.

So this mere $300 million cut that you refer, which is coming out of the soil bank and price support part of the farm budget is a pretty darn big percentage of the farmer's real share of that budget.

And if net income to any other major segment of our economy had dropped about 20 percent during the last 5 years (as agriculture has) and seen its costs go right on up (like all costs have) they would be screaming bloody murder at this stage, or sooner.

Farmers, of course, are just supposed to tighten their belt and take it.

Throughout your editorial you stand firmly behind Mr. Benson, lauding him for his tireless efforts to reduce subsidies and bring about an efficient modern United States agriculture that can be self-supporting in a reasonably free market.

That of course is just expressing a matter of opinion—and not an outright misrepresentation of facts as your farm budget statement was.

But even though it is just your opinion, which you certainly have a right to expound, may we offer these comments:

First, American agriculture is efficient—the most efficient the world has ever known. And it is for that reason that we are the best-fed Nation the world has even known.

Matter of fact, Henry, agricultural production has been increasing about 3 percent per year (on the same number of acres), or about twice as fast the population has been growing. This rate of increase in productivity is better than industry has been doing—just as a point of interest.

And that really brings us to the nub of our difference, no doubt.

Probably you are a great admirer of the steel industry. I select it only because it is rather in the news now. In your book it is no doubt self-supporting in a reasonably free market.

Well, perhaps. But right now they seem to be operating that industry at about 60 percent of capacity. Like corn and cotton and wheat and dairy products, there's too much steel.

So what do they do, Henry? They simply put their labor force on relief—which is maybe a kind of a government-sponsored soil-bank idea, come to think of it—and close down 40 percent of their mills and hold their price steady and firm. Yes, maybe even higher.

Now you say, why don't farmers do that. After all, they are only overproducing about 5 percent, not 40 percent as the steel boys would be doing, if they were sticking to the job.

Well, you see prabably a half a dozen men decide the productive rate of the steel industry, maybe even less than that.

There's about 5 million farmers in the business. They can't make a few phone calls and decide to let 5 percent of their land stand idle or turn 5 percent of their milk cows dry. The only way they have, at all, of cooperating together on such a decision is by working together through their government. And that's not a new idea, Henry. All kinds of your efficient industries do that. Oil, for example. They have all sorts of quotas, that they set up by cooperating together—through Government.

But it's funny. It always seems to be different when industry does something like that.

You say in the last paragraph that the "administration's program (of lowering price supports) is moderate enough, indeed too moderate."

Lowering price supports is, of course, simply a means of driving farmers out of production through lowering their prices. That's the way it is supposed to work.

Well, Henry, your fair-haired boy in the Agriculture Department has been doing that for 5 years now. Our corn supports have been eased off right along. Yet in the fall of 1954 we had about 350 million bushels of corn on hand. Last fall, after several years of the Benson treatment, we had 875 million bushels on hand.

We could quote you a lot of other crop figures that would tell about the same story.

It has to be that way, Henry. Here's a farmer with a 200-acre farm, $20,000 worth of livestock and equipment, probably a mortgage and in any case a lot of fixed expenses. That is, they are fixed in that they don't get lower.

If the price of corn drops 30 cents a bushel he has only one alternative; that's to raise more corn and try to keep his income up where it was. The lower the prices get, the harder he tries to do that. You remember Henry, that in the early 30's we had our biggest surpluses when corn was 10 cents a bushel.

You see Benson has been punishing farmers for several years now—trying to get them to cut production—and last June 30 the government's holdings of farm commodities was about $5.3 billion. In 1952 it was $1.1 billion.

Don't you think it's about time to take another look at the Benson approach? We think it's been a monumental failure.

The only way the Benson program will ever accomplish its purpose is to absolutely and completely bankrupt agriculture—to the place where some farms would stand idle and grow up to weeds. Then rural taxes would go unpaid, rural schools (in towns of 5,000 and more) would fail to meet their payrolls, country banks would close and towns, even the size of Des Moines, would be hit and hit hard. Then farm production might go down.

That's when the Benson program will succeed, and not before.

Is that what you folks want, Henry?

You say What's the answer? That you are tired of all this backing and filling and changing plans and all that.

We're with you there, Henry. It's a perfectly ridiculous performance that we have been going through and we don't blame city folks for getting tired of the whole silly business.

But it's really simple. All we need is something like the soil-bank idea (call it what you will). This is going to cost a little money, Henry. (But so does the steel and the oil business, although they have their assists arranged more inconspicuously.) Furthermore, it won't be one-half as costly as bankrupting agriculture. Actually that is just something that the Nation just can't afford to do.

But the result will be, in contrast to the Benson program which you admire so much, a healthy agriculture, with some land put in the bank for future use, solvent farmers that can buy tractors and cars (boy, wouldn't Detroit like that now?) and send their kids to college—just like you do.

It's as simple as that. But you've got to have an administration (and a Secretary of Agriculture) that thinks so—and believes in that kind of a rural America.

Well, Henry, that's the position of the Times-Citizen. Probably it dosn't make a hell of a lot of difference to you folks on Life. But when we pull a boo-boo, we try to correct it. Thought you might want to, too.

THE TIMES-CITIZEN,
Iowa Falls, Iowa.

Alcoholic Beverage Advertising

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CECIL R. KING
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 26, 1958

Mr. KING. Mr. Speaker, today I am presenting a petition from my constituency protesting the advertising of alcoholic beverages. This petition was submitted by Mrs. Della Painter of 1215 South Grevillea Avenue, Inglewood, Calif., and was signed by constituents of the 17th Congressional District of California. The petition and signatures follow:

To CONGRESSMAN CECIL R. KING:

We, the citizens of the 17th District of California, again urge your support to remove the advertising of alcoholic beverages from our homes.

Dr. Walter Fraser, Mrs. Neva L. Fraser, 321 West 130th Street, Hawthorne, Calif.; W. T. Rouse, 8337 Belford Avenue, Los Angeles, Calif.; Hunter R. Hilton, 1211 South Grevillea, J. C. Davis, Jr., Loys L. Davis, 3352 West 116th Street, Betty Johnson, 3857 West 113th Street, Inglewood, Calif.; Ruth Mayfield, 1851 West 95th Street, Los Angeles, Calif.; Della L. Painter, 1215 South Grevillea Avenue, Mrs. Mary E. Padrick, Arthur L. Padrick, 832 Larch Street, Cheryl M. Korpi, Jacob L. Korpi, 829 Myrtle Avenue, Mrs. Mina C. Acton, 405 East Arbor Vitae, Mrs. Cora Levang, 828 South Larch, Inglewood, Calif.; Emma Sutter, 4803 West 121st Street, Hawthorne, Calif.; Mrs. Albertine Cunningham, 411½ East Kelso Street, Mrs. L. D. Chisholm, 330 East Tamarack Avenue, Mabel C. Holzmer, 142 West Kelso, Frances McCartney, 10228 1st Avenue, Inglewood, Calif.; Orvilla J. Glass, 2033 West 99th Street, Los Angeles, Calif.; Margaret Manor, 9800 5th Avenue, Florence Libaise, 8720 12th Avenue, Mrs. Mary Anna Jack, Alfred D. Jack, 4016 West Century Boulevard, Howard S. Somerville, 4056 Century Boulevard, Lorraine Santogeanis, 945 Orchard Drive, Mary Fenwick, 930½ Orchard Drive, Mrs. Fern D. Veitch, 444 West Queen Street, Inglewood, Calif.; Geraldine Albert, 11520 Judah Avenue, Los Angeles, Calif.; Louise M. Hamilton, 3518 West 78th Place, Inglewood, Calif.; Etta Knee, 11526 St. Andrews Place, Los Angeles, Calif.; Henry W. Stoody, 424 West Spruce Avenue, Miss Emma D. Eakin, 10528 Condon Avenue, Mrs. Lois D. W. Reeves, 10814 Firmona Avenue, Mrs. Hilda N. Shoemaker, 11003 Eastwood, Mrs. Gertrude E. Dore, 11216 Grevillea, Inglewood, Calif.; Mrs. Anna K. Haines, 4115 West 106th Street, Lennox, Calif.; Mrs. Verda Harwick, 10321 Buford, Mrs. Myrtis Beard, 4019 West 101st Street, Inglewood, Calif.; Mrs. Ruth Crone, 20837 South Normandie Avenue, Torrance, Calif.; Mrs. Elien Gjetley, 10935 Condon, Mrs. Nellie Eakin, 10528 Condon, Mrs. Gertrude Runyan, 1232 Truro Avenue, J. H. Miller, 3429 West 111th Place, Mrs. Alberta Mayberry, 3021 West 80th Street, Mrs. Lilian R. Milbauer, 1008 South Fir Avenue, Inglewood, Calif.; Gordon Cizek, 4111 175th Place, Torrance, Calif.; Mrs. Harriet J. Waian, 8804 10th Avenue, Inglewood, Calif.; Jolene Smalley, 5717 West 74th Street, Los Angeles, Calif.; Marian L. Hanson, John Hanson, 3519 West 185th Street, Torrance, Calif.; Howard E. Mall, Barbara Mall, 3500 West 83d Street, Inglewood, Calif.; Ronald Johnson, Bettye J. Johnson, 3937 West 115th Street, Hawthorne, Calif.; Anita P. Cizek, 4111 175th Place, Tor-

rance, Calif.; N. K. Hankins, 18027 Falda Avenue, Torrance, Calif.; Mrs. Emma G. Kaufman, Mrs. Leafy Routh, 317 Magnolia, G. W. Bowden, 3308 West 79th Street, Inglewood, Calif.; Harold L. Worthington, 437 East 234th Walk, Wilmington, Calif.; Catherine M. Brooke, 5041 West 123d Place, Hawthorne, Calif.; Ronald D. Smith, 409 East Buckthorn, Inglewood, Calif.; Marguerite Read, 9423 South Western, Los Angeles, Calif.; Mrs. S. W. Crowell, Samuel W. Crowell, 258 York Street, Hawthorne, Calif.

Drysdale Brannon, Courageous Editor

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN V. BEAMER
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 26, 1958

Mr. BEAMER. Mr. Speaker, a copy of a memorial written by W. H. McGrew has come to my attention and I include it in the Appendix of the RECORD under the unanimous consent of my colleagues.

I personally knew Dry Brannon for years. He assisted me immeasurably in the fight for the freedom of Bill Oatis. It always was a privilege to consider him as one of my sincere friends:

The late Drysdale Brannon, the courageous managing editor of the Marion (Ind.) Chronicle for more than a quarter of a century, possessed a many-sided personality that often was both the delight and despair of both his friends and his foes. But everyone admired him for his faithfulness to those he admired and respected.

It was typical of the Brannon philosophy of life that when a friend was in distress, no stone would be left unturned in his continuing efforts to provide assistance. Such was the case when on April 23, 1951, his friend and former fellow worker in the journalistic vineyard, William (Bill) Oatis, then the Associated Press Bureau chief in Prague, Czechoslovakia, was seized by Czech secret police and was charged with "hostile activities and spreading secret information."

Knowing full well that arrest in a Communist-dominated country almost inevitably would lead to imprisonment, Dry girded for a long and unremitting struggle to obtain his release from that prison. This epic struggle for a friend was destined to dominate Dry's thinking throughout the painful years of Oatis' imprisonment and the flow of stories about the slightly built Oatis did not end until he was released.

No Johnny-come-lately in a brass-knuckle battle, Brannon carefully drew up a blueprint of his planned assault against the red ramparts, and the attack continued without letup as the case of Bill Oatis was carried before the court of world opinion. Yet this was a labor of love for a man who knew no fear, even of the dread disease which eventually caused his death.

Thus began a long struggle that was to keep the Oatis case constantly "in the news" not only in Marion where Oatis began his journalistic career under the guiding hand of this master craftsman, but in the halls of Congress, in the State Department and even in the White House.

Dry Brannon had a deep and abiding affection for Oatis and could recall many of Oatis' eccentricities which were blazoned across the pages of the Nation's newspapers to excite interest in this strange, moody newsman who had spent his salad days in Marion and started his writing career on the Marion Leader-Tribune.

Within a matter of weeks the Oatis file began to grow; and that growth was destined to continue unabated until his final release. During the long struggle there was a certain grimness on the Brannon countenance as the weeks dragged on into months and years. But Brannon was relentless in his efforts and the barrage of stories continued to be written on a battered old typewriter which also had recorded other spirited battles for truth and honesty over the fruitful years.

Thus Bill Oatis became the martyr of journalistic freedom through the word pictures that were skilfully woven, either by Brannon himself, or through his suggestion and direction, by members of his staff. This fighting editor dredged deeply into his capacious memory to recall the many interesting facets of the Oatis personality; and all these were dispatched over press wires to an indignant free world.

It was typical of this aggressive editor and reporter that there should be no compromise with truth—either on the continuing Oatis stories, or any others of lesser importance. He hated sham and deceit and was ever alert to the danger of graft and corruption. And he came to hate communism, not only because it was a denial of everything that was decent and worthwhile, but because it had harmed a friend.

Lithuanian Independence Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANTE B. FASCELL
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 26, 1958

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, although it has been almost impossible to penetrate the hermetically sealed borders of Lithuania since its occupation by the U. S. S. R. 12 years ago, let us take the opportunity of Lithuanian Independence Day, February 16, to especially express our hopes for the eventual emergence to freedom of this former Republic.

Today Lithuania is a dominated country; however, that she has retained her former culture and religion is apparent through the ideologies and desires voiced by those who have managed to reach the free world since Lithuania's annexation.

I join with the friends of Lithuania in commemorating the 40th anniversary of her independence.

Americans of Lithuanian descent, as represented by the Lithuanian Council of Miami, Fla., expressed themselves as follows:

Whereas the Soviet Union has consistently violated all the international agreements and political pacts signed between her and other states; and

Whereas as a result of such violations the Republic of Lithuania, as well as other Baltic States, in 1940, have become the unwilling victims of the Russian imperialism; and

Whereas the Soviet Union by offering the so-called peaceful coexistence to the United States strives to achieve the recognition of her unlawful domination in eastern Europe: Therefore be it

Resolved, That this great gathering of loyal Americans of Lithuanian descent commemorating the 40th anniversary of the independence of Lithuania, and the 795th anniversary of its origin as a nation with the coronation of its first king, Mindaugas, in 1163, urges the Government of the United States not to place implicit faith in the Soviet rulers' words about peaceful coexistence because the basic aims of the Soviet Union to conquer the world have not changed; be it further

Resolved, That this meeting urges the Government of the United States to not enter into any new political agreements or pacts with the Soviet Union unless the Soviet Union agrees to restore freedom and sovereign rights to the enslaved nations of eastern Europe; and be it finally

Resolved, That this meeting calls upon the Government of the United States to continue to support the efforts of the people of Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia, as well as of the other captive nations to regain their freedom.

The Governor of our State, the Honorable LeRoy Collins, and the mayor of Miami, Fla., the Honorable Robert King High, have proclaimed February 16 as Lithuania's Independence Day in the following proclamations:

PROCLAMATION, STATE OF FLORIDA, EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENT, TALLAHASSEE

Whereas February 16 marks the 40th anniversary of the rebirth of a free, independent Lithuania after 120 years of Russian domination with Lithuania once again under that same yoke; and

Whereas February 16, 1918, is still being observed, for the love, desire, and hope of freedom still burns in Lithuanians' hearts; and

Whereas thousands of Lithuanians, guided by that love and desire for freedom, came to this great land of promise and became its loyal citizens, contributing wholeheartedly to its cultural and material growth, and have come also to our great State of Florida, contributing in like measure to its phenomenal growth; and

Whereas, as true sons of liberty, these American citizens of Lithuanian origin or descent continue to labor to secure those same blessings of human dignity they enjoy in this great democracy for their less fortunate brethren under the domination of Russia: Now, therefore,

I, LeRoy Collins, by virtue of the authority vested in me as Governor of the State of Florida, do hereby proclaim February 16, 1958, as Lithuania's independence day in Florida, and call upon our people to join with fellow citizens of Lithuanian descent in the hope and prayer that liberty and independence will soon be restored to that brave nation so wrongfully oppressed.

In witness whereof, I have hereunto set my hand and caused the great seal of the State of Florida to be affixed at Tallahassee, the capital, this 5th day of February A. D. 1958.

LEROY COLLINS,
Governor.

Attest:

R. A. GRAY,
Secretary of State.

A PROCLAMATION, LITHUANIA'S INDEPENDENCE DAY, 1958

Whereas 40 years ago, on February 16, 1918, the freedom-loving people of Lithuania through their representative council, the Taryba, at the historic capital of Vilnius, proclaimed to the world in the oldest living language the rebirth of a free and independent Lithuania after 120 years of Russian domination; and

Whereas people of Lithuanian origin or descent have helped this country to establish its independence and have contributed their share in the development of its natural resources, industry, and art; and

Whereas the United States granted recognition to Lithuania on July 28, 1922, and does not recognize the fruits of the Soviet-Nazi division of spoils which resulted in the occupation and purported annexation of Lithuania by the U. S. S. R.; and

Whereas citizens of Lithuanian origin or descent will hold a mass meeting commemorating the 40th anniversary of the independence of their homeland to reaffirm their faith in democracy and to renew their efforts to secure the liberation of their less fortunate brethren from oppression: Now, therefore,

I, Robert King High, mayor of the city of Miami, Fla., do hereby proclaim February 16, 1958, as Lithuania's Independence Day.

In observance thereof I urge all our people to join with fellow citizens of Lithuanian descent in the hope and prayer that truth and justice will prevail throughout the world and that true liberty and independence of a brave people will soon be restored.

In witness whereof I hereunto set my hand and cause the seal of the city of Miami to be affixed.

Done in the office of the mayor of the city of Miami, Fla., this the 11th day of February in the year of our Lord 1958.

ROBERT KING HIGH, *Mayor.*

Speech by the Honorable Adlai E. Stevenson

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MELVIN PRICE
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 17, 1958

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address:

SPEECH BY THE HONORABLE ADLAI E. STEVENSON AT THE HARRY S. TRUMAN DINNER, BANQUET HALL, SHERATON-PARK HOTEL, FEBRUARY 22, 1958

The chairman has spoken to you, in words I greatly appreciate, of a man who wasn't President. I am here, however, to pay my respects—and yours to a man who was.

Several weeks ago a Chicago newspaper carried this headline: "Adams Insists Ike Really Is the President" (Chicago Tribune, November 19, 1957).

No newspaper ever had to write that kind of headline about the man we honor here tonight. For the Nation knew, without having to be told by a White House assistant, that in deed as well as name, on Sundays through Saturdays, from January through December, the President was—Harry Truman.

Some new concepts of the office of the Presidency have emerged in recent years of Republican rule. But the ideal President Truman held of the office he filled is, I think, still the ideal not just of Democrats, but of Americans. It is part of our tradition that ex-Presidents—at least the great ones—become very quickly in our minds not Republicans or Democrats, but great Americans. Especially is this true, it seems, in February, the shortest month in the year.

Others will speak tonight of various elements in the concept of the Presidency we identify with President Truman. I want to mention, in my brief moments, one of these qualities in particular.

It is candor.

Harry Truman stands before this political generation as the vigorous and pungent embodiment of candor and truthfulness in our public life.

Indeed I can assure you from personal experience that you never had to wonder where you stood with Harry Truman.

But more than that, he believed in telling the American people the truth about their condition. For politics is essentially an educational process, in which people grow to their full stature through participation in great decisions. But people cannot participate in great decisions unless they know the facts. The first condition of a successful democracy is an informed people. It is an indispensable part of the Presidential responsibility to make sure the people have the facts, no matter how grim and sobering these facts may be.

Harry Truman believed that the American people should know the score.

But at times his successor does not seem to even want us to know who is playing.

There are many dramatic contrasts between the Truman and the Eisenhower administrations—in the sharpness of decision, in the creativity of public policy, in the whole national temper and morale. But perhaps no contrast is more dramatic than the change in the relationship between the Government and the people.

That change can be briefly summed up: the Democrats regarded the people as responsible partners, able to take their own share in the labor of public policy; the Republicans regard the people as customers, to be bemused, beguiled, and manipulated—to be sold, not told.

Very early in this administration, a high official on the President's staff said: "We're going to merchandise the living hell out of the Eisenhower administration."

And that is precisely what they have done. These years of Republican rule have been stained by heavy failure in many areas—the excesses of McCarthyism, the disintegration of our alliances, the loss of confidence in us abroad, the decay of our military position, and now the decline in our economic vitality. But perhaps nothing has injured us more, or struck so deep at the jugular vein of democracy, as the abuse of the people's right to know. This administration's record of systematic and unblushing misrepresentation, concealment and half-truth has few precedents in our political history. And what makes it more offensive is that it has all been conducted in an atmosphere of such ostentatious piety.

I don't want to recite the familiar litany of foolish words and broken promises—the expenses that were to be cut, the budgets to be reduced, the secret agreements to be denounced, the prices to be stabilized, the schools to be built, the farm surpluses to be eliminated, and the great brains they were going to bring to Washington.

Do you recall all their wild talk about a lurid mess down here in Washington that they were going to clean up? Well, we've really got one now and they've made it worldwide; it's our biggest export commodity.

And that's what I want to talk about—candor and foreign affairs.

Back in the beginning they fooled the people with talk about liberating Eastern Europe, unleashing the Formosa Chinese, rolling back communism. Well, we have paid a heavy price for those empty, misleading slogans not only in the satellites, but in Western Europe and in the uncommitted nations.

Then they channeled American thinking into purely military concepts, ridiculed the intellectuals—and even the eggheads—pandered to complacency, and encouraged the illusion of American omnipotence. They ignored the progress of Soviet education, concealed the weaknesses of the Allied coalition, misrepresented Russian military strength and political penetration. As our prestige and influence and confidence declined, they reported every setback, every disappointment, every defeat as a triumph of statesmanship from which we had emerged more respected and invulnerable than ever.

Worst of all, they never stirred, stimulated, or spurred the American people. Instead, they lulled America into a dangerous slumber from which we were only recently awakened by the shock of sputnik.

Do you remember Operation Candor—the big project for telling the truth about atomic weapons? Other administrations have regarded candor as a prime obligation of Government. It is characteristic that an administration hypnotized and sustained by public relations experts regarded it as an operation. And it is even more characteristic that, in the end, they dropped the whole idea.

It wasn't long ago that the Secretary of State was solemnly assuring a congressional committee that Russia was on the point of collapsing. What was on the point of collapsing was Mr. Dulles' own foreign policy.

Do you remember all their rosy reports about the Geneva Conference and the President's great triumph? And what happened? The Soviets pushed confidently forward into the Middle East.

Do you remember all the assurances from the President and the Republican orators during 1956 that they had a patent on peace, that we were trusted, beloved, invulnerable, and our prestige was never higher? What happened? Could there have been a more disastrous proof of the lost confidence and desperaton of our oldest, best allies than Suez?

And how far behind would we have fallen in education and missiles if the Russians had not launched the sputniks?

I say that we have been misled from beginning to end about our most vital concerns—about our military strength, about the power of the Communists, about our broad position in the world.

But the truth is slowly emerging at last. The people, or too many of them, wouldn't believe us Democrats in 1956, for truth, like the sun, can be observed; but, like the sun, only for a time.

I think we could forgive the administration a good deal—indeed, we never expected much—if we felt that it had been honest with us and even honest with itself about our most important affairs.

We Democrats will have many powerful issues in the elections this fall. But none, I think, will and should be more fundamental than this one—the restoration of truth to Government. For if we Americans know the truth, the facts, the problems, there is in us the wisdom and the strength to meet the problem, to do whatever needs to be done, to face danger as part of achieving destiny.

But this is an issue which imposes an obligation on ourselves, too—an obligation to tell the truth even when it hurts.

If we don't live up to this obligation, we will not deserve the people's trust.

But if we do, we can look forward to victory not only in 1958 but in 1960.

A Southern Editor in Chicago

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE M. GRANT
OF ALABAMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 26, 1958

Mr. GRANT. Mr. Speaker, Grover C. Hall, Jr., editor in chief of the Montgomery Advertiser, on Monday of this week delivered a most interesting and enlightening talk before the Inlaid Daily Press Association at the Drake Hotel in Chicago. The association is an organization of 478 editors and publishers from 20 inland States.

A SOUTHERN EDITOR IN CHICAGO

Ladies and gentlemen, I'm not the first man connected with the Montgomery Adver-

tiser to speak to a Chicago audience on an explosive subject. Before me, there was a printer named Albert Parsons. He was an anarchist and his message to Chicago was, "workingmen of America, learn to manufacture dynamite." A little later (1886) Parsons was hanged here for heaving a bomb in the Haymarket riot.

I expect my trip to Chicago to be less eventful than that of Citizen Parsons, and I will hold up my end if you will hold up yours.

Anyway, let me assure you that I'm not an anarchist, even if I do deplore the Little Rock bayonets and argue that the 9 most energetic and mischievous Congressmen in Washington are the 9 Justices of the Supreme Court.

I'm more like a cotton Whig who wishes he could get together with you conscience Whigs.

I am pleased to come to Chicago to discuss with you the grievous race problem of the South—the south side of Chicago, where more Americans are in immediate physical danger because of race strife than in all the Southern States together.

Pietistical experting on the race disharmony in the Southern States is a convenient and easily mastered hobby, but if you want to talk about blood spilled, skulls cracked, deceit practiced, evasion and defiance of law on a grand scale—your dateline will be, not Little Rock, or Montgomery, but Chicago, Detroit, Philadelphia, New York.

HORSE LATITUDES

School desegregation in the South has hit the horse latitudes. Those visionaries in and out of the South who thought that once the Supreme Court had decreed desegregation it would follow like a point after touchdown are now getting their answer.

It has now taken $5,000,000 and the United States Army to enroll nine colored children in the Little Rock school. The result of this rash intrusion will be the derangement of the personalities of those pawned colored children, the reelection of that antic adventurer Faubus, and a discharge of more extremism into the Southern air.

The progress of school desegregation is well illustrated in North Carolina, which is endowed in the fantasies of the Northern press with lots of liberal mascara. In North Carolina, 9 colored children out of 320,000 are in white schools.

After 4 years, there are in Arkansas, North Carolina and Tennessee a total of 270. The figure for Mississippi and South Carolina is less spectacular.

Don't be misled by a few masochistic southern prophets who revel in the Little Rock bayonet and go loping around in circles whipping their own behinds like the self-flagellants of the Middle Ages. The reality seems to be this: If northern politicians, lick-spitting and honey-bunching the minority voting blocs in the North, impel the Federal Government to grind down upon the South, 1 of 2 things may happen. Much of the South will close its schools or there will be violence.

Until New York, Chicago, Detroit, and Philadelphia can quell their own state of guerrilla warfare between the races and crush the reign of rape and knife on schoolhouse staircases, their politicians and editorial jingoes should have the graceful forbearance to take sabbatical leave from their aggressions against the South.

HAMMUS ALABAMMUS

There is a growing rigidity of position being forced upon southern politicians by the holy-rolling of opportunistic northern politicians and the primitive NAACP with its swagger stick and shiny new jackboots.

You see this rigidity in the current race for governor in Alabama. One candidate has promised, "I will go to jail to preserve segregation." Another has spoken of arresting the FBI in certain circumstances to preserve segregation. A third one has vowed, "I will die to preserve segregation." So far none has taken a position on the use of atomic bombs to preserve segregation.

Mind, these are sophisticated men no more inclined to race-baiting than you are. What they say is just some hammus Alabammus made necessary by the fears and frustrations of a large element of voters. And please be certain that, by inversion, there is an equal supply up the way of hammus New Yorkus and Illinoisus.

A conservative editor, in the North or the South, has to fight a 2-front war all the time with the two extremes. Thumb back to your Thucydides and what he wrote of the class wars in Greece 2,500 years ago and you'll see something familiar. It was a time, Thucydides wrote, "when reckless audacity * * * came to be considered the courage of a loyal ally; prudent hesitation, specious cowardice; moderation was held to be a cloak of unmanliness; ability to see all sides of a question was accounted inability to act on any."

SOUTH'S BAR OF CONSCIENCE

The colored man is misused in both the North and the South, though he is far more deceived in the northern paradise. On this, however, there is one basic concession that the honest southerner must make to the North. In the North there is no resistance to the enfranchisement of qualified Negro voters. In some parts of the South, there is.

Like the citizens of Washington, D. C., southerners living in areas threatened by Negro government recoil. What they see existing and to come politically in Detroit and Philadelphia validates their fears. All the same, whereas a Southerner is sincerely easy in his conscience about separate-but-equal schools, he cannot so easily acquit himself before the bar of his own conscience on the question of denying a qualified colored man the ballot.

RACE STRIFE IS PORTABLE

At some point this country will work free of its fantasy that there is something different in the moral constitution of the southerner and northerner that makes of the one a white devil exploiting the colored man and of the other a compassionate deliverer and fraternity brother.

Already the North has about 40 percent of the colored population and the lemming tide rolls on—about 2,500 to Chicago every month, 1,700 to Los Angeles, 1,400 to New York, etc. Chicago already has 700,000 and New York a million, the same as Alabama.

Their migration has proved that race strife is quite portable. For it requires more policemen in one district of Chicago to restrain race warfare than among all the 40 million people of the Southern States.

Above all, the North will grasp the essential reality when it finally recognizes that a sorrowful fact of our national life is—wherever in America colored people migrate in significant numbers, they encounter resistance and rejection.

LOOK AWAY DIXIELAND

Your Illinois politicians applaud the Little Rock troop drop, but say nothing of the NAACP estimate that 90 percent of Chicago's elementary school children attend schools that are predominantly of one race, nor the charge that the Chicago authorities mean to keep it that way through the pattern of new school construction. Your Illinois politicians caterwaul about Jim Crow in Montgomery, Ala., but grapple not with the fact that, according to the National Conference of Christians and Jews, there is more residential segregation in Chicago than in Montgomery.

Last August in the Calumet Park area there was a race riot in which 37 persons were injured. Always in dread of a full-scale race war in the summer months, the Chicago authorities assigned 934 policemen to patrol the area. And on that very same day, Senator PAUL DOUGLAS, of Illinois, was receiving a group of Alabama Negroes in his office, making a national sensation of their woes and demanding action, not in his Chicago constituency, but in Alabama.

FLIGHT OF THE BUMBLEBEE

However, my favorite abolitionist is Gov. "Soapy" Williams, of Michigan, that exuberant collegian who is working his way on a Walter Reuther "scholarship."

In 1956 Governor Williams canceled a speaking engagement in Alabama because the dinner was segregated. A few months later I saw him land here for the Democratic convention, bringing with him something called the Michigan manifesto. This manifesto was another of those emancipation proclamations that freed the slaves in the Confederate States but said naught of those in the neutral border States.

To get the manifesto to Chicago, the Governor flew it over Dearborn and about 20 other Michigan cities where Negroes are totally or as nearly as possibly excluded from residence. Fifteen thousand colored constituents of Governor Williams work by day in Dearborn, but the valid boast of the mayor of Dearborn is that not a one is allowed to spend the night. Then Williams landed in Chicago, having borne the manifesto over Trumbull Park, where at that time 150 Chicago policemen were guarding 23 Negro families.

Whereupon, his excellency strode to the chancel of the Americans for Democratic Action temple and shook the manifesto at wayward Montgomery, where, by the way, several colored families live in peace on a street a few paces from the mansion of the Governor of Alabama.

CHAINED TO THE 19TH CENTURY

If only the South had as many new industries as it has ecstatic missionaries and hellmouth preceptors, it would be rich as Texas and might even consider, this time with more hope of success, another Civil War.

A basic reason why the national debate on the race issue is so irrational is the failure of the American press to report strife as eagerly and fully in the North as in the South. And the reason for this dereliction is mainly that northern attitudes are chained to the century before this one, when the South was the oppressor of the Negro and the North was his deliverer in a great war.

The otherwise virile Chicago press is joined with radio and TV in a formal code for muffling or suppressing spot coverage of race incidents. This is because, as both the Sun-Times and Chicago Defender have recently said, Chicago sits on a powder keg and the fuse is short. What about Montgomery, an international symbol of violence? When some dynamite was used, my newspaper published an extra.

LITTLE SQUIRT, PAGE 60

I have time to specify two examples of the scandals of omission in officious, self-righteous northern papers.

If the Reverend Martin Luther King gets a traffic ticket, that's news in Detroit. But when a Detroit mob of about 500 whites stone the newly bought home of a Cherokee Indian mistaken for a Negro, the 3 Detroit papers shrink it to brief items on page 3, page 16, and page 60. And only 1 of the 3 papers used the word "Negro" to explain to Detroit citizens what was happening in their city.

These Detroit papers could staff the Emmett Till trial in Mississippi, they had just run the empurpled Thunder Over Dixie series, they demanded that Dulles permit their reporters to cover Red China—but a violent mob of Detroiters within spitting dis-

stance of their city desks was a little squirt of type on page 60.

The New York Times owns large rugs and employs efficient sweepers. The dramatic at-sea race riot in Buffalo got a total of 11 inches in 2 days, pages 10 and 50.

BETTER, BUT STILL—

It is nevertheless my judgment that the northern press is now performing more faithfully and that it will land on its feet. After all, even Henry Luce can't blame the felonies and corruptions of the Puerto Rican schoolchildren in New York on their previous life in segregated Dixie.

But in predicting the rehabilitation of the New York press, I must nevertheless conclude on a guarded note. With 644 New York schoolchildren expelled from school and thus unleashed to make the streets as dangerous as the classrooms, the New York Herald Tribune button was still stuck on the faraway Little Rock 9. On February 14, the Herald Tribune carried a mawkish editorial, a kind of valentine in spots, demanding that the Little Rock school reinstate Minnie Jean Brown, who had been suspended for repeated misconduct, and encouraging Minnie Jean to throw soup right back at her white classmates.

Foreign Air Competition

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JOHN V. BEAMER

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 26, 1958

Mr. BEAMER. Mr. Speaker, a dozen years ago, directly at the close of World War II, a traveler contemplating a trip to Europe would not have had any great choice of air carrier, despite the fact that, at that time, three United States-flag airlines were operating across the Atlantic.

The trip was not the easiest, either. DC-4 equipment was the best available, and the traveler had midway stops at Bermuda, the Azores, Gander, or Goose Bay, depending upon his destination and depending upon the weather. No nonstop operations were even hoped for, and extended weather delays were not unusual.

Today, Mr. Speaker, the situation has undergone a remarkable change. United States carriers have been reduced to 2 because in 1950 American Overseas Airlines saw the handwriting on the wall and asked to be relieved of its transatlantic certificate. The handwriting was the rapid growth and expansion of a dozen foreign airlines which now parallel our carriers in the battle for transatlantic business—a battle which we are slowly, but surely, losing.

My attention was focused on this problem, Mr. Speaker, by a searching article recently published in the Wall Street Journal. It tells of the wide-open, no-holds-barred competition for the tourist dollar among airlines operating out of Miami into the Caribbean and into Central and South America.

Several years ago, Mr. Speaker, the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce had the privilege of some wise counsel from Mr. J. T. Trippe, president of Pan American World Airways, in which Mr. Trippe expressed considerable concern over a policy of indiscriminate competition being pursued on international air routes by our Civil Aeronautics Board.

At that time, Mr. Trippe expressed greater concern over the impact of competition from foreign carriers than he did from competition between American carriers themselves.

In some quarters, his fears were taken lightly. At the time of his testimony before the House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, in which he predicted the ultimate seriousness of foreign-flag air competition, our friends from abroad were not in a particularly strong competitive position. Their equipment, in most cases, was inferior to ours and their frequency of operations was far below our levels. Thus, shortsighted people involved in civil air transport, lacking Mr. Trippe's broad vision, could not anticipate any serious threat to our United States air supremacy in the international field from the flag lines of foreign countries.

How quickly the entire picture has changed.

For the past several years, the combined operations of foreign lines flying between Europe and the United States have been carrying more passengers than Pan American and TWA together despite the fact that Pan American and TWA have scheduled flights with frequencies that have done both the airlines proud in the matter of aircraft utilization.

These foreign lines, Mr. Speaker, are still pulling away from our United States-flag lines year by year, little by little, in total passengers hauled. And they are accomplishing this by flying the finest equipment available—equipment manufactured in the United States and paid for, directly or indirectly, with American taxpayers' money in the form of foreign-aid grants or loans.

As we all know, since the Bermuda Conference of 1946, we and the other nations of the world have been operating under bilateral air agreements. As an example, our carriers fly to Great Britain and BOAC in turn flies to New York. Pan American and TWA fly the Polar route from the west coast to Europe and so does SAS, the Scandinavian Airlines System owned by the governments of Norway, Sweden, and Denmark. However, this arrangement is not nearly as reciprocal as it may seem. The economic balance is heavily in favor of the foreign lines because New York is infinitely more valuable to KLM and Swissair than are Armsterdam and Geneva to Pan American and TWA, respectively.

Here is an interesting example: Qantas is the commercial air transport arm of the Australian Government. Through an arrangement with our Government, Qantas is now permitted to operate from Australia to Honolulu to San Francisco across the United States to New York and then on to Europe and beyond to Australia giving Qantas a true round-the-world operation which it so proudly advertises in our American newspapers and magazines. Pan American, on the other hand, does not have an around-the-world operation because the 3,000 miles separating our east coast and west coast are forbidden to Pan American by our Civil Aeronautics Board, although all Pan Am's United States competitors in the foreign field have lucrative domestic routes. How, Mr. Speaker, can Pan American compete with Qantas on a worldwide basis when our own Government will not allow our largest international airline to operate within its own borders?

The French are piqued at us right now because our State Department will not grant Air France extravagant additional concessions to an already profitable route it operates between France, the United States and Mexico. It is my understanding, however, that the United States has offered to give Air France a direct route to Los Angeles on the condition that Air France give up its route to Houston. Air France so far has not operated the Houston route, although it has had authority, under its bilateral, to do so since 1951.

Mr. Speaker, I could go on endlessly illustrating the disadvantages our carriers experience in keeping abreast of their foreign competition, all of it government-owned and highly subsidized. But a better example of what our carriers face from abroad is illustrated in a most engrossing article carried in the Wall Street Journal of January 29.

Mr. Cal Brumley has done a fine job of research in preparing his article, and under unanimous consent, I include Mr. Brumley's essay from the Wall Street Journal in the Appendix of the RECORD:

LATIN AIRLINES: THEY SWARM INTO UNITED STATES—LOWER FARES WIN TRADE FROM YANKEE RIVALS—THEY CUT COSTS WITH CHEAPER PLANES, LABOR—SOME DRAW BIG GOVERNMENT SUBSIDIES—FLYING THE BAREFOOT TRADE

(By Cal Brumley)

MIAMI.—"We taught the Latins to fly and now they are taking our business," grumbles an executive of the Latin American division of Pan American World Airways here.

When the roar of a Convair Super 340 passing overhead recedes, the executive adds: "And don't let anyone kid you. This Latin airline competition is serious. In our Latin division, where only 9 international airlines competed for traffic in 1945, there are more than 50 flying today."

The hard-pressed United States airline industry, already buffeted by rising costs and shrinking profits, is worriedly watching a flourishing number of Latin-owned air carriers slice off bigger and bigger hunks of the United States-Latin America traffic. Nearly 1.5 million travelers annually fly between the United States and the score of American republics that lie to the south, some 50 percent more than the number that fly between the United States and Europe each year.

And the Latins' inroads appear to be just beginning. Additional Latin airlines are planning to compete with United States carriers on United States-Latin American routes. And some of the Latin lines are laying plans for extending their operations to compete with United States carriers on Atlantic and Pacific routes.

LATIN LURE

The chief Latin lure: Lower fares, made possible by cheaper equipment, low cost labor and, in some cases, heavy government subsidies. For example:

The one-way fare from Miami to Guatemala City on Empresa Guatemalteca de

Aviacion, the Guatemalan government airline, is only $55, excluding taxes. Pan American's fare is 50 percent higher.

A flight from New York to Santiago, Chile, costs only $280 on Cinta, a Chilean line, while the cheapest fare on Panagra, its United States-owned competitor, is $412.

And it is $42 cheaper to fly from Chicago to Sao Paulo, Brazil, on Real Aerovias, a Brazilian carrier, than it is to take Braniff Airways.

FOREIGN COMPETITION

While more than 50 lines batle for Latin American traffic, including such United States carriers as Pan Am, Braniff Airways, American Airlines, National Airlines, Eastern Air Lines, and Pan American-Grace Airways, only 8 foreign carriers contend with Pan American Airways and Trans World Airlines for the transatlantic traffic, and only 2 foreign airlines compete with Pan American and Northwest Airlines for the cross-Pacific business to and from the United States.

Foreign-owned airlines raked in some $238 million from globe-trotting Americans in 1956. This was 44 percent of the total the United States travelers spent on international air travel that year and compared with 42 percent in 1955.

Growing foreign competition is particularly painful to American carriers now. The average profit margin of the United States carriers has plunged to about 3.3 percent from as high as 7 percent in 1952. One United States airline, Braniff, already is receiving a Federal subsidy on its South American routes; $ 89,000 for fiscal 1958, for instance. And there is talk in the industry that other lines, such as Panagra, soon might ask for Federal aid. Even an interim 6.6 percent increase in fares, granted this week by the Civil Aeronautics Board, is termed inadequate by many of the United States airlines to solve their growing financial troubles.

In addition, the toughening competition comes just at the time the Yankee lines are trying to raise more than $2 billion to purchase some 340 new jet and turbo-prop craft which they have on order.

PAN AM'S REVENUES

Pan American officials say the Latin competition is becoming so rigorous that its Latin division yields only 5.8 cents on each mile traveled by a paying passenger compared with a yield of 7.9 cents per passenger revenue mile on Pan Am's transatlantic flights.

For an idea of how the Latin airlines are swarming into this country, stroll down the flight line here at Miami's International Airport, the favorite port-of-entry for the Latin lines. No fewer than 22 Latin American airlines touch down here with such craft as DC–4's, Constellations, Viscounts and converted C–46's. Five of these lines have made their maiden flights to the United States within the past year. Ten years ago only two airlines from the south ventured this far north.

More newcomers are expected this year. "There probably will be 1 or 2 Argentine airlines, one from Haiti and another from Ecuador in Miami shortly," says Thomas R. Green who makes a practice of keeping track of such plans. Mr. Green is president of Dispatch Services, Inc., which contracts to operate ground crews and ticket agents for the foreign lines.

The United States doesn't permit foreign lines to compete with domestic carriers for business and passengers traveling between United States cities. However, a foreign line with proper permission can offer its international service to and from other points in the United States besides just such coastal spots as Miami. Consequently, many Latin lines are now pushing their service inland and to the busy United States-European runs to compete with the international service of United States lines.

Cinta, formally known as Linea Aerea Chilena, for example, began twice weekly service from Santiago to Miami in August, 1956. Just a year later Cinta spread its wings and added service to New York.

Now, says John Wells, Cinta's manager in Miami, "It is generally understood the company plans to fly the Atlantic." Rome is considered the most likely European terminal.

Other Latin lines are equally eager. Aeronaves de Mexico started Mexico City-New York flights in December. Empresa de Viacao Aerea Rio Grandense, a Brazilian airline known as Varig, is negotiating for approval to begin service to Europe this year. In these European operations, of course, the Latins also compete with United States airlines.

And at least one Latin line is hoping to invade the United States west coast and slice off a share of the transpacific business. Real-Aerovias Brazil System, which has been flying to Chicago for the past year, hopes to obtain landing rights at Los Angeles or San Francisco as a stopover for a planned route to Tokyo. "We also would like a New York terminal," says Arlindo Moura, United States general manager for Real.

When a foreign airline wants to enter the United States, or seeks to extend its service within this country, it must apply to the Civil Aeronautics Board and the State Department for approval.

UNITED STATES LINES COMPLAIN

Yankee lines complain the CAB and the State Department have been too freehanded in granting such permission. The agencies argue that permission is granted only on a reciprocal basis; when a Brazilian line, for example, is granted the right to enter the United States, Brazil, in turn, must grant similar rights to a United States line. The agencies say that no permission has been granted without repayment.

"By and large," claims an executive of one Latin American line, "the United States has given the Latin lines a shabby deal. Until the recent bilateral agreements between the United States and Mexico, there were nine United States lines operating into Mexico and only one Mexican line going into the United States and it was partly owned by Pan American."

There are some reasons besides lower fares that explain why Latin airlines are doing so well. For one thing, many South and Central Americans prefer to fly on lines operated by fellow countrymen as a matter of national pride.

LOWER FARES

But the main reason is the lower fares offered by many of the Latin airlines. In the words of a Honduran airline executive: "You might say we fly the barefoot trade."

Not all Latin airlines offer fares lower than their North American competition. Some of them, like most United States lines, belong to the International Air Transport Association which sets uniform prices on overseas runs. These include such lines as Cubana de Aviacion and Varig, a Brazilian line, which fly such up-to-date planes as the Viscount and Super-Constellation. A majority of the Latin lines, however, do not belong to the IATA, and consequently do not abide by the association's rules on fares.

One reason these lines are able to tempt passengers with lower fares is that they fly what the United States lines are inclined to class as jitney or secondhand equipment. Most bargain priced Latin international flights are made in DC–4's which lumber along at 225 miles per hour. A Constellation cruises at 300 and a Super-Constellation or DC–7 sails along at 340 to 360 miles per hour.

Cost of jitney equipment, most of which was purchased used or from Government surplus, is much lower than that of new planes used by the North American lines. Transportes Aereos Nacionales, a Honduran airline known as TAN, which flies four converted C–46's, paid only $5,000 for its first plane, says its vice president and general manager, C. N. Shelton. He declines to name the prices paid for the other three, but says, "We couldn't operate without the inexpensive equipment." A new DC–7B carries a price tag of $2,250,000.

Another reason that the Latins can operate on the low fare schedule is cheaper wage rates. The president of a line in Peru says wages in South America are a third less than in the United States.

Also helping the Latins keep their fares down is considerable aid from their own governments. The Air Transport Association complains that in a recent 8-year period Argentina put $83 million into its airlines either in direct cash subsidy or stock ownership. And some of the lines, of course, are government-owned and can get by with smaller profits than privately owned carriers.

LOWER TAXES

Too, many of the Latin flyers are not hit as hard by taxes as their Yankee competitors. For example, while United States corporations pay income taxes as high as 52 percent of their profits, Honduras, the home of TAN, has a tax rate of 20 percent to 25 percent, says TAN's Mr. Shelton. "There's no doubt about it," he says, "lower income taxes are one reason we can charge lower fares."

Another cost-cutting technique peculiar to the Latin lines: A freer mixing of cargo and passengers than the United States lines. "We may have diplomats and a consignment of monkeys, anteaters, snakes, tropical fish, or even penguins on the same flight," says George Poulos, district traffic and sales manager for Aerovias Panama. Thus, a flight short on passengers can make up the difference by increasing its cargo. TAN, for instance, equips its planes with fold-away seats to expand or contract the passenger and cargo compartments depending on the day's business.

Many passengers are lured to the Latin lines because they often offer more direct routes than a competing North American line.

NON-STOP FLIGHT

"We fly cheaper than anyone else because our route goes direct and nonstop from Miami to Guatemala City," says John Farrow, a sandy-haired Englishman who is United States traffic and sales manager for Aviateca. Pan Am's flight to the same point has stops at Havana and Meridia, Mexico.

While most Latin planes are older and slower than their competing United States counterparts, their safety records are as good as those of United States flights, the Latins stoutly insist.

They also offer, in some instances, passenger amenities comparable to their Yankee competition.

Aerovias Panama Airways, which charges only $55 for a one-way flight from Miami to Panama City, compared with $94 on a United States line, serves hot meals, has three stewardesses to look after the comfort of passengers and serves beverages including cocktails and hard liquor, free.

"We can serve free drinks because we buy our liquor at Panamanian instead of United States prices," explains APA's Mr. Poulos. A note for Scotch fanciers: He says a fifth of Ballentine's Scotch whiskey sells for $2.50 in Panama compared with $6.50 in the United States.

To meet the Latin competition the United States lines rely on faster schedules and better equipment and stress Yankee know-how. Panagra will get four of the first Douglas jets delivered to Pan Am to assure Panagra a "strong competitive position in its area." Panagra is owned by Pan Am and W. R. Grace & Co.

The Latin lines are also making progress toward modernization of equipment. Cubana de Aviacion already is flying Vickers Viscount turbo-props and is ordering Boeing 707 jets and Bristol Britannia turbo-props. Varig has 2 French Caravelle jets on order and is considering increasing the number to 5.

MORE MODERN PLANES

The Latin lines hope to be even more competitive as they get additional modern equipment. "We expect a lot of business out of the Midwest when we put Super Constellations on our flight to Chicago," says Real's Mr. Moura. Real will take delivery on four Super H Constellations early this year to replace DC-4's on the company's runs connecting Buenos Aires, Rio de Janeiro, Miami, and Chicago.

Ironically, the United States lines are responsible, in part at least, for the vitality of the Latin airlines. Pan American started 13 Latin lines to act as short-haul feeders for its international service and mapped out routes, trained pilots, ground personnel, and pioneered public acceptance. Now many of the lines, in which Pan Am still holds a minority interest, are competing internationally.

North Americans still supply many Latin lines with know-how. TAN, Aerolineas Peruanas and Compania Equatoriana de Aviacion, for example, use American pilots.

North Americans also bankroll some of the growing Latin lines. American Winston Guest, for example, financially backs Guest Aerovias Mexico, 52 percent, of which is owned by Mexican nationals, according to Mr. Morteiro, the line's general manager.

Just how fat the bankrolls of the Latin airlines are is hard to determine. Most of the lines are reluctant to talk about their financial health. Their status is further complicated by a frequent intermingling of private and government money in the enterprise.

TAN's general manager, Mr. Shelton, says the now-profitable airline hardly broke even from the time it was established in 1947 until its route was extended to Lima in 1954. "It was a struggle until then," Mr. Shelton says.

Compania Mexicana de Aviacion, whose stock is listed in Mexico City, is another profitable company. In 1956 it earned over $1 million, or 7.5 percent on gross receipts.

Self-Help Is No Magic Wand

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DONALD E. TEWES
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 26, 1958

Mr. TEWES. Mr. Speaker, the Agriculture Committee currently is preparing for hearings on a farm bill known as the self-help dairy proposal. It was developed by the leading farm organizations and authorities of the Nation. I introduced the bill, because I found it a realistic, practical approach to the complex problems with which the dairy industry is beset.

Because it is realistic, and because the problems it attacks are complex, there is no claim made that this legislation will solve overnight the economic tangle that has developed over two generations.

The self-help bill does not pretend to be a magic wand for dairy problems. It is a promising plan which recognizes the hard facts of dairy farming and marketing.

This warning would be superfluous except that in the past, broken faith in supposed panaceas has been an important factor in the failure of farm programs to command continuing support.

Because the self-help proposal holds the long-range solution to present difficulties, I think that now is the time to establish in the minds of the Representatives who may vote on it, and in the minds of the farmers who may be directly affected by it that self-help promises no "pie in the sky."

If this legislation is passed, there will be a period of adjustment. There will still be the risks and economic choices that make dairy farming attractive only to the tough minded and the able. Some dairy farmers are going to succeed under self-help, and some are going to lose ground. That has always been true of farming, and will cease only if farming becomes a public utility.

What self-help will do is to provide dairy farmers with bargaining power at least comparable to those with whom they must bargain in marketing their milk. It will allow a good farmer to make a living and to progress economically. And it will relieve the taxpayer of the cost of protecting the market from surplus.

It may be that farmers would prefer to be told that Congress can, with a roll-call vote, perform economic miracles, but I believe differently. Farmers are more sophisticated than some are willing to admit. They have been over the course of impossible promises and broken faith too many times not to know that their welfare lies with hard-fact planning, not magic wands.

Statement of the Honorable Lester Holtzman, of New York, Before the House Committee on Post Office and Civil Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LESTER HOLTZMAN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 26, 1958

Mr. HOLTZMAN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to include in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the remarks I submitted recently to the House Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, in support of pay raises for our postal employees.

My statement follows:

Mr. Chairman, I would like to take this opportunity to express once again my keen interest in legislation now before your committee, which would provide a much-needed and much-deserved pay raise for our postal employees.

For the past several years the sentiment in Congress has been overwhelmingly in favor of such an increase, and last year the House of Representatives and the Senate saw fit to pass legislation which called for such adjustments. Unfortunately the President vetoed this legislation after the adjournment of Congress, and we did not have an opportunity at that time to reconsider the bill.

This year your committee is considering legislation early in the session, and I am very hopeful that we will be able to have a satisfactory bill enacted in the very near future, giving us ample time to effect repassage of the bill in the event of adverse Presidential action.

During the last few years the committee has listened to a steady stream of verified testimony which has shown the great need for pay raises. The cost of living has continued to spiral upward and our postal employees wage a continuous struggle to provide their families with the bare necessities of life. Many of them have had to seek additional employment to supplement their inadequate earnings from the Post Office Department, and in many households the wife has been forced to obtain work so that the family can maintain a decent standard of living.

Our postal workers are among the most faithful of Federal employees, working long hours at hard work, and many times under adverse conditions, to insure the prompt and uninterrupted flow of the mails. They are loyal and conscientious, but we must face the fact that even career employees are being compelled to leave Government service for more lucrative positions elsewhere.

The last salary increase was approximately 3 years ago, and it did not even come close to offsetting the high cost of living at that time. The upswing of living costs remains with us and the outlook for the future is not promising.

The Post Office itself has felt the results of the inadequate salaries in the high percentage of turnover of personnel. Years ago an individual sought employment with the Department, learned his job and became a valuable cog in the postal machinery, contributing immeasurably over a period of years to a more efficient operation of the postal service. Currently the Department is faced with the heavy cost of continuously training new employees, who in many instances find no incentive to remain in the service. This, of course, has a disastrous effect on the productivity and efficiency of the Department.

We must face the problem realistically, and bring about a fair and equitable adjustment of pay scales for these employees. As Members of Congress, we have a duty and responsibility to the men and women in Government service, and we cannot in conscience fail to provide them with adequate salaries. We must restore their morale and their self-respect, and I respectfully urge the committee to report out a just and satisfactory bill without delay.

Complacency, Confusion, and Coverup at the White House

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 19, 1958

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I commend to the attention of our colleagues the following article which appeared in the New Republic magazine of January 6, 1958. The situation described in the article has deteriorated since the writing of the column:

BRINGERS OF BAD TYDINGS

The most disturbed group in the country today are the Wall Street internationalists.

They are the ones who sold us a well Eisenhower in 1952 and a sick Eisenhower in 1956. They pull the strings which control newspapers, banks, chambers of commerce. They are well-meaning men and enlightened according to their limitations. Every 4 years they become interested in politics but lose interest between times. Taft's isolationism frightened them and they swung to Eisenhower, as they had before to Dewey and Willkie.

Now, in horror, they see what they have done. The Nation is in danger, there is a cipher in the White House, and their conscience tells them they are responsible. I use the phrase "Wall Street internationalists," but that is not really accurate. Henry Luce does not operate in Wall Street. Charlie Wilson does not operate in Wall Street. I am speaking of the informed, multimillioned power elite all over the country that makes the Republican Party its chosen vehicle, knows the world is round, and thinks politics something it can dabble in.

That is really why the alarmist news of the so-called Gaither report is leaking out all over Washington. This is the report which Jim Hagerty declares does not say that the United States of America is weak in relation to Russia at this time. The Gaither report has not been published and almost certainly won't be. If published it would expose the inexcusable complacency of the administration. But who prepared the report? Why, good, sound millionaire Republicans for the most part. They are part and parcel of the Wall Street Internationalists who gave us Eisenhower. They made a serious study of Russia and America and were scared by what they discovered. They were even more scared when they gave the report to the National Security Council and heard Eisenhower's inadequate reaction. Now they want the report put out and the calculated leaks are coming from them.

Amiable White House Secretary Jim Hagerty has a penchant for night life on foreign assignments. At his best he is a superb public relations technician, but he was hardly himself in the ridiculous episode at Paris when he tangled with the New York Herald Tribune Humorist Art Buchwald. He interpreted as a deadly insult what anybody else could see was a mild spoof. American correspondents find it difficult to believe, in spite of Hagerty's denial, that Eisenhower did not himself prompt Hagerty to his otherwise inexplicable rage.

THE PRESIDENT LISTENS

One of the saddest sights Americans have ever seen was the well-loved Eisenhower sitting by last week in the post-NATO televised report to the Nation while Dulles meandered through 24 of the 30 minutes performance. You could not follow what was said because the situation spoke so much louder. Here was the President of the United States, looking bored and self-conscious, cast in a subordinate role to an underling. He listened; Dulles talked.

Eisenhower has had no press conference since October 30. The American Government is built on the Presidential principle: we put all our eggs in one basket. But in our present fix the President has offered no great program, no new ideas, no rallying point. He will be in office another 3 years.

Whence will leadership come? Congress? We should like to be optimistic for a change (honestly, friends, this gloom gets us down, too), but in all candor the prospect is none too good. The House is a great unwieldly folkmoot; the Senate is not equipped to carry on coordinated executive planning. In periods of congressional domination (like the present) there is normally an interval of partisanship and stagnation.

We ran across this quotation the other day: "The most dangerous thing about the Eisenhower influence, we believe, is the theory that because he is a general this much-divided man will not let our defense decay. * * *" Yes, it was in this column September 16. The first sputnik October 4.

The rumor that the new car models aren't going very well is now confirmed. Economists had looked to Detroit to pull us out of the present recession. But Detroit boosted the prices of new cars about $100 each. Walter Reuther suggested that, instead of raising, it lower car prices $100 and promised to take the price cut into consideration in wage negotiations. Detroit snooted Reuther. Now the recession deepens. We are in a production race with Russia, but our steel mills are operating at only about two-thirds capacity. (How preposterous can we get.) Year-end business seers predict recovery about "mid-1958" (the orthodox time-limit for this kind of prophecy). Well, we can offer a cheery note here. We honestly don't think the current downturn will last very long. As Harvard's Sumner Slichter says, there hasn't been a recession in history that could be halted so easily. Even a headless administration can't stand by and see a recession grow.

THREE-HEADED EAGLE

Actually the administration isn't headless. The American eagle now has three heads. There is Eisenhower, Sherman Adams, and Nixon. Eisenhower is head of state but no longer head of government. Adams wasn't elected but has the power. NIXON has only limited power but was elected.

Adams is not accountable to the voters, not accountable to Congress and his influence is unique in history. He is, alas, a limited man. He sneered at Adlai Stevenson when Dulles made a gesture of bipartisanship before NATO; he termed sputnik nothing more than a "basketball"; he fought to keep defense spending down in 1957 to allow a political tax cut this year.

There is a widespread belief that NIXON has more power than he has. But NIXON has few real executive responsibilities. Aside from attendance at weekly Cabinet and National Security Council meetings he sees the President only perhaps once a month; Adams is in and out of Eisenhower's office all day. NIXON's mental equipment is remarkable. Whether he has any convictions nobody knows.

T. R. B.

Humane Slaughtering of Livestock

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. W. R. POAGE
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 26, 1958

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter from the American Jewish Congress:

AMERICAN JEWISH CONGRESS,
New York, N. Y., February 20, 1958.
Hon. W. R. POAGE,
House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN POAGE: We are writing to you at this time to express our appreciation for your statements during the debate of H. R. 8308 on February 4, regarding the humaneness of the Jewish religious method of slaughtering animals for human consumption. At the same time, we wish to correct some inaccuracies during the debate and to clarify possible misunderstandings of our position on humane slaughtering legislative measures, particularly with regard to one part of the January 29, 1958 letter from Dr. Leo Pfeffer to you.

We were pleased to read in the letter of January 20, 1958 from Mr. Fred Myers, executive director of the Humane Society of the United States, to you, the statement that in the opinion of the Humane Society "based upon expert testimony already presented to Congress and upon personal observation, that the Jewish method of slaughter, when performed according to the laws of schechita by a trained and religiously supervised shochet, results in virtually immediate loss of consciousness by the animal and should be legally recognized as being humane." It was even more gratifying to note your comment in referring to shechita that "ritualistic slaughtering is, as I see it, when carried out in compliance with the Mosaic law, one of the most humane methods yet devised." While the humaneness of shechita has been repeatedly demonstrated through scientific studies conducted by eminent pathologists and other authorities in the fields of veterinary medicine, anatomy, and physiology, it is good to know that as a member of the United States Congress who has made a study of the subject, you have come to the same conclusion and were thoughtful enough to state your view on the floor of the House of Representatives.

In response to a question from Congressman JAMES ROOSEVELT, you said "as far as I know, there is no group except the Union of Orthodox Rabbis that has not agreed to these amendments. I may be wrong, but I know of no other group that is not in favor of these amendments." You will recall that the Rabbinical Council of America and the Union of Orthodox Jewish Congregations of America are opposed to such legislation. Needless to say, the position of these orthodox organizations is not due to a lack of concern about cruelty to animals. Rather, it stems from the apprehension based on the experience in other countries that humane slaughtering legislation no matter how worded may threaten shechita and may be a forerunner of a movement to ban shechita.

Referring to the undersigned organizations, Congressman MULTER said during the debate we "are in favor of and support this measure." This statement is inaccurate. As you correctly stated, we were opposed to H. R. 8308 in the form in which it was originally introduced. As stated in the letter from Dr. Leo Pfeffer to you dated January 29, 1958, in its present amended form we do not oppose the measure. However, while we do not oppose the measure as amended, we are not proponents of the bill. We are sure you understand and appreciate this distinction.

Inasmuch as H. R. 8308 is still to be considered in the Senate, may we clarify one part of Dr. Pfeffer's letter of January 29 which may be subject to misinterpretation. We have reference to the paragraph which reads:

"We understand further that while the bill, as amended, would empower the Department of Agriculture to restrict or prohibit shackling or hoisting of conscious animals in connection with slaughtering according to the ritual requirements of the Jewish faith, it does not restrict or prohibit, nor does it authorize the Department of Agriculture to restrict or prohibit the use of the Weinberg or revolving pen, as is used in Great Britain, and that such use of the Weinberg pen is a humane method of preparing the animals for slaughter."

We wish to underscore the correctness of your statement to the House of Representatives regarding our position to the effect that we want to prevent any unnecessary cruelty. This applies to the preparation of animals for slaughter as well as the act of

slaughter itself. We have no desire to protect methods of handling or preparation of animals which may be inhumane. At the same time, we see no need for restricting or banning present methods of handling which may not be inhumane.

To be more specific, while we hold no brief for and oppose such forms of shackling and hoisting which may be inhumane, it was never the intention of the undersigned organizations to imply that shackling and hoisting per se are inhumane and, therefore, subject to being prohibited in all their forms by the Department of Agriculture. We do not understand this to be the legislative intent of your bill. You will recall that Mr. Fred Myers, in his letter of January 20, advised you that in the amendments since written into H. R. 8308 "we have purposely avoided * * * a detailed description of humane methods of handling animals as they are brought into position for slaughter, in order to allow for future inventions in that field."

In any event, whether it may be existing methods of handling animals preparatory to slaughter; necessary modification of present methods; the revolving pen or methods as yet to be devised; our position precisely stated is that we are opposed to any methods which may be inhumane without necessarily ruling out existing methods which are or which could be modified so as to be humane.

We respectfully request that you insert this letter into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD so that all who are interested may know exactly where we stand in the matter of humane slaughtering legislative proposals and how much we appreciate your efforts in behalf of religious liberty by your support of the Jewish religious method of slaughtering animals for food.

Once again, please accept our deep thanks for your cooperation and consideration.

Sincerely,

AMERICAN JEWISH CONGRESS,
By ISAAC TOUBIN, *Executive Director.*
RABBINICAL ASSEMBLY OF AMERICA,
By RABBI DAVID C. KOGEN,
Acting Executive Director.
CENTRAL CONFERENCE OF AMERICAN RABBIS,
By RABBI SIDNEY REGNER,
Executive Vice President.
UNION OF AMERICAN HEBREW CONGREGATIONS,
By RABBI JAY KAUFMAN, *Vice President.*
UNITED SYNAGOGUE OF AMERICA,
By RABBI BERNARD SEGAL,
Executive Director.

Who's Who Citation for Mount Pleasant, Iowa

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRED SCHWENGEL
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 26, 1958

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that the city of Mount Pleasant, Iowa, has been singularly honored by a citation in the 60th anniversary edition of Who's Who in America, I am moved to call attention to this recognition and ask permission that the citation appear in the Appendix of the RECORD.

Mount Pleasant is the only community in the United States to be honored in this manner this year and is the second community in history to receive the citation.

Deviating from the publication's established practice of choosing 10 persons to whom citations are awarded, the editors have given one of the citations to the town of Mount Pleasant, Iowa, because of the citizens of Mount Pleasant, Iowa, in their efforts to improve and expand the facilities of Iowa Wesleyan College. Other awards or citations went to individuals in widely scattered places in the United States for various reasons.

The citation is carried under the heading, "Special Citations and Outstanding Memorial Gifts," with this explanation:

The board of editors has awarded special citations to the following donors of gifts to educational institutions. Some are selected because of the size of the gifts, and others because of their significance in respect to the particular purposes designated, or because they are outstanding as memorial gifts.

The citation is headed "The Town of Mount Pleasant, Iowa," and states:

Although communities are seldom cited in these pages, there are occasions when the efforts of townspeople as a whole are so outstanding that they demand special recognition. Such is the case with the citizens of Mount Pleasant, Iowa, in their efforts to improve and expand the facilities of Iowa Wesleyan College.

Two years ago the college began a quiet effort to interest the twonspeople in the capital improvement needs of Iowa Wesleyan. The first gift was a pledge by a businessman to pay $5,000 over a 5-year period. Today the college is able to announce that the original gift has been multiplied by more than 40 times for a total exceeding $200,000. This amount does not include an additional program of giving by local businessmen of $12,000 per year for operating expenses. Over the originally planned 5-year period the total will be in excess of $265,000.

A sum such as this is a great deal of money for a community of only 6,000 people. It amounts to $9 each year from every man, woman, and child. It illustrates, as did the Who's Who report on developments in North Carolina a couple of years ago, how much some communities value their independent educational institutions, and to what lengths they will go in personal sacrifice to preserve these cultural assets.

A Pretty Fine County

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALT HORAN
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 26, 1958

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I am pleased to include a splendid editorial by Russ Hill, able editor and publisher of the Davenport Times, of Davenport, Lincoln County, Wash.

The editorial defends one of the finest counties in the United States:

Only a person blinded by his own ego could assume that life is dull for others. Only an academic prig could conclude that more than its fair share of drabness has been relegated to the smalltown society.

It is easy and logical to judge that the metropolitan city is simply the weak flesh and false paint of the American way of life, and that the backbone and heart is in the smaller community.

One might also decide that all cynics are domiciled in major cities and that all love and understanding is centered in rural areas. However, thoughtful people believe that truth, beauty, and goodness are not available only to special segments or individuals.

Those who refer to the small town as dull, might more aptly use the word "successful." It would be more fitting, at least in any of the 7 towns of under 1,500 population in Lincoln County, Wash., which is the second-largest wheat-producing county in the Nation and one of the richest per capita counties in our country.

It is true that we have no hungry people in our small towns in Lincoln County. We rarely hear of a repossession of a car or an electric appliance. Almost all of the 9,500 people, sharing in some way in the $30 million grain harvest of 1957, in Lincoln County have telephones, radios, comfortable homes, and autos. The Davenport Times tells every week of some family going to Hawaii or Europe or buying a new inboard boat or a cottage at the lake. These people play golf, fish, bowl, and dance. They belong to the granges, churches, lodges, and clubs to such an extent that discipline must be exercised to arrange an evening at home. Does this sound like a dull society?

It has been suggested that the society of the small town is introverted, and it is acceptable if it refers to the truth that people in this society mend their own fences first, and are slow to cast stones toward neighbors in the metropolitan areas. These same people oversubscribe causes such as the Red Cross, March of Dimes, and Boy Scouting and still build churches and pay taxes.

The smalltown society is complacent? Perhaps, if you mean having a sense of inward satisfaction. Most of the dissatisfied breeds of Socialist and Communists seems to grow in the metropolitan areas. It is difficult for them in the small town where people have such pride in their community and Nation that they will not be brought to a frenzy by malcontents. The people in the small town are not only interested in peace, but are apt even to practice brotherhood of man.

He who states that the society of the small town is monolithic in making decisions has a good point. The 1,500 people of Davenport, Wash., are as inspiring as the rock of ages when it comes to community progress. They have accepted the bills within the past very few years for a new $350,000 high school, a $300,000 grade school, a $200,000 gymnasium, a $50,000 street-paving program and erected by subscription a community hall in memory of war dead.

In the small town you find a society with great strength cultivated by a sense of tolerance and gratitude that represents a sentiment intelligence rather than frantic drive. And most important the people of the smalltown society have a great ability for forgiveness, even for those who sling at them an arrow tipped with the poison of parochialism.

Administration's Farm Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 19, 1958

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include a letter received from Mr. M. K. Thornton, executive

director, Texas Agricultural Limestone Association, in which he has analyzed the farm message of the President presented to the Congress on January 16, 1958:

TEXAS AGRICULTURAL LIMESTONE ASSOCIATION,
Bryan, Tex., February 6, 1958.

Congressman OLIN E. TEAGUE, of Texas,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: I am presenting to you for your consideration, my ideas with regard to the farm bill as presented to you on January 16, 1958.

The last paragraph on page 1 points out a condition that exists, which is that over half of our would-be self-sustaining and self-respecting farmers depend on nonfarm activities to maintain themselves and that less than half of our farmers produce 90 percent of our food and fiber. This is true and means that the small farmer needs help badly if he is to remain as a self-sustaining entity. Apparently in the minds of some, this group should be sacrificed for the industrial type farmer. If such is done economic dislocation in the cities will likely result and at the same time an independent thinking segment of our society will be further depleted. Personally, I think that anything that will further serve to deplete our rural population is unwise.

On page 2, we find the statement that "prices received by farmers on the average are 3 percent above those of a year ago and that during the last 2 years, farm income has stabilized. * * *" Further down on the same page, the statement is made that "rising production costs continue to limit net farm income and so forth." There is certainly an inconsistence between these two statements. Actually as you know, farmers are beset on all sides by rising production costs and have to extend themselves in every possible way to maintain a reasonable net income.

We find the statement that "farm real estate prices are at an alltime high, reflecting the basic optimisms, and so forth." I cannot agree with this statement. In my opinion, it is the result of dull and spiritless pessimism on the part of the two and three hundred acre farmers who sell their land to escape the realities of hopeless drudgery without an adequate compensation for their labor.

The men who buy their places are men who are looking for an escape from income taxes, etc., and wish to put their capital where it will not evaporate. The small farmers are selling off their accumulations of a lifetime and moving to the city in the hope that they can enjoy the privileges and well-being of city conveniences. Too many times this dream turns out to be only a mirage. In other cases, due to drought and other adverse conditions the sale of all their accumulations is the final resource of a hopeless future. These people needed help. The remnant needs help.

At the top of page 3 we find the statement that large numbers of rural people have not benefited from price supports nor other changes in agriculture. This is part of the overall problem that they do not have the money to participate in the programs as now existing and have had to eke out a bare existence the best way they can.

There are those who hold that any program that will help these people restore fertility and productivity of the land is wasteful and self-defeating in the end. This I cannot subscribe to because the great revolution in agriculture stems from those soil-improving practices instituted by the Department in the thirties and repeated frequently enough in the same land to actually bring about desired changes. These desired changes have been accomplished slowly but surely and are continuing. These soil-improving practices which are spoken of in a derogatory way as the "cafeteria approach" are sound and need to be continued. It was the "cafeteria depletion process" that brought us to bankruptcy in our soil resources during the late twenties and early thirties. For generations farmers removed from the soil every year a small but definite amount of the soil capability and carried it to town with their hats in their hands and asked the people what they would give them for the product of their labor and their soil fertility. In so doing, they built a great Nation and a great State but these same resources that had been removed stepwise during this great building period need to be restored to the land if we are to remain strong and happy.

The stepwise approach has met with the needs of the land and fitted into the finances of many of our small farmers and ranchers. Surely the Nation as a whole should be willing to support such a program of restoration in light of history for its own benefit.

In this message, there are certain phases of agricultural programs that are supposed to be deleted and other phases reduced. That portion slated to be reduced or deleted under the agricultural conservation program contains that part which has meant much in the great agricultural revolution. The stepwise restoration of the soil is largely responsible for the agricultural revolution. Instead of reducing this portion, it seems to me, that in view of what our rural population has accepted, the appropriation should be increased and those portions that are to be deleted should be restored and funds increased.

We also find in this message the statement that the acreage reserve program should be deleted because farmers do not participate in it. At the time this message was being read to the Congress, the administrators of the State ASC were canceling out applications for participation in the acreage reserve program because funds were exhausted. It now appears likely that the conservation reserve will have to be limited in participation because of the interest of the farmers. The farmers that are signing up for these practices are those who need help the most. It also appears likely at the present time that those farmers participating in the ASC program may be liimted for lack of funds. All of this is in current contradiction to irresponsible statements made by certain members of the Department of Agriculture. Farmers want the help and need the help if they are to maintain their way of life.

In looking over this presentation, I feel that those who are responsible for the development of this program as presented to Congress have lost touch with men at the forks of the creek and do not realize that their needs are a vital part of our overall agricultural problems. The farmer's and rancher's needs in the restoration of the land and building for himself a good life should be considered.

To that end, it seems to me that the ASC program should be left as it is or even expanded in its scope of soil conservation and restoration in order that those who work the land will have an opportunity to participate in the good things of life.

Perhaps one way to improve the program would be to make the acreage reserve and the conservation reserve part of the ASC program and increase the funds available rather than reduce the funds and delete certain parts.

I hope in your deliberation, you will see fit to maintain the entire ASC and soil bank programs as they are or expand them for I am sure from my experience that the restoration of the land through the use of adequate mineral fertilizers and cover crops in a sound farming system will result in much happiness and greater well-being among the farmers of the State, particularly those in the older farming regions. This will redound to the best interest of the country.

Yours very truly,

M. K. THORNTON,
Executive Director.

More About Reuther, V—Walter Reuther's Political Ambitions

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
CLARE E. HOFFMAN
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 18, 1958

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, it is a matter of common knowledge that Walter Reuther and his political pals have long politically controlled Michigan. Vicious, lawless violence has been their weapon, misuse of union funds their practice. Gov. "Soapy" Williams is a jumping jack manipulated by Reuther and Gus Scholle, State president of the CIO–AUW. Reuther's activities as a politician were clearly disclosed by Senator BARRY GOLDWATER—a columnist gives us a glance at a part of the situation. George Todt wrote, February 1, 1958, in the Valley Times of California:

WAY TO RESIST SOCIALIST TYRANNY

"Hail Columbia, happy land.
Hail, ye heroes, heavenborn band.
Who fought and bled in Freedom's cause."
—Joseph Hopkinson, Hail Columbia.

Ten years ago, Walter Reuther took off his union mask and allowed the politician to show through. Said Mr. Reuther: "political action * * * shall have first call upon my time and energy as president of the international union."

Not collective bargaining—but political action, instead, his first priority—for the socialistic boss of the AFL–CIO committee on political education (COPE). The latter being none other than the organization which cost President Eisenhower and the Republican Party control of Congress in the last election. And this despite a phenomenal 9 million plurality of votes cast for the President.

As Senator BARRY GOLDWATER of Arizona pointed out in his far-seeing address at the Republican dinner in Detroit on January 20, "Walter Reuther, by his own statement, sees himself primarily as a politician. The union appears to be merely a convenient stepping stone."

What the master of COPE has already done is to lay the foundations for his own Social Labor political party in the future. None who have examined his brainchild, COPE, can come away with less than a feeling of the immensity, the enormity, even the ingeniousness of the arrangement he has constructed for himself. It is a tremendous effort, being down-played for the moment, but ready to burst forth in behalf of Mr. Reuther's political ambitions at any time with a thunderous roar.

This dynamic political entity, Reuther's vehicle, is financially motivated with more money than may be found in the coffers of either major political party put together. Regardless of any artful dodges used, the money is to a remarkable degree that of enforced contributions from union men who dare not show themselves in disagreement with the leader. Many of them are Republicans. Their money is placed unethically

and immorally on candidates of the opposite political faith.

Now the long arm of COPE has reached out past Michigan, Mr. Reuther's home grounds, and taken over the State of Oregon in the last elections—and is presently reaching for the Golden State, California. Are we to be next on the Reuther timetable?

The question, which is paramount, is what can be done to prevent it? Jeffersonian Democrats, old line Republicans, and American patriots in general are as one in their concern at the socialistic threat emanating from COPE in their direction. Can they join together to stop this menace in its tracks?

It could be done if the various warring factions would bury their petty quarrels and bickering in behalf of an overriding issue—a great crusade right here at home. This can be tested in the gubernatorial campaign this fall in California. In Senator WILLIAM F. KNOWLAND, the GOP candidate, the people of California have a champion who is the antithesis of Walter Reuther. He has already struck both Reuther and COPE the deadliest kind of blow by advocating his Labor Bill of Rights to effect union democracy inside union ranks and the right to work—which is the best kind of job insurance for those three-quarters of the American work force not presently organized against their wills into unions.

Every Democrat, Republican and patriot who hates socialism and wants to resist it now can do so in California by the simple expedient of finding out who Reuther and his COPE political machine supports for governor—and then alining himself or herself with his opponent. Which, in this case, is Senator KNOWLAND.

In my time I have been a Jeffersonian Democrat, a traditional Republican and President and/or member of some old-line American patriotic societies. I know what ought to be said to any member of such groups who believes, as I do, that the Constitutional Republic of the United States must be preserved at any cost if human liberty is to survive in this country and throughout the world:

Forget your differences—band together—and organize yourselves immediately to withstand dictatorial and tyrannncal power from would-be tyrants in our midst. Don't worry so much about what is happening to others across the sea. Wake up and learn what is already happening to you right here at home. And don't put your head in the sand afterwards. It is the duty of every loyal Democrat, Republican and patriot to resist socialist tyranny, and those who advocate it, wherever they may be found. Our only motto should be: What is best for America? So what are we waiting for? Let's go. Are you with us? How about it?

Senator Yarborough Pleads for the Backbone of American Life

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. W. R. POAGE
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 26, 1958

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Temple Daily Telegram:

SENATOR YARBOROUGH PLEADS FOR THE BACKBONE OF AMERICAN LIFE

It seems to us that everyone interested in what's happening to our Nation and our way of life should give thought to the plea of Texas Senator RALPH YARBOROUGH for the small farmer.

"We are trying to preserve a way of life that was here before the Revolution * * * and has been here up to this generation," he said, in outlining an emergency program to help these farmers.

Whether his program would work, we can only guess, though it apparently would. But its objective seems to us to be absolutely valid, and further to be of deep significance to the entire Nation.

The administration's farm policy as conceived by Secretary Benson has been and is to reduce the farm population along with planted acres. This idea has been sold to the administration by professional economists, who may be right in their economics.

They argue that we have too many farmers on too many small farms, and that only the larger land units can be farmed profitably today. Therefore, they say, let's act to get the small farmers off the land and into city jobs in factories, etc.

In money terms, that argument may make sense. In human terms, it does not. In fact, it seems to us to be almost criminal, in those human terms.

It amounts to forcing a new pattern of life on people who do not want it, who prefer to live on their own land as their fathers did—and who are vastly better Americans on that land than anywhere else.

This compulsory relocation idea inevitably contributes to higher relief rolls and unemployment payments in the cities, temporarily or permanently. It creates rootless and dissatisfied city dwellers, strangers to city ways, and thereby must surely increase both adult and juvenile delinquency. True accounting must add these hidden factors to the real cost of such a policy.

Obviously, in our civilization, if farmers were organized they would be in no danger of becoming human guinea pigs in such an experiment. But they aren't organized effectively. They are all but defenseless.

Our argument is not that farmers should be compelled to stay on the land. Some of them prefer to move to town. Our argument is that those who want to stay on the land should be able to do so if there is any practical or reasonable way to accomplish that. To us, the equation seems simple—one family living as it prefers to live is a national asset, but the same family living as it does not prefer to live is a national liability. And we have far too many of these liability families now.

We are not today trying to make it possible for small farmers to stay on the land. The administration admittedly has planned and worked to liquidate as many of them as possible. That's the point Senator YARBOROUGH is making—that we owe it to ourselves and our Nation to make this effort, before we wake up and find that we have plotted the uprooting of our way of life that has literally been the backbone of America.

We still need that backbone. Read any day's news, and see if you can say we don't.

A Bill To Aid the Deaf

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ARCH A. MOORE, JR.
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 26, 1958

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Speaker, I read with great interest the syndicated column (Eleanor Roosevelt's Day), of February 13, 1958, which was concerned with legislation to provide additional compensation for veterans having the service-incurred disability of deafness of both ears. Mrs. Roosevelt devoted her entire article to H. R. 4214 which was introduced on January 31, 1957, by the Honorable ROBERT H. MICHEL of the 18th District, Illinois. The bill is currently pending before the House Veterans' Affairs Committee and I therefore have submitted Mrs. Roosevelt's comments into the Appendix of the RECORD in order that more attention might be focused on those unfortunate veterans that seem to be somewhat forgotten.

A BILL TO AID THE DEAF

LOS ANGELES.—I seem to do nothing these days but write about people who are living on pensions, but today's case is not one of finanical disability.

The Peoria (Ill.) Chapter No. 1 of the Disabled American Veterans is supporting a bill, H. R. 4214. The member of the chapter who wrote to me about it is 100-percent disabled because of complete loss of hearing with absence of bone and air conduction. He told me:

"The purpose of this bill is not for additional compensation but that we veterans with this type of disability may have peace of mind in knowing we are protected by law."

He must be a young man because he is a World War II veteran, and evidently feels the loss of hearing very keenly.

He says:

"We are isolated from our loved ones, we are isolated from the social and entertainment world of sound. We cannot even go to the church of our choice and hear our minister speak the word of God. Our only means of communication is the writing pad and lipreading. I am sure that no person, with all of their God-given senses, would sell hearing for any amount of money."

I should think that men with this disability would be assured of complete compensation, but if this bill is needed to give them this assurance, I am sure that every voter in this country would want it to be passed. And I have no question but what the Members of Congress will feel the need of giving the veterans this reassurance. Of course, any disability must be proved to be service-connected, but in a case of this kind that would not be hard to prove.

Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HALE BOGGS
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 13, 1958

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following testimony of A. B. Sparboe for the Chamber of Commerce of the United States, before the House Ways and Means Committee, February 26, 1958:

RECIPROCAL TRADE AGREEMENTS ACT

My name is A. B. Sparboe, I am vice president of Pillsbury Mills, Inc., Minneapolis. I appear on behalf of the Chamber of Commerce of the United States to present its views on renewal of the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act. I am a member of its foreign commerce committee.

The Chamber of Commerce of the United States is a national federation of over 3,300

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

trade and professional associations and State and local chambers, with an underlying membership of 2,500,000 businessmen, and over 21,000 direct business members.

The chamber membership has supported the reciprocal trade agreements program for the past 24 years.

It is with sincere regard for the diverse and sometimes conflicting interests of our membership that we have sought a common denominator to serve as the basis of our recommendations.

This common denominator is the national interest.

The concept of the national interest in trade policy must start with the principle that the objective is to strengthen the national economy. Beyond that, the national interest must be concerned with the relation of trade to the defense and security of the United States, including its effect on foreign relations.

The legislation before you (H. R. 10368 and other identical bills) would renew the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act with certain changes. The national chamber makes the following recommendations:

1. That the act be extended for 5 years. This is essential for consistent adherence to a policy of expanding world trade.

2. That the President be granted authority to lower tariffs on a gradual and selective basis in return for trade benefits from other countries.

The alternative methods of reduction set forth in the bills appear sound. Under the first method, the President would be authorized to reduce a rate of duty by 5 percent for 5 successive years. He would be authorized to reduce a duty by this same total amount over a shorter period, but no reduction in excess of 10 percent of the July 1, 1958, rate could become initially effective in any 1 year.

Under the second method, the President would be authorized to decrease the rate by not more than 3 percentage points ad valorem, but no reduction could be made initially effective in any 1 year which would exceed 1 percentage point.

Under the third method, the President would be authorized, as at present, to reduce an existing rate which is above 50 percent ad valorem down to 50 percent ad valorem. Here, too, the reductions would be carried out gradually, with not more than one-third of the total reduction to be made initially effective in any 1 year.

The progressive, but gradual, removal of barriers to trade should proceed in accord with the needs of businessmen conducting their trade in a free enterprise economy. Action under this authority would, of course, be subject to the peril-point procedures of the law and to the usual escape-clause safeguards.

3. That the proposal not be approved which would authorize the President to raise duties as much as 50 percent above the rates of duty in effect on July 1, 1934 (instead of 50 percent above the duties in effect January 1, 1945, as in present law).

The present Trade Agreements Act already provides considerable authority in this direction. The new proposal would use as the base rates, as of July 1, 1934, those actually enacted in 1930, the highest in our history. This would not seem to be realistic, necessary or desirable. In some cases, the proposed authority, if applied, could permit an increase of several hundred percent above the actual rates now in effect. This would be particularly true of commodities where the 1930–34 rates were on an ad valorem or percentage basis.

The very existence of such authority would increase the element of uncertainty in United States trade policy. To include in the act a provision essentially capable of vitiating the program's objective of fostering the healthy expansion of trade seems inconsistent.

4. That the proposal for technical change in peril point action, directed to achieving more prompt and effective consideration of serious injury cases, be approved.

The reciprocal trade agreements program is the means through which the United States is able to participate in cooperative measures to expand international trade by reduction of tariffs and other trade barriers on a mutually advantageous basis. International trade is a powerful weapon for peace. Moreover, it is essential to the continued expansion of the economy of the United States. It benefits the consumer, spurs long-term economic growth and conforms to the spirit of a free enerprise economy.

The reciprocal-trade-agreements program as a basic segment of United States foreign economic policy faces two new challenges, bringing new urgency for maintaining effective negotiating power and making the extension of this act even more imperative.

THE SOVIET ECONOMIC OFFENSIVE

While not as dramatic as the missile race, the Soviet economic challenge is no less real. We cannot readily doubt this fact when Nikita Khrushchev so bluntly said less than 3 months ago: "We declare war upon you * * * in the peaceful field of trade. We declare a war we will win over the United States. The threat to the United States is not the ICBM, but in the field of peaceful production. We are relentless in this and it will prove the superiority of our system."

Expanding Soviet imperialism is taking the form of a centrally directed state-financed drive for economic penetration of the underdeveloped areas. We have seen it happening recently in Egypt and Syria in the Middle East and in Indonesia in the Far East. Unless checked, it would happen elsewhere in Asia, Africa, and Latin America.

Millions of people, the oil of the Middle East, and the vast resources of Africa are in danger of being subverted or lost to the West. Attractive trade facilities are being offered—including barter. Moscow is sending trade missions to any country which will receive them, especially the countries uncommitted in the East-West struggle. A rash of trade agreements between Communist nations and the free world were concluded in late 1957. Already this year, a Soviet trade representative offered Asian nations long-term trade agreements in all basic commodities.

The Soviet bloc sold $2.1 billion worth of merchandise last year to the free world—an increase of 70 percent in 4 years. Our Government officials have pointed out that there is no technical or economic reason why the Communist bloc cannot double or triple this volume within a very few years. In this way, Russia seeks to tie other areas to the Soviet orbit and to exploit the trade difficulties of the free world.

It must be remembered that many of the countries friendly to the United States must trade to live. If they cannot trade with us on mutually agreeable terms, they will surely trade with others.

The Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act, conceived as a means of easing the barriers to American exports and imports, has become a symbol of international trade cooperation.

THE EUROPEAN COMMON MARKET

On January 1, 1958, the European common market became a reality. United States exports to the 6 European common market countries are running at about $3 billion a year. Our private direct investment in these countries already totals over $1½ billion, with new direct investments (excluding reinvestment) taking place at an annual rate of about $250 million.

The threat of being shut out of traditional European markets by high tariffs is of acute concern to United States businessmen. The gradual elimination of trade barriers among the six common-market countries, coupled with the maintenance of a common tariff against the outside world, will place American exporters to the area at an increasing disadvantage vis-a-vis their competitors within these countries.

Many leading United States industries plan a partial shift from exporting to the area to investing within the area by setting up branches or subsidiaries in Europe or by licensing processes to existing European firms. In this way United States firms produce for the common market area and at the same time avoid the tariffs which may be imposed against our exports to the common market countries. American investment will be attracted also by the advantages of large-scale operation in a new market of 160 million consumers.

But a continuing flow of United States foreign investment abroad cannot take place indefinitely unless earnings from such investments can be withdrawn in dollars. The longer-run solution must lie in expanded trade. The United States must be willing to import on a sufficient scale to enable other countries to meet dividend, interest, and amortization requirements, as well as to pay for the goods they currently buy from the United States.

Both the initial and long-range loss to the United States economy can be offset only by effectively bargaining with the common market on a reciprocal basis. Representatives of the European common market have stated: "The European economic community stands ready to negotiate reductions in the common tariffs provided other countries meet us halfway."

Thus, it does not seem to be a time to remove or weaken the President's negotiating authority.

As the world's greatest trading nation, the United States has a tremendous stake in maintaining the most effective negotiating authority and bargaining possible. In 1957, for example, United States exports were valued at $19.5 billion, with imports amounting to $13.2 billion.

The United States consistently exports more than it imports. Generally speaking, foreign countries can pay for United States goods only to the extent that they can earn dollars by selling to the United States. In recent years, however, a large part of the dollar difference has been covered by various foreign-assistance and mutual-defense programs. A consistent and continuous large export surplus, financed out of the tax revenue, is neither economic nor in keeping with the position of the United States as a creditor nation.

THE ROLE OF EXPORTS

The Department of Commerce has reported that in 1956 exports constituted 5.7 percent of the gross national product. Exports comprise a much higher proportion of our production of movable goods—around 9 percent in 1956. It should be noted, of course, that much of the gross national product consists of services, construction, and retail distribution, which are not by nature exportable.

The percentage of our agricultural output exported is even higher than the comparable percentage of our nonfarm production, and hence substantially higher than the average for the economy as a whole. For agricultural producers the vital importance of export markets is beyond dispute. Even among those manufacturing industries with below-average export ratios, a great majority depend on foreign markets for an important share of their sales, profits, and jobs.

Primary manufacturing industries, such as iron and steel or nonferrous metals, have a total interest in export markets which is larger than their direct interest because a significant part of their production is proc-

essed by other industries and exported in some other form.

THE IMPORTANCE OF IMPORTS

It must be remembered that, in addition to increasing the dollar exchange available abroad for potential buyers of United States exports, our import purchases improve our own scale of living, increase the range of free choice available to American consumers, and reduce the prices at which the merchandise is available to consumers. Thus, the United States economy as a whole benefits from reductions in cost or improvements in design which actual imports have created or potential imports have stimulated. Such increases in efficiency reflect the power of competition to create better products at lower costs.

A primary national economic gain from foreign trade centers in the imports for which our exports are exchanged, as well as in the sale proceeds from the latter. This may readily be understood by an examination of the character of our imports. Despite the fact that this Nation is perhaps the most nearly self-sufficient of all, there are many items which must be imported.

In the aggregate, the value of United States imports in 1956 was equivalent to about 3 percent of the gross national product, or to a little over 6 percent of the estimated value (at early stages of distribution) of movable goods purchased in the United States. Directly or indirectly, imported goods are in daily use in virtually every American home, factory, and office, and the dependence of United States industry upon imports of many strategic materials is such that they are essential to keep factory wheels turning and assembly lines moving. Imports provide 10 percent of the raw materials that American industry needs to turn out everything from automobiles to space rockets. Without tin, nickel, manganese, chrome, and cobalt—most of which are imported—whole industries would be seriously affected.

THE PROBLEM OF COMPETITIVE IMPORTS

Criticism of the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act has centered largely on the matter of serious injury to domestic industries by competitive imports. The extent to which American producers may be adversely affected by imports at a particular time cannot be precisely determined without a detailed analysis of the firms and products involved. While the producers who may be affected adversely by imports represent a relatively small segment of American production, they are, nonetheless, an important segment, and the incidence of injury cannot be disregarded. It is, therefore, vital that a means for affording reasonable relief for injury to such producers be continued in the law.

For this reason also the chamber has stressed the need for the gradual and selective adjustment of tariffs, with provision for modification or withdrawal of concessions, in order to deal with unforeseen developments seriously injurious to domestic producers.

We believe that proper safeguards exist in the present law and that tariff relief for industries during a period of adjustment is adequately provided. The proposal (sec. 4 of the bills) to speed up escape-clause action is a desirable one. In all cases determination of injury due to imports should be judged in the light of the national interest. Only in this way can the sound objectives of reciprocal trade be attained and all segments of our economy best be served."

CONCLUSION

The chamber strongly urges that the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act be renewed in a form to assure the effective achievement of its objectives. Not to do so will be at our own peril.

Statement by Secretary of State Dulles on the Mutual Security Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER H. JUDD
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 26, 1958

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, Mr. John Foster Dulles has appeared before the Foreign Affairs Committee on many occasions during the last 10 years. It was generally agreed by committee members that his statement before it today was perhaps the most forceful, clear, and convincing of all. Under leave to extend my remarks I include the statement:

STATEMENT BY THE HONORABLE JOHN FOSTER DULLES, SECRETARY OF STATE, BEFORE THE HOUSE FOREIGN AFFAIRS COMMITTEE IN SUPPORT OF THE MUTUAL SECURITY PROGRAM, WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 26, 1958

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, the President has sent to the Congress a forceful message calling for the vigorous continuation of the mutual security program. In my estimation that course is vital to our country's safety.

I

The era of change

We live today in a historic era of change. It will spell the rise or fall of whole civilizations and of great nations. Some will meet the challenge; others may succumb.

The Congress and the executive branch, in whom our fellow citizens have reposed their trust, bear an enormous responsibility to understand clearly the nature of this challenge and to respond to it. The adequacy of our response will determine, for generations to come, whether our peoples will, in peace, enjoy the blessings of liberty or start upon the downward slope that leads to increasing encirclement and ultimate war or subjugation.

What are the great currents of change? There are two which transcend all others.

Communist imperialism

One is the revolutionary movement of international communism. Within 41 years a small group of violent men, starting in Russia, have seized control of all or major parts of 17 nations, with nearly 1 billion people.

The Communist bloc now boasts of enormous military power—ground forces of 400 divisions, vast air fleets, naval forces, including 500 submarines, and nuclear bombs and outer space missiles. They are developing a large economic potential. All of this is centrally controlled and used primarily to achieve its original goal of world conquest.

The drive for progress

The second great revolutionary element in the world today is the march toward independence of colonial peoples. Since World War II, 20 nations with a population of 700 million people have achieved their independence. And these people, as well as the peoples of other less developed nations, are determined that they must and will have economic progress.

Soviet economic penetration

The Communist imperialists are seeking to amalgamate the current of new nationalism into their own movement. This makes the total challenge more acute. Asia and Africa and other nonindustrialized countries are becoming major battlefields of the cold war.

Until a few years ago Communist imperialism sought to expand by a policy of threats, bluster or armed action. These crude and obvious methods ceased, however, to pay dividends.

Now the Soviet leaders follow a new technique. Where they formerly treated all free nations as enemies, they now profess the greatest friendship toward them—particularly toward those which seek economic development.

Having set out on this new course, they have followed it with energy—and capital and skilled manpower. They have made offers of economic help to nations in all parts of the globe. They and other bloc nations have already entered into agreements with 16 nonbloc nations for lines of credit or grants totaling nearly $1.6 billion in economic assistance and an additional $400 million for military assistance.

The Soviets are providing not only promises, but performance. They are actually providing capital assistance according to their pledges. They are providing rapidly increasing numbers of technicians. They are engaged in vigorous efforts to increase their trade with nations in all parts of the free world.

The Communist bloc's economic offensive is, of course, not designed genuinely to help newly developing countries to achieve sound economic growth within a framework of political independence. Just as the people now within the Sino-Soviet bloc are exploited, so the newly independent peoples would be exploited. But that goal is camouflaged behind propaganda which represents that only through association with the Communist bloc can the less developed peoples achieve the progress that they seek.

The present Communist political-economic offensive forms part of the Communist strategy of gradual encirclement and eventual strangulation of the more developed free nations, notably the United States.

This is the process which, if we fail to understand it or, understanding it, fail to respond effectively, will lead to the gradual diminution of the perimeter of freedom until it is pushed back to our own shores and we and perhaps a few remaining allies will be but a beleaguered island in a red sea.

Mr. Khrushchev has recently said:

"We declare war upon you—excuse me for using such an expression—in the peaceful field of trade. We declare a war we will win over the United States. The threat to the United States of America is not the ICBM, but in the field of peaceful production. We are relentless in this and it will prove the superiority of our system."

That is a warning to be heeded.

II

What should our course be?

I emphasize these powerful movements at large in the world because many are inclined to think in terms merely of increasing our own military power.

Such course would be suicidal.

As President Eisenhower said in his message on the mutual-security program, "we must not allow concentrations of our own military might to divert us from other essential objectives of our vital security policy."

The task before us is manifold. We must, of course, deter war—whether general nuclear war or limited war. But also we must prevent Communist absorption or envelopment of free nations by the more subtle means of economic penetration and political subversion.

Deterring war

Let us consider first the problem of deterring war. We have long since decided that we cannot do this alone. To attempt that would lead to intolerable taxes and in-

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

supportable increases in the draft of our young men and women. Even then we would be weaker than we now are with collective effort. This collective way is the only sensible way. To that end there exist NATO, SEATO, ANZUS, the Baghdad Pact, and our bilateral arrangements with the Philippines, the Republic of Korea, the Republic of China, and Japan. The Organization of American States also has its common defense aspects.

These arrangements embody promises to come to each other's help. These promises are important. But also there is need of military strength-in-being. Our program of mutual security has that as one of its principal purposes.

In the 8 years of this mutual effort our allies have vastly increased the effectiveness and numbers of their forces. We have contributed weapons and material. Yet our help, though substantial in amount and critical in kind, has been but a fraction of the total effort. In this whole period we have contributed $20 billion in our military assistance program while nations associated with us in the collective defense effort have made defense expenditures totaling $122 billion.

There is another aspect of our mutual defense effort which is of transcendent importance. The most powerful deterrent to aggression is our strategic Air Force and our naval might. This great power is heavily dependent on dispersed bases around the world. These are supplied by many of our allies and friends as part of their contribution to mutual defense.

Local aggression

We cannot be sure that mobile strategic power will, alone, suffice to deter all aggression elsewhere. There is need also for local forces to resist local aggression and give mobile power the opportunity for deployment. As the President said in his message last week: "It is imperative that the free world maintain strong conventional forces capable of dealing with such aggressions wherever they may occur."

Our associates in mutual security are willing to provide the great bulk of the needed conventional forces if we will provide some of the necessary arms and, in certain countries, some of the economic strength needed to support their military establishments.

In the world as it is today, the peace of our country and the peace of every free world nation rests in the most liberal sense on the great forces of the United States combined with the great forces of the free world. Together they create an arch on which rests the safety of our homes and loved ones. The military assistance and defense support aspects of the mutual security program are the keystones in this arch of our security.

Development program

Let me turn now to our strategy to counter the Communist efforts to manipulate, for their purposes, the great political and economic evolution that is occurring.

I have heard it said that we must not enter into a competition with the Soviet bloc in this field. My reply is that we are not entering into a competition with them. They are entering into competition with us. They are attempting to take over and pervert for their own ends the normal processes whereby, historically, nations that are not yet developed borrow abroad to get their own capital development underway.

In this political-economic warfare, the Soviets are aided by the fact that within the free world the development of new nations has traditionally rested with private capital. In our own country's early history we borrowed great sums from foreign investors with which we built many of the railroads with which we opened up our country and many of the factories which were part of our industrial development.

Today our Government favors the greatest possible participation by United States private capital in the development of the less developed areas of the world. However, the political risks in many of these countries are greater than private persons will assume. Therefore, unless there is to be a breakdown in what have been the normal and historic means of developing less developed countries—a breakdown which would put great victories within the Communist grasp—governmental funds must play a part. In this connection I would like to quote from the warning joined in by members of your committee serving on our delegation to the United Nations General Assembly 2 years ago:

"We are in a contest in the field of economic development of underdeveloped countries which is bitterly competitive. Defeat in this contest could be as disastrous as defeat in an armaments race."

III

The program for mutual security in fiscal year 1959

If these are the challenges which confront us, what then must we do to surmount them and go forward?

An essential part of the answer is in the President's proposals now before you.

First, to maintain the peace, we must maintain the military strength of the free world as a deterrent to Communist armed aggression.

The President has asked $1.8 billion for military assistance, that is actual military goods. Of this approximately $510 million will go to our NATO allies, essentially for modernization and missiles. Some nearly $700 million will go to Korea, Pakistan, Taiwan, Iran, Vietnam, and other countries separated from the full power of the Soviet bloc only by a border gate or a narrow strait.

We believe that the ground forces maintained by certain of these countries can be reduced in number as more modern weapons enable firepower to go up. The sums requested include consideration of that factor.

The President also asked for $835 million for defense support. This is to go to countries in which our military assistance is helping to support substantial military forces so that these countries can and will maintain such forces and, in some cases, contribute additionally to the common defense.

Defense support is proposed for 12 nations. As in the past, the great bulk of it, 70 percent is intended for only four of these—Korea, Taiwan, Vietnam, and Turkey.

None of these 12 nations has the economic capacity to support forces of the size we believe important to our common defense without our help. These nations are collectively providing three million armed men in ground, air and naval units located at strategic points around the perimeter of the Communist bloc.

The second great purpose of our mutual-security program is to deal realistically with the second great challenge I have mentioned—the determination of the peoples of the newly developing nations to make economic progress. We have the instruments for this in our well-established technical cooperation program and our newly created development loan fund.

We believe we should make a moderate expansion of technical cooperation this year in a few countries where we now have programs and to undertake new programs in nations which have recently gained independence. The total needed for 1959 is $142 million.

There is one new aspect of our technical cooperation program to which I should like to refer specifically—the extension of the United Nations technical assistance program agreed to at the recent meeting of the General Assembly.

This important and difficult matter was handled by Dr. JUDD, of your committee. I hope that at a later time he will explain the serious problem which the United States faces.

The development loan fund is now the only element of the mutual security program which can ordinarily be used to promote assistance for development. It was recommended to the Congress last year, upon the basis of numerous studies prepared in the Congress, the executive branch, and the public, that a loan agency be established which would make it possible for the United States to help friendly nations develop their economies on a basis of self-help and mutual cooperation.

The committee of conference on the authorizing bill recommended that the fund now be established as a corporation. This is in accord with the views of the executive branch and we recommend to the Congress that this be done, in a form that will assure that lending by the fund will be fully coordinated with the foreign policy interest of the Department of State, the mutual security activities of ICA, and the lending of the International Bank and the Export-Import Bank.

Last year the Congress appropriated $300 million for the fund and authorized the appropriation of $625 million for the coming fiscal year. Since the appropriation of the funds for fiscal year 1959 is already authorized, your committee will not be called upon to act on an authorization this year. Nevertheless, I would like to make clear to you my belief that for all the reasons I have discussed earlier, it is immensely important that the full amount of these funds be made available as part of the capital of the development loan fund. They are as important for the future safety of our country as any dollars appropriated for weapons.

There are other needs—some close to our collective security effort—which cannot or should not be met out of military assistance, defense support or other categories. These will require special assistance. There are two main groupings in which these needs fall. The first is to help maintain stability both political and economic in certain nations where we do not support substantial military forces and which are not therefore eligible for assistance under defense support. Such nations include Ethiopia, Morocco and Libya, where we have military installations, and Jordan. Secondly, special assistance is also designed to support such activities as assistance to West Berlin, to continue the worldwide malaria eradication program, and for other important uses.

After the needs which can be programed in advance have been considered, there will still remain a need to be able to meet unforeseen emergencies. The President has asked a $200 million contingency fund for needs of this nature. It would be reckless, in the light of conditions existing in the world today and the virtual certainty of Communist cold-war initiatives that we cannot now forsee, to leave the President without an emergency fund of at least this size.

Other programs, for which the President requests in the aggregate $100.6 million, will be dealt with in detail in the coming days of your hearings.

IV

We can afford the security we need

I know that many Members of the Congress and their constituents are concerned by the cost of our mutual security program. Some are unable to understand why we should engage in economic assistance abroad when there is plenty to do here at home.

In this connection it should be borne in mind that the great bulk of our foreign-aid funds, over three-fourths, are spent in the United States in the first instance. The mutual security program is estimated to

account for the employment of some 600,000 American people. To cut these funds would be to cut employment here at home.

There are, however, even more important considerations. The program is for the mutual security of our own and other free nations.

I know that this program is often called foreign aid and that it is regarded by some as a giveaway.

There is no giveaway in this program, but there would have been and there would be a giveaway if we did not have it. We would have indeed given away a dozen or so nations with their hundreds of millions of people. We would indeed have given away the access which we and other nations have to essential resources. We would indeed have given away essential bases.

Worst of all, we would have given away America's great spiritual heritage.

This Nation was not founded for the purpose of gaining safety or to achieve material prosperity. This Nation was founded to demonstrate ideals which our founders believed would achieve worldwide acceptance. Those ideals were expressed in our Declaration of Independence which, as Lincoln said, meant "hope for the world for all future time."

Today this American idealism, once known the world over as the great American experiment, finds its dynamic expression in this mutual-security program.

I have heard it said that he who pleads for mutual security has no clients, no constituents. Nothing could be further from the truth. His constituents are the entire American people, for it is their interests that are involved and their ideals that are at stake.

The issue is a simple one. Are we so poor that we cannot afford to pay for peace and security and to continue to cultivate in the world those concepts of national independence and human liberty for which our Nation was founded? Everyone knows that, if we were to be attacked by force of arms, we would afford to fight back. Surely we can pay the infinitely lesser cost of waging peace.

Give 'Em Their Paychecks Intact

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAROLD R. COLLIER
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 26, 1958

Mr. COLLIER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to insert an editorial which appeared in the February issue of Coal-Heat magazine, and which I feel points up clearly and concisely the need to eliminate the checkoff system which has led to the fiscal irresponsibility which exists throughout a great porton of our Nation today, not only on the part of many of our citizens but the Government as well:

To eliminate the checkoff is one way to reduce taxes and the price of literally everything we buy or use.

Only the checkoff—dues, fees, special assessments—automatically has made it possible for union bosses to play Napoleon, engage in power politics, and, on occasion, literally stangulate business or industry.

One's paycheck should be inviolate, virginal. And it should be illegal to withhold any part of the paycheck for any purpose whatsoever, including social security and taxes.

Since most employees are conscious only of take-home pay, many live in a dream-world—with the illusion that employers can pay the taxes, the fringe benefits, union dues, and assessments—that the Government can take care of everything, which is sheer fiscal irresponsibility. It's the hidden or concealed costs, taxes, inflation, that are playing havoc.

Let mama get the paycheck intact, and dues and special assesments to the unions won't continue to be automatic. Let mama pay the taxes, cash in hand, and the cry to cut taxes will exceed anything we've ever heard.

Except for the withholding tax, the Federal budget would never have gotten out of hand.

Eliminate the withholding tax, and let individuals pay their own taxes directly—and we will soon see fiscal responsibility just as we will among labor organizations when members pay their dues—directly.

Psychologically and economically the checkoff and the withholding tax are immoral and a violation of our constitutional rights.

MATS Gets Fatter

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 26, 1958

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I insert in the RECORD an excellent article from American Aviation magazine for February 24, 1958, concerning what they call the world's largest free line—meaning the Military Air Transport Service—which is known to a number of us as MATS.

I take this opportunity to remind our colleagues in the Pentagon that the Congress laid down a definite policy in its report on the Department of Defense appropriation for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1958, directing the Department of Defense to make greater use of commercial air carriers before authorizing transportation on Government-owned and Government-operated transportation, such as MATS.

This policy is laid out in detail in Senate Resolution No. 543, of the 85th Congress, 1st session, and was concurred in and emphasized in the report of the managers on the part of the House, including myself, in House Report No. 481 of July 23, 1957, on the defense appropriation for the current year.

I insert both those statements of congressional policy in the RECORD at this point prior to the magazine article so that all Members and readers of the RECORD may fully understand the position that the Congress has taken in this regard, and can judge for themselves whether or not the Defense Department has lived up to the congressional directives.

I think it is not revealing any committee secrets, Mr. Speaker, if I say that, in line particularly with Senate Report No. 543 and House Report No. 841, and the requirements in there for a report, that the officials of the Department of Defense can anticipate a number of searching questions concerning the progress, or lack of same, which has been made by them in implementing the congressional directives.

The article follows:

MATS GETS FATTER, BUT CONGRESS ONLY FRETS

(By Gerald A. Fitzgerald)

The world's largest free airline—Military Air Transport Service—began this year like any other year, with a congressional investigation. In all likelihood, there will be more hearings and investigations before 1958 ends, and MATS will continue to grow as it does every year, despite congressional injunctions to the contrary.

Congress, in this case the House Subcommittee on Military Operations, each year suggests that MATS get out of the airline business, to which the military in effect retorts: "Is that an order?" So far it hasn't been an order, with the result that this United States Government airline grows and grows and grows.

Representative CHET HOLIFIELD'S (Democrat, of California) subcommittee, now looking at MATS, seems more deeply interested in the MATS problem than have previous congressional investigators been. Nevertheless, chances are that even this group will have little effect on a military that is used to having its own way.

In any case, if you want one sure, quick way to raise the blood pressure of any airline management, scheduled or nonscheduled, just mention MATS. To airlines, it means the world's largest airline and their biggest single competitor for traffic.

Defense Department, parent of this Government airline, denies being in competition with anyone and gives the reason for MATS' tremendous capacity for cargo and passengers the effective, but not necessarily valid answer: "Required for wartime emergency."

If there were any assurance that this requirement was one that had a limit on it, the commercial operator might be able to take some consolation, but there is no indication of any such limit in military thinking.

MATS' fleet has been for some time considerably larger than those of all the domestic carriers put together and it continues to increase in size and capacity with each succeeding year. The President, Congress, and numerous congressional and Government committees have repeatedly told MATS to avoid competing with commercial interests wherever possible.

MATS, however, continues to register substantial traffic increases every year. How much increase occurs each year in so-called opportune airlift or the movement of hitchhikers is unknown, as this is not reported and is unscheduled. The fact that a young California reservist has set up an Air Force flight-information service and is making a good living by supplying MATS flight information to eligible hitchhikers suggests that travel this way may be more than just opportune.

Cryptic Department of Defense and Air Force answers to charges of competition, not to speak of the waste of tax money, do not satisfy everyone. Commercial carriers for a certainty are not satisfied with things as they are; nor is a congressional committee currently taking a look at the Department of Defense and MATS transportation pictures.

For more than a month now, since an industry outcry over the Air Force-proposed bailment plan erupted into a congressional hearing, Representative HOLIFIELD'S Subcommittee on Military Operations had been asking a lot of questions about Department of Defense and MATS transportation policies.

Department of Defense and its extensive panel of witnesses, led by Assistant Air Force Secretary Dudley C. Sharp, repeatedly have emphasized that MATS and other Air Force

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

and military transport operators must maintain a fleet of the size they do, and exercise the fleet regularly in the interests of readiness and the national defense.

With this idea neither the carriers nor the subcommittee wish to quarrel, but what is the actual defense requirement? And, if the CRAF (Civil Reserve Air Fleet) is to be depended upon in time of emergency, as it has been so heavily in the past, should not it also be kept ready and aided as much as possible in its attempts to replace worn and outmoded equipment, and expand its capacity toward the time of an emergency? These, principally, are the issues before the subcommittee.

Carrier representatives made it clear in testimony before the subcommittee that the intention is not to deprive the Nation of any of its wartime emergency capability, but rather to further it. In almost every emergency airlift situation to date, commercial carriers have figured signficantly. During the Korean conflict, for example, commercial carriers provided 50 percent of the airlift, and with only 5 percent of the aircraft that were available to MATS.

The contributions of commercial carriers to national emergency needs are a matter of record and neither their willingness nor their ability are questioned. The trouble now is that the carriers have invested tremendous amounts of money in an attempt to modernize and expand their fleets to meet civil and possible military needs. Every bit of traffic is needed to afford the necessary expansion and modernization.

With some of the smaller independents, also members of CRAF, the question is not one of modernization and expansion, but one of survival. Many of the independent or supplemental carriers depend upon Department of Defense traffic for as much as 95 percent of their business. In the face of rising operating costs and a fall-off in their defense business, many may have to close their doors unless relief comes quickly.

That there is much more Department of Defense traffic available and eligible for commercial carriage cannot be denied. The practice of scheduling training flights to coincide with troop movements is well known. MATS claims to operate no domestic services or rather no scheduled domestic services.

Take note of two recent MATS accidents; one on January 7, when a MATS C–47 crash-landed near Bolling Air Force Base with 21 persons aboard; and another on February 1 near Long Beach, Calif., when a C–118 crashed and killed 35 soldiers. Almost all of the passengers involved in both crashes were traveling on Government business; the very people that Congress intended to be carried by Commercial carriers.

Many MATS flights, formerly scheduled domestic flights, were transformed into so-called hospital flights and the remainder are now classified as irregular or training flights. However, there is still much in MATS passenger and cargo operations that is anything but irregular.

Civilian Department of Defense employes have complained about being forced to travel on official business in outmoded and uncomfortable B–25 bombers on training flights. Airlines lose a lot of business each year to MATS and troop-carrier transports when whole planeloads are carried on morale flights. This probably is justified in many isolated areas where the United States has bases.

That's really not the problem, however. Commercial airlines, as has been demonstrated, can carry for almost any purpose at much less cost than any military operator.

The Flying Tiger Line recently concluded a 6-month passenger contract operation for MATS in the Pacific, using the latest type Super Constellation equipment. Its charge to the Government was $184 per passenger delivered from the United States to Japan. MATS cost for the same trip, furnished to the House Appropriations Committee during fiscal year 1958 defense budget hearings, was $212.

Similarly, in the Atlantic, Seaboard and Western Airlines, during a 6-month MATS passenger contract, provided service from the United States to Europe, also aboard Super Constellation equipment, at a cost of $105 per passenger. MATS' cost for the same trip, as furnished to committee, $137.

The differences in these costs, significant in themselves, become enormous when multiplied by the hundreds of thousands of passengers now transported by MATS. Savings that would be made possible through greatly increased use of commercial airlines would be substantial, and more funds would be available for military combat activities.

Some traffic would not be appropriately assigned to the commercial operator for security and similar reasons, but the vast majority of it he is able to carry and anxious to get.

The Hoover Commission went into this issue a few years ago and recommended substantial increases in the use of commercial carriers. To some extent these recommendations have been followed, but not to any really significant degree. Military response to these and other recommendations from Congress that are made annually at appropriation time has been little more than lip service.

The situation admittedly is a complex one and the transport industry has recognized this. It has also demonstrated its willingness to help in whatever way it can toward a solution. But in the end, it is not the transport industry that must propose a solution. These answers must come from Congress.

SENATE REPORT NO. 543, DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE APPROPRIATION BILL, 1958

GENERAL STATEMENT

* * * * *

Use of commercial carriers

Last year in the conference committee on the Defense appropriations bill the Senate joined with the House in stating in a letter to the Secretary of Defense that the Government should, to the greatest extent practicable, adjust its use of air transportation so as to use existing unutilized capacity of United States air carriers. This statement was based upon our position that maximum utilization by the Department of Defense of United States civil air carriers is essential both in the promotion of our free enterprise economy and in the provision of the necessary ready reserve civil airlift for national defense; and that Government operations of its own air transport facilities should be limited to that essential to military security.

The committee reaffirms its position of last year that the Department of Defense should utilize the services of commercial transportation, in preference to Government-owned and Government-operated transportation, to the fullest extent possible when, upon using the same cost standards for both commercial and Government facilities, it is found to be more economical, and further, that in evaluating relative costs of transportation, the Department should recognize the specific monetary value of time saved as an important factor in the award of competitive bids in transportation.

It is the desire of the committee that all commercial carriers be given a fair and equal opportunity to offer their facilities on a bid basis to the Department of Defense, and be provided to the extent practical with equal access to information regarding commercial movements of cargo and personnel. The Department should make every effort to centralize the procurement of such transportation so as to consolidate movements in the interests of economy and to avoid the practice of arbitrarily dividing groups into such small units as to necessitate unwarranted additional expense.

The committee desires that at installations where private carriers are permitted to offer their services for sale to individual personnel, representatives of all commercial carriers should be afforded equal access without discrimination.

The committee notes with approval that the Air Force budget reflects increased use as compared with fiscal year 1957 of civil air carriers to augment the Military Air Transport Service in the movement of military personnel and dependents. This is offset in part, though, by the decreased use of civil air carriers in moving cargo for MATS. In summary we do not feel that sufficient effort has been made by the Department of Defense in the international and overseas field to "adjust its use of air transportation so as to use existing unutilized capacity of United States air carriers."

It is the wish of the committee, therefore, that within the 1958 appropriations for operations and maintenance and for military personnel the Defense Department reprogram expenditures for operating MATS and other Government-owned transport activities sufficiently to permit the funds so reprogramed to be applied toward procuring the services of United States civil air carriers to meet as nearly as possible 40 percent of the passenger requirements and 20 percent of the cargo requirements of the Military Air Transport Service.

The committee desires that a report be made by the first of January 1958 which would indicate the progress made by the Department of Defense in implementing this directive.

HOUSE REPORT NO. 841, CONFERENCE REPORT ON DEFENSE APPROPRIATIONS FOR FISCAL 1958, JULY 23, 1957

* * * * * *

Amendment No. 36: Deletes provision of the Senate providing for competitive bidding. This matter also is now under study by the legislative committees. The committee of conference strongly feels that competitive bidding should be required whenever practicable for more effective and economical procurement.

Amendment No. 37: Deletes provision of the Senate pertaining to the procurement of commercial transportation. The committee of conference emphasizes the importance of the Senate committee report on use of commercial carriers and calls on the Department of Defense to carry out the full intent. However, it is realized that the procurement of commercial transportation must be made in accordance with existing law.

* * * * *

GEORGE MAHON, HARRY R. SHEPPARD, ROBERT L. F. SIKES, W. F. NORRELL, JAMIE L. WHITTEN, GEORGE ANDREWS, JOHN J. RILEY, DANIEL J. FLOOD, CLARENCE CANNON, R. B. WIGGLESWORTH, ERRETT P. SCRIVNER, GERALD R. FORD, JR., EDWARD T. MILLER, HAROLD C. OSTERTAG, JOHN TABER, Managers on the Part of the House.

The Double-Edged Sword

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 19, 1958

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I commend to the attention of our colleagues the ruthless propaganda which the

Egyptian dictator, Abdul Nasser, is using to spread terror in the Near East. The following editorial from the magazine Prevent World War III, winter-spring 1958 issue, demonstrates Nasser's attempt to destroy the independence of all Near Eastern countries:

THE DOUBLE-EDGED SWORD

In the previous issue of Prevent World War III (No. 50) we analyzed the cunning maneuvers against the Arab kings conducted by the Egyptian dictator Abdul Nasser. We predicted that Nasser's failure to destroy the independence of Jordan's King Hussein last spring by peaceful means would drive him to more drastic action. The concluding part of the article went to the heart of Nasser's overall objectives:

"Will the kings be prepared for the coming counterattack? Nasser's next move may be camouflaged by the smokescreen of a new drive on Israel. The bright young man had been adept in employing the bogey of Israel as a means of whipping recalcitrants back in line. Will the kings dare to penetrate the anti-Israel fog which has already led them back to the brink of self-destruction?

"There is no doubt that the struggle between Nasser and the Arab kings will continue to the bitter end. Nasser will never give up his dream to rule the Arab world, and only the kings stand in his way. If the Egyptian dictator is to succeed, he must eliminate them."

Apparently Nasser now believes that his hour of retribution has struck. The hue and cry over the so-called Turkish menace, whipped up by Soviet propagandists, provide the right kind of atmosphere for Nasser's own moves. Throwing away all diplomatic niceties, Nasser has now gone over to the offensive. He has unleashed every propaganda weapon in his arsenal to spread terror, fear, and paralysis in the same way that Hitler's Wehrmacht employed the tactics of schrecklichkeit.

Last year the Nasserites pretended to be friends of the Jordanian king. They said he was fundamentally a good soul but that he was naive and misled by the agents of imperialism, i. e., United States of America. They even expressed confidence that the king was not beyond redemption provided he listened to the bright young man from Cairo. However, King Hussein acted in a way that was shocking. He dared to maintain his independence. This was something that galled Nasser. That is why the Nasserites today are literally crying for the blood of the king.

Through press and radio, Cairo has vilified the king, his family, and his government. On November 3, the Egyptian newspaper Ash-Shab cried out that a leading member of Hussein's government "met with Ben Gurion and Golda Meir and agreed that one state should be formed between them as one economic unit." This alleged deal was denounced as a "bloody crime." Then the paper made this ominous prediction: "When the people of Jordan and Palestine rise they will destroy the plot which was hatched in darkness and will destroy the plotters who plotted against their lives and existence and who sold out their cause in return for the dollars of imperialism."

Since it is evident that Moscow and Cairo coordinate their propaganda thrusts, it was not long before the Soviets chimed in. They came out with the tale that the United States insisted that certain Arab districts be given to Israel and King Hussein agreed. No matter how well Cairo and Moscow coordinate, they ought to remember the old Latin precept mendacum memorum esse oportet (a liar must have a good memory).

With the enormous propaganda resources at the disposal of the Moscow-Cairo axis, it did not take long before the whole Middle East was deluged by fantastic stories concerning King Hussein's treachery and crimes. Indeed, the insults heaped upon the Jordanian King "reached the point of almost unprintable opprobrium" (New York Times, November 18, 1957). All this frenzied propaganda from Moscow was unleashed because King Hussein allegedly sought peaceful negotiations with Israel. Those who have been attracted to Soviet peace propaganda should take notice of this episode.

The significance of the anti-Hussein campaign will be lost if it is merely regarded as a squabble between local contending forces in the Middle East. A study of Cairo propaganda shows very clearly that Nasser is aiming at a much larger target, that is, the United States of America. This is how it was summed up by one of Nasser's newspapers, Ash-Shab: "Jordan's return to a liberal policy and the downfall of King Hussein and his reactionary government will help to crush the American-Zionist plot of settling the Palestinian question and of eliminating the refugee problem. This will weaken the position of other reactionary governments in the Middle East, and so Arab nationalism will achieve further victories. But the American fortress will fall in battle. It will fall and be trampled upon by the feet of the advancing nationalist masses, by Arab nationalism which has been able to withstand storms, face developments, and deal imperialism severe blows. Other imperialist fortresses will topple before the advance of Arab nationalism, and America will live to see this."

It will also be noted that Ash-Shab speaks of weakening the position of other "reactionary governments in the Middle East." This is not spelled out, but already Cairo newspapers have been training their guns on the regime of King Saud. One Egyptian newspaper, Al Ahram, cast aspersions as to King Saud's motives in offering to mediate the Turkish-Syrian crisis. Indeed, it openly suggested that Saud was acting as a tool of the United States State Department.

The attacks upon King Saud's integrity and the massive assaults against King Hussein have created profound alarm in Arab circles. King Saud himself appealed to Nasser to stop these attacks. He wrote: "All causes of hatred among Arabs must be removed immediately. We regret the current campaign and promise to work to the utmost to eliminate it." King Faisal expressed similar sentiments and deplored "radio attacks conducted by an Arab state against another." The Baghdad radio complained that Nasser's ruthless methods were "against etiquette and proper political argument." The speaker of the Jordanian Parliament, Mustafa Khalifeh, also joined the appeal to halt the campaigns of hate "which are poisoning the Arab atmosphere."

In the Bible it is stated that he who lives by the sword shall perish by the sword. We would amend that truism by adding that they who cooperate in spreading the poison of hate may some day be forced to swallow it themselves. The kinds of Saudi Arabia and of Iraq should bear this in mind as they now appeal to Nasser to preserve the standards of etiquette in his relations with them. In principle, we share their concern and of all other Arabs who oppose the Goebbels-like attacks emanating from Cairo. However, the kings who are now the immediate targets cannot be absolved from sharing in the responsibility for the present wave of hate which seems to have drowned out reason.

It was only a short time ago that these very same kings were actively working with Nasser in drumming up fanatical hatred among the Arab peoples against Israel. A thousand times Israel was cursed by these Arab kings and their spokesmen. A thousand times the illiterate and uninformed Arab masses were called upon to dedicate their lives toward the destruction of the Israeli people. When the Arab kings joined with Nasser in whipping up emotions and fanaticism among the Arab peoples, they embarked on a dangerous cause.

Hate propaganda is a double-edged sword and, in the last analysis, will inevitably cut down its inspirers. It will do no good for the Arab kings as they are now doing, to beat their breasts before Nasser and promise their eternal enmity toward Israel. This is not the way out for them. Indeed, it is precisely the course which leads to a dead end and their own elimination.

As we stated in Nasser's Expendables, the Egyptian dictator's tactics toward Israel are guided by far-reaching objectives which include the destruction of all independent Arab States. After Nasser's fiasco in Jordan last year his prestige and influence began to wane. In common with all dictators Nasser could not tolerate such a state of affairs. One might say that it is a law of dictators that they can never rest on their laurels, but must ever press forward. It was the specter of isolation, of being discredited as a sawdust Caesar that compelled Nasser to resort to the terror which he has set loose. This is the reality of Nasser's present actions and no amount of appeasing by the Arab kings will do any good.

The Arab States which want to be independent of Nasser's imperialistic designs cannot have it both ways. They cannot offer to sacrifice the independence of Israel while they maintain their own sovereignty. They must understand that just as peace in the Middle East is indivisible, so is the independence of all the Middle Eastern states including Israel. Therefore, a sovereign independent Israel is the sine qua non for maintaining the independence of all Arab states. When the leaders of the Arab peoples finally recognize that hate propaganda must go and that their peoples must be told the truth about the West, then the survival and independence of all Arab countries will be assured and peace will reign in the Middle East.

An Outmoded System

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ARCH A. MOORE, JR.
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 26, 1958

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Speaker, in appropriation bills coming before Congress this year, we will be scrutinizing each item carefully to determine where cuts can be effectively made without injury to our national defense or to the economy of our country.

The following editorial from the Fairmont Times, Fairmont, W. Va., for February 22, 1958, entitled "An Outmoded System," certainly spells out one area where Congress can and should reduce the Federal budget. The abolishment of the antiquated system of postal savings should be a must on the list of congressional economies to be made this year. I urge my colleagues to support legislation introduced for this purpose as well as other economies recommended in the last Hoover Commission report.

The editorial follows:

AN OUTMODED SYSTEM

The Federal Government's Postal Savings System filled a genuine need when it was established nearly half a century ago. But the tremendous changes wrought during that half-century have so altered our national

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

life that the use of post offices as banks is no longer necessary or sensible.

In 1910, transportation was slow and there were relatively few banks. This combination of factors put banking facilities out of the reach of many citizens, in rural areas especially. Also, banks were less dependable in those days; they were not as carefully regulated as they are in our time.

Under modern conditions, the Postal Savings System is costing the taxpayers money. There might be some excuse for that if large numbers of people were still dependent on postal savings facilities, but this is not the case. Therefore, the Postal Savings System should be discontinued.

This is not a new idea. Discontinuance has been recommended by various high Government officials, including not only the Postmaster General but also the Secretary of the Treasury and the Comptroller General. The Hoover Commission, as long ago as 1955, urged liquidation of the system as a needless burden on the taxpayers.

The facts weigh strongly on the side of a bill, now in the House, which would disdiscontinue the Postal Savings System. Though the amount of tax money saved would be relatively small, Congress would be wise to take this step in the direction of greater economy in Government.

Democrat Sins, GOP Slips

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PERKINS BASS
OF NEW HAMPSHIRE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 26, 1958

Mr. BASS of New Hampshire. Mr. Speaker, I request unanimous consent to have included in the Appendix of the RECORD, a recent column by George Dixon which appeared in the Washington Post entitled "Democrat Sins, GOP Slips." This puts a proper perspective on some of the criticism which the press directed at the Republican Party in recent months.

The editorial follows:

DEMOCRAT SINS, GOP SLIPS
(By George Dixon)

How it is being accomplished would baffle a student of the occult, but the sins of the Democrats are constantly being made to appear as the transgressions of the Republicans. Whenever the Democrats do anything wrong it doesn't seem to be long before the notion spreads that it was the fault of the GOP.

Let us start with the attempted natural gas gouge: The fight to slacken Federal controls so that an extra billion dollars can be jimmied out of the consumers has been led by the two Democratic leaders of Congress, Senate Majority Leader LYNDON B. JOHNSON, and Speaker SAM RAYBURN. But now the impression is widespread that House Republican Leader JOSEPH W. MARTIN Jr. was up to his disheveled hair in it.

Poor JOE, who wouldn't know the natural from the laughing-gas lobby, was finagled into attending a Texas fund-raising dinner in his honor. Unbeknownst to him it was being run by natural-gas people who tried to con people into buying $100 dinner tickets by picturing JOE as the man who would swing the congressional vote for the gas gougers.

JOE may be as innocent as a Massachusetts gas consumer, but it's going to be hard to smother the impression that the gas plot is Republican dominated because the man who sent out the come-on letters was H. J. (Jack) Porter, Republican national committeeman for Texas. Porter sent out 500 of these letters, and why he failed to foresee that at least 1 would almost certainly fall into tattling hands, should provide an interesting I. Q. study.

The morning the story of the GOP ineptitude broke, I ran into a prominent Democratic Senator. He was in convulsions. He finally made himself coherent enough to splutter: "Do you think Jack Porter is the smartest politician who ever came down the Texas pike?"

It reminded me, in reverse, of the old gag: "If you're so smart, why ain't you rich?" Many of these Texas Republicans are rich, but when it comes to political brains they act poverty stricken. In one stroke of brilliance they've made it appear as if the Republicans are the natural-gas bandits.

Almost simultaneous with this, the impression has spread that the so-called Federal Communications Commission whitewash has been GOP maneuvered. This was brought about by talk of White House and Sherman Adams pressures. It obfuscated the fact that the investigation of regulatory agencies, which blew up with the firing of its chief counsel and the quitting of its chairman, was Democrat dominated.

The Democrats have certainly succeeded in spreading the notion that the Republicans are to blame for the missile and rocket lag. This probably should be rated as the No. 1 irony. The Democrats were in control at the close of World War II when Wernher von Braun was working on the V–2 rocket. It was not until the Republicans took over that Von Braun was given the go-ahead to expand his V–2 into the Jupiter.

The GOP is being depicted as the party of the piledup deficit, high taxes, and farm surpluses. They are just reluctant legatees. The Republicans also seem unable to counter the illusion that they are the bloated rich and the Democrats the exploited poor.

The picture now is so topsy-turvy that I hear everybody at Republican national headquarters has been ordered to quit carrying matches in case of a natural-gas leak.

Chicago's Sewage Disposal System Cited Among Seven Engineering Wonders of America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BARRATT O'HARA
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 26, 1958

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, it will be of interest to the membership of the House, which thrice has passed by overwhelming majorities the Lake Michigan water diversion bill fathered by the Honorable THOMAS J. O'BRIEN and supported by the Illinois members of both parties, to learn that the American Society of Civil Engineers has presented to the Metropolitan Sanitary District of Greater Chicago a bronze plaque in recognition of its sewage disposal system being classified by the society as 1 of the 7 engineering wonders of America.

This is conclusive answer to those who, entirely uninformed on the subject, have sought to confuse the understanding of the need and the purpose of Congressman O'BRIEN's water diversion bill by suggesting that Chicago wants to dump her sewage in Lake Michigan. The fact is, of course, that for Chicago's sewage disposal the sanitary district has constructed and is operating the largest disposal plant in history or in existence now. Its recognition by the society of the most learned and experienced engineers of the United States as one of the seven engineering wonders of our country is of such interest that I am extending my remarks to include the order of business at the awarding ceremonies on February 22, 1958, during the national convention of the American Society of Civil Engineers and the addresses of Louis R. Howson, president of the society, and Anthony A. Olis, president of the board of sanitary trustees.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

The order of business of the seventh wonder plaque presentation ceremony on February 22, 1958, at the board room, Administration Building, Metropolitan Sanitary District of Greater Chicago, follows:

1. Chairman Dr. John A. Logan, professor of civil engineering, Northwestern University and president of the Illinois section of American Society of Civil Engineers, introduces the guests:

Dr. Harold Gotas, dean of engineering, Northwestern University.

Mr. Robert Crown, president of the Empire State Building Corp. As proprietor of another of the America's seven wonders, he is no doubt with us today to get a preview of a similar ceremony which will be held in his wonderful building in the near future.

Mr. Earl Harrington, president Western Society of Engineers.

Mr. Arthur Rubloff, chairman of the board, Arthur Rubloff & Co., and father of the famed Fort Dearborn project.

Mr. E. G. Norell, president, Chicago section, American Society of Electrical Engineers.

Mr. M. V. Maxwell, vice president, Chicago section, American Society of Mechanical Engineers.

Mr. William A. Dundas, general superintendent of the Metropolitan Sanitary District of Greater Chicago, who did much of the creative engineering which went into the building of this great system.

Mr. Horace P. Ramey, chief engineer of the Metropolitan Sanitary District of Greater Chicago, whose half century of devoted work has contributed to the stature of the sanitary district.

Mr. William H. Wisely, executive secretary American Society of Civil Engineers.

Mr. Wm. F. Patterson, vice president, the Metropolitan Sanitary District of Greater Chicago.

Mr. Casimir Griglik, trustee, the Metropolitan Sanitary District of Greater Chicago.

Mr. J. B. Martin, trustee, the Metropolitan Sanitary District of Greater Chicago.

Mr. John A. Cullerton, trustee, the Metropolitan Sanitary District of Greater Chicago.

Mr. John G. Henneberger, trustee, the Metropolitan Sanitary District of Greater Chicago.

Mr. Frank W. Chesrow, trustee, the Metropolitan Sanitary District of Greater Chicago.

Mr. Francis T. Delaney, trustee, the Metropolitan Sanitary District of Greater Chicago.

Mr. Wm. S. Nordburg, trustee, the Metropolitan Sanitary District of Greater Chicago.

2. Chairman introduces Mr. Louis R. Howson, President of the American Society of Civil Engineers.

3. President Howson makes presentation talk.

4. Chairman introduces Anthony A. Olis, president of the board of trustees of the sanitary district. Mr. Olis was elected a trustee of the sanitary district in 1946 and reelected in 1952. The board elected him president in 1950 and under his leadership the sanitary district has expanded its scope and functions to meet the challenge of metropolitan growth. Mr. Olis is a graduate of the University of Chicago Law School and holds a doctor of law degree.

5. President Olis makes acceptance talk.

6. Chairman thanks guests and closes meeting.

PRESIDENT HOWSON'S ADDRESS

The address of Louis R. Howson, president of the American Society of Civil Engineers, at the seven wonders plaque ceremony follows:

About 2 years ago the American Society of Civil Engineers, the oldest engineering society in the United States, established a committee to study civil-engineering structures in the United States, evaluate the importance of their contributions toward better living, and select the seven which might be classified as the seven civil-engineering wonders of the United States.

In order to have the selection made from as comprehensive a source as possible, the society asked each of its 74 sections to give consideration to the civil-engineering construction of the area each served and make nominations to this committee of civil-engineering structures believed worthy of consideration in their area. Several hundred suggestions were received, accompanied in most cases by a description of the project and the particular conditions leading to their nomination for consideration. This list was narrowed down through various steps, and finally there emerged what the committee appraised as the top seven civil-engineering wonders of the United States.

The civil branch of the engineering profession has been frequently designated as the public-welfare and public-service branch of the profession. It has been instrumental in the development of modern living, such as our railroads, waterways, highways; our urban development, their water supply, sewerage, and other essential facilities; the ability to establish property boundaries and reestablish them as needed. Accordingly, in the consideration of this large number of civil-engineering projects there was uppermost in the minds of the committee this question of service of the particular facility in modern living.

The seven civil engineering wonders include the Grand Coulee Dam, the Empire State Building, the San Francisco-Oakland Bay Bridge, the Colorado River Aqueduct, the Panama Canal, the Hoover Dam, and the southwest sewage treatment plant of the Metropolitan Sanitary District of Greater Chicago, the selection of which is being commemorated here today by the dedication of a bronze plaque.

The southwest sewage disposal plant of the Metropolitan Sanitary District of Greater Chicago is the largest in the world. It was not selected, however, for that reason. It was selected because in its construction and operation it, and the sewage disposal system of which it is a major part, embrace all phases in the development of the art of waste treatment and is an example of the highest combination of modern practices in waste disposal.

Originally, Chicago sewage discharged into the Chicago River and then into Lake Michigan, from which the water supply was taken. As the population increased, so did the typhoid mortality and it became so serious that in 1889 the Legislature of the State of Illinois created the Sanitary District of Chicago. That body promptly undertook, through engineering investigations, the solution of the problem. The first step included the diversion of all sewage from the lake to a newly constructed canal, approximately 30 miles in length, through which water was drawn from Lake Michigan and discharged to the Des Plaines River, the Illinois River, and thence to the Mississippi River, taking with it all of Chicago's sewage flow. At the time that diversion was made there was no other method of sewage disposal in this country for quantities of anything like the magnitude of Chicago waste.

As years passed studies were continued, methods of sewage disposal were developed, and beginning about 1920 the Sanitary District of Chicago began to construct sewage disposal works. Also, as time passed the refinements of sewage treatment processes increased, culminating in the construction of the southwest district plant with a capacity of approximately 1,000 million gallons per day (4 million tons per day). This plant is capable of treating this vast volume of waste so that it is returned to the Illinois waterways without detriment to downstream neighboring States.

This work, involving the expenditure of hundreds of millions of dollars, has been designed for the district by civil engineers working in cooperation with chemists and bacteriologists over a period of several decades.

Before the sanitary district was created, the typhoid death rate in Chicago reached a peak of 173.8 per 100,000 people. The Siamese twins of sanitary engineering, water supply and sewage disposal, have reduced this figure until today the figure is less than 1 per 100,000 consistently. Over the United States similar projects have been effective in saving approximately 100,000 lives per year; without them, many would have died from water-borne diseases, primarily typhoid.

This selection of the southwest sewage treatment plant as one of the seven civil engineering wonders of the United States and the presentation of this plaque are concrete indications of the workings of the civil engineering profession for the benefit of mankind.

Modern urban development could not exist without the primary civil engineering works of distribution, water supply and waste disposal.

PRESIDENT OLIS' RESPONSE

The following is the address of Anthony A. Olis, president of the board, the Metropolitan Sanitary District of Greater Chicago:

Thank you, Mr. Howson.

This wonderful plaque is a milestone in the history of the Metropolitan Sanitary District of Greater Chicago.

I accept it on behalf of the board of trustees, the staff, and the residents of the sanitary district, those who have gone before us and those who will follow us, as well as the 5 million of us there are today.

For the sanitary district, unique in conception and a pioneer in function from its very beginning, has been a creation of the people it serves.

The idea of the sanitary district was born in a citizens' committee in 1885 following a disastrous flood which led to pollution of Lake Michigan and an epidemic of water-borne diseases.

They planned the sanitary district as a metropolitan government cutting across municipal lines to perform a specific task vital to all of the people within a natural geographic area. So far as we can learn, this was the first step taken in this country in this direction—and only in recent years has the metropolitan concept of service government taken root in the other large cities.

Simply put, the sanitary district was officially created by the legislature in 1889 to prevent the pollution of Lake Michigan, the source of drinking water. It was given the power to tax and to issue bonds and it was made directly responsive to the voters through its nine trustees elected at large.

This whole plan was submitted to the voters in a referendum on November 5, 1889, and they approved it by a vote of 70,958 to 242. In my opinion, that percentage has held through the years—and therein lies the strength of the sanitary district and the reason its achievements could rate this signal honor from the American Society of Civil Engineers.

The few who carp and whine and drag their feet have been swept along in the swelling tide of those who are building Greater Chicago into the first city of the planet Earth.

By the turn of the century the sanitary district had reversed the flow of the Chicago River and made it flow away from the lake with its polluted load. They had built interceptors to pick up the wastes along the lakefront.

Next came the Cal-Sag and the North Shore Channels and an ever-widening network of intercepting sewers. At the start the sanitary district served 185 square miles. Today it serves 900 square miles in Cook County—Chicago and 115 suburbs.

The sanitary district pioneered in the construction of sewage treatment and disposal plants, and in our own time we have seen this system come to a stage of completion where we could say: "All of the wastes originating within our borders is being given complete treatment."

It would be pleasant—or would it?—if we could rest on the district's laurels now. But a great and challenging task still confronts us.

This metropolitan area is low and level. Its streams are few and small and easily polluted. Floods are an expensive nuisance. Our waterways—71 miles of navigable canals within the sanitary district—will be called upon to play an ever-increasingly important role as the St. Lawrence seaway brings seagoing traffic to our shores. Our industry and our population grow day by day, increasing the sewage load.

How are we meeting these problems?

We have a plan for flood control, and we will push until the job is done if the public and the legislature continue to support us.

Our network of interceptors—already 250 miles in length—is growing by the day, keeping abreast of the residential development of the metropolitan area.

Our treatment plants are being modernized and enlarged. An experimental research program is underway searching for more efficient, more economical methods of treatment and disposal.

The Cal-Sag is being widened as a Federal project to increase its barge and ship capacity. Incidentally, it will increase its capacity for carrying floodwaters and bring some measure of relief to the south side.

We are dredging the north shore channel and that will ease flood pressure on the north side.

When the main channel of the sanitary and ship canal is widened from the Cal-Sag junction to Lockport—the final phase of the Government's Cal-Sag project—the safety margin against floods will be substantially increased.

Everyone of these measures will help us prevent the pollution of the streams in Cook County. Each is a step forward in the task of preparing this area to house 8 million residents by 1980.

I am certain I speak for every resident of this area, Mr. Howson, when I say the sanitary district is grateful for the honor your society has given us.

In a large sense, this award was earned by the men who went before us. Our right to share in it will be determined by how well

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

we meet the responsibilities and problems which face us.

I am sure this plaque, prominently displayed in our administration building, will be a source of inspiration to all of us as well as to the men to whom we hand the reins in the years to come.

Thank you.

East Berlin—The Lost City

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PATRICK J. HILLINGS
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 26, 1958

Mr. HILLINGS. Mr. Speaker, an extremely perceptive insight into East Berlin has been given us by Mrs. Jerene Appleby Harnish, publisher of the Ontario-Upland, Calif., Daily Report.

Mrs. Harnish is an astute reporter and she recently wrote an excellent series on her trip behind the Iron Curtain, one of which dealt with the "dying city of East Berlin."

Mrs. Harnish's article clearly develops that East Berlin is an example of what Communist oppression can do to a city and its people. I suggest that all members of Congress read the following article to remind us of what communism can do to obliterate the future:

(By Jerene Appleby Harnish)

The Iron Curtain clanged down on us as we entered cars, driven by Communist chauffeurs, to be taken on our conducted tour of the East Sector of Berlin. We knew that we were under guard and we also had an uneasy feeling that we were being watched by other state officials. Our guides made it clear to us that we were to be allowed to stop at approved spots to take pictures. Sentry boxes, men in uniform, and bridges were forbidden subjects as were all areas which might have military significance. Thus began our visit to Communist East Berlin, a city dying under the oppressive hand of the Kremlin.

The only area which our Communist guides were anxious to show us was the famous street called Stalin Alle but referred to by West Berliners as Stalin alley. The buildings, stretching for blocks along this one street, merely serve to emphasize the superficial attempts on the part of the Communist regime to rehabilitate the East Sector of the bombed-out German capital. In the pictures accompanying this article it can be seen that the apartment buildings, only 10 years old, were hastily constructed to make a show rather than provide desperately needed housing for East Berliners. In fact these apartment houses have not been thrown open to the homeless workers but are largely occupied by party bureaucrats. Small state-owned stores occupy the first floor of these apartments, a pitifully inadequate shopping area for the population of the East Sector.

The style of architecture used by the Russians in building Stalin Alle has long been out of date in the Western World. It is similar to the ugly and pompous type of architecture used in some American cities in the 1920's. The facades of the buildings are covered with dirty buff tiles already falling off in many places. Some of the apartments boast small balconies, common to European architecture, but many of these have become completely unusable because of broken railings and missing floors. The whole effect of Stalin Alle is one of shoddy grandeur, an affront to German standards of workmanship.

In an effort to make these structures impressive they have been built eight stories or more in height. Their depth, on the other hand, averages about 40 feet giving the whole avenue the look of a movie set—all front and no back. Through the archways of the new buildings and down the intersecting streets the rubble of bomb-destroyed buildings is clearly visible. Little attempt has been made to clear away the ruins of World War II, either in the immediate vicinity of Stalin Alle or in other portions of the city. The new buildings themselves show no evidence of proper upkeep and repair.

As we drove around East Berlin we were struck by the lack of activity in the streets. Few automobiles are to be seen, practically none of which are privately owned. Army trucks made the only real traffic noise we heard. There were a few listless shoppers going silently about their errands. We decided that the only commodity we envied the East Berliners was the unlimited parking space available.

The day after our conducted tour of East Berlin we again crossed the line between the free world and the Communist slave world to go to the East German airfield at Marienfelde. Only on a Russian-controlled airline could we reach Warsaw, our next stop. We were forced to wait a while at the Lufthansa Station on Stalin Alle before going to the airfield. The waiting room was typical of all those we visited later at the various airfields behind the Iron Curtain. There are always huge maps on the walls and usually globes conveniently placed so that travelers may see at a glance the land masses under Communist domination. The map on the wall of the East Berlin waiting room is a beautiful job of inlaid wood and is ornamental in the extreme.

While we were waiting to be taken to Marienfelde by bus we were given permission to walk up and down the nearby arcades in front of the small shops. The window displays were revealing in that they showed the extremely limited choice of articles for sale. Several of us entered a shop selling Russian-made nylon stockings. We asked to see some wool socks but they were not available. Since there were no other customers in the store the girl clerks seemed very friendly and smiled as they accepted gifts of American cigarettes. After we left, one girl came running after us proudly to present us with a small illustrated booklet picturing the shop's wares.

A few children warmly dressed in cheap woolen garments were playing around the square. They followed us around looking curiously at our clothes and especially at our shoes. Good leather shoes are always a source of interest to people behind the Iron Curtain because they are almost unobtainable there. Several little boys posed for pictures as they chewed happily at the gum we gave them.

As we waited to go to the airfield we felt the heavy hand of Communist authority on our shoulders. The new order from the Kremlin demanded that all visitors crossing East German territory obtain visas from the nonexistent East German Government. This ruling had been issued the very week we arrived in West Berlin in order to pressure Americans into recognizing puppet East Germany as an autonomous nation. Several of the group had announced that they would turn back to West Berlin rather than seek such visas against the United States State Department's orders. It was decided to go on to the airport without such visas and see if we could not proceed with police stamps only. A United Press representative advised us to try this method—and it worked.

When our flight number was called over the loud speaker we went onto the airfield to find a two-motored, Russian-built plane waiting for us. It is called the Illy 14 and is an almost exact copy of the good old American workhorse of the air, the DC-3. Like the DC-3, this Russian plane is safe, slow, but not too comfortable. It must fly at lower altitudes because the cabin is not pressurized. Also the heating system is dependent on the motors so that the cabin is bone cold until the plane is in the air. The meals served on these Russian planes are simple to the point of being elementary—bread, sweet butter, cheese, and ham with a cup of tea or coffee and a wizened apple. As we were to learn during the next few weeks, air travel is not luxurious behind the Iron Curtain.

The Russian pilots are obviously well trained for their jobs. Their take-offs and their landings are extremely good. And the story that there is no flying over satellite and Russian territory in the daytime by American tourists is simply not true. The hostesses called attention to points of interest as we flew over them. In all cases the stewardesses on these planes were pretty Communist girls who spoke good English. There was no hesitancy on their part to answer questions. In fact they were quite chatty.

We were now on our way to Warsaw, the capital city of satellite Poland. We were no longer free agents to travel as we wished. We were wholly in the hands of Communist couriers and subject to their orders.

Let's Cure the Scientist Shortage Now

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. VICTOR L. ANFUSO
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 24, 1958

Mr. ANFUSO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to insert an article written by me and published in the March 1958 issue of the magazine Mechanix Illustrated, which has just come off the press.

The article deals with the proposal contained in my bill, H. R. 9610, to establish a United States Science Academy, how this institution would be set up and how it could contribute to our national security. I am glad to bring it to the attention of all my colleagues.

It reads as follows:

LET'S CURE THE SCIENTIST SHORTAGE NOW

(By VICTOR L. ANFUSO, Member of Congress, Eighth Congressional District, New York)

A military man of increasing importance in this age of ICBM's and sputniks is the soldier-scientist. The manpower shortage in this field is acute and growing steadily worse—and yet the problem is being handled in the conventional business-as-usual manner.

There is currently little encouragement for the young scientist to join the armed services. In fact, any young men who want to be soldier-scientists under present conditions are being unrealistic. They stand a fine chance of being utilized as motor mechanics or telephone operators.

Recently a young draftee known to the academic and scientific worlds as a mathematical genius was discovered in the Army, assigned as a clerk-typist at Fort Lee, Va.

Pvt. Ernest Shult was only one victim of the Armed Forces' so-called "Classification System," and his case might be considered humorous if it were not so tragic. Today we cannot afford to waste a single scientist in a position that does not take full advantage of his talent and knowledge.

Repeatedly, we now hear these warnings: "Don't get hysterical. We do not have to copy Russia's totalitarian methods of regimenting science." I agree. But let's not lose sight of the fact that the Russians don't have to worry about placing enough scientists with their armed forces. The Kremlin presses a button and gets all the scientific manpower it needs, where it needs it.

I believe our free system can be just as effective if we establish a United States Science Academy. I have drafted a bill for a law creating the United States Science Academy, and by now the bill should be under active consideration in Congress. Talks I have had with some of my colleagues and various science leaders regarding the Science Academy have been encouraging. As a matter of fact, after contacting the White House I have reason to expect approval of the bill from the President, and bi-partisan support for it in Congress.

If passed unchanged, my bill will contain the following provisions:

1. The establishment of a permanent United States Science Academy under the Department of Defense.

2. The purpose of the Academy will be to train selected citizens, to be known as cadets, for service as officer-scientists with any of the Armed Forces.

3. Cadets will be between 17 and 25 years old and will receive a minimum of 4 years training.

4. Upon graduation, all cadets will be required to serve a minimum of 3 years in the Armed Forces of the United States.

5. Admission to the Academy will be by competitive examinations supervised by the National Science Foundation.

6. Candidates shall also be named by foreign nations who are allies of the United States, provided such candidates can pass a strict security check.

7. Physical standards will be minimized; by deemphasizing brawn we may get more brain into the Armed Forces. We should not forget that one of this country's most brilliant scientists, the great Steinmetz, was a badly deformed cripple.

8. The atmosphere at the Science Academy will be studious but not overmilitarized. The cadet's standing as a scientist will be the only consideration—not his military knowledge. We already have three service Academies.

In all other respects, for purposes of administration, the science cadet will receive a completely free education, pay, housing, medical care, and supervision, under the same rules now governing other service Academies.

Since this is an entirely new venture, there is no way of estimating now the cost of establishing the Science Academy, which I hope will be equipped with the finest facilities that money can buy. No doubt, it will run into many millions of dollars, to be financed out of the Defense Department's budget. It may mean a tax increase somewhere along the line. But how else can we meet such a challenge as was reported recently from Russia—that the Communists are going to establish an entire "scientific town" with a population of 20,000, 10 major research institutes, a large new university, and housing accommodations for the best scientific brains to be gathered from all parts of Russia?

Perhaps you may have noticed that nowhere in my bill is the sex of acceptable cadets mentioned. That was deliberate. I believe the academy should be coeducational. I realize this may arouse some opposition to the bill; I hope not, for we have neglected too long the vast, untapped potential of scientific contributions from American women.

It has been estimated that at some Russian atomic projects, as many as half the scientists are women. In this country we have a handful of women scientists in good jobs. Our Science Academy might very well attract such brilliant cadets as Joyce Myron, the 18-year-old student from the Drexel Institute of Technology, who dazzled millions of Americans when she displayed a staggering knowledge of atomic energy on TV's $64,000 Question.

What will the United States Science Academy accomplish that other private technical schools and universities cannot?

In the first place, it will assure our Armed Forces of a definite, reliable, and steady number of highly trained scientist-officers. We must remember that graduates of private schools are under no compulsion whatsoever to join the Armed Forces. Just the opposite is usually true. We have to snare many of them through the draft, if and when we can. We even have difficulties obtaining them as civilians attached to the Armed Forces because we cannot pay the high salaries of private industry.

On the other hand, the incentive for becoming a science cadet is quite strong. The cadet will not only get a free education, but he will get paid for it. He will be free to devote all his time and energies to his first love, science, and not to waiting on tables or jerking sodas in order to pay his tuition, room, and board.

Although it has been estimated that some 40 percent of our top high-school graduates never go on to college because they cannot afford it, money will not stand in the way of recruiting a science cadet for Uncle Sam.

One reason America is graduating only half the number of science students as Russia, say the experts, is the fact that scientists in America lack public respect and prestige. Says Dr. Edward Teller, noted "father" of the hydrogen bomb: "In Russia, a boy thinks about a career as a scientist, the way a young girl in our society thinks about becoming a movie star."

The United States Science Academy should prove a glittering attraction for young Americans, and should do much toward restoring the tarnished prestige of scientists in this country. The Science cadet will enjoy the prestige and dignity that comes with graduation from West Point or Annapolis.

I first began to give serious thought to the problem of training scientists for our Armed Forces back in 1955 and 1956 when, as a member of the NATO Parliamentary Conference, I attended secret briefings by Generals Gruenther and Norstad. I came away from these meetings considerably disturbed by the news that Russia was drawing ahead of us in the science race.

I thought about the nation getting such great military leadership from West Point and Annapolis—then why not the same for the world of science from a United States Science Academy? When our own complacency was shattered by the sputniks, I decided the time had come to act.

I am confident that adding a Science Academy as this Nation's fourth defense bastion will add greatly to our national soundness and strength.

Whether you agree or disagree with the idea of a Science Academy, it is at least worthy of public discussion and debate in Congress, and I am sure your Representative would be pleased to have your views and suggestions—and so would I.

Independent Commissions—Their Function in Our Form of Government

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOE L. EVINS
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 26, 1958

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Speaker, in connection with the hearings on the regulatory agencies by the Special Subcommittee on Legislative Oversight, we must not lose sight of the fundamental and basic situation of which the unpleasant revelations of the committee are merely symptoms. That basic situation is simply that some of our independent agencies have fallen under the influence and domination of the executive branch of our Government in contravention of the original intent of Congress in establishing them and the constitutional reservation of the right to regulate commerce by the Congress. Once any agency becomes subject to pressures from others, its capacity for making judicial decisions in the public interest is impaired. Under such circumstances, it is not surprising that the situation now being exposed by the House special committee should exist.

Pertinent to this subject, Mr. Speaker, the Honorable Robert T. Bartley, Commissioner, Federal Communications Commission, in a scholarly address before the Political Study Club of Washington, D. C. pointed out the basic and constitutional issues involved in the present controversy. Because of the pertinence of Mr. Bartley's address, I request unanimous consent to have it reproduced in the appendix of the RECORD. I commend this reading of Commissioner Bartley's address to my colleagues and others.

The address follows:

INDEPENDENT COMMISSIONS—THEIR FUNCTION IN OUR FORM OF GOVERNMENT

(An address by the Honorable Robert T. Bartley, before the Political Study Club of Washington, D. C., April 20, 1957)

The subject of my talk, Independent Commissions, Their Function in Our Form of Government, is one of extreme complexity, largely because our commercial economy is extremely complex.

The independent commissions about which I wish to speak are those which are engaged in the regulation of commerce. There are some 38 commissioners in the regulatory independent commissions who try to see to it that the public interest is paramount in the activities of the industries regulated. The Interstate Commerce Commission lays claim to being the first alphabetical agency. The ICC was created 70 years ago in 1887. The stewardship of the ICC as an independent Commission was such that the pattern was followed by Congress in establishing the Federal Trade, Federal Power, Federal Communications, Securities and Exchange, and the Civil Aeronautics Board.

As I read and study history, I become more and more impressed with the amazing wisdom of the founders of our Constitution. The only satisfactory explanation I have been able to discover for their amazing wisdom is that they were more experienced in

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

the abuses of governmental power. They lived in times of monarchy, feudalism, military dictatorships, colonialism, revolution, and, yes, even anarchy. And sometimes I wonder if they didn't have more time to think about important things that really matter, instead of being busy managing time-saving devices. If you will pardon a personal reference which I think may illustrate what I mean, I believe that I was better prepared for classes when I rode horseback to school than I am today for office work after bucking automobile traffic. I had a nice smart horse that didn't talk back, but a car has got no sense. The point is that I got where I was going and I had had some time to think.

I believe that our Founding Fathers were more aware of the dangers of centralization of power because they saw more of abuses at close range and with more thinking time at their disposal they were able to create our Constitution which provides for all the powers necessary to govern and yet leaves that power in the hands of the governed. Our Government has been termed one of checks and balances. Its powers are, of course, entrusted to the three branches of Government: executive, legislative, and judicial.

Our Founding Fathers, however, did not believe it wise to entrust the regulation of commerce to the executive branch of Government, but lodged such authority as close as it possibly could, as a practical matter, to the people.

The critical section of our Constitution on this subject reads as follows: "The Congress shall have power to regulate commerce with foreign nations and among the several States, and with the Indian tribes."

So, Congress has the sole power to regulate commerce, that is, to prescribe the rules by which commerce is to be governed. Chief Justice Marshall said, "The wisdom and the discretion of Congress, their identity with the people, and the influence which their constituents possess at elections, are * * * the sole restraints on which they have relied, to secure them from its abuse."

The Congress has not only the right to regulate commerce, but it is its duty to see to it that intercourse among the States and the transmission of intelligence are not obstructed or unnecessarily encumbered.

Commerce generally is subject to the antitrust laws but many businesses take on the character of natural monopolies because competition would be wasteful. For example, some cities for a while had two telephone systems. If you desired to talk with anyone in your town who had a telephone, it was necessary to have two instruments and pay for service to two companies. It is deemed by Congress essential that these natural monopolies be regulated as to rates and service.

How then is Congress to cope with so complex a problem as the regulation of rates and services of utilities. Recourse to the courts for damages resulting from monopolistic abuses took years and years for settlement and by the time a decision was final, the economic situation had changed. Members of Congress could not give the time necessary to effectively regulate these interstate corporations whose activities or products were vested with a public interest—these public utilities.

It became evident that it was necessary that Congress delegate some of its powers to regulate commerce to some continuing body in order that such regulation might be effective.

It could have adopted specific and detailed legislation and called upon the Executive to administer the law. But, with the rapid change and development in our economic structure, it was apparent that greater flexibility in legislating rules would be necessary to keep up with progress. And, aware of our Founding Fathers' fear of too much executive power, very few of the powers of regulation over commerce have been entrusted to the executive departments—notably, the antitrust laws. And, even here, the Congress has seen fit to have in addition an independent agency, the Federal Trade Commission.

Furthermore, the Congress was aware of the sensitive nature of the economic beings it sought to regulate and of the damage which could be done by arbitrary or capricious actions by such agency it empowered to regulate commerce. It was also aware of the political influence it could exercise over the people generally.

So, Congress conceived a number of independent agencies. They were to be independent of the executive. They were to have legislative authority in the sense that they could implement the law passed by Congress by the adoption of rules to carry out the intent of the law. And they were to adjudicate cases involving complaints by users against the regulated industry, or decide between contenders for a certificate of convenience and necessity or select among applicants for licenses to engage in the service affected with the public interest. The Congress provided that the courts could reverse any action of one of those agencies which was arbitrary or capricious.

And, finally, and of immense importance was the concept that these independent agencies should be bipartisan. Congress wanted the benefits of our two-party system. It had rejected the idea of delegating these powers to the executive or an executive department or to a single administrator. These commissions were to be composed of an uneven number (like the Supreme Court—and for the same reason—to avoid tie votes). No more than a majority of one to be from the same political party. The concept is that the Commissions should have the benefit of conflicting viewpoints in order that their decisions and actions reflect not partisan political convenience, of whatever party happens to be in power, but that their decisions should be based on the merits as reflected in a record developed through bipartisan participation—just as laws are enacted by Congress. Members of these commissions are appointed by the President with the advice and consent of the Senate for fixed terms.

The six Commisisons which I named earlier are in daily contact with every corporation of any size in the United States. These Commissions regulate the interstate rates and services for such mammoths of industry as the railroads, bus and truck land transportation, aviation, and power and gas. And practically every other corporation of any size comes within the purview of the laws administered by the Federal Trade Commission and the Securities and Exchange Commission.

With respect to the FCC, our rate and service jurisdiction encompasses the world's largest corporation, the American Telephone & Telegraph Co., and its interstate subsidiaries, the Western Union's domestic landline system, and the several international communications carriers.

As a Government official, I simply can't resist giving some statistics. Radio's increasing impact on the daily lives of the American people is borne out by the 1,600,000 authorizations which the FCC has issued in that field—a growth of over 200,000 from last year. Many people do not realize that for each radio and television station which broadcasts programs to the public—some 4,500 broadcast stations thus far—there are 85 times as many radio stations of other kinds, such as those engaged in marine services, aviation, land transportation, police, fire and forestry protection, industrial operations, and common carrier communication services. In these nonbroadcast services, there are more than 1,200,000 transmitters in use. Operators who man the Nation's radio transmitters hold more than 1 million permits of different grades. In addition, there are about 150,000 amateur operator permits.

For the regulation of these industries in the communications field, we have approximately 1,100 employees. One-third of these employees are stationed at monitoring stations throughout the country for the purpose of seeing that users of radio operate in such a manner that they do not interfere with other stations. That leaves around 700 people outside the Commissioner's offices, to handle the application processing, to carry on hearings and investigations, and advise with the Commission with respect to short-term and long-term policy matters.

So far as the Commission's budget for its activities is concerned, I have in the past referred to it as the plugged nickel, which means simply this. The budget for FCC's operations amounts to less than 5 cents per annum per person in the United States. With that plugged nickel, the Commission is supposed to "regulate interstate and foreign commerce in communications by wire and radio, so as to make available so far as possible to all the people of the United States a rapid, efficient nationwide and worldwide communication service with adequate facilities at reasonable charges for the purpose of national defense, and for the purpose of promoting safety of life and property through the use of wire and radio communication." That's lawyer language for saying the public is entitled to fast, cheap communications service.

Notwithstanding the tremendous job which regulatory agencies have to do, they are today quite unpopular. I now understand what Senator McFarland told me the day I was confirmed as a Commissioner when he said "Bob, you are more popular today than you will ever be again."

It is only natural that the regulator would be unpopular with the regulated—if the regulator is doing an effective job. We Americans just naturally react unfavorably to being told "No", even when we understand that must be the answer for the good of all.

One complaint against us, though, is legitimate and gives us great concern. That complaint relates to the delays encountered by the parties in securing decisions.

Remember, one of the reasons for the creation of commissions was to avoid the long delays experienced in court. Now for a long time, these agencies were able to operate in such a way that interested parties received answers expeditiously and the public was, I believe, better served. Remember, too, that even then actions of the Commissions which were arbitrary were reversible in court. But that was not enough for those who lost cases or who, for one reason or another, wanted an impending unfavorable decision delayed. So, gradually over the years, we have seen a whittling away of the powers of these Commissions in providing expeditious service to the public.

Now, one of the reasons for these delays lies in the fact that the personnel force provided for these agencies has remained about the same as before the war; whereas, some of the industries regulated have doubled and trebled in size. Indeed, in the case of television, a completely new complex industry has been born, an industry in which the public has invested some $18 billion in 40 million television sets. To help us execute our duties with respect to the 4,500 Standard, FM and TV stations, our Broadcast Bureau operates on a budget of approximately $1 million with only 160 people. This simply is not an adequate force to handle the innumerable problems in this field with expedition.

I digress for a moment to point out that I am giving you my personal views—not necessarily those of my sponsor. I'm reminded of the book entitled "An Unbiased and Unprejudiced History of the War Between the States—From the Standpoint of a Southerner."

My views here are the result of my own experiences over the last 20 years—during which time I worked in and with independent commissions; on the Hill, where I had an intimate insight into the objectives and intent of congressional committees who passed the laws forming these agencies; as an officer of a licensee of the FCC who could feel directly the impact of administrative regulation; and now—on the other side of the fence—as a member of one of these independent commissions.

Another contributing factor for delay is the recent increase in the laws providing for more "due process."

Let us see how this has come about.

Back in 1938, after Congress had set up a whole administrative pattern of independent regulatory commissions, attempts were made to break down this pattern. James Landis wrote a book entitled "The Administrative Process," in which he pointed out:

"Only a year ago (meaning 1937) a distinguished group of scholars, reporting to the President of the United States—in language hardly indicative of academic restraint—described the independent administrative agencies of the Federal Government as constituting a headless fourth branch of the Government, a haphazard deposit of irresponsible agencies and uncoordinated powers, whose institution did violence of the basic theory of the American Constitution that there should be 3 major branches of the Government and only 3."

Although this frontal attack on independent commissions was defeated, a pincers movement succeeded some years later and resulted in the enactment of the Administrative Procedure Act. I believe Congress was seeking to remedy abuses which had arisen in the functioning of certain agencies within the executive departments which led primarily to this statute—not from abuses in the six agencies I am discussing.

But, even when early bills preceding the Administrative Procedure Act were being considered, there were warnings raised against attempting to remedy abuses by general legislation affecting all administrative agencies. And these cautions were spoken not by partisans of the agencies themselves, but by eminent judges experienced in judicial review of administrative matters, and by members of the bar practicing before administrative agencies. For example, the Association of the Bar of the City of New York, whose committee on administrative law was then headed by John Foster Dulles, put itself on record as disapproving the bills. Its report pointed out that administrative law is an intricate field encompassing numerous agencies dealing with a variety of diverse subject matters; and that no one procedure is adequate or appropriate for the handling of all these different fields.

In summation—what does all this add up to?

We have seen that Congress set a statutory course for independent commissions to follow. It established what it presumed would be a fair and qualified group of people to administer an act on a bipartisan basis. For a long time, and without interference from the executive department, it provided these commissions with adequate funds and personnel to operate effectively. It prevented the courts from interfering with the decisions of the commissions on matters of judgment by limiting the power of review to those cases in which the commission had acted in an arbitrary or capricious manner.

But, what has happened in recent years? The basic intent of Congress in creating independent commissions is slowly but surely being defeated, in my opinion, by the following factors:

First. The executive department has been extending its influence upon independent commissions in a crippling manner through restricting their budget and personnel justifications before Congress—and has been encroaching upon the important functions of certain administrative agencies. In addition, the independent regulatory agencies are required to secure prior approval from the executive department before they submit to the Congress their views concerning legislation affecting their respective agencies and the laws entrusted to them by Congress. Moreover, in certain important situations, the independent agencies must secure the prior approval of the principal legal officers of the executive department in order to petition the United States Supreme Court to review court decisions made against such independent agencies.

Second. The judiciary, through restrictive and hampering interpretations of the law and requisite procedures, has hamstrung the expeditious handling of cases and has apparently indicated in certain decisions an intent to exercise its judgment in place of the commission's. In this connection, it is interesting to note that the Supreme Court has had occasion in a recent case to remind the lower court that the Communications Act must be read as a whole and with appreciation of the responsibilities of the administrative body charged with its fair and efficient operation. The Court also pointed out that the growing complexity of our economy induced Congress to place regulation of businesses like communication in specialized agencies with broad powers; and that courts should be slow to interfere with the agency's conclusions when they are reconcilable with the statutory directions.

Third. And, finally, Congress itself has made it difficult for the independent commissions to function effectively. Through certain basic procedural restrictions (such as the APA) and crippling amendments to the basic statutes (1952 amendments), Congress has followed a trend of removing from members of commissions their latitude of action and exercise of discretion and judgment—which tools, I believe, are essential to a fair and expeditious handling of the complex matters with which we have to deal.

Through these three means—the intervention of the executive, the courts, and through legislative acts themselves, it has become more and more difficult for these arms of Congress to carry out efficiently, effectively, and expeditiously the very policies which Congress itself delegated to them.

The public has a direct and vital interest in the effective functioning of the FCC. All of our actions have a direct impact on the public—from the institution of service by a new local radio or television station—right through the efficient operation of your police and fire departments, public utilities, and industrial companies through the use of radio—all the way to the rates you pay for interstate and foreign telephone and telegraph service.

It is rare, however, with the exception of public utility rate cases, that the public participates directly, or voices its opinions before the Commission. Therefore, as I see it, the Commission must itself represent the public interest in its deliberations. It must, in fact, be an affirmative defender of the public's right to the best possible communication service, in carrying out the mandate of Congress in this branch of commerce.

Currently, more and more Members of Congress are becoming concerned with the declining prestige of the independent commissions and with their declining efficiency. If you read the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, you will become aware of this. If you depend upon the newspapers and radio, however, you will likely find little on the subject—perhaps because it is so complex—and perhaps because they do not think their readers or listeners will be interested. On the other hand, how can the public generally be interested or concerned about something they don't read or hear about. Maybe it's a vicious circle.

It is interesting to note that a recent report by a House Small Business Subcommittee made five recommendations after studying the activities of independent commissions. They take a column in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of March 20, 1957, since they are written in legal language, but basically this is what they say:

1. Authority to name the chairman of these commissions should be placed in the commissions themselves instead of with the executive. For years, the ICC and Federal Trade Commission rotated the chairmanship among their members and this arrangement worked very well;

2. That these agencies should not have to clear their requests for appropriations with the Bureau of the Budget;

3. That they should not have to clear their requests for information from the industries they regulate with the Bureau of the Budget;

4. That they should not have to clear their legislative proposals with the Bureau of the Budget; and

5. They should be allowed to seek Supreme Court review of lower court decisions without having to go through the Solicitor General.

Subsequent to this report, Congress appropriated $250,000 to its House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce to make a study of the manner in which these agencies operate. We should be hearing much more about this study in the next couple of years.

Now, if you were going home by horse and buggy and had plenty of time to think through what I have said here, I believe you would conclude, as I have, that:

First. The Founding Fathers were wise to place the authority to regulate commerce close to the people—in the Congress.

Second. The Congress was wise when it refused to delegate its authority to the executive branch or to an administrator but instead established independent bipartisan commissions.

Third. That needless procedural steps in issuing decisions should be avoided—and where they exist eliminated.

Fourth. That the commissions should be adequately manned to cope with their innumerable complex problems.

Address by Mr. Robert F. Six Before the National Transportation Outlook and Planning Conference, Washington, D. C.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BYRON G. ROGERS

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 26, 1958

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD an outstanding talk made yesterday by Mr. Robert F. Six, president of the Continental Air Lines, with headquarters in Denver, Colo., before the National Transportation Outlook and Planning Conference of the United States Chamber of Commerce in Washington, D. C.

Mr. Six has had more than 25 years experience in air transportation. He points out many problems in air transportation that must be solved.

The address is as follows:

Gentlemen, I am grateful for the opportunity to participate in this panel discussion on the economic outlook and planning for the transportation industry.

My remarks, on behalf of the air transport industry, will be in key with the comment made by Senator GEORGE SMATHERS at the close of the railroad's testimony before his most important Subcommittee on Surface Transportation.

He said, "Our country, its economy, its population, are all moving forward. Changes

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

are inevitable and are, in fact, occurring at an astonishing pace. Transportation, one of the primary factors of our growth and our change, is itself undergoing great change.

"It is important that all of us in and out of transportation must raise our sights and develop a new attitude, a spirit of objectivity and selflessness, if we are to stop the destruction of a vital part of the transportation system and the downward trend of the Nation's economy."

These remarks, intended essentially to sum up the deteriorating railroad situation, are equally applicable to all elements of our transportation complex and particularly to our own industry.

The Government, through its regulatory agencies, is explicitly charged with the fostering and encouragement of the civil-aviation industry.

In measuring the degree to which this encouragement has been carried out, or will be carried out in the future, I like to think in terms of three pertinent yardsticks. They are:

1. Will Government action improve service to the public?

2. Will this action strengthen our international position, particularly with respect to Russia? and

3. Will the Government's action serve to let our free-enterprise system act as a stimulus to the economy?

Using those yardsticks, let's see what's been done.

The airlines, acting in the best spirit of free enterprise, have committed themselves to the investment of more than $2 billion for new jet-powered aircraft. This is an investment that will not only allow the United States airlines to maintain their supremacy, it is an investment that will spread out through the whole economy, creating new jobs, making new skills, and priming the sluggish pump of the current American economy in the healthiest way—through private funds.

First and foremost, then, is the financial health of the industry. That health is tied in directly to fares that we are permitted to charge the traveling public.

Continental, along with 11 other trunk airlines, has asked the Civil Aeronautics Board for fare increases averaging 15 percent. Two weeks ago, the CAB granted an interim 4 percent increase along with a dollar-per-ticket charge.

Many observers felt that this increase would solve our financial problems. Unfortunately, it will not; and let me cite a few figures to illustrate the point. The industry grossed an estimated $1,500 million in 1957. Net profit after taxes and interest was about $25 million. If the 4-percent increase had become effective February 1, the estimated gross for the industry in 1958 would be $1,700 million, of which $45 million would be the net. This means that the combined profit for 1957 and 1958 will be about $65 million, or not much more than $57 million registered in the single year of 1956.

It can be expressed in still another way. The profit margin in 1957 was only 1.57 percent. The increase would bring it up to 2.61 in 1958, which is a long way down from the 4.6 percent of 1956, or the 7 percent of 1952. Again, it should be noted that the estimated gross revenues in 1958 will be more than double those of 1952, but the profit margin will be a good deal less than half.

Besides painting a dreary financial picture, those figures tell a lot more. At a time when the earnings, and cash reserves, of the airlines should be at historic highs to permit the transition into the jet age, we find that they are at historic lows.

Fiscal health, at this time, is vital to our financing of the jets. Where is the money going to come from? We've arranged for some loans and a little equity financing. There is also the cash throwoff from depreciation. We'll be able to pick up some additional funds as we phase out our present equipment. That will still leave us short about $600 million. The remainder will have to come from the earnings that we retain and the additional financing that we can accomplish.

We know that the investing public evaluates corporate securities on the basis of earning power—past, present and potential. In the final analysis, the owner of securities recognizes that an adequate flow of cash earnings to pay interest and to meet sinking fund requirements is his best protection. Absence of strong earnings will tend to destroy investor confidence in a company.

Because of the poor earnings position of the carriers today, it is becoming increasingly and painfully obvious, that there is a flight of capital from the airlines. The common stock of the 12 trunklines are now selling at about 64 percent of their book value while even in the dark days of the industry—1947—they were selling at 155 percent of their book value. From a comfortable high in 1946 of 324 percent over book value, the selling point has dropped and dropped during the last decade.

It's also possible for an airline to raise money by borrowing it from banks or other lending institutions. I say "possible" but at this point our weak earnings make it improbable that we can raise any substantial amount of capital that way. A measure of credit strength is the debt-equity ratio which is simply the relationship between the borrowed money and the owner's money in the business. There should be as much equity money as borrowed money in any company. The electric-utility industry, for example, has a ratio of 1 to 1. Bankers have made it clear to us that they will not be willing to provide debt money to airlines on any more liberal basis.

Using a little simple arithmetic, we soon find that were the entire $1,500,000,000 of outside financing required by the airlines through 1960 to be in the form of debt, a debt-equity ratio of 3 to 1 would result. The investment community has told us that they will not allow the airlines a ratio even close to that figure.

Essentially, then, Government confidence and understanding, through the grant of higher fares, will stimulate our aim to provide better service to the public, improve our international posture, and encourage the free-enterprise aspects of the economy.

But there is another, and more compelling reason, why the airlines must be financially fortified as they take the important step into the jet age. The reason lies on the other side of the Iron Curtain where a going jet air system is now operating, not only within Russia, but from Russia to other countries.

Just recently Russia's Aeroflot began their first service to the West at Copenhagen. They have concluded an agreement with England for reciprocal service and it is becoming evident that the Soviets are showing increasing interest in air service to the United States.

While we fly jets experimentally, they fly them commercially. They have flown their current commercial jet, the TU–104, to our shores three times. The last occasion was early this month when the jetliner landed at Baltimore carrying the new Russian ambassador. Observers predict that by the end of this year, the Soviets will be operating more than 100 new turboprop and pure jet aircraft.

The addition of the jets to the civil air fleet of the United States provides not only a great benefit to the passengers, it promises even greater benefit to the national defense effort. As an example, our military today has not one jet transport on order, but is depending on the airlines to provide the necessary jet air transport airlift.

As part of their planning against a national emergency, the scheduled airlines have earmarked the very best of their present equipment to the Civil Reserve Air Fleet. These planes are available on 48 hours' notice for any global assignment in support of combat forces.

Measured in terms of today and tomorrow, the ton mile lift of the CRAF fleet will be four times greater. In 1957, the capacity of the CRAF fleet was more than two billion miles while in 1961, when the jets on order have been received, the capacity will be more than 8 billion ton miles annually.

We are prepared to move ahead and provide the many benefits that characterize the jet era. We merely need a regulatory climate that will encourage our ambition.

Let us move that yardstick around and apply it to another situation confronting the industry: the user charge. Some critics would have the public believe that we pay no user charge for the airways system and that the air is just one great area of free rides for all. This just is not the case.

Last year, for example, the airlines paid about $25 million, for their share of the Federal airways. They paid this fee through the 2-cents-per-gallon tax that is levied on aviation fuel. I think you will agree that an industry that pays more in user charges than it is able to retain in profits is more than paying its way.

Not content with this contribution, the Government now seeks to increase this tax to the point where it will become practically confiscatory. The proposal now is to increase this tax immediately to 3½ cents per gallon and then increase it by annual increments of three-fourths of a cent per gallon until it reaches the level of 6½ cents. This would mean that by 1962 the airlines would be contributing $167 million a year for the maintenance of the airways.

This figure is so in excess of the most optimistic prediction of the industry's earnings as to be out of sight.

Here again, let the Government assume the responsibility that it has. Let it add up the cost of this new system, both to maintain and operate it. Let it then recognize that the Federal airways are an element of our defense program where a first priority is properly given to military aircraft. Priority rights should carry a premium price tag. Let it then determine on a fair basis how much of the system is used by the airlines; how much by the private flier; how much by the business flier; and, most important of all—what portion of the system's cost should be borne by the military with its thousands of airplanes using this system.

With so much at stake, with so much to look forward to, it is perhaps significant that this year marks the 20th anniversary of the Civil Aeronautics Act. The act sets forth not only the rules by which we live, but through its philosophy, sets the spirit which motivates our most ambitious plans. The philosophy is simply this: The Government, recognizing that a sound air transportation system is vital to the economy and national defense of our Nation, will seek always, and all ways, to foster, encourage, and promote the United States civil aviation industry.

With a mandate like this one to show them the way, we are confident that the Government, and its regulatory agencies, will seek and find a sound and consistent policy that will allow us to improve our service to the public, that will strengthen our international position in the face of Russia's challenge, and that will encourage our free-enterprise system to stimulate the American economy.

In closing, I should like to say that our industry is very encouraged by the Board's recent move in granting the interim fare increase of 4 percent plus $1 a ticket. We sincerely hope that with the wealth of evidence presented in the general passenger fare case, that the Board will in the very near future resolve this case and provide the carriers with an increased fare level adequate to permit earnings that will allow them to compete effectively in the forthcoming jet age.

1829-1880

Appendix

Youth Activities Conference of Wisconsin Department of Veterans of Foreign Wars

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, February 27, 1958

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I was pleased to read in the February, 1958, issue of the Wisconsin Veteran, the official publication of the Department of Wisconsin Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States of America, a description of another of the constructive contributions made by that fine organization in my State, and in the other States of the Union.

I refer, in this instance, to the fourth annual Department Youth Activities Conference, which was held last month as a part of the midwinter conference of the VFW.

The conference heard frank and constructive presentations from leading experts as regards what has been done, is being done, and should be done so as to reduce the problem of juvenile delinquency.

What I like about the conference is its affirmative approach; its recognition of the need for a positive, not a negative, viewpoint toward our youngsters.

The VFW is to be congratulated for its fine work along these lines; paralleling the contributions made by that other great spokesman for the veterans of America—the American Legion.

I ask unanimous consent the front-page article from the Wisconsin Veteran be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

"KEEPING YOUNG FOLKS BUSY" IS THEME—YOUTH CONFERENCE HELD AT MIDWINTER MEETING

BARABOO.—A unique feature of the 1958 midwinter conference was the fourth annual department youth activities conference held on Saturday, January 25. The purpose of the conference was to make an evaluation of the VFW youth programs now carried by many posts and auxiliaries in the State.

Also, the purpose was to urge posts and auxiliaries to expand their programs and also to encourage others to undertake youth activities work.

GEORGE JOHNSON IN CHARGE

Making the arrangements for the conference was George Johnson, Milwaukee, department youth activities chairman. He presided during the session and introduced the various speakers on the program.

Approximately 150 persons attended the discussion period, which was opened by greetings from Duane Peck, Baraboo mayor.

COUNTY JUDGE SPEAKS

The first speaker was Sauk County Judge Robert Golmar, whose father was one of the founders of the famed "Golmar Brothers Circus."

Judge Golmar declared that there was too much emphasis on juvenile delinquency and not enough emphasis on the 95 percent who do not get into trouble.

He told his audience that he was amazed that more youth do not get into trouble, because it is so easy today.

He further stated that in 1957, 93 children were brought into his court—which also has juvenile jurisdiction. He declared that on the basis of his observation there were a number of reasons for youthful delinquency. First and paramount he asserted that if a youngster feels insecure or that he is not wanted, he is apt to get into trouble.

A case in point was that of a child who when an infant was tied to his chair for hours and now, at 15, had been in 16 foster homes, and his basic trouble was that he was angry at his father and mother for abandoning him.

WHAT YOUNGSTERS NEED

Judge Golmar then propounded a query: "What do youngsters need?"

He said that playgrounds are not necessarily good for delinquents, because many of them are retarded, consider themselves outcasts, so in order to show off they get into trouble. He advocated a number of means of alleviating this situation. First, he recommended the increase in number of foster homes. He said that it is very easy to have babies adopted, but no one seems to desire to cope with growing boys. Foster homes, he said, could save many.

Secondly, a traveling psychiatrist in the State could confer with juvenile authorities and assist in rehabilitating many.

Thirdly, he urged the revival of CCC camps.

Fourth, he said that though he might be in the minority he was of the opinion that universal education was the bunk. He asserted that many youngsters can't learn, and should be working.

Finally, he declared that more understanding is needed in this very important area.

In closing, Judge Golmar said that "it isn't a question of children. It is a matter of family." In each instance of a juvenile delinquent, he said, he found that the parents were emotionally disturbed.

MRS. ALLNESS WELL RECEIVED

Mrs. Ada Allness, Viroqua, who is a member of the Governor's Committee on Children and Youth, delivered an interesting talk that was extremely well received by the audience. She complimented the Veterans of Foreign Wars for their tremendous contributions in community service.

"Knowing what my own home town VFW post is doing in community service, I know it is magnified on a statewide and national level," she said.

QUALIFICATIONS GIVEN

In explaining her qualifications to speak on youth problems, she said that she had been a teen-ager, that she lives with three teen-age daughters, and that now, at middle age, she was at a point where she could evaluate in a detached manner the problems of teen-agers.

TEEN-AGERS HAVE PROBLEMS

"Teen-agers," she said, "have many trials and tribulations. Such as what to wear, when to drive, dating, and studying. One reason that we oldsters are critical of young people is that we are envious of the life they lead. And many of the chief critics have forgotten their past."

She took a La Crosse newspaper and pointed to the many news items pointing out the derelictions of the youth. And then she also mentioned that a closer scrutiny would also reveal many fine achievements by the youth of the city, also.

ENVY OF OLDSTERS

"Altogether too often our own discontent and envy causes us to criticize," she said, "for our attitudes quite frequently are based on our own backgrounds."

DUTY TO YOUTH

"Our duty to youth," she said, "is to show the teen-ager that his period of life is the beginning of life—a preparation—and to warn him not to try too many things in a few years. Because there is a long life ahead.

"For after all," she said, "teen-agers have time on their hands, and their problem is to know how to use it. And young people who know how to make use of their leisure time do not have problems."

GROW UP TOO FAST

"Because of our movies, TV, and other mediums of communication, in the modern world a child grows up too fast," Mrs. Allness went on. "It is through groups such as the VFW, the church, the school, that youth can learn in many ways how to take care of his leisure time."

YOUTH'S NEEDS

She concluded by making the following suggestions: First, it is necessary that youth put their leisure time to good use. Second, there is need for responsible adults to give love, affection, and recognition. She was of the opinion because of their military careers VFW members can be of great influence.

Third, an opportunity to participate in group life should be afforded. Fourth, she declared that there is too much of a distinction between youth and grownups—instead of a constant working together. This latter method is being tried, she said, in many communities.

Finally, Mrs. Allness said that opportunities for employment for young people must constantly be evaluated in order to instill confidence in them.

She concluded with this famous saying: "All that is necessary for evil to prevail is for good men to do nothing."

FELDMANN SPEAKS

Senior Vice Commander in Chief Louis Feldmann, who has had experience as a law enforcement officer, said that there was nothing wrong with children. He said that children have always been of some trouble to their parents—and likewise, parents to children. The problem, he felt, is mainly one of interpretation of customs; that adults do not keep up with the times. Thirty years ago, he said, a child spent much more time at home. But as we all know, there has been considerable change because of the tremendous change in the means of communication.

He pointed out the various programs of the national VFW organization—such as

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

sponsorship of marble tourneys, teener baseball, Boy Scouts, and bowling—and urged active post participation. And he said that if we take care of youth, youth will take care of tomorrow.

He agreed with Mrs. Allness that the basic problem emanates in the home.

OTHER SPEAKERS

Other speakers included Elmer Kruger, Eau Claire, who spoke on the VFW department junior rifle program; Elaine Johnson, DeSoto, department auxiliary president, who reviewed some of the activities of the auxiliaries in the field of youth activities, emphasizing the baby sitting schools sponsored by the Viroqua and Middleton auxiliaries; Vernon Olson, department commander, who spoke briefly about VFW community service; Keith F. Genrich of Portage, who explained the teener baseball program; and youth activities Director George Johnson.

PLAQUES AWARDED

Department President Mrs. Johnson and senior Vice Commander in Chief Feldmann awarded plaques to two Baraboo high school students, in recognition of exceptional scholastic records and outstanding service to their community. The recipients were Miss Karen Nelson and William Luethy.

In accepting his award, William declared that Baraboo is fortunate in having a VFW post in the community helping youngsters.

A citation was also presented to junior Vice Commander Orville Scheuerell for his community service attainments as state chairman in 1956 and 1957.

Ten Years—The Czechoslovak Question in the United Nations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN F. KENNEDY

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, February 27, 1958

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, this week marks an unhappy anniversary, for it was on February 25, 1948, that the Communist coup d'etat took place in Prague, marking once again the temporary passing of free Czechoslovakia.

It was during 1948 also that Democratic Czechoslovakia lost its two greatest modern citizens, Eduard Benes and Jan Masaryk.

These thoughts are tempered by the reflection that this year also marks the 40th anniversary of the founding of the Czechoslovak Republic under the inspired leadership of Thomas Masaryk. Unfortunately, we are still witnessing the legacies of the action in 1948, but we are equally certain that the principles and aspirations of 1918 are the enduring ones.

The suffering of the Czechoslovakian people under foreign despotism are all the more grievous when we recall that Czechoslovakia represents one of the oldest European states. It is a country which was long hospitable to a diversity of peoples and ideas, and its cultural roots can be traced more than a thousand years.

To all men of freedom Prague represents a haven and beacon of freedom, and to all men of learning Charles University in Prague, founded in 1348, is one of the great intellectual lodestars of western culture.

Czechoslovakia has never had an easy independence, but it has never lost its identity and sense of freedom.

Mr. President, I hope this week will be one of memory for Czechoslovakia's past greatness and determination for its future redemption.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a memorandum prepared by the Czechoslovak National Council of America.

There being no objection, the memorandum was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TEN YEARS—THE CZECHOSLOVAK QUESTION IN THE UNITED NATIONS

On February 25, 1948, the Communist coup d'etat in Czechoslovakia was accomplished and became successful because it was directed and secured for the Czechoslovak Communists with the aid of the Soviet Army stationed in nearby East Germany and Austria, Deputy State Secretary Valerian Zorin was sent to Prague to observe the fulfillment of Soviet plans.

The permanent representative of Czechoslovakia to the United Nations, Dr. Jan Papánek, wrote a note of protest against Soviet interference in Czechoslovakian state affairs.

On March 10, 1948, report of the mysterious death of Jan Masaryk was received. Ambassador Hernan Santa Cruz helped introduce the Czechoslovak case into the Security Council in the name of the Chilean Government.

On March 17, 1948, the Security Council met. The Soviet delegate, now Foreign Minister of the U. S. S. R., Mr. A. Gromyko stated that the complaint was an invention without foundation and a gross insult. He attacked the Chilean Ambassador, "amoral American newspapers," and Dr. Papánek. But the Security Council voted 9 to 2 to request Dr. Papánek to present his views before the Council. He presented in detail developments in Czechoslovakia and produced additional evidence about the threat of Soviet Army intervention and acknowledgment by Prague Communists of this support.

British delegate, Sir Alexander Cadogan in his statement among other matters declared his conviction that Jan Masaryk made his last desperate sacrifice; he gave his life to prove to all the world that this change had been forced upon his nation. The French delegate, Alexander Parodi said that President Benes is deprived of his freedom of expression, probably guarded and a prisoner of the regime which has taken control of his country.

The United States delegate, Ambassador Warren Austin said that Czechoslovakia was a nation which understood democracy. All the world knows that. Too much has happened which is not in character with the Czechoslovak people and tradition. Too much has happened which bears a striking similarity to what happened in other countries, for the Security Council to be satisfied with perfunctory or categorical denials, or with further red herrings.

Ambassador Santa Cruz closed his forceful address by requesting that a committee be created to investigate what happened in Czechoslovakia.

The Security Council debated the Czechoslovak case during the months of April and May 1948. From that time on it has not taken any action on the Czechoslovak question and it remains an unresolved item on its agenda.

With a view to the furture, the record of the debate on this question in the Security Council will prevent the falsification of history. The Czechoslovak people need never fear the revelation of the truth in this matter. They should on the contrary demand that it be engraved in history, whose memory is more durable than metal.

There is another fact, however, which is pertinent to this. The Communist putsch in Czechoslovakia was prepared and carried out so ingeniously that the stifled outcry of the nation, whose throat had been seized by international communism was not heard abroad. The victims of Communist terror in jails, in concentration and slave camps doomed to slow death, could not cry out.

The Soviet Union did not remove the Czechoslovak question from the agenda of the Security Council with its veto. Unresolved, it remained there and can be taken up again when a suitable opportunity presents itself; when new circumstances or a change in the international situation make it possible.

All who believe in the eventual liberation of Czechoslovakia by new forces of a morally reborn nation, also believe that the debate on the Czechoslovak question in the forum of the United Nations was not the epilog of a suffered defeat, but rather the foreword of a better and brighter future.

Voice in the Wilderness

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH W. YARBOROUGH

OF TEXAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, February 27, 1958

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, it is now clear to one and all that the plight of the family-size cotton farmer in Texas and across the Nation has been worsened by the soil-bank plan. Just how much the soil bank and some other Federal programs have done to kill the family farmer is graphically shown in a recent editorial in one of Texas' outstanding weekly newspapers, the LaGrange Journal. While we do not agree with all of the reasoning, this editorial accurately states the end result.

For those who have not had the opportunity of becoming acquainted with Texas, the city of LaGrange is located in central Texas in the heart of the original Texas cotton belt. It is primarily an area of small property owners—family farmers who have lived generation to generation on their land, and they want to continue living on their farms. But thousands and thousands of them are having to move to town, and leave the land.

The editor of the LaGrange Journal, L. A. Duewall, is a man close to the cotton farmer. He understands and states their problem very well in an editorial in the Thursday, January 23, 1958, edition. His editorial is entitled "Voice in the Wilderness."

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of aforementioned editorial be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

VOICE IN THE WILDERNESS

Hear, oh Washington, the cries of a small town newspaperman in central Texas. Hear the earnest plea of a representative voice of the small cotton farmer.

Why have you continued to let go unheeded the needs of the cotton industry? Why have you continued to surpress the basic unit of American life, the small, family-size farmer? Why have you deserted us?

Your soil bank takes over a half billion dollars a year to operate. It offers Federal pay to the farmers to take cotton and other major surplus crops out of production.

Whom has it helped? Has it helped the family farmer with 5, 6, or 7 acres of allotment? Has it helped the Mississippi State Penitentiary which was paid $71,000 for idling 1,000 acres of cotton? Has it aided the Garvey farms in Colby, Kans., which received $278,187 in soil-bank payments? Has it helped the tremendous problem of overproduction?

Has not the soil bank amounted to little more than a bonus payment to the larger growers at the taxpayers' expense?

Your acreage controls program has failed. What equity is there in acreage controls?

Is there any equity when a man like Monroe Wood, whose farm is located south of Odessa, Tex., grows 191 bales of cotton on a 31-acre block of land, an average of 6 bales to the acre? Compare his acreage allotment with that of a Fayette County producer who does well to grow one-half bale per acre. Where is the equality in that type of system? Where is the justice?

How has the total farm program fared during controls by the Federalists out of Washington? Production has increased, costs of the farm program are the highest on record, while farm income has fallen steadily.

Farm income dropped from $16 billion in 1951 to $11.6 billion in 1957. This drop occurred during a generally increasing income and profits for everybody else. This means that the farmers' costs were higher for the things he had to buy.

Today farmers are leaving the farms in record numbers; the farm debt is the highest it has been in the history of this Nation.

On the cotton front, cotton is in major trouble because of the laws that have encouraged farmers to prosper by not planting, a socialistic concept if we ever saw one. Farmers cannot prosper by not planting. The only way for cotton farmers to prosper is to be allowed the freedom they need to plant, and through ever expanding markets for farm products.

What has happened to the cotton industry during the controls by the Federalists from Washington? United States cotton farmers have been cut back in acreage from 24 million in 1947–49 to 16 million acres in 1955–57. Manfacturers of synthetic fiber production in the United States is up the equivalent to about 11 million bales. Foreign cotton farmers have expanded the planting of cotton and prospered. Foreign cotton production since 1947 is up over 13 million bales.

Who killed cotton as king? The question was answered in a recent editorial in the Houston Chronicle, which said, "The cotton industry is dying in the Southeastern States where once it was king. Thirty years ago, and more, Uncle Sam started to solve the farm problem. Consider the results.

"In 1930, Alabama, Georgia, North and South Carolina planted about 10,500,000 acres of cotton, and produced 4,850,000 bales, or 36 percent of the Nation's total. This year 77 percent of the cotton acreage of these States has been taken out of production. They will grow about 1,500,000 bales (one-third of that grown in 1930), and only 13 percent of the national total.

"Less cotton, fewer jobs. Some 4 million people formerly employed growing cotton have migrated to the congested cities of the North. This year, 30 percent of the already limited acreage went into the soil bank, the latest gadget to solve the farm problem. That means still less cotton in this section next year and still fewer jobs.

"Thirty years of restricted acreage, price supports, and 'umbrellas' over foreign producers have done what could have been predicted."

But that isn't all the story. The real victims of the entire program of controls, subsidy, etc., are the family farmers. They, in effect, have been stripped of their right to work and to make a living, in direct violation of the Constitution.

Not only are the family farmers the victims, but as William Jennings Bryan warned, the cities stand or fall with the vanishing family farmer. The strength of the American people, or any people for that matter, comes from the soil. Towns today are becoming ghost towns; small farms are becoming ranches; and Government is subsidizing large farms.

We fear our way of life is going, and if allowed to continue we fear may cause the people to be open prey to any "ism" which might offer hope.

The situation is more serious than meets the eye.

Let not this be the voice of one crying in the wilderness. Hear, oh Washington, hear.

Funeral Meditation for Joseph Harmon Reass

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHAPMAN REVERCOMB
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, February 27, 1958

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a funeral meditation by the Reverend John F. Streng, who is the pastor of St. James Evangelical Lutheran Church, of Wheeling, W. Va. The funeral meditation was delivered at the burial services for Joseph Harmon Reass.

Joseph Harmon Reass was a distinguished citizen of my State. He was one of the organizers of the American Legion. He was outstanding in his leadership of the American Legion, and was long active in post No. 1 in Wheeling.

There being no objection, the meditation was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FUNERAL MEDITATION

Text, St. Luke 24: 8: "And they remembered His words."

Members of the mourning family, members of the military, and friends, in the Providence of God we are met in this hour to bid farewell to a noble American citizen of sterling Christian character. Joseph Harmon Reass was a faithful member of St. James parish for over half a decade rearing his family in the fear and admonition of the Lord. Joseph Harmon Reass had another claim to fame. He endeared himself indelibly and immortally to millions of blue-blooded American citizens young and old as father and cofounder of the now world-renowned military organization known as the American Legion. Every hamlet, village, city, and metropolis, in our land has felt the tremendous positive impact of this benevolent institution. It has stood guard over the highest standard of patriotism and citizenship through unselfish service to God and country.

Wherever the American flag flies, wherever an ex-service man deserves encouragement, wherever the Constitution of the United States is endangered or in need of constructive interpretation, there comrades gather and unitedly pledge themselves to fulfill a sacred obligation toward God and Government.

When by the grace of God, this young soldier returned to his beloved land, there rose within his heart a burning desire. His love for his country and church moved him to concentrate on finding a way to cement the friendship and fellowship of stout-hearted men, who through united peaceful efforts in American citizenship might help to avoid another world conflict, and conflagration. Thus in 1919 an overseas victory base became the mecca for determined doughboys, who caucused in solemn and serious deliberations that the agonies of war, the memories of misery, and the valor of unselfish comrades living and dead, and the deep convictions of the futility of armed conflict might be indelibly engraven in the minds of generations to come.

Our brother comrade was one of the leaders in that noble enterprise which has so immeasurably determined the destiny of our Nation, under God. Today its international influence has become a bulwark beyond every battlefield in which sleeps the flower of American youth.

Let we forget, these brave men wove into the fabric of American integrity the ingredients of lasting peace and prosperity, based upon loyalty and personal devotion. Let we forget, these brave warriors of yesteryear, willing to sacrifice their last ounce of devotion to save their country from slavery, deserve what little honor we can bestow. God in His mercy will remember them as good and faithful servants.

Centuries ago an inspired penman under the influence of the holy spirit surveyed the miracle of the resurrection of our Lord. He recalled how his Master's intrepid disciples remembered His words of prophetic intent and impact. The authority and authenticity of those prophesies became the basis of their own convictions upon which they established what later became known as the Christian church. Their challenging simple statement was also the creed of the deceased. Of him it can be likewise said: "He remembered His words." And in sacred remembrance of the dying words of many comrades, our now departed brother, returning from the holocaust of hell, together with like-minded veterans, remember that America can remain strong only when her frontiers remain fortified with charity toward all and malice toward none; when family and friends are safe from any foe only because they are united in worship, work, and watchful vigilance.

He remembered too the word of the Lord that "righteousness exalteth a nation"; and: "blessed are the peacemakers, for they shall obtain peace." He saw in the Christian home a fortress that need not capitulate to any enemy without. He saw in the union of thousands of comrades known and unknown a common cause which no sinister philosophy of inferiority or divided national interests could infiltrate.

And now he has been summoned to final rendezvous and reveille in the bivouac of the dead. He has joined that vast throng of emancipated heroes whose roll of honor can be estimated only in terms of eternity. He rests from his labors and his works do follow him. America has lost another illustrious citizen whose foresight and fortitude has strengthened the ramparts we watch. The Lord has taken His servant home as one who came out of great tribulation to wash his robe white in the blood of the lamb. Final taps are sounded for him here; but never

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

ending shall be the trumpet sound amid the welcome victory chorus of the redeemed.

May His memory inspire country and church, family and fatherland to remember his words and deeds in the light of life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness. Amen.

Foreign Aid—How We Look

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD J. THYE
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, February 27, 1958

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "How We Look," which was published in the Washington Post of yesterday. The editorial is most thoughtful and timely, and I believe it will be of value to all readers of the RECORD to have the editorial published in it.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Post of February 26, 1958]

HOW WE LOOK

The searching questions about the United States contained in the letter from a young Vietnamese girl which we published on the front page yesterday have caused considerable consternation in Washington. Some persons assume that the letter was a Communist plant. We are convinced from what we know of the background of the letter that it was not; that the questions are sincere and that they deserve thoughtful answers. Obviously the young lady has absorbed Communist propaganda. But the views which she expresses really pose a challenge for this country to do a better job of making itself understood in Asia.

It is quite natural in a country such as Vietnam, which was long under colonial rule, that people should be suspicious of large groups of Americans who descend upon them. These suspicions are fed by the occasional Americans who are overbearing, who are impatient with the locals and seldom see them except to dispense advice, who live in sumptuous houses and whose chauffeurs imperiously honk for the peasants to scatter. There are relatively few such persons in comparison with the numbers of Americans sympathetically doing their best to help, but they hurt. The effect of such arrogance is compounded by reports of American racial discrimination which are widely discussed among the darker skinned peoples of Asia—although the American information services tried hard to show that the events at Little Rock came about because it was the policy of the United States Government to eliminate discrimination.

Special difficulties arise in Vietnam because of the character of the divided country and its government. Independent Vietnam was born in the war with the Communist Viet Minh. The United States quietly urged France to grant full independence, but to some persons the United States seemed to be alined with the country they regarded as their oppressor. The Geneva armistice left Vietnam split into two parts, and when American advisers replaced French colonial administrators their motives were suspect.

The government of President Ngo Dinh Diem has proved a good bet for American help in establishing stability. Mr. Ngo is an authentic nationalist, and his objectives are praiseworthy. But he has little understanding of the function or importance of a democratic opposition, and there has been an autocratic cast to his regime. The reasons why he resists nationwide elections for reunification have never been fully explained. Part of the task in Vietnam is for President Ngo to take the people more fully into his confidence.

American aid to Vietnam last year amounted to nearly $300 million. Much of this went directly or indirectly into support of the 10-division army maintained against the Communist threat. But there is an impressive showing for economic help—resettlement of nearly a million refugees, a flourishing agriculture, small industries starting up.

It is difficult at best to explain that the primary interest of the United States in extending aid is to assist other countries to maintain their freedom. The quest for markets is easily disposed of; American exports to Vietnam last year amounted to only $75 million out of a worldwide American total of $19.5 billion. But to many Asians the United States unquestionably does seem more interested in signing up anti-Communist allies in the cold war than in helping people for their own sake.

Obviously there is no simpler answer to the young Vietnamese girl, but part of it lies in official American attitudes. Communism, and even the brutal events in Hungary, are something remote from the experience of many Asians. But what the United States has done to help neutral India without strings—and the eloquent thanks of the Finance Minister for pioneering the concept of aid by richer countries to those less fortunately placed—does have meaning in Asian terms.

What the episode really illustrates is that, whatever may be the shortcomings of the American information program, the information people can't do the whole job by themselves. The need is for official actions and statements to reflect an understanding of Asian desires, for recognition by Americans at home that their own conduct is on trial. The need is for American representatives abroad who are trained in local languages, who are willing to live on a modest scale and who can win the trust of the people.

It is particularly fitting that the Vietnamese letter should have arrived at a time when discussion of foreign aid is so current in Washington. Far from regarding this single instance impatiently as a rebuke or a demonstration of ingratitude, administrators and legislators ought to look upon it as a stimulus. We hope that the young lady will receive many answers—and that the appropriate answers will be translated into official policy.

St. Joseph's College Ranks Among Top Five in Nation in Number of Degrees in Physics

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KATHRYN E. GRANAHAN
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 26, 1958

Mrs. GRANAHAN. Mr. Speaker, it was with a great sense of pride that I read recently in the publication of St. Joseph's College, The Hawk, an article reporting that this outstanding Philadelphia institution, located in my congressional district, is among the top five institutions of higher education in the Nation in the granting of degrees to physics majors.

This is a really remarkable record, I believe. St. Joseph's ranked after the University of California, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Harvard, and the University of California at Los Angeles.

I congratulate the Very Reverend J. Joseph Bluett, S. J., the president of this outstanding institution, for its outstanding physics department. Also, Mr. Speaker, in view of the tremendous interest being displayed by our Government and by the Congress, as well as by our citizens generally, in the problem of educating more scientists, this is an achievement, which I believe merits the attention of the Congress.

Consequently, I submit for inclusion in the Appendix of the RECORD the article referred to in the Hawk of St. Joseph's College, as follows:

COLLEGE RANKS FIFTH IN PHYSICS MAJORS

The American Institute of Physics recently announced St. Joseph's College ranked fifth in the Nation as regards the number of degrees granted to physics majors in 1956. This information resulted from a national survey recently conducted by the institute.

Only 18 of the colleges canvassed granted more than 20 degrees in physics to June graduates. St. Joseph's granted 32. The first four schools were The University of California, MIT, Harvard, University of California at Los Angeles.

St. Joseph's has placed every one of its students seeking employment after graduation in industry since the inception of the cooperative program in 1951. The rest of the students have gone on to graduate work in physics, mathematics and engineering.

The physics department is now educating 263 undergraduates at St. Joseph's. Included in this number are 54 sophomore premeds, 100 freshman physics majors and 66 physics majors from the upper classes.

Rev. John O'Connor, S. J. has announced that the physics department has received an anonymous donation of $12,000. Part of this sum will be used to set up a medal for the highest average in physics in sophomore year.

Death of Bob Reeves, Sr., Fighter for Good Government

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RALPH W. YARBOROUGH
OF TEXAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, February 27, 1958

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, while the 85th Congress was in adjournment between its sessions, Texas lost one of her most active workers and fighters for good government. Bob Reeves, Sr., died at Franklin, county seat of Robertson County, Tex., on November 30, 1957.

Utterly courageous, he served for 16 years as sheriff of Robertson County, thwarting one bank robbery in progress with a gun duel, with a bandit.

Bob Reeves managed campaign after campaign for me in Robertson County in our 5-year fight to take the leadership of the Democratic Party out of the hands of its enemies who were seeking its defeat

and destruction. Bob Reeves quietly organized and in the last two campaigns he obtained majorities for us of more than 2 to 1 over the opposition in Robertson County.

His wise, quiet counsel will be missed in our strategy meetings. His leadership will be missed by all the people of Robertson County and the middle Brazos River Valley area. There is none there now to fill his shoes. An oak has fallen in the forest.

Mr. President, the Franklin Texan of December 5, 1957, printed a brief sketch of Bob Reeves, Sr.'s life, with the names of the surviving members of the family. I ask unanimous consent that this account be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BOB REEVES, SR., DIES OF HEART ATTACK SATURDAY

Funeral services were held Monday afternoon at 2 o'clock for Bob Reeves, Sr., 62, former sheriff of Robertson County and mayor of Franklin. He died of a heart attack at his home in Franklin at 11 o'clock Saturday night.

Services were held at his residence with Brother O. C. Hartsell of Springhill, La., officiating, assisted by Brother Weldon Hamill of Mexia, Rev. Verlon Feller, and Brother Lee Faulkner. Songs were rendered by a group under the direction of Henry Ellison of Rockdale.

Interment was in the Franklin Cemetery with Riddle Funeral Home in charge. Active pallbearers were Carl O'Rear, G. W. Holland, Lad Nickelson, Rannell Nickelson, Carl Duffey, J. Lynn Mauk, W. O. (Bud) Baxter and Bill Hamilton. Honorary pallbearers were D. J. Easterly, H. P. Culpepper, Goree King, Clarence Hale, Bill Palmos, W. S. Barron, Robert Lloyd Jackson, Bassett Davis, Damon Newsome, A. G. Scott and Doctors R. W. Huling, Mitchell Brown, Howard Smith, J. G. Sanders and J. B. Barnett.

Mr. Reeves was born on January 26, 1895, near Bald Prairie. He died on November 30, 1957. He was a lifelong resident of Robertson County.

For 14 years, from 1936 to 1950, he served as sheriff of Robertson County. He also served as a deputy sheriff under Sheriff W. A. Nickelson. He was a former mayor of Franklin and at the time of his death was a member of the city council.

Early in life he was in the general mercantile business at Bidge. He also owned extensive ranching interests there. In recent years he was in the insurance business and also owned the Pioneer Motel and Cafe.

Mr. Reeves received nationwide attention for one of his law enforcement encounters. He shot and killed a bank robber during a bank holdup in Bremond on December 23, 1947. Mr. Reeves was deadly accurate with any firearm.

Mr. Reeves was affiliated with the Baptist Church. He was very active in civic affairs, serving as chairman of county bond and Red Cross drives. He was also active in the affairs of the Democratic Party.

Survivors are his widow, Mrs. Oda Boring Reeves, of Franklin; two children, Mrs. Robert E. Ford of Los Angeles, California and Bob Reeves, Jr., of Midland; 5 grandsons, Bobby and Kevin Ford and David, Stacey and Kippy Reeves; and 1 sister, Mrs. Ila Boring of Houston.

The Need for Arctic Research

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, February 27, 1958

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, every Senator no doubt has seen maps and projections portraying the military significance of the Arctic area.

In the event of war—which we hope, of course, will never come—the region over the North Pole might become virtually an aerial highway of bombers and missiles flying in both directions.

Under these circumstances, we can hardly afford to ignore any opportunities to strengthen our security network, so far as early warning systems, guided missile installations, and the like, are concerned.

I was pleased to read, therefore, in the New York Herald Tribune of February 14, 1958, an important article entitled "Lack of North Pole Data Called Peril to Security," written by Ansel E. Talbert, the miltary and aviation editor of that distinguished newspaper.

It told of a new report by an Arctic Research Advisory Committee, which stated grimly that the United States would practically invite a scientific Pearl Harbor if it failed to appreciate the full importance of the Arctic area.

The report confirmed the warnings, which have been presented for a number of years, by one of America's great polar aerial pioneers, the famous Col. Bernt Balchen.

Unfortunately, Colonel Balchen's warnings, like the warnings of other prophets of aviation, have not been sufficiently heeded.

So, too, the longtime stress by the late Rear Adm. Richard E. Byrd, concerning the significance of the Antarctic, has likewise not been sufficiently heeded.

Under these circumstances, I appeal once again for action on the Senate and House sides on the Wiley-Richard E. Byrd Commission bill, so as to establish a continuing organization which would protect America's national security in both the Arctic and the Antarctic.

I earnestly hope that both polar regions may be used for man's progress. I hope that out of them will come a tremendous wealth of scientific data which would be usable by all nations.

But I cannot close my eyes to the primary needs of my own country—the need basically for national survival.

I ask unanimous consent that the article from the Herald Tribune be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LACK OF NORTH POLE DATA CALLED PERIL TO SECURITY

(By Ansel E. Talbert)

The United States and Canadian Governments have just been warned by their joint Arctic Research Advisory Committee that scientific information available on the strategic north polar basin is so seriously inadequate as to endanger North American security.

Unless the two nations meet the situation, according to the Committee, we will invite a scientific Pearl Harbor.

The committee, composed of 20 outstanding scientists and military men of the 2 nations specializing in Arctic research and tactics, says that operation of atomic-powered submarines and atomic icebreakers at the top of the world soon will be no novelty. In a report that pulls no punches, the committee members state that expanded Arctic research is essential in the face of large-scale, intensive, and competent Arctic research and development being pursued by the Soviets without fanfare. It almost certainly will have reverberations in Congress and the Canadian Parliament.

NEED FOR MISSILE SITES

After recalling that America's atomic-powered submarine *Nautilus* recently traveled under the Arctic icepack to within a few miles of the North Pole—and was prevented from continuing only by a minor communications antenna failure—the report notes that defenses must be planned now against Soviet submarines which could make similar trips.

The committee members believe there should be an immediate study of the feasibility of establishing intermediate-range-ballistics-missiles bases, not only on land in the high north of North America, but also on the Arctic Ocean icepack. They also recommend establishment of a policymaking Office of Assistant for Arctic Research in the United States Defense Department and a completely integrated program of American and Canadian Arctic research pushed with all possible speed. Their report further says:

"The concept that the Arctic is a barrier to an aggressor is no longer tenable—the Arctic is a highway to those who have the wit to use it. We cannot depend on superiority over the adversary in numbers, in physiological or mental toughness, or in heavy industry. The free world's only certain sword and shield is superiority in basic knowledge and spirit * * *.

"The Arctic's true military potential can only be transformed to the dynamic by means of studies specifically oriented to the problem."

In addition to representatives of the United States Air Force, Army and Navy, and Defense Department, the committee membership includes others representing American and Canadian scientific institutions, the Canadian Joint Staff and the Arctic Institute of North America, which has offices in both Nations.

The joint committee originally was organized at the request of Rear Adm. R. B. Bennett, Chief of Naval Research of the United States Navy. Many of its warnings and findings confirm those made in Washington during the past several years by Col. Bernt Balchen, famed Arctic and Antarctic pilot and explorer, before his retirement from the Air Force.

BALCHEN URGES ACTION

Colonel Balchen told this correspondent about the report: "Its recommendations are splendid, but they should have been carried out years ago * * * let us hope they now are adopted without further delay."

Colonel Balchen and the members of the Arctic Research Advisory Committee feel that a joint American-Canadian push northward involving specialized Arctic units equipped with missiles and other nuclear weapons would threaten the Soviets with a relatively invulnerable offensive force remote

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

from our own heartland and relatively close to their own offensive Arctic deployment.

In emphasizing the Soviet Union's historic interest and preeminence in the Arctic regions, the committee report pointed out that Soviet bases already are deployed along thousands of miles of the coastline of Siberia and that scores of Soviet scientific parties were working on the ice pack itself on both sides of the Pole.

The report asserts that Soviet submarines, not necessarily atomic-powered at present, but with under-ice capabilities in all likelihood explore the North and east coasts of Greenland and (Soviet) reconnaissance planes already probe the high latitudes of the Western Hemisphere. Before writing it, the committee made a tour of present Arctic bases in Canada, Alaska and Greenland.

National Guard Cuts Opposed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HERMAN E. TALMADGE
OF GEORGIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, February 27, 1958

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, 79 members of the Headquarters Company of the 48th Armored Division of the Georgia National Guard, stationed at Macon, Ga., have wired me expressing their wholehearted opposition to proposed cuts in the strength of the National Guard. I ask unanimous consent that their telegram be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the telegram was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MACON, GA., *February 25, 1958.*

Hon. HERMAN E. TALMADGE,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:

We wholeheartedly oppose suggested reductions in the National Guard and urgently solicit your help in our fight to maintain a strong National Guard ready to deter any aggressive force.

Headquarters Company, 48th Armored Division: Louis White, Samuel Dennard, Bryan Howard, Alfred Underwood, Hubert Williams, George Willis, Frank Groce, Evan Lewis, Walter McGraw, John Donald, Harrold Dupree, Bobby Pritchett, Charles Renfoe, David Adams, Elmer Griffin, James Hutto, Louis Ray, Ronald Sharpe, Herbert Simpson, James Smith, James Wade, William Darley, Clark Sauls, James Spear, Edwin Anderson, Hansel Averett, Cordia Barbee, James Donald, Richard Haralson, Thomas Haynes, Hodge Malone, George Meadows, Warren Meadows, Phillip Usen, William Pender, Bobby Sands, Kary Wey, Jackie Amerson, Walter Amerson, Leonard Avera, Charles Buffington, Melvin Foskey, Raymond Huff, Robert Jones, Joseph Kelley, Will Melvin, Bobby Mines, William Mines, Charles McCuen, Bobby Nelson, Elbert Parker, Tommy Rhoden, James Richardson, David Sanders, James Shepard, Francis Swann, James Thompson, Bobby West, Oscar Woodward, Robert Ard, Roland Cromer, Alton Everidge, Larry Howell, Jerry Joyner, Billy Jones, Alton Kimsey, Charles Pritchett, Talmadge Ryals, Chauncey Smith, John Smith, Roger Taylor, Therom Watson, Riley Windham, Vernon Bray, Clifford Hooten, James Hubbard, Charles Jiles, Richard Little, Jimmy Hutton.

Indian Treaty Payments Should Not Be Taxed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD L. NEUBERGER
OF OREGON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, February 27, 1958

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, the Federal Government is starting to reimburse members of the Pacific Northwest Indian tribes for abandoning the historic fishing rights at Celilo Falls on the Columbia River so that the great multiple-purpose dam at The Dalles site may become a reality. Eventually, tribal members will receive about $25 million for the rights they established through treaty agreement with the United States Government.

It now appears that the Bureau of Internal Revenue seeks to levy a capital gains tax on individual tribal members for income they receive from reimbursement. I do not believe there are grounds in justice and equity for such a levy. The Indians reserved these fishing grounds to themselves through a treaty with our Government. The Indians did not initiate the action through which the fishing rights were eventually canceled by the Federal Government. They are realizing the $25 million reimbursement on a more or less involuntary basis. The fishing grounds were needed for the dam reservoir area. Moreover, how is the capital gain to be evaluated? Who is to say that the fishing rights had a value of less than $25 million when originally acquired through treaty? I do not think the tribal members should be subjected to this levy, despite the absence of any specific legislative tax exemption for the Celilo fishing rights.

An excellent article on this subject recently appeared in the Oregonian for February 24, 1958, written by that newspaper's Washington correspondent, Mr. A. Robert Smith. So that the Senate may have the benefit of additional information on this matter, I ask consent to have the article printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TAX MEN SEEK SHARE OF INDIAN INDEMNITIES
(By A. Robert Smith)

WASHINGTON.—Uncle Sam's tax collectors are trying to get a share in those payments which the Government is now making to four Northwest Indian tribes who suffered by the flooding of the Celilo Falls fishing grounds. The Bureau of Internal Revenue's Seattle office has ruled that the individual members of the Umatilla, Yakima, Warm Springs and Nez Perce tribes, who collectively will be in line for about $25 million, will have to pay a capital gains tax.

The Bureau of Indian Affairs, from its Portland area office on up to the Indian Commissioner, are opposing the tax collectors on this one and siding with Indians. The Commissioner of Internal Revenue ultimately will have to decide the issue, but if the decision goes against the Indians, they are expected to go all the way to the Supreme Court if necessary in fighting the decision.

The Umatilla tribe is the first to have received any of its share—which totals $4,616,971—in the form of a check for $1,500,000 the end of January. The balance is to be issued later. The Yakimas are due about $15 million, the Warm Springs about $4 million, and the Nez Perce tribe about $3 million.

All had treaty rights in the fishing sanctuary at Celilo Falls on the Columbia River, which was inundated by the reservoir behind the Dalles Dam, now nearing completion.

Internal Revenue has had mixed success in trying to tax Government payments or the profits from property of Indians. In some historic cases, the courts have backed up the Indians, which is what the Northwest tribes are now relying upon.

The tax collectors argue that all citizens are subject to the income tax. Attorneys for the Indians contend that when the Federal income tax was adopted in 1913, Indians weren't yet citizens. They were granted citizenship in 1924.

The income tax now applies to all Indians who are out on their own, without dispute. The quarrel concerns those still in trust status who may receive certain unusually large benefits that would put them into a taxable bracket.

This is one problem, at least, that is settled respecting the Klamath Indians and their valuable property. Assuming some plan is allowed to take effect within a few years by which the tribal members are separated from Federal trusteeship and allowed to cash in their share of tribal assets if they wish, they will each be in line for a sizable payment.

Based on the Interior Department's appraisal of tribal assets, they will be eligible for nearly $60,000 each.

The Klamath Termination Act declares that "no property distributed under the provisions of this act shall at the time of distribution be subject to Federal or State income tax. Following any distribution of property made under the provisions of this act, such property and any income derived therefrom by the individual, corporation, or other legal entity shall be subject to the same taxes, Federal and State, as in the case of non-Indians."

This language should certainly protect the Klamaths from the treatment the tax collectors are giving the Umatilla, Yakima, Warms Springs, and Nez Perce Indians. Since these latter tribes have no such iron-clad legal protection, it would appear only fair that the Eisenhower administration unite behind the principle of protection which the Indian Bureau is advocating.

After all, was there a tax collector stationed at Celilo Falls to assess the Indians for the number of salmon they caught

George Washington, 1732–99

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN JARMAN
OF OKLAHOMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 26, 1958

Mr. JARMAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include in the RECORD a sonnet in memory of George Washington, by Dr. Glen Levin Swiggett.

GEORGE WASHINGTON, 1732–99

(By Glen Levin Swiggett)

Why do we not hold always in our thought
This man who is the symbol of a free
America and of that liberty
Which freedom-loving Pilgrim Fathers sought,
And for which, men of peace, they bravely fought?
Why not hold to the principles that he
Steadfastly held, and let the whole world see
We try to live by rules that he has taught?

The memory of this man we must not let
Fade from our lives as we now enter on
Adventures perilous to his concept
Of a free nation, nor must we forget
That by example, not by gifts, are won
Such nations' friendship as we should accept.

Appeal of American Citizenship to Foreigners

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK CHURCH
OF IDAHO
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, February 27, 1958

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, inscribed on the Statue of Liberty are these words which give voice to the American dream:

Give me your tired, your poor,
Your huddled masses yearning to breathe free,
The wretched refuse of your teeming shore.
Send these, the homeless, tempest-tost to me.
I lift my lamp beside the golden door.

The dream still lives, Mr. President. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a letter written to me by one who passed this statue a little more than 5 years ago, with his grandparents and orphaned younger brother, on the way to the lakes and pines of Bonner County, Idaho, and I ask that my reply be printed immediately following the letter.

There being no objection, the letters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SANDPOINT, IDAHO, *February 18, 1958.*

Hon. FRANK CHURCH,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. SENATOR: Today I have been to Coeur d' Alene where, in the Federal Building, I was fortunate enough to pass the naturalization examinations so that I may be sworn in in April as a citizen of this city, county, and State, and of the United States. Now the way is open for me to explore those benefits of democracy of which I have heard and dreamed for years.

Though I have not yet been sworn in by the Federal judge, I am so pleased at today's success that I want to write to someone about it before I sleep tonight. And I think it fitting that I write and thank you and your Members of Congress who by your laws have made possible this wonderful miracle of saving us former central Europeans from the ghastly living death of the Communist machinery. Your liberal laws dealing with us who were once displaced persons have given us a new lease on life and a determination to be of devoted service to this new land of our adoption.

When I celebrated my 18th birthday last October, like other youth I quickly registered with the draft board. But the 18th birthday also meant that I could make formal application to begin the processes of becoming a naturalized citizen. So in short while my maternal grandparents (who brought me to America) and I had made out our preliminary papers, fingerprints, etc. We had been residents here for 5 years last April; so that requirement was taken care of. My younger brother and I had easily learned English in the schools, but the language and knowledge of civics did not come so easily to my grandparents, both of whom are past 50 years of age. You can imagine how happy I was that they as well as myself were able to pass today's examinations so that we all three can be made citizens together next month.

And now that I am almost a citizen I am wondering whether the privilege of attending the United States service academies is available as readily to naturalized citizens as to native born citizens. I know it may be nearly a year early for me to ask that question, but I must plan ahead. I am very interested in what I have heard and read and studied about the Naval Academy at Annapolis. I have been told that to get information and permission to attend I must address either a Senator or Representative from Idaho to Washington, D. C. As you are the youngest of our congressional people from Idaho, it occurs to me that you may be interested in the problems of youth and their education and would be willing to inform me as to the channels for getting more information about how to apply for a Naval Academy appointment for entrance in the summer of 1959 class.

I am past 18 years old and am in fine physical health. I am in my junior year at Sandpoint Senior High School and have been on the school honor roll every semester of my junior and senior high school thus far.

I am president of the junior class and am vice president of our Sandpoint Chapter of the Future Teachers of America.

I have been active in all branches of athletics up to this year. This year I have had to work in the bus station and newsstand 4 hours each afternoon and evening and all day on Sundays. That cuts out the athletics but still permits me to get to club and association meetings and our math seminar and such things.

For practice I have taken one administering of the college board exams and hope to take the merit scholarship exam that is to be given later this spring.

That gives an outline of some of the things I have been doing these past 5 years and 10 months since we came past the Statue of Liberty and took the train out here to Bonner County. I shall be glad to furnish any other details that may be of interest to you in case you could and would consider me as a possible candidate for nomination on your quota next year.

After my freshman year of high school, I attended on scholarship the honor students summer camp on the campus of Montana State University at Missoula. That helped me in gaining greater ease with my reading and speaking of English. If I earn enough this year, I hope to spend some time next summer taking some more additional academic work of similar sort.

I think my major interest in college will be electronics and engineering. My school grades have been straight A's for the high-school record up to the past semester when I slipped back to a couple of B's to mar my record. If I can get those grades up and pass the competitive exams with good scores, I shall hope to get scholarship aid for college attendance. If I can present physical and mental qualifications good enough to win appointment to and attendance at one of the Service Academies, then I can really get a good education and put my accomplishments to real service in the United States to which I already owe a great debt.

I shall be glad for any advice or assistance you may be able to give me in line with the rambling inquiry I have been making.

I shall also be glad to furnish names of any references that you may require before considering my requests further.

Thank you for your kindness.

Sincerely yours,

JACK BACKES,
(Formerly: Jack Zellenkowitsch; now: Jack Backes.)

P. S.—Since being saved from the concentration camp by my maternal grandmother, I had taken my mother's maiden name; but now as part of Naturalization I have had my surname changed to Backes, the last name of our father who died in the Tito concentration camp 11 years ago this month.

FEBRUARY 26, 1958.

Mr. JACK BACKES,
Sandpoint, Idaho.

DEAR JACK BACKES: First, I want to tell you how moved I was to read your letter. Yours has been an experience which leads you to value our democracy and its traditions to a high degree, and you are to be commended on the tremendous progress you have made since you came to the United States.

I am eager to assist you in your desire to attend one of the service academies. Because I feel that any worthy young man in Idaho, who can qualify, should have an opportunity to be considered for appointment to one of the service academies, last year I established this program. I have the Civil Service Commission give competitive examinations at several convenient locations in our State to assist me in making my nominations to the Army, Navy, Air Force, Coast Guard, and Merchant Marine Academies. Another such examination will be given in July of this year. If you will fill out the enclosed personnel form and return it to me, I will see that you are notified well in advance of the time and place where you can take the exam. Also enclosed is a sample questionnaire which will indicate the scope of the exam. Under separate cover I am sending you catalogs from each of the service academies in order that you can study their requirements and programs.

Congratulations, too, to you, your brother, and your grandparents upon becoming citizens. I welcome you and I am certain that our country, our State, and the city of Sandpoint will benefit from having residents who understand from firsthand knowledge the terrors of communism, and who, as a result, place an especially great premium on freedom.

Sincerely,

FRANK CHURCH,
United States Senator.

Congress and Foreign-Aid Funds

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STYLES BRIDGES
OF NEW HAMPSHIRE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, February 27, 1958

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article from the Washington Evening Star of February 21, 1958, written by Constantine Brown entitled, "Congress and Foreign-Aid Funds—Appropriations for

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

Yugoslavia, Poland, and India Expected To Stir Fight." I think this article deserves congressional attention.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CONGRESS AND FOREIGN-AID FUNDS—APPROPRIATIONS FOR YUGOSLAVIA, POLAND, AND INDIA EXPECTED TO STIR FIGHT

(By Constantine Brown)

There was an inevitable revulsion among rank-and-file Senators and Representatives when they read President Eisenhower's message asking for another $4 billion for foreign economic and military aid.

With the cost of living creeping upward, high taxes, and an uncertain economic situation at home, it is only natural that the legislators—and particularly the Republicans, who face an uphill struggle next November—should wonder how the American people will feel if they are burdened with another $4 billion in expenditures abroad.

It was recognized, however, that there is some merit in the Chief Executive's claim that much of this outlay is intended to strengthen our own national defense. This theme song has been repeated since 1950. In those 8 years we have contributed $38 billion for that purpose. Yet only a few months ago we heard loud laments from our defense experts that America and her allies are weaker than the U. S. S. R. and her satellites. Moreover, our allies in Western Europe, while accepting the American taxpayers' dollars, play the international game to suit their own interests and are revising downward their defense potential.

Senate and House leaders of both parties feel, however, that after some pruning of the administration's estimates they will be able to obtain approval of a satisfactory foreign-assistance program on a selective basis. This means that Congress itself, will single out the recipients and how much each of them will receive.

The administration is asking, for instance, $1.8 billion in direct military assistance for its allies. This means actual weapons. This amount will be seriously debated. It is natural that our active allies (Turkey, Vietnam, Nationalist China, and South Korea) should receive sufficient arms to permit them to resist any kind of aggression by either the U. S. S. R. or Communist China. They do not have the means to produce weapons—except Turkey, which can manufacture small arms but not heavy equipment or planes. Neutralism is unknown either to the government or people of these nations, although they are directly under the guns of the enemy. The administration is endeavoring to whittle down the ground forces over the protests of their respective governments. On the other hand, our Western European allies who have an industrial potential as good as ours are in a position to provide their own armament. Instead, these allies, such as Britain, are cutting down the conventional forces and expect us to provide them with guided missiles. The best they are willing to do for the common cause is to provide the necessary sites for our prospective IRBM's.

Germany could produce as good if not better nonconventional weapons than ours at cheaper cost. But the Bonn Republic's admission to the NATO was accepted by France and the other European members of the coalition with the provision that she will not be allowed to manufacture such weapons. She is, in fact, a second-class member of the coalition because of the fears of the West Europeans that she might become once more a military power.

Under present world conditions, it is felt in Congress, all free nations which are aware of the Communist threat and wish to resist it should do their utmost to face the situation and not leave it to George (in this case Uncle Sam) to do the job. Judging by the present mood of Congress the chances are that there will be some substantial trimming of the $1.8 billion asked by the executive.

There will be little room to slice the indirect military support of 12 associated nations. Seventy-five percent of the proposed $835 million is earmarked for South Korea, Nationalist China, Vietnam, Turkey, and Thailand. The majority of the legislators favor continued support to these countries. Neither is there much likelihood that the amount of $212 million for assistance to Morocco, Libya, and other recently born countries to help sustain their stability will be cut to any substantial degree. We have important air bases in Morocco and Libya.

The economic development assistance amounting to $626 million and the President's contingency fund of $200 million are expected to be among the most controversial items of the 1959 foreign-aid program. It is believed by the suspicious-minded legislators that the administration intends to use these sums totaling $826 million of the taxpayers' money to provide countries such as India, Yugoslavia and Poland with the assistance which Congress would otherwise deny them.

Heated debates are inevitable on the floor of the Senate and House after the respective Appropriations Committees bring out the bill.

Soil-Bank Program

SPEECH
OF
HON. MARTIN DIES
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 25, 1958

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H. R. 10881) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1958, and for other purposes.

Mr. DIES. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, when this matter was before the House last year the majority of us voted against the soil-bank program because this was generally conceded to be an unsound, unworkable, and harmful program. There was very little said in its behalf, but there was a great deal of information given to the House in reference to the many abuses of the program. It appeared to be the general consensus of opinion that a great deal of money had been wasted and that the farmers had received no real benefit from it. There was a well-grounded fear that its passage would alienate the sympathy of the nonfarm population to the extent that in time all farm programs would be scrapped.

When the bill went to the Senate the soil-bank program was restored in conference. Now we are told that the $500 million allocated to the program is insufficient to take care of the applicants because the Agriculture Department miscalculated with respect to the number of applicants and have refused to reallocate the $500 million among all qualified applicants. Because of this refusal on the part of the Agriculture Department, we are told that we must appropriate an additional $250 million for a program which is generally regarded as unsound. It is conceded that the Agriculture Department can now reallocate the funds so as to give all the applicants their fair share. But since the Department refuses to do this, we are told that we must increase the original appropriation.

Mr. Chairman, if this argument is valid, the Congress is at the mercy of the various agencies of the Government. All that any agency need do is to ignore the amount authorized by Congress and come back for a supplemental authorization. To me this appears to be extremely dangerous. More and more Congress is becoming a rubberstamp. During the 20 years I have served in this body, Congress has lost much of its prestige and power. The blame can be placed at our own door. The Department of Agriculture knew that Congress had limited the funds authorized to $500 million. There was no excuse for the Department of Agriculture to administer the act in such a way as to exceed this limitation. The farmers knew that there was only $500 million available for this program; no one was deceived. The only fair way for the Department to proceed at this time is to reallocate the funds but to stay within the amount which Congress authorized. We can compel them to do so by a simple resolution.

If this were a sound and constructive program, we might be justified in increasing the authorization, but no one thinks that it is sound. No one can defend it. If it is right to spend our children's earnings to pay people not to work land, then it is equally right to spend their money to pay people not to work in factories, in offices, or anywhere else. If this program is justified as a means of reducing farm surplus, why would not the same kind of program be justified in reducing labor surplus? We now have some four or five million surplus laborers. Would anyone suggest that we have the right to eliminate this surplus by paying 5 million laborers in America not to work? The principle is the same. It is frequently said that we have too many lawyers. Would it be right to pay the surplus lawyers not to work?

The ultimate effect of this kind of legislation is to destroy any hope we have of establishing a sound and workable farm program. The farmers need all the friends they can get because they are in a minority. You cannot win friends for the farmers by taxing people to pay farmers not to work land. Heretofore, the payments made to our farmers were based upon sound conservation principles. If the farmer received money from the Treasury, he was required to do something to build up his land for the benefit of future generations. You must remember that future generations must pay the bill because we are now operating on deficits as well as taxes. Have we any right to bequeath the burden of debt to future generations unless we give them some benefit in return? There is nothing more important to them than the conservation of our soil. It is not right to take money from one citizen who is compelled to work to earn the money in

order to give that money to another citizen for not farming land.

I know that there have been more abuses in connection with this soil-bank program than in connection with any agricultural program that I have seen in the past 30 years. It is a fact that can be verified in every community that there are people who use this program to buy land. Think of how unfair and utterly ridiculous it is to tax the American people for a program that enables some people to buy land without doing any work. As far as I am concerned, I am tired of being taxed for such purposes when I know that the farmer is not being benefited by it. I voted against it last year. The Senate put it on. Now I am told that regardless of my vote last year and the fact that based upon honest convictions I could not support it, I ought to vote for it this year because employees in the Department of Agriculture refused to follow the law. Of course, if they can do this in connection with this authorization, they can do it in every other instance. Congress distinctly said, "We are going to authorize $500 million for this program, and that is all." The Department knew that. It was plain understandable language. If any department of government can bring about an increase in appropriations by disregarding the law or through mistakes, then we are at the mercy of the departments.

It certainly seems to me that since the Congress limited the amount to $500 million, the Department ought to be compelled now to allocate that money among all the qualified applicants. They can do it. Of course, it may make some people angry, but my observation is that most of the farmers think we are crazy because we passed the measure in the first instance. The average farmer knows that it is not right. You and I know that it is not right. It is not right and never will be right to tax people who have to work for a living in order to give it to somebody for doing nothing, absolutely nothing. If you can do it for the farmers, you can do it for the independent merchant; you can do it for everyone else in our economy. We have come to the time that our Government has forgotten the vast unorganized segment of our population in America, the millions of people that are not organized and do not have a lobby, and are not able to exert influence. They are the ones who are paying the bill.

Since I have been in Congress, I have supported sound and honest farm programs and I shall continue to do so, but I will not suport a program which says to a man, "All you need do is let your land lie idle." The farmer has an honest case for parity because he is compelled to buy in a closed market and sell in an open market. Many of the products that he buys are produced by industries which are protected from foreign competition by the tariff. Furthermore, many industries are able to stabilize their prices which the farmer cannot do.

I do not believe that the farmers favor this program. Naturally, every farmer is going to try to get his share of it, but that does not mean that he favors it. I think that what he wants is equality of opportunity with all other producers. He wants his fair share of the national income He cannot survive if he is compelled to sell his products at low prices and pay high prices for the things which he must have.

This soil-bank program is not any answer to the farm problem. It is purely political. But we do not have the money to indulge in politics.

A Pitch for Trinity

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES B. UTT
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 27, 1958

Mr. UTT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I would like to insert the following article entitled "A Pitch for Trinity," which appeared in the February issue of Western Water News, San Francisco, Calif.:

A PITCH FOR TRINITY—FARM BUREAU GIVES WATER USERS' POINT OF VIEW

In a statement presented to the Subcommittee of the House Committee on Interior Affairs during the hearings on the Trinity River Power development program, the American Farm Bureau brought clearly into focus the warter users' interest in the program. The statement was presented by A. L. Andersen of Colorado and Louis A. Rozzoni, president of the California Farm Bureau Federation—both members of the Board of the American Farm Bureau Federation.

Public Law 386 of the 84th Congress authorized construction of the Trinity division of the CVP as a Federal project. However, it contained a proviso authorizing and directing the Secretary of the Interior to make engineering studies and conduct negotiations with any non-Federal agency with respect to proposals to purchase the falling water. The Secretary conducted the studies and negotiations as directed and reported to the Congress under date of February 12, 1957. The Secretary recommended joint development of the waterpower resources of the Trinity division by the United States and the Pacific Gas & Electric Co.

SUPPORT JOINT DEVELOPMENT

Andersen told the committee that the factual data had been analyzed by the Farm Bureau technicians and that the fundamental data on which the proposed legislation is based had been accepted by the various agencies interested in the development program.

The Farm Bureau statement emphasized the importance of the original intent of the Congress in connection with water and power development. The committee was told that "the Congress in passing this act laid great stress on the statutory role of electric power for assisting irrigation and other objectives of the project. To definitely fix the place of electric power in this project Congress, after stating the primary purpose of the project, went on to say that electric power revenues were to be used 'as a means of financially aiding and assisting such undertakings.'"

HIGH VALUE ON FALLING WATER

On the value of falling water the statement was made that "in the proposed agreement for joint development the Pacific Gas and Electric Co. proposes to pay the United States an average payment of $4,600,000 annually for use of the falling water. This annual payment to the United States would be equal to more than $5 per acre-foot for the water used in power generation—water which is not consumed in the process of producing electric energy, but which is fully available downstream for sale in the various units of the Central Valley project for irrigation purposes. For example, Central Valley project water is sold in the San Joaquin Valley for $3.50 per acre-foot.

"According to the report of the Secretary of the Interior dated February 12, 1957, this schedule would contribute to the CVP during the 50-year contract period $165 million more than the Government would receive from Federal development of the Trinity Division. It is clear that the interest of water users is to obtain from Trinity the maximum contribution to Central Valley project that the marketability of the power will warrant, and that this objective will be furthered by private development. It is, of course, recognized that any estimate of this nature may necessarily be modified by other developments such as construction of the San Luis unit of the Central Valley project."

IMPACT ON CVP

Andersen called attention to the report of the Secretary of the Interior which advised the Congress that "under the present Central Valley rate structure the Trinity Power facilities, if built by the United States, would require substantial assistance from other project revenues in order to meet repayment requirements." He asked the question "Why should the users of water and power on the various units of the Central Valley project be required to pay or help pay for the Federal Trinity power plants? We believe this would defeat the purposes as declared by Congress in enacting the Central Valley Project Act of 1937."

BIG TAX PAYMENTS

Under the proposal of the power company, tax payments will approximate $83 million to the Federal Government and $62,600,000 to State and local government.

Noting this situation Andersen said: "Considering tax payments to Federal, State, and local governments and the increased revenues to the Central Valley project from the sale of falling water, joint development of the Trinity division would provide additional total revenues of $310 million above all-Federal development during the 50-year contract period.

"We recognize that under certain assumptions, the preference customers, most of whom are located in one city, would be required to pay more for electric power than under all-Federal construction. This additional benefit to a small group of preference customers must be compared to the total benefits to be derived from joint development. We believe that the benefits from joint development to farmers as water users in California and as taxpayers throughout the Nation far outweigh the subsidy that would be enjoyed chiefly by the residents of one city in California."

Concluding that taxpayers cannot be expected to supply all of the billions which will be required for the contemplated program of water and power development in California, Andersen stated that "public and private interests must work together to provide the funds for these needed developments. Revenues from the lease of the power privilege to agencies which can sell electric power at full market value under State regulations will help make possible this gigantic and desperately needed water conservation development. We believe that the Trinity water power development should be authorized to operate under this type of financing.

GREATER BENEFITS

"As the Secretary of the Interior said in his report to Congress in February 1957, 'joint

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

development would provide substantially more funds for potential irrigation and multipurpose development in the Central Valley project area. This means that the power resources of the Trinity River division under joint development would provide the greater benefit to the project area and to the Nation as a whole.'

"It seems to us that the Secretary's statement is in complete harmony with the situation and that it is clearly in line with policies of the American Farm Bureau Federation."

The Importance of Extending the Full Appropriation for the Library Services Act, Public Law 597

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT C. BYRD
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 27, 1958

Mr. BYRD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include a statement which I have submitted to the House Appropriations Committee's subcommittee studying the budget of the Department of Health, Education and Welfare. My statement is in support of the full appropriation for the Library Services Act, Public Law 597.

The statement follows:

THE IMPORTANCE OF EXTENDING THE FULL APPROPRIATION FOR THE LIBRARY SERVICES ACT, PUBLIC LAW 597

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, I greatly appreciate this opportunity to speak in behalf of the proposed legislation to extend the full appropriation of Public Law 597, the Library Services Act. Federal aid to the States for public libraries in the rural areas of our Nation has always been of great interest and concern to me. I was happy to have been one of those Members who sponsored this type of legislation in the United States Congress. The passage of the Library Services Act in June 1956 represents somewhat of a triumph in many respects. I would not be human if I were not to admit that the passage of Public Law 597 gave me deep personal satisfaction, for it embodied a great deal of my own proposal for Federal aid to extend library services to rural areas. Other than this, however, and of far greater importance is the fact that the library services bill represents a concern on the part of the Federal Government for those 27 million children and adults in America without library services of any kind, and for the additional 53 million Americans with only inadequate libraries.

However, the passage of Public Law 597 was but the first step in getting a program of Federal aid to libraries underway. The funds authorized by the act are $7.5 million a year for the 5 years, beginning July 1, 1956. For the first fiscal year Congress appropriated $2,050,000. This amount provided for a basic grant of $40,000 to each of the States, Alaska, Hawaii and Puerto Rico, and $10,000 to the Virgin Islands. For the second fiscal year beginning July 1, 1957, Congress appropriated $5 million. The time has now come when we must seek appropriations for the third fiscal year, to carry on the programs that have been established. When we review the tremendous progress that has been made in the first 2 years, the importance of granting the full amount of $7.5 million authorized by the Library Services Act becomes obvious.

According to the Library Services Branch of the Office of Education, participation of the States in the program exceeds all expectations. During the first fiscal year of the program, 36 State plans for the further extension of public library services to rural areas were approved. These 36 States were able to match, and in some cases to overmatch the Federal funds provided. According to Public Law 597, the Federal grant must be matched according to a formula based on the State's per capita income. Additional funds are allotted based on the rural population of the State as compared to the rural population of the United States. The law also specifies rural areas as being those of less than 10,000 people, but large centers may be included in plans to extend public library services to rural areas.

The whole approach of the legislation of the Library Services Act was to stimulate State and local governments to develop their own library programs. During the first fiscal year the Federal Government paid grants to the States totaling $1,440,000. To match this amount State and local governments together were required to contribute $1,282,861. Actually, the 36 participating States managed to put as much as $4,224,120 into the effort, and so outdistanced requirements by nearly $3 million. We could not ask for more evidence of the willingness of the State and local governments to bring library services to the rural areas of our country. It is also proof of the careful preparation and planning which has been carried out by the State library agencies well in advance of the passage of the Library Services Act.

How was the money spent in the first year of this Federal aid program? If you will bear with me, I would like to give you a breakdown of the total budget of the 36 States' plans. The total budget of the 36 States amounted to $5,664,120. Of this $2,300,475 was spent for personnel, $2,083,622 for books and other library materials, $601,938 for library equipment and $678,085 for operating expenses. Included were approximately 80 new professional positions and 30 new bookmobiles.

Now that the second year of the Library Services Act is under way, the Federal program of aid to the States for rural libraries is being conducted in 45 States and the 4 territories of Guam, the Virgin Islands, Alaska, and Hawaii. The Office of Education expects to receive plans from Puerto Rico within a few weeks. The 3 States who have not as yet submitted plans are Delaware, Indiana, and Wyoming, and there is a possibility that the State plans for Delaware are to be received before the end of the second fiscal year. Under the appropriation of $5 million granted in the second fiscal year, it has been calculated that the matching funds from State and local sources amounted to $4,569,000. From all accounts, it would seem that the achievements of the second year of the program will be as impressive as the first.

The Library Services Act now approaches the middle year of its 5-year program. I do not wish to burden you with further financial evidence to emphasize the full importance of granting this program the full authorization of $7.5 million to carry on its highly dedicated mission. Rather I would like to emphasize that there is a great deal at stake here, the importance of the public library as a means of educating the American people.

Within recent weeks we have heard and read innumerable laments concerning the deterioration of American education. Figures have been published comparing our graduates in scientific and technical fields with those of other countries, particularly Soviet Russia. We have been reminded of the lack of intellectual pursuits on the part of the American people, and of our poor disregard for the scholar and his work.

I will not deny that all of these weaknesses exist and have existed for some time. The time has come, however, when we can no longer afford to ignore these weaknesses of ours. To do so is to invite disaster for ourselves and our children who are to come after us.

I am convinced that Americans everywhere are willing and ready to go forward to achieve those things that will strengthen America's intellectual forces. The response which they have already made to the Library Services Act is the best evidence of this fact. At a time like this we cannot deprive the American public of one of the greatest means to improve and educate itself. The 27 million Americans without library services of any kind is certainly one of the most compelling reasons to continue the program of the act. And the additional 53 million Americans with only inadequate library resources is another equally compelling reason. I would like to think, however, that the most compelling reason for giving the Library Services Act an opportunity to operate under a budget of $7.5 million dollars is the future of America itself.

Again, I wish to thank the members of the committee for making it possible for me to present my plea for a full appropriation for Federal aid to the rural areas of our great Nation.

Lithuanian Independence

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GLENN CUNNINGHAM
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 27, 1958

Mr. CUNNINGHAM of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I join many of my colleagues in a salute to the freedom-loving people of Lithuania in their celebration of the 40th anniversary of Lithuanian Independence Day. It is a shameful thing that these people find their homeland once again under the domination of a foreign nation.

Forty years ago this month the people of this Baltic nation threw off the chains of oppression and knew freedom. It was a day to be remembered and celebrated within the nation and by its citizens and former citizens around the world. It culminated a centuries-old struggle for freedom and liberty.

In those dark days of 1939, when so much of the world lost freedom, Russia moved into Lithuania, and independence was gone. Still today the Soviet armed might controls the nation. But the freedom once known by the people of this nation remains as a memory and as a dream for the future. Despite murders, intimidation, deportations, and all manner of pressures by the Red leaders, the people of Lithuania are still Lithuanians, not Russian puppets or Communists.

The people of this once-independent nation still strain for freedom, and we of the free world can take courage from the valor of the Lithuanian people. The Lithuanians in America are not numerous, but they are known in this country. Their deep religious feeling and their reverence of freedom and independence make them welcome.

I wish to join the rest of the free world in saluting the oppressed people of Lithuania and in marking the 40th anniversary of Lithuanian Independence Day. May fredom once more be possible for these courageous people.

The Soil Bank

SPEECH
OF
HON. GEORGE S. McGOVERN
OF SOUTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 26, 1958

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H. R. 10881) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1958, and for other purposes.

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. Chairman, I would like to join the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN] in supporting the proposed supplemental appropriation of $250 million for the acreage reserve portion of the 1958 soil bank. I will also support the amendment to be offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. REUSS] limiting the amount any one producer may receive under the acreage reserve to $3,000.

From the very outset, I have stated publicly that the soil bank is no solution to the farm problem and I say that again today. But poor as the program is, we must provide enough funds to cover the farmers who have come to sign up for it in good faith. Regardless of our personal views on the soundness of the soil bank, we cannot hold out the hope of contracts to the farmers and then tell them at the last minute that the funds are exhausted.

The Department of Agriculture had announced that farmers would have until March 7 to sign up for the acreage reserve feature of the plan. Suddenly, with lines of farm applicants waiting to sign their contracts, the Department announced that the program would have to be placed on a first come, first served basis. The Department has inadvisedly seen fit to place such a loan interpretation on the $3,000 limit to any one producer which the Congress passed last summer, that they have used available funds much faster than would otherwise have been the case.

To date the soil bank acreage reserve has not materially reduced farm surpluses, it has not cut farm program costs, and worst of all it has failed to restore adequate income to American farmers. The program has been of little or no benefit to most of the family-size farmers of the Nation.

There is no doubt in my mind that the same amount of money which we have poured into the soil bank could have produced much better results if it had been invested in a farm price support program geared to the family-size farm.

I believe that the farmer wants to farm; he does not want to depend for his annual income on some scheme which pays him a small sum for letting his land go unworked. Naturally farmers will in many instances sign up for the acreage reserve payments when they are confronted with the kind of depressed farm prices that have been established by Secretary Benson.

Much can be said in support of the conservation reserve section of the soil bank, but the acreage reserve is nothing more than a stopgap which should be replaced as soon as possible by a genuine price protection program for farm commodities.

For the present, we have no other reasonable alternative than to vote the necessary appropriations to meet our moral obligations to the farmers who have planned for acreage reserve sign-ups in 1958.

Democracy in Argentina

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN SHERMAN COOPER
OF KENTUCKY
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, February 27, 1958

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Democracy at Work," published in the New York Times of February 26, 1958. The editorial comments upon an exchange of correspondence between Representative CHARLES O. PORTER, of Oregon, and Assistant Secretary of State William B. Macomber, Jr.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DEMOCRACY AT WORK

The election in Argentina, the revolution in Venezuela that followed other revolutions against dictatorships in Colombia and Argentina, the popular pressure that forced the Peruvian dictator to hold fair elections, the Cuban struggle—these and other events of recent years are signposts in the long, hard, uphill journey toward democracy in Latin America.

Last week a manifesto was issued here through a stanch democrat, Prof. German Arciniegas of Columbia University, a former Minister of Education and Ambassador of his native Colombia. It was signed by a long list of distinguished statesmen, scholars, political leaders and editors in many of the Latin-American countries and was circulated throughout the hemisphere in the free press. It is a firm and dignified statement of the democratic principles that should guide Latin American nations and an expression of faith in the fitness and readiness of the Latin countries for democracy.

By coincidence, an official statement from the United States was published about the same time and largely overlooked in the rush of big news. This was in the form of an exchange of letters between Representative CHARLES O. PORTER, of Oregon, and Assistant Secretary of State, William B. Macomber, Jr.

Mr. PORTER wrote to President Eisenhower on February 13 suggesting a statement congratulating the Venezuelan people on the overthrow of the Pérez Jiménez regime. Mr. Macomber replied on behalf of the President and ended his letter with a significant sentence that is worth attention and constant repetition.

"While we are not in a position to intervene in the internal developments of the countries of Latin America," he wrote, "we are in a position to feel—and we do feel—satisfaction and pleasure when the people of any country determinedly choose the road to democracy and freedom."

This exchange of letters was published in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of February 18. It should give some comfort to those who think that the United States has given too little support to the struggle for democracy in Latin America and has shown too much friendliness toward dictators.

Wings Over the Capitol

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT HALE
OF MAINE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 26, 1958

Mr. HALE. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the May 1937 issue of the Journal of the American Institute of Architects:

WINGS OVER THE CAPITOL

(By Leicester B. Holland, chairman, Committee on Preservation of Historic Buildings)

Controversy is always unpleasant. I think particularly so to architects, but sometimes it is necessary, even for architects, to stand squarely on one side or the other of important questions. And because the institute has conferred on me the honor of the chairmanship of the Committee on Preservation of Historic Buildings, I feel it my duty to speak, when the preservation of the most historic building in the country is threatened, as I think it the duty of the institute itself to weigh carefully, and give its official opinion clearly, concerning architectural matters of importance to all citizens of the United States.

THE EVER-EMULOUS ARCHITECT

It is a curious fact that every architect who has worked upon the United States Capitol, though constrained to accord his work with that of his predecessor, has felt that he could better it. But fortunately those employed were great enough to respect what had been done, and develop their own designs in harmony therewith.

The immediate concern, when L'Enfant had laid out the city of Washington, was to erect two buildings: one a palace, in the European sense, to house the President; the other the legislative halls to house the Government. Two competitions, perhaps the first architectural competitions in the country, were announced and held. For the President's house, the design of James Hoban immediately won; but for the much more complicated structure, the Capitol, no satisfactory plans were submitted. Providentially a late design was offered by Dr. William Thornton, an extrordinarily versatile man, a doctor, an amateur artist, and later the first United States Commissioner of Patents. His scheme for the Capitol was at once greeted with the highest praise. It was simple, noble, admirable, all the encomiums of the 18th century vocabulary were showered upon it by Washington and Jefferson. But as he was not a builder the work was carried out by a succession of recalcitrant supervisors, until finally Hoban took over the construction of the Capitol as well as the White House

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

and there was peace. By 1800, when the Government was due to move to Washington, the northern section of the building, designed to house the Senate, was complete.

THE GRANDEUR THAT WAS THORNTON AND THE GLORY THAT WAS LATROBE

Then all efforts were turned to the southern section—now Statuary Hall—which was to accommodate the House of Representatives. To eliminate the complications of dual control, Latrobe was called in, in 1803, to design and to build, but in accordance with Thornton's original scheme. Latrobe was the apostle of the Greek revival. Naturally he found fault with Thornton's modified Roman inspiration, just as he complained that Thomas Jefferson, with whom he was in constant consultation about the Capitol, would not forget the Roman orders and realize that only in the Greek was true beauty to be found. But naturally also, he matched the exterior of Thornton's wing exactly. And then, in 1814, while the construction of the great rotunda between these two completed sections was still little more than foundations, the British sailed up the Potomac and did their best to burn it all. The interior was gutted but the outer walls stood solidly. Only the cornice and balustrade at the roof line were wrecked and where the flames licked through the windows the exterior was scorched and smoked. The exterior was quickly restored just as it had been, and tradition says that like the White House, which was also burned, it was then repainted to hide discloration. But inside all was to rebuild, and all the interior architecture became modified Greek in style.

THE NEW ENGLAND CROWN

In 1817 Latrobe stepped aside, and Bulfinch the master architect of Boston, the first American-born professional, was called in. He executed the central eastern portico as Latrobe had planned it, with stylistic mannerisms of his own; he completed the rotunda and crowned it with a wooden dome much less classical than Latrobe had intended, and he built the western extension in the center wholly according to his own design. The curious spacing of the columns there recalls most strikingly his portico on the Boston State House. Finally in 1830 the Capitol was completed, and Bulfinch went back to Boston. His characteristic touch is neither so Greek as Latrobe's nor as Roman as Thornton's, a little more naive than either but harmonizing beautifully with both.

A PRESIDENT TO THE RESCUE

For 20 years while the country grew, the building stood unchanged, admired by all. At last both legislative bodies had increased to such extent that enlargement became obligatory. Mills, then Architect of the Capitol, suggested a large addition to the east, forming a Greek cross, but President Fillmore, anxious to preserve the building which had become a venerated symbol, would have none of this. So Mills resigned and Walter took his place. He too suggested a great eastern extension, which Fillmore promptly condemned, but also submitted an alternate plan in accordance with the requirements. "It was desirable," said the President, "not to impair the harmony and beauty of the present building, which as a specimen of architecture is so universally admired. Keeping these objects in view, I concluded to make the additions by wings detached from the present building, yet connected with it by corridors. This mode of enlargement will leave the present Capitol uninjured."

The composition, now practically three separate buildings, extended twice as far from north to south as it had done before, and Bulfinch's little dome was quite inadequate as a central motive. So Walter included a large new dome as part of his original composition. And he designed it most masterfully, not as a separate thing resting upon the roof of a building less than half its height, but taking as its base the central colonnaded portico of Latrobe and Bulfinch and building up from that in diminishing rings to the great hemisphere. So that the whole grows in one majestic pyramid, straight from the ground to the crest of the goddess of freedom. In this respect, there is no large dome like it in the world. I do not think there is any more beautiful.

THE MONUMENTAL SNIVY [1]

But the problem of constructing such a dome was difficult, for the walls on which it must rest were built for a much smaller mass, and without tearing out the whole interior and building new and heavy foundations in the unstable hillside, a masonry structure was impossible. Walter here showed ingenuity to match his artistry. He adopted the only possible material, iron. He placed the upper drum and the dome itself directly above Bulfinch's circular wall; the lower ring of columns was carried on iron brackets cantilevering out from it; and around the base he set an octagonal wall or podium of iron, entirely free from the inner construction, to act as a transitional member between the circle above and the rectangular portico below. This iron skirting is purely stage scenery, it carries nothing and rests as chance will have it, just on whatever walls it happens to cross. It is entirely meant for visual effect, and in this it is entirely successful, also it is perfectly secure. But it happens that the front portico below is very deep, about 32½ feet in fact, so that while the face of the skirting is well back of the face of the front line of columns and the pediment, it is actually 12 feet 10 inches in front of the back wall underneath. This discrepancy shows clearly in a section of the building, but actually in elevation it is very hard to see. Only from points far around to the side and close to the face of the building is it apparent. I doubt if anyone has ever noticed it unless it was called to his attention. Yet this is the much discussed "overhang of the dome", which has served as the ostensible reason for later proposed alterations to the facade.

Walter's wing buildings are of marble, unlike the central part of the building and the dome, which are uniformly painted. Turned at right angles to the longitudinal axis of the central part, they create a broad and shallow court in front, and at the rear project a little less than Bulfinch's central mass. In general effect they are quite classic. Walter had been to Europe and doubtless was much influenced by the classic revival in Germany, for his flutted columns and low pediments have the somewhat dry correctness of scholarly classicism, which Bulfinch's more Jeffersonian portico lacks. But again the new work, though slightly different, harmonizes excellently with the old.

THE PERFECT BLEND

In 1865 the Capitol was completed just as it stands today. And as it stands it shows two miracles. The first is esthetic; it is almost unbelievable that a succession of building operations, by such various hands, could have resulted in anything but a hodgepodge, quaintly picturesque at best. Instead the outcome is by common accord one of the most beautiful buildings in the world, dignified, simple, well proportioned, harmonious in its varied detail, unique in composition. It is certainly finer than any of its architects could have planned, if he had been left wholly to himself.

THE HISTORICAL MIRACLE

The second miracle is the picture of its history which it presents. For by extraordinary luck and thanks to the watchful eyes of successive Presidents, nothing of its various building periods as shown on the exterior has been lost, save Bulfinch's wooden dome. It stands today as it stood at the end of the Civil War. If in the mind's eye one blocks out the wings and the dome, it is to be seen as it was completed by Bulfinch in 1830. If then the hand be held to hide the central portion, it stands as Latrobe left it in 1817, the two low domes bespeaking his interiors. Remove these last and we see it as the British found it when they burned it in 1814. Remove the left hand part in turn and it appears as was in 1800 when Washington became the Capital City of the United States. And this is not just the appearance of successive stages that we see, it is the actual substance of the masonry. Closer inspection reveals in many details the various masters' hands; Thornton's pilasters have entasis, those of Bulfinch have simply sloping sides, while those of Walter are vertical in the classic manner. The capitals show where one man's work stopped and another man's commenced. It is the visual history of American architecture for any who can read it, and it is the only building in this country that tells its story as the cathedrals and palaces of Europe do.

From the esthetic and from the historical point of view it seems incredible that any architect should wish to change it. And yet almost every architect that has been connected with the Capitol has wanted to try his hand at it.

GILDING REFINED GOLD

Walter, himself, was the first. When he had finished his work he was not satisfied. What architect is satisfied with his finished work? His thoughts returned to his first design, he wanted a great central mass projecting eastward. Doubtless the older work seemed to him less stately than his own, in detail and material. He drew up a plan to do it all over in marble and bring the center out as far or farther than the wings. Later he drew another scheme practically filling up all the court. These are what are spoken of as the architect's original designs for completion of the building. Fortunately there has never been any serious thought of executing any of them, even the present plans ignore them, except as argument for changes of a different sort.

EXTRAMURAL REPERCUSSIONS

Since Walter, the titular Architects of the Capitol have not been designers; they have rather been engineers, admirable constructors supervising the execution of other men's plans. Thus, when the next expansion became necessary, through the shocking congestion of the Library, it was not the Architect of the Capitol who provided the design but the firm of Smithmeyer & Peltz. And this time the addition was not made to the Capitol itself, but the Library was moved bodily outside and given a building all its own. And in accordance with earlier history, when the new Library was finished the architects felt that the Capitol was out of harmony with it and drew plans for doing it over to conform with their own creation. The new design had eight little cupolaed towers, like minarets around the central dome, producing somewhat the effect of a modified classic mosque. But, fortunately, the design was never executed.

ECHOES OF THE COLUMBIAN EXPOSITION

Then a little later, to provide more room for the overcrowded quarters of the legislative bodies, the House and Senate Office Buildings were erected, again expanding the Capitol outside itself, and again not from designs of the Architect of the Capitol, but this time from those of Carrère and Hastings. And when their work was done, did Carrère and Hastings draw plans for the alteration of the Capitol? Of course, they

[1] This word is not to be found in any dictionary.

did, though the initiative came from a congressional committee, Carrère and Hastings being called in to devise ways of correcting the overhang of the dome and to replace the painted sandstone with marble. The architects categorically condemned Walter's proposed eastward extension and presented two new schemes, A and B. By the first, the whole eastern wall of the old building was to be brought forward 12 feet 10 inches, just enough to catch the overhang of the dome. It was all to be done in marble with Walter's rhythm substituted for Thornton's in the decoration of the walls, Walter's fluted columns substituted for Bulfinch's plain ones, and the width of the central motive increased by two columns so that it should be larger than the entrances to Walter's wings, with the pitch of the pediment changed from Bulfinch's style to Walter's. Scheme B was like A in elevation, only the facade was brought forward 32 feet 6 inches, so as to provide office room within and a corridor connecting Walter's wings on the second and third floors. But Carrère and Hastings very strongly advised against adoption of this second scheme, as they said it would fill up the shallow court, one of the most attractive features of the present composition. And in fact they seemed to have such appreciation of the building as it stood that they questioned whether it would not be wisest simply to reface the existing walls in marble in their old position. Again, fortunately, neither design was executed.

The last extension has been to remove the Supreme Court from its old quarters to a vast new building facing the Capitol. The architect, Cass Gilbert, died before he had time to realize how little in accord the design of the old structure was with his new marble temple. And so we have no recommendation from him that the work of Thornton, Latrobe, and Bulfinch should be given the Gilbertian touch.

SECOND GROWTH

Since then, the extensions themselves have been extended, the House Office Building in a new structure by the Allied Architects of Washington, the Senate Office Building in additions by Wyeth and Sullivan and the Library in an annex by Pierson and Wilson. As traditionally proper, the Architect of the Capitol has now been assisted in drawing plans for the current projected reformation of the old building. Again, as Carrère and Hastings discarded Walter's suggestion, so now Carrère and Hastings' vehement warnings against filling the court are disregarded, and it is proposed to bring the facade forward as much as 40 feet.

Such is the history of the building. It has been eloquently epitomized by Charles Moore in his introduction to Glenn Brown's History of the Capitol:

"Historically, the Capitol at Washington is the most important structure in the United States. Other buildings, such as the Old South Church in Boston and Independence Hall in Philadelphia, are connected with important episodes in the history of the country. The Capitol is unique in that it both typifies the beginning and also marks the growth of the Nation. Like the great Gothic cathedrals of Europe, its surprising merit is not its completeness but its aspirations."

And I may add that it is notable also in that as it has grown, the new work has never entailed the destruction of the old, except for Bulfinch's little dome, and that recently all its growth has been in widening rings outside itself. From the historical point of view it is amazing that any architect should wish to start the destruction now.

THE DEATH SENTENCE

The present bill before Congress makes destruction mandatory. It does not create a committee of Congress to study and report, but a committee which, with the aid of the Architect of the Capitol and such architectural advisers as it may choose, shall proceed to the extension of the eastern front "in substantial accordance with either scheme A or scheme B" of Carrère and Hastings' studies, and the substitution of marble for the original sandstone. Regardless of whether aesthetic or utilitarian gains are to be had from the proposed changes, it is certain that all the exterior stone work of Thornton, Latrobe and Bulfinch is irrevocably doomed to destruction once the bill becomes law. That is inescapable. The form may be retained, on the west at least, but new stone of a different character will be substituted for the original work throughout.

AND ALL FOR WHAT?

What are the gains that could warrant such a sacrifice? Those claimed are three: 1. Provision of a visible support for the scarcely visible projection of the skirting of the dome; 2. Substitution of marble for painted sandstone, as a more durable material and to make the central portion match the wings; and 3. Provision of extra committee rooms within the building and, if the extension be brought far enough eastward, a gallery on the third floor connecting the new House and Senate wings.

In all the hearings, the proponents of the change have emphasized the fact that increased internal space is not a primary incentive, but a secondary desideratum. It is, however, the factor which to many architects might seem decisive. But before undertaking such a change most architects would wish to know how much space was needed and where it would be most useful. So far as we know, no thorough study of these matters has been made, and none is contemplated under the terms of the bill, which calls for extension only according to a predetermined plan. If added space is vital, it is not at all impossible that it could be found by internal reorganization without any extension, or by removing some of the subsidiary activities outside the building, as has been done when space was needed heretofore. Or if room cannot be found within the present walls, it might be possible to extend Walter's wings to the east or to make additions to the north and south of his work in such manner as to be practically invisible from the front. The alteration would then be to the newest and least interesting, rather than to the oldest part of the building. If the corridor in the upper story, seemingly of use chiefly to members of the press gallery, were necessary, it might be added with less disfigurement on the west side than on the east. But no such alternatives, or say others, can be considered by the terms of the bill.

MAJOR OPERATIONS FOR MINOR ILLS

Again if the overhang of the dome is intolerable to those who know about it, it could be cared for by simply bringing forward the face of the wall beneath, under the portion, reducing the depth of the latter to 20 feet; or the whole portico, or simply the central part of it could be brought forward 12 feet, using the same material and leaving Thornton's and Letrobe's work untouched. But no such alternatives can be considered by the terms of the bill. Aesthetically such moderate changes, though hardly warranted, would undoubtedly be preferable to moving the whole facade eastward, for as Carrère and Hastings emphasized, moving the facade lessens the depth of the shallow court, and moving it 40 feet, as is contemplated, would almost wholly destroy the court. Even an appreciable eastward movement of the portico alone, would somewhat diminish the present unity of the central mass rising from ground to dome.

THE DREAM OF MARBLE HALLS

The substitution of marble obviously admits of no alternative except to preserve the old painted sandstone. This change is the one, perhaps the only one, which might have general popular appeal, for there is no denying that marble is the more expensive material. But aesthetically, as well as historically, there would be a loss rather than a gain. For Thornton's detail is much more interesting than Walter's, yet it is sandstone detail and could hardly be copied in marble without losing its effect, as one can hardly copy pine furniture in rosewood without absurdity. If marble is to be used, marble detail should be adopted, as Carrère and Hastings planned, thus making Walter's wings in all respects the oldest instead of the newest parts of the Capitol.

The change of material would entail an even more serious esthetic consequence. The dome is of iron, painted; it will always be so. At present the substructure from which it grows is also painted, and there is unity of color and texture throughout the central mass, the wings being frankly appended units. If the central portion be made of the same material as the wings the effect will be quite different. There will be then an extraordinarily long, low marble building, 10 times as wide as it is high, on top of which the dome, of another color and texture and twice as high as the walls below, will rest. The unfortunate appearance of the result need hardly be stressed.

My capacity in the institute is primarily concerned with history. Yet, as an architect, I realize that historical values must be sacrificed sometimes to esthetics and esthetics to utility. But these necessities must be very compelling to warrant such sacrifice in the case of so rare a monument as the Capitol. At present, no major utilitarian necessities are advanced, and esthetically, the changes seem bound to produce a loss rather than a gain. To sacrifice the present very beautiful composition which embodies the history of American architecture, simply to make it more academically correct, or just for a love of marble, seems to me, frankly, a piece of parvenue vandalism. If this be architecture, then architecture in America is not the goddess I have thought her, but a hussy who would swap her honor for a new spring hat.

Poll of the Fourth District of California

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM S. MAILLIARD
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 27, 1958

Mr. MAILLIARD. Mr. Speaker, again the citizens of the Fourth District of California have shown a commendable interest in the affairs of their Government by responding in gratifying numbers to my most recent questionnaire. One out of every sixth registered voter was asked to participate and, as of this date, over 18 percent have replied, many including carefully considered analyses of the more vital issues.

I am greatly encouraged by the substantive thought given to some of the most important current problems. The following tabulation may be of interest to my colleagues:

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

	Percent—		
	Yes	No	No opinion
1. Do you favor replacing the Joint Chiefs of Staff with a single military chief who would give orders to all the services?	54	41	5
2. Should we finance an all-out crash program, regardless of cost, to attain supremacy in missiles, rockets, and satellites?	45	51	4
3. President Eisenhower's new budget calls for $3.94 billion for the mutual security program to help our allies. Should we spend the money for—			
a. Military assistance to our allies?	45	42	13
b. Help in promoting the economic development and political stability of less advanced nations to counter Russia's economic cold war?	78	16	6
4. Do you favor—			
a. The elimination of all price supports for agriculture (cotton, wheat, corn, rice, peanuts, and tobacco)?	63	30	7
b. Payments to farmers who take land out of production (practicing conservation) for a certain period of years?	32	61	7
5. Do you favor Federal grants, matched by State funds, to improve mathematics and science courses by providing for better equipment and higher pay in some cases?	72	25	3
6. Do you believe that each State, as best it can and will, should solve a classroom shortage without the financial aid of the Federal Government?	56	41	3
7. Do you favor Federal legislation guaranteeing democratic elections in union affairs and also requiring annual reports on the handling of union health, welfare, or pension funds?	93	5	2
8. Do you believe your Representative in Congress should accept postponement of projects in his district, no matter how worthwhile, in order to reduce the budget or increase funds for defense?	45	48	7

Better Educational Opportunities

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GLENN CUNNINGHAM
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 27, 1958

Mr. CUNNINGHAM of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing legislation which will, in my opinion, do more toward assuring American youth constantly better educational opportunities than any program of Federal scholarships, any Federal program of classroom construction or any other Federal program.

My bill allows school teachers and school administrators to deduct for income tax purposes professional and extraordinary living expenses incurred while furthering their educational training. It would allow any teacher or administrator a maximum $600 deduction from gross income prior to determining taxable income.

Teachers and administrators could deduct expenses of tuition, fees, books, and transportation from home of record to the institution, as well as expenses for meals and lodging.

Such legislation would encourage teachers to continue their professional education, and I would suppose it would be an encouragement to young people entering the field, since it is a universal truth that promotion and allied salary increases in the teaching field go most usually to those who are seeking to improve themselves through further professional training.

Through encouraging teachers to improve themselves and through encouraging students to enter the teaching field by making it easier for them to advance their status and salary level, I feel this bill will do much to improve the already high caliber of teaching in our schools.

Through an improved caliber of teaching, our so-called math and science lag will soon dissolve. The shortage of teachers should certainly be attacked by making teaching more attractive financially. And finally, there is no new agency, bureau or even office needed in this legislation. No new employees need to be hired and there is no appropriation needed to carry it out.

Interparliamentary Union Holds Its 46th Conference in London, 1957

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL A. REED
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 27, 1958

Mr. REED. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following:

INTERPARLIAMENTARY UNION HOLDS ITS 46TH CONFERENCE IN LONDON, 1957

The 46th conference of the Interparliamentary Union was held in London September 12–19, 1957. Only 4 years before, the United States Congress had been host to the Union at the Capitol in Washington. Meantime, annual conferences had been held in Vienna in 1954, Helsinki in 1955, and Bangkok in 1956.

Although the union is almost 70 years old, this was only the 46th meeting, since it did not always meet annually and did not meet during the periods of 2 World Wars. Yet the idea of the union, participation of parliaments in the foreign affairs of their countries, the establishment of the principle of arbitration of disputes, and the struggle to bring about peace through mutual understanding had never been abandoned and the verging on London by 49 civilized nations, intent upon peace, was a strong indication of the continued force of a great idea. The United States was a charter member of the union in 1889.

The United States delegation, which had left Washington a few days previous, consisted of Hon. HENRY O. TALLE, of Iowa, chairman, who went to fill the place of Hon. DANIEL A. REED, president of the group; Senator GORDON ALLOTT of Colorado, Senator RALPH E. FLANDERS of Vermont, Senator J. ALLEN FREAR of Delaware, Senator J. WILLIAM FULBRIGHT of Arkansas, Senator THOMAS C. HENNINGS, JR., of Missouri, Senator ESTES KEFAUVER of Tennessee, Senator A. J. MIKE MONRONEY of Oklahoma, Senator STROM THURMOND of South Carolina, and Senator ALEXANDER WILEY of Wisconsin, a vice president of the group. The House delegation consisted of Congressman HALE BOGGS of Louisiana, Congressman HAROLD D. COOLEY of North Carolina, also vice president of the group and member of the council, Congressman CHARLES B. HOEVEN of Iowa, Congressman KENNETH B. KEATING of New York, Congressman JOHN MCMILLAN of South Carolina, Congressman GORDON L. MCDONOUGH of California, Congressman W. ROBERT POAGE of Texas, Congressman JOHN M. ROBSION, JR., of Kentucky, Congressman ANTONI N. SADLAK of Connecticut, and Congresswoman KATHARINE ST. GEORGE of New York. Mr. William T. Reed, assistant secretary for the minority of the Senate acted as secretary of the delegation while Dr. Franklin Dunham accompanied the group as permanent executive secretary and liaison to the Interparliamentary Union and United States Embassy. Mr. Pat Holt of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee and Dr. Charles J. Zinn of the House Judiciary Committee acted as observers during the conference.

At the opening of the conference 49 nations made up the membership of the union. These nations are, Albania, America (United States), Argentina, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burma, Ceylon, Czechoslovakia, Denmark, Finland, France, Germany, Great Britain, Greece, Haiti, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Laos, Lebanon, Liberia, Luxembourg, Monaco, Netherlands, Norway, Pakistan, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Rumania, Spain, Sudan, Sweden, Switzerland, Thailand, Turkey, U. S. S. R., and Yugoslavia. At the first meeting of the council held early in the week, applications were received from Egypt (to return to the conference), Algeria, South Vietnam, and Ghana. All but Ghana qualified technically and were elected. Absentees were Turkey, Peru, and Haiti, so the nations in actual attendance remained at 49, though there are now 52 members in the union, the largest number of representative parliaments in its history.

Meetings of both the conference's executive committee and the council were held during and, in th case of the executive committee, after the conference, as well. Invitation from Brazil to meet in Rio de Janeiro, the fourth week of July 1958 was formally accepted and the council meeting for 1958 was subsequently set for Geneva, approximately March 1. Since the conference will be so early in the summer, this is of course the first time the conference will have met on the South American continent and a great number of Latin-American nations are to be expected.

Members of the United States delegation were in many advance conferences during the early part of the week serving on committees and attending council meetings until the inaugural of the conference which was held with all the panoply of ritual and color in Westminster Hall, ancient seat of the British Parliament with Queen Elizabeth II, presiding. In a short and beautifully-given speech, the Queen reminded the delegates from all the world that it had been 67 years since the first meeting in London (the second meeting of the union actually to be held) and that those same high hopes for peace through parliamentary action were the potential truth of peace of these meetings. The Prime Minister, Mr. MacMillan, responded to her greetings, as did the Minister for Foreign Affairs, Mr. Selwyn Lloyd and Lord Stanagate, retiring president of the council.

The Queen's speech follows:

"It gives me great pleasure to be able to attend the opening of the 46th conference of

the Interparliamentary Union and I extend a warm welcome to the representatives of national parliaments from all over the world.

"This great Hall of Westminster is the birthplace of British parliamentary institutions. The first Parliament was summoned here 700 years ago and many great events in the history of parliament and nation have taken place within these walls. This hall bears witness to the durability of the system and it is therefore a most suitable choice for this meeting of the Interparliamentary Union.

"I am proud to say that political life in all the nations of the Commonwealth, of which I am the head, is based on parliamentary government. We regard it as both the proof and the guardian of our democracy. It may not please all the people all the time, but it is essential if the individual is to remain free and all are to be equal before the law.

"The Parliament at Westminster has seen many changes and survived many crises. It has adapted itself to the conditions of each succeeding age without loss of vitality or strength. This has happened because there have always been men who have realized that it is the principle of parliamentary government that is important and principles are only kept alive by people who believe in them passionately.

"Other nations have developed political assemblies in different ways with a great diversity of form and function, but the fact that so many are represented in this union is a solid expression of faith in Parliament as the first and principal instrument of democracy.

"Sixty-seven years ago, at your first meeting in London, a resolution of the union recorded your belief that closer relations between the members of the various parliaments would make for peace. Subsequent events have not been very encouraging but everyone here today knows the potential truth of these words. The union brings you together, not as representatives of governments but as representatives of parliament. You are all men and women in public life with obligations and duties to those whose interests you represent in the counsels of your own countries. Whatever differences may exist between the nations you, at this meeting, have much in common.

"If this union can help you understand each other's problems and points of view, if it can help you to advance those forms of government and standards of international dealing which we know to be right, then we may yet win that concord among the nations which has been sought for so long and which we need so urgently today.

"I wish your discussions every success at this 46th conference of the Interparliamentary Union."

The Prime Minister said, in part:

"It falls to me—and this is a very great privilege—to offer to Your Majesty in the name of this distinguished and representative gathering our sincere thanks for so graciously consenting to open our conference. We all realize the heavy burdens which lie upon Your Majesty, and the many claims upon your time and strength. We are therefore doubly grateful for the honor which you have done us.

"Here, as Her Majesty has reminded us, we are assembled in an ancient building hallowed as the very birthplace of our parliamentary institutions. These have been developing with many changes during many centuries of history and the particular form which our parliamentary democracy now takes is the result of a very prolonged development. I think it would be quite wrong to overlook the fact that parliamentary institutions allow of different kinds of relationships between the executive authority, be it crown, or president, or cabinet, and the deliberative and legislative assembly. The precise balance of rights and powers between the two are always changing. In some countries these are governed by written constitutions, in others they respond to different conditions at different times, but there is one essential if parliamentary government is to have a real meaning. Parliamentary representatives must represent their electorate. They must not be the creations of some outside body. They must be individuals and not ciphers. Free men are not nominees. They must have the right of free speech and free criticism. Whatever their powers be at any given time in the development of a country, parliament and executive must be separate and living institutions with their own sense of responsibility and their own rights and duties.

The Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, said in part:

"There is another way in which we can effectively help to improve the situation. It is on the topic of disarmament that I particularly wish to speak to you today. The Interparliamentary Union devoted an important part of its time at its last session in Bangkok to the study of this problem. There is plenty of controversy about it. But as your guest I do not want to go too far into the controversial aspects with you this afternoon. I want rather to indicate the way to common ground.

"I wish to emphasize three points. First, the need for progress; second, the opportunity which the world has of making progres at this time and, third, the lines upon which progress can be made.

"First, with regard to the need to make progress. A race in armaments is wasteful and dangerous. It is wasteful because it draws off resources in men, in money and materials. It absorbs scientific inventiveness and technical knowledge. All those, if they were devoted to peaceful purposes, could greatly enrich the world and add to the sum of human happiness. A race in armaments is dangerous because it increases tensions and adds to the risk of war. At the present time the hydrogen bomb is the greatest deterrent to war.

"Our security in this country to a large extent is based upon that deterrent. But we should much prefer a comprehensive disarmament agreement, properly controlled, covering all the fields of armaments, of a nature that would make a major war impossible. What we wish to do at the present time is to make a beginning on the way towards that comprehensive agreement.

"Second, the opportunity to make progress. The disarmament subcommittee has been meeting in London for the past 5½ months. It has now adjourned and reported to the disarmament commission of the United Nations. It has not been able to record agreement between its 5 members, although 4 of them have put forward joint proposals. I believe that many people are disappointed that this period of intensive work should end without agreement.

"It has been a great disappointment to the government and people of the United Kingdom. There is a temptation to look at the results of the talks in a mood of cynicism or even despair. The very fact that there was a certain optimism about these disarmament talks 2 or 3 months ago has tempted some to give way to disillusionment or impatience.

"I, however, do not look at the matter in this way at all. There has been a period of useful discussion. Much attention has been given publicly and privately to the problems involved. We face a new session of the United Nations. I believe that psychologically it is the time for us to make progress: the cost of arms, the nature of modern arms, the strains and stresses in the world—all these combine to reinforce the challenge. It is not as though progress in disarmament would simply affect the budgets and economic situations of the countries. It would also of itself contribute to the relaxation of tension necessary to further progress.

"How then could progress be made? I would venture to set out four essential considerations governing our approach.

"First of all, it would be a mistake to wait until there is sufficient agreement to enable a comprehensive disarmament plan covering all stages to be evolved and agreed upon. Such a comprehensive plan is still our objective—one which will include the prohibition and elimination of all nuclear weapons and the reduction of conventional armed forces and armaments under strict control to levels needed for internal security and nothing else.

"But in the world of today it would be foolish to believe that any such plan is practical politics. We will not abandon it as an ideal but it will not happen soon. We should therefore now aim at a partial or first-stage plan, one upon which there is a chance of agreement being reached.

"My second point is that if a start is to be made toward partial disarmament, it is not wise to impose political conditions for the first step. Before the process of disarmaments gets to an advanced stage, I am certain there will have to be political settlements of certain outstanding problems. I think we would be unwise to specify what these problems might be, because that might simply be to erect barriers to further progress. But for a first stage or partial plan I think we should have in mind such measures as are likely to be acceptable without any political preconditions.

"Thirdly, agreement to be sound must involve disarmament both in the nuclear and in the conventional field. Whatever debates there may be, whatever the clever dialectics on either side, you will not get one group to accept a measure of nuclear disarmament unless the other group also accepts conventional disarmament. You will not get one group to accept conventional disarmament unless the other accepts nuclear disarmament. We have to be realistic in these matters. It isn't a question of propaganda positions, who wins the war of words, it is a question of realities and there will not be an agreement unless those two march pari-passu. There are two reasons for this. Some countries have a striking superiority in conventional weapons. They are in a geographical position to move conventional armies and armaments without great problems of transportation. For them conventional attacks are much easier to prepare and to launch and, indeed, to maintain. There are other countries with scattered responsibilities, with long lines of communication which have to be over the sea in large measure, countries which are therefore in quite a different position. That is the first reason for conventional and nuclear disarmament proceeding together.

"The second reason for our saying that nuclear and conventional disarmament must go together is that we hate war, by whatever weapons it may be waged. We believe that a world war fought with so-called conventional weapons similar to those of the last war but improved upon, will be just as terrible for the world as a war fought with nuclear weapons. It may take longer for society to destroy itself, but it will happen just the same.

"The fourth point is that if such a partial agreement is to contribute to a sense of greater security in the world and not the opposite, it must consist of measures capable of being controlled and must provide for the degree of control considered necessary. It is no use entering into agreements which are simply declarations of intention. In the realm of disarmament, it is my firm belief that treaties, however solemnly enacted which do not provide for controls, will do nothing to increase international confidence."

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

The business of the conference actually started at 2:30 p. m. in the afternoon when sessions began in the admirable circular auditorium in Church House, close by St. Margaret's Church and the abbey. After the election of Sir Malcolm Stoddart-Scott, chairman of the British group as president of the conference and the Honorable HENRY O. TALLE as a vice president, a letter of greeting was read from the Honorable DANIEL A. REED, president of the United States group who could not be present with the delegation. Ringing applause greeted the close of the letter and, subsequently, a radiogram of greetings was sent by the entire conference to Mr. REED, beloved member of the union, on the occasion of his 81st birthday?

The general debate opened on the report of the secretary general which had been circulated in advance to all delegates. Speakers for the United States delegation were the Honorable HENRY O. TALLE, of Iowa, chairman of the delegation, and the Honorable J. WILLIAM FULBRIGHT, Senator from Arkansas. The general debate continued until Saturday morning when the three questions on the agenda were brought up for discussion. The first question was the refugee resolution. This question had received long and exhausting debate both in committee and at the council meeting in Nice, 1957. Both Congressman KEATING and Senator HENNINGS spoke on this question. Congressman KEATING had attended the special meeting in Nice, called to discuss this question before the council met and had already inserted in the resolution points consistent with the United States views on this alarming problem—a source of primary concern in the Near East, as well as in many other locations. By amendment, it was possible to submit and pass the resolution with the principle of voluntary action demanded that no refugee should be pressured to return to either his own or any country without his complete consent. This was upheld by Senator HENNINGS, as well, and was so passed.

The question on Monday, September 16, was the influence and control by parliaments over governments. Senator FLANDERS and Mrs. ST. GEORGE spoke to this resolution and supported a Philippine amendment which brought it within the scope and philosophy of both our governments as well as those of the direct parliamentary form. It was so passed.

The third general question was the stabilization of prices of primary products. Congressman TALLE and Senator KEFAUVER spoke to this resolution and both advocated a stricter and more accurate means of information on primary products and fair dealing in adjustments of world commodities as the affected the economic life of all nations, large and small. A resolution embodying these ideas and calling for a world conference on prices was passed.

Letter of President DANIEL A. REED, of the United States group, addressed to the 46th conference of the Interparliamentary Union:

"MY DEAR LORD STANSGATE: I am happy to be able to extend to you and through you, to all the assembled delegates of the respective countries represented in London, my most sincere greetings.

"One of the bitter disappointments of my life is to miss the opportunity of attending the sessions of the 46th interparliamentary conference at London this year. It is wonderful to have the 'mother of parliaments' as our host at this time.

"My admiration for the far-flung Commonwealth and its mother country has grown through all the years from my youth to the fourscore I can count today. Although I am prevented by circumstance and on the advice of my physicians to attend this meeting, I know the London conference will be another historic event in man's constant search for a just and durable peace. To these ends and purposes, I fervently join with you in spirit today.

"Peace is not a passing elusive state of inactivity. It is a dynamic, attainable objective, so well defined by St. Augustine centuries ago in his words: 'It is the tranquility of order.' Tranquillitas was the Latin word the eminent church doctor used and it means even more than the English word which has grown from it. It is not simply a sense of well-being. It is actually the sense of being—being just to your neighbor.

"In all my visits to London and to your other cities of traditional industry and importance, the lovely lake country, the bonnie hills of Scotland, and your nearby neighbor, the ever-green emerald isle, I always have been impressed by the sheer beauty of what might have been, except for the gulf stream, an icy stretch of land in a subarctic sea. Instead, it has been blessed by nature to be the home of a great people, whose energy and integrity has influenced every part of the civilized world.

"It has brought law and order into man's undertakings—it has laid the foundations for democracy and self-government and wholesome respect for authority, without which men cannot peaceably live with one another. It has not always accomplished its eternal aims but it has heroically striven, I believe, to bring them about.

"In the late unpleasantness (which, incidentally, is as late as the 18th century) our own revolution was led by sturdy sons of Britain—Washington, Franklin, Hamilton, Jefferson, and the Adamses, who clung to the principles of law and order, aided and abetted by many English statesmen back home who fought in your very parliament for the cause which their kinsmen in the United States were upholding.

"By language, law, custom, and kinship, we are very close to you. By great waves of immigration from all of Europe, the Scandinavian countries, the Near East, the Middle East, Africa, and the Far East, in fact, from all the world, we are kin to every segment of the human race.

"In the deepest travail of the second World War (may there never, never be one called the third) your distinguished leader Sir Winston Churchill, one of the most valiant men the world has ever produced could cry out, with Arthur Hugh Clough in his fateful prophecy written in the early part of the 19th century: 'Say not the struggle naught availeth, The labor and the wounds are vain, The enemy faints not, nor faileth and as things have been, they remain.'

"Again:

" 'And not by eastern windows only,
When daylight comes, comes in the light,
In front, the sun climbs slow, how slowly,
But Westward, look, the land is bright.'

"Not by eastern windows only, so well represented now in the Interparliamentary Union and in its Bangkok meeting but by westward look to North and South America, the Conference plans to meet in Rio de Janeiro next year, so demonstrating its new universality and its worldwide constructive effort for peace and understanding among all peoples.

"I cannot close without recalling those words of Alice Duer Miller, beloved American poetess whose wonderful poem, The White Cliffs of Dover, written in 1941 just 1 year before her death, ended with these 2 lines:

" 'And in a world in which there is no England,
I do not care to live.'

"We thank the Creator of this universe that He chose to make England live, and live on, to be the host as you are, in 1957, to the half-hundred nations now assembled in the very cradle of parliamentary practice and procedure, this glorious monument to self-government, Westminster Hall. There have been 8,000 peace treaties written in the last 3,500 years and each one of them contained a clause that 'the peace shall be permanent.' The average life of each treaty was 2 years. That does not mean anything unless we think that it is quite unimportant in the course of human events. We are working along idealistic lines of bringing about peace, and it means a long, hard battle but it must be won if civilized humanity is to survive.

"This is the idealistic principle in which every mother on earth is interested—it is peace; and if we are to have peace, it is going to be through the parliaments of the free nations of the earth, not through the executives of the nations. It is the men who are close to the heartbeats of the mothers who are sent to the parliamentary bodies of the respective free nations that are eventually going to bring about peace. I believe this may be the very step to the solution of the problem which the world has long awaited.

"I wish I could be with you to take part in the work toward that 'tranquillity of order' St. Augustine so well defined.

"Let us remember peace is not a static condition—it is a dynamic force and the Interparliamentary Union can, I believe, by its exercise of reason, prudence, and justice, help mightily to bring it about.

"Sincerely yours,

"DANIEL A. REED,

"President of the United States Group of the Interparliamentary Union."

Speech of the Honorable HENRY O. TALLE at opening of 46th conference of the Interparliamentary Union:

"Mr. President, fellow delegates, ladies and gentlemen: This morning the Interparliamentary Union witnessed with the profoundest emotions of respect the impact of loyalty and devotion between a people and their Queen when Her Majesty, Queen Elizabeth II, opened the first session of this conference. It was an event we shall never forget, an event which, as a ceremony and a spectacle of graciousness, could not be excelled.

"The Interparliamentary Union convokes its 46th conference in the year 1957 in an atmosphere of tradition and history congenial to our aims, because England has been the workshop of freedom for the western world.

"It is a profound and basic truth that the philosophy of the dignity of the individual has its roots in the Old and the New Testaments and in all the great religions. But it was Anglo-Saxon will-to-freedom which gave it meaning in the everyday life of man, and here in London and in these immediate environs we have the very anvil, so to speak, on which the modern creators of freedom hammered out the faith and the law basic to the freedom we cherish. Here we walk within the very walls within which were evolved what became in its time the greatest of parliaments.

"We are most happy to be convened in the great and beautiful metropolis of the United Kingdom, where every ancient castle, tower, temple, and monument speaks of the rich history and culture of a magnificent nation and of the men and women who made it great, from Chaucer and Shakespeare to Churchill—Blackstone, Milton, Locke, Newton, Pitt, Nelson, Tennyson, Byron, Victoria, Disraeli, and Gladstone—and the many other bright stars in the British galaxy who have for centuries illuminated the long and tortuous road to humanity's fulfillment.

"We are thrilled to meet in this historic hall of the ancient palace of Westminster, which is so rich in historical association, and where the representative English Parliament was born.

"What is it that we ask shall be done at this conference? We ask only that man set-

tle his relations with man on a plane of peace. We ask only that man substitute arbitration for war. We ask only that peace itself be made a philosophy of life and not an instrument of diplomacy to be shuffled like a playing card in a highly dangerous game. We seek, as this agenda so eloquently proves, to direct the attention of nations to the care of those who, even as I speak, are the victims of war and near-war.

"Gathered here are the delegates of 49 nations of this universe. I wonder if you will agree with me that it is doubtful if the representatives of so many people ever before met under a spiritual canopy of amity and mutual goodwill like that which prevails at this conference. None of us seeks as against the other to impose a standard of conduct or a philosophy of government or law that may be either unsuitable or premature or unacceptable.

"What we all seek is to consult together in the manner of parliaments and to put into as concrete form as may be, the world's infinite yearning for peace and mutual happiness. It happens that I, an American delegate, speak from a racially Scandinavian background. It is my pride in the valor of the Norsemen and their lordly individualism and independence that persuades me to say that the very idea inherent in the word, 'parliament' forbids that any one man, or any one nation, shall prevail over or dominate the others.

"The political faith of the American people expresses itself in the fact, as nearly as it can be made operative, that the United States is a nation of 172 million people governed by themselves. The Government, as in this assembly before me, takes the form of decision by representation. In the United States it is representation of the people both by districts—upwards of 400,000 people to a district—and geographically, by States. The individuals and the parties in power, far from remaining static, or themselves determining their successors, are in a constant state of rotation. They change subject to the will of the people in whom rests the power—absolutely—of decision by ballot, free and secret.

"You will forgive me for making these elementary comments about my Government. I shall be intensely interested in hearing you discuss yours. This is one of the facets of our consulting together. For it is this interchange of views that we all hope may bring about the mutual understanding conducive to the peace we are here to help assure to a tension-ridden mankind.

"We in the United States who believe in the philosophy of the West, imbedded as it is in 2,000 years of development, have gone to extraordinary means since 1945 to help the world toward its appreciation and perhaps its adoption. It has basically influenced our policy, our finances, our budget, our economy. Since we in this assembly are representative of every area of the world, what we aim to do is not to proselytize one another, but rather to accept each other's differences without hostility. But we do this without blurring our vision, much less blinding it, to our central purpose: world peace.

"American freedom has not only its roots but its very soul in British tradition. We are profoundly thankful for the observation of that great English statesman, Mr. Gladstone, and we shall never cease to quote his famous conclusion: 'As the British Constitution is the most subtle organism which has proceeded from the womb and long gestation of progressive history, so the American Constitution is, so far as I can see, the most wonderful work ever struck off at a given time by the brain and purpose of man.'

"American freedom made itself workable through this constitution.

"Therefore, when I speak of the congenial atmosphere in which we meet, it is this mutual interweaving of history that I have in mind. For let us not suppress the pride we of the West must feel in the spectacularly apparent fact that, as the United States borrowed from England in struggling for America's sublime credo, equal justice under law, so Asia and Africa and the Middle East and the Far East are even in this hour, groping for their freedom inspired by that same philosophy. Just as the United States from the beginning and today is erecting her inherently American edifice of free government from the collected wisdom of the past—Hebrew, Greek, Roman, European—from Christ and Moses, Solon and Aristotle, from Montesquieu and John Locke, so the newly awakened areas of the earth are at this moment responding to this same eternal cry of man for his right to be free.

"All the world, its peace, its stability, its future, is face to face now with man's soaring demand—where liberty is still denied him—for his right to establish in his own way the justice that he cherishes. He is clamoring for his right to insure domestic tranquillity, his right to promote the general welfare, his right to secure the blessings of liberty to himself, and his posterity.

"Those who can read the writing on the wall know how inevitable are the forces of history. Those who can read the writing on the wall know that no instinct in man, once aroused, is more difficult to suppress than the instinct for liberty. We here, if we are to remain true to the founding principles of this institution, the Interparliamentary Union, have it as our bounden duty to satisfy to the fullest this elemental quest of man for the right to be himself.

"Mr. President, I wish at this time to congratulate the secretary general on his proficient work in preparing the preliminary documents, the agenda, the draft resolutions and various reports—all of which will greatly facilitate the proceedings of our conference.

"I look forward to the debates of our meeting on the very important topics listed in the agenda. I trust that our discussions will contribute to enlightening ourselves as well as international public opinion in this increasingly interdependent world. We cannot solve the problems of our times unless we first understand them. And understanding comes most surely through full and free discussion.

"Finally, we all know that the task of building a peaceful world is a slow and painful process at best. We must build stone upon stone. In this atomic age there is no acceptable alternative to constantly striving for our great objective—the creation of a peaceful world with justice and freedom for all mankind."

Speech of the Honorable J. WILLIAM FULBRIGHT at opening of 46th Interparliamentary Union Conference:

"Mr. President, I am honored to be permitted to address this great assemblage of parliamentarians. The secretary general has produced a complete and, on the whole, an objective and dispassionate report which reflects some of the troubles besetting the human race as we move through these middle years of the 20th century.

"Troubles of course are not new to the human race, but we should recognize that these troubles are very largely of our own making.

"We are capable, in the sense that we have the technical and scientific knowledge, of feeding, clothing, and housing the 2½ billion of us. We have the means, in short, to achieve freedom from want. This is one of the four freedoms to which one of the great Presidents of my country referred in one of his finest speeches. I am sure you remember the other freedoms which President Roosevelt listed on that memorable occasion—freedom to worship, freedom of speech, and freedom from fear.

"It is a sad commentary that we have not been able so to organize our affairs as to achieve these freedoms. This is not the forum in which to make propaganda as to who is, or is not, responsible. We here cannot settle any of the great issues which divide the world. We have no authority to do so, if we could. The place in which to resolve these issues is the United Nations, now meeting in New York.

"The United Nations cannot function properly if we have no confidence or trust in each other's word, in each other's intentions.

"Confidence can develop only from a course of conduct over the years. It does not arise from propaganda hocus-pocus.

"What we can do in this gathering is to get to know each other better. We can develop confidence in each other, assuming, of course, that we are not wholly depraved. All of us are human beings before we are Americans, or Britishers, or Russians, or Indians. A biologist would have difficulty in distinguishing one from another.

"If one assumes, as I do assume that human beings are rational creatures, that they do not wish to commit suicide—then how can we go about preventing self-destruction by nuclear weapons?

"To me the first and obvious step is to get to know, to understand each other—not through propaganda which is unreliable, but through personal conversation and observation.

"The differences between men as men are slight. The differences between their institutions and their prejudices are great, but these institutions and these prejudices have been changed in the past and can be changed in the future in response to the needs and desires of men—the desire to live, for example.

"When we meet in London, we are inevitably, I think, given renewed hope. These historic surroundings, which saw the birth of free political institutions, remind us that we do make progress and that such institutions can change, they can adapt, and that they do endure, sometimes in spite of very great difficulties.

"Indeed, the mere fact that we are gathered here is itself a tribute to the strength and vitality of such institutions. We are representatives of legislative bodies that range from the oldest to some of the newest. It is significant that even in countries where parliaments have no real power, the dictators still feel called upon to give lipservice to the forms of democratic self-government. The idea of democratic government is one of the most powerful that has possessed the human mind. I recall a remark of Voltaire, who said, 'There is one thing more powerful than all the armies in the world, and that is an idea whose time has come.'

"If we cannot today say that the time has come all over the world for the idea of democratic government, through freely elected legislative bodies, at least we can say that the idea is making encouraging progress.

"Our primary task in this conference is to get to know each other, and our great task back in our respective countries as members of legislative bodies is to encourage our peoples to get to know each other. This is not something which can be achieved in a day, or a year, or even perhaps in a generation. But over the long term, I believe the best means of reducing world tensions and of achieving world peace is an international program for the exchange of persons among nations.

"I am not afraid to let an opponent expound his views. I have enough faith in the truth and soundness of our own cause to be confident that it will prevail in a fair and free exchange.

"The United States has done considerable in the field of exchange of persons, both from the point of view of enabling citizens of other countries to come to our country and of

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

enabling Americans to go abroad—to live, to study, to understand other cultures, and to take that understanding home with them. I am proud to have played a small part in sponsoring some of these United States programs.

"I think that my own country should do more along this line, and I hope that it will. I hope that each of you will join in urging such programs upon your own governments when you return to your home.

"Exchange-of-persons programs are not expensive, and they seem especially cheap when contrasted with the cost of modern armaments. Yet I think it is only through the kind of understanding which exchange programs bring about that we will ever be able to reduce the cost of armaments.

"I expect the newspapers and the radio in most of your countries have carried reports of debates and differences in the United States over American foreign policy. Those differences exist, of course—not only in the United States but also in other countries where people are free to express differences. Such differences—strongly held and vigorously expressed—are the nourishment, the very essence of parliamentary institutions.

"But let me say this, so far as the United States is concerned: The things that unite us, as Americans, are greater and stronger than the things that divide us. I suspect this is true, also, of the other representatives who are here from democratic countries.

"The justification of a conference such as this one, it seems to me, is that it makes us more keenly aware of this simple fact.

"If we have brains enough to discover the secrets of nature itself, surely we must also have brains enough not to blow each other up. Otherwise, the story of the human race will indeed be a sad and pitiful one; and it will perhaps be a kindness that there will be no one left to write the story, much less to read it."

Speech of the Honorable KENNETH KEATING on the refugee problem, Interparliamentary Union Conference, London.

"It is particularly fitting that we meet today in London to discuss the universal problem of refugees. First, because historic London, steeped in traditions of the common law, of liberty, and of freedom, seems a proper place to turn our thoughts to many who are denied those privileges, or who may be forced to forego them if we stand by passively. Secondly, who can forget that we meet in the same city where momentous disarmament talks have so recently been held—discussions which, by their very awesome nature—tend to overshadow the seemingly less significant problems of exiles and refugees who seek a shelter today?

"But our lofty concern with justice and our natural preoccupation with prospects for world peace must never cause us to overlook the very real human suffering of the thousands of homeless and depressed emigres who today wander aimlessly the map of the world. They are, after all, victims of wars we so desperately seek to prevent in the future.

"Never before in the history of civilized man has the problem of the refugee been more acute than it has been within the last 2 decades. Never before have so many been uprooted from so many lands in so many unhappy ways.

"While it is true that miraculous strides have been taken to find shelters for the homeless and to provide havens for the oppressed in the years since the end of World War II, much still needs to be done. All of us here today, through our legislative bodies, are uniquely fitted to stimulate and participate in this humanitarian crusade.

"Certainly the draft resolution on refugee problems, if judiciously interpreted and put into action by men of good will, could achieve much good. For example, all can agree that much benefit can accrue from honestly promoting the education of young refugees, as well as efforts to aid in the resettlement, housing and employment of emigres. These are all objectives vigorously pursued and carried out by my government.

"My attention is drawn particularly to the admonition in the resolution that refugees should enjoy the same conditions as nationals of the receiving country with regard to their right of association.

"To Americans, this is axiomatic. Ours is, after all, a land of refugees, founded by men and women who had fled from persecution. In the United States the refugee—like the immigrant—has always been accorded equality in all his dealings. He is given every conceivable opportunity to make his own way and has traditionally been accorded the same safeguards and protections afforded every American citizen.

"Today, as throughout our history, many of the leading citizens of the United States are foreign born or the children of foreign born parents.

"For example, the present Congress of the United States contains Members born in England, India, Poland, Italy, Bulgaria, Canada, and Russia, to say nothing of countless others whose parents were born across the seas.

"The rich and varied mixture of backgrounds, bloods, and cultures which goes to make up America today has contributed uniquely to the building of our Nation. We are proud of our tradition of according haven and extending the hand of welcome to the world's homeless and oppressed, just as we are proud of the record these people have achieved in our midst.

"Much as I concur in the general objectives of this resolution, there are several aspects of it which are susceptible of misinterpretation, and are consequently disturbing. I refer particularly to the sections which deal with the vital question of the repatriation of refugees.

"Now, all men of good will most certainly agree that all refugees who so desire should be allowed to return to their native lands. That is but their birthright as human beings and freemen.

"But, in our zeal to insure that the return of refugees to their lands is not interfered with, we must take care not to lend assistance to or approve of the efforts of those who would force repatriation on unwilling emigres. It is fundamental to any sound and fair refugee policy that repatriation be completely voluntary.

"Certainly, this union should not condone the tactics of any member who resorts to threats, intimidation, and moral blackmail to force repatriation. But we know that some nations have been guilty of these practices, and if we do not amend the resolution before us we may be guilty of giving them a chance to continue such infamous actions with impunity.

"It is a wel-known fact that nefarious groups have been working for years to force the return of unwilling Russian nationals all over the world. Their tactics run the gamut from threats to loved ones still living behind the Iron Curtain, to threatened—and perhaps perpetrated—kidnapings.

"A most blatant campaign has been carried on by Hungary's Kadar regime to coerce refugees settled in Austria. There have been cases in my own country, where official representatives of Communist countries have attempted—and sometimes succeeded—in intimidating Russian nationals who were living peacefully. Potential areas, inhabited by Russians nationals, include West Germany, Austria, Argentina, Belgium, Brazil, and Great Britain. Are we to stand by without protest while repatriation teams, under the guise of informational and humanitarian works, employ their tactics of threats, intimidation, and disruption?

"At the same time, it should be noted that certain nations of the free world, notably Austria and the German Federal Republic, have been the target of repeated charges of obstructing the repatriation of emigres. The facts simply do not bear out these accusations. It is clear that Soviet refugees are entirely free to return if they desire, but these nations have wisely and courageously refused to compel any emigre to return against his will and have attempted to resist the intensive campaign put on by Communist groups.

"The resolution under consideration today offers us an opportunity to strike a ringing blow for the principle of voluntary repatriation. Certainly, we must not here today take any action which could in any way be interpreted as a stamp of approval of the activties of these groups which are exerting undue and unjustified pressure on refugees to return behind the Iron Curtain.

"For that reason, we should amend section 8 to make it unmistakably clear that this great body is opposed to any coercive activities by any nation either to force or to prevent repatriation.

"The wording of section 8, and other sections, of this resolution, as they now stand, invites the continued use of the force and fear which have been practiced all too often in the past. With these thoughts in mind, an amendment to section 8 has been tabled to insert a new subparagraph (d), to read as follows:

" 'Prohibits pressures upon or intimidation of, refugees by the receiving country or by their country of origin with respect to repatriation. No language in any of the preceding subparagraphs of section 8 shall be deemed to express any contrary intent.'

"If we are to work and hope for a world peace based on justice and freedom, we cannot allow the present tactics of these repatriation teams to continue without rebuke. It is unthinkable that this organization could go on record with a resolution which in any way might be construed as approving or condoning these strong-arm tactics.

"I therefore ask wide support for the amendment I have outlined. It has the unanimous support of the American delegation, which is dedicated to the ideal of freedom of movement of peoples everywhere.

"The Declaration of Independence of the United States contains these immortal words:

" 'We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable rights, that among these are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.'

"To an American, these are not merely high-sounding, empty phrases. They are living, breathing principles which the United States practices today in all phases of its activities. I trust their application to the principles here enumerated are both obvious and acceptable to all men of good will assembled heretoday. If so, we must amend the resolution before us.

"In so doing, we can print in bold, black letters our dedication to the principle of free and unfettered movement without the use of pressure or intimidation to force or prevent such movement. In accepting this amendment we can forge more strongly than ever the bonds of friendship, respect for individual rights, and devotion to justice which hold such hope for the peace of the world."

The speech of the Honorable THOMAS C. HENNINGS, Jr., at the 46th conference, Interparliamentary Union:

"The problems presented today for the world community of nations by the existence of refugees are of such gigantic magnitude that it is occasionally felt that it is impossible to do anything about them. The causes themselves—natural disasters, such as fire, flood, famine, and pestilence; and man's inhumanity to man: war and perse-

cution because of race, religion, or political belief—defy complete analysis and ready solution and consequently demand unceasing direct attention themselves. But as long as such causes exist, we will have refugees.

"We must, therefore, strive to find solutions to the refugee problem just as we direct our energies to raising standards of living, improving health and sanitation, wiping out illiteracy, obtaining fair wages and hours and working conditions, and achieving mutual understanding and respect of all peoples.

"The strong spirit of human solidarity not only makes all men brothers but makes life itself worth living. We national legislators, who enact our countries' laws, have grave and challenging responsibilities. It is appropriate that our international association devote some of its time to discussing these important issues. It is fitting that the League of Nations, the United Nations Organization, and the Interparliamentary Union have expended considerable thought and effort on behalf of refugees in this century. We must continue our efforts but we must remain on guard at all times to avoid simply approving resolutions with pious phrases, merely expressive of good intentions. Superior goals are expressed in article 13 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, which says:

" 'I. Everyone has the right to freedom of movement and residence within the borders of each State.

" 'II Everyone has the right to leave any country, including his own, and return to his country.'

"Yet we know that most nations of today are far from actually granting those objectives—to their own people or aliens.

"To take worthwhile steps in the right direction, we parliamentarians should examine the conditions which prevail in our own countries and see what national law changes we can bring about. At the same time, we should not lessen our support for such international activities as those which are conducted by the Intergovernmental Committee for European Migration and the office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees.

"In regard to national programs, I want to call attention to a recent action by the Congress of the United States. The American Congress, in enacting several immigration law amendments in the past month, recognized a national responsibility concerning refugees and provided for the issuance of nearly 19,000 immigrant visas in addition to regular quota allowances. German expellees to the number of 2,500 and 1,600 Dutch ethnics, are the only groups with earmarked totals; this represents an advance in approach to immigration and a discarding of rigid national origin or regional concepts; thus, properly qualified refugees and escapees from tyranny any place in the world become eligible to enter the United States for permanent residence, and eventual United States citizenship if they so desire.

"Admittedly these numbers for refugees are not large, even when combined with the provision, unlimited in number, for the admission of alien orphans in the next 2 years. But it is not in numbers where I find the major significance of America's most recent immigration law. I believe great importance should be attached to the fact that this act represent another step by the United States away from the total exclusion policy which was not altered substantially until World War II. America can no longer be criticized for operating an Oriental exclusion law and the new provisions for refugees, and family reunifications, make it clear that area of origin is no longer the ironbound test for admission to our shores for residence.

"But as interested as I am in this legislation, which I have supported wholeheartedly, I feel somewhat as did the critics in the old Roman Senate, who used to ask:

" 'How long, oh, Cato, must we continue to pass only piecemeal legislation?'

"Therefore, I support the amendment of the United States delegation, which provides protection for individual rights and voluntary repatriation."

Speech of the Honorable KATHARINE ST. GEORGE on control of governments by parliaments, at the 46th conference, Interparliamentary Union:

"First let me add my praises to those that have already been given to the British members for their generous hospitality, their unending kindness, and the superb and competent arrangements they have made for the comfort and pleasure of all the delegates.

"Certainly nothing could be more fitting than that the 46th Interparliamentary Conference should be held here in London, in the shadow of the mother of parliaments. For we must all acknowledge that it is from the genius of the British people that the idea and ideals of parliamentary government sprang, in the first instance and, therefore, inasmuch as all of us here present belong to parliamentary systems of one sort or another, we are all somewhat beholden to England and to her Parliament.

"Our discussion centers today on the influence and control by parliaments. We, of the Interparliamentary Union, do well, at this time in the world's history, to pause and take stock of parliamentary governments of the world and our own in particular. While it may not be a popular premise, I submit to you that the parliamentary system has suffered grievously as a result of two world wars and that it no longer has the vigor, strength, and dignity that it possessed in the second half of the 19th and first quarter of the 20th centuries. There are many parliaments in the present age that are nothing but rubberstamps, representing only one party and, therefore, only the opinion of the government in power. The words of a French lady, going to the guillotine, are quite applicable: 'Ah, liberty, what crimes have been committed in thy name.'

"Why has this situation come about? It seems obvious that wars, on the modern scale, deal deadly wounds to parliamentary governments. If a government is to wage such wars successfully, everyone down to the very schoolchildren must be regimented. Free enterprise ceases to exist, conscription becomes universal, and obviously representative government in parliament and congressional assemblies plays a very secondary if not supplementary part in government.

"Above all, criticism and debate are not tolerated during a state of war and both criticism and debate are the very lifeblood of representative government.

"This Union has always been dedicated to peace, and it does well to pursue that course, because we may well be entering the twilight of parliaments, and unless we have peace we may also see the end of the system altogether.

"As we go back from this conference, let us highly resolve to cultivate peace and understanding among ourselves and all the peoples of the world. Let us also do everything in our power to raise the prestige and power of our elected representatives.

"In my country the Founding Fathers envisaged and planned a government of three coequal branches: legislative, judicial, and executive. This was an ideal arrangement, but only constant vigilance can make it work. In our country, just as in yours, liberty has to be fought for all the time. Liberty and self-government can be killed by indolence and lack of interest on the part of the citizen almost as easily as by war.

"Sir Winston Churchill in his message to us says: 'Parliamentary institutions have confronted, and have triumphantly overcome, the heaviest assault ever made upon them.' I would that I could share this optimism, but I cannot. We may well have survived the assault but we are sorely wounded and it will take our best efforts to bring free representative government back in its full glory.

"About 200 years ago, Edmund Burke stood on the floor of the House of Commons and championed vigorously the cause of the 13 colonies in North America who were in rebellion against England. Can you imagine such a thing happening in the world today? Of course you cannot. We have seen men and women driven from public life for far less. Such conduct today would be regarded as treason and would be dealt with accordingly. Yet history does not record that Burke was made to suffer unduly for his opinions, so clearly expressed. Many doubtless disliked them, most persons probably disapproved of them, but he was permitted to pursue his course in peace.

"Yes, as we stand here and look at the past in parliamentary history, let us try to keep this system strong and undefiled. Let us not be complacent and spend our time in silly congratulations and foolish optimism. Let us not be lulled into the belief that because there are more parliaments there is more freedom, this is not necessarily so.

"Benjamin Franklin is reported to have said to an old lady in Philadelphia who asked him what form of government the new Nation was to have: 'A republic, if you can keep it.'

"We as we go back to our respective homelands can paraphrase these words 'A free parliamentary government if we can keep it.'

"We will only keep it by cultivating peace and understanding among ourselves—by educating ourselves and our peoples in the difficult practice of free government, by remembering the words of Voltaire 'I disapprove of everything you say, but will fight to the death for your right to say it.' Above all, realizing that we personally have been greatly honored to be chosen as representatives of sovereign peoples and that as individuals we must work and strive to represent them always with dignity, integrity and true patriotism, so that these free people under God shall not perish from the earth."

Speech of Honorable RALPH E. FLANDERS at the 46th conference, Interparliamentary Union:

"Mr. President and members of the Interparliamentary Union:

"The subject of this session is the influence of and control by parliament over the government. This subject is particularly appropriate for a meeting in this capital, whose parliament is properly called the 'mother of parliaments.' The primary instrument of government under the British constitution is the parliament itself. That constitution is an organic development, evolved by growth and changes over centuries of history. In the pagentry and setting of our opening session those centuries were displayed before our eyes. Let us hope that the British people will always preserve these values of history, made visible.

"Her royal highness, Queen Elizabeth II, who so graciously opened our sessions, reigns but does not rule. The centuries of evolution have placed upon parliament the sole responsibility of ruling. Yet the reigning of Elizabeth is both a vital and a preserving force in the British commonwealth of nations even though it is not directly concerned with governing. Its scope lies with the intangibles, which must be strong and healthy if the tangibles are to be effective.

"All the governmental power of Great Britain has come to be concentrated in the House of Parliament, in the ministries selected from them and in the administrative and judicial branches which they control. The people control parliament in contested elections. Through their elected servants the people control every element of their government.

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

"The draft resolution now before us sets forth the British parliamentary practice as the norm to which all governments of all nations should seek to conform. As Members of the House and Senate of the American Congress we would, first, subscribe wholeheartedly to the purpose of bringing governments under the control of peoples; but we must call attention to the fact that the parliamentary system is not he only means by which that can be accomplished. In our country the functions of government are divided between a Chief Executive, a legislative body, and a Supreme Court. The President and the two Houses of Congress are elected by popular vote. The Judges of the Court are appointed by the President with the advice and consent of the Senate as evidenced by a vote of confirmation.

"Here we have three distinct branches of Government—legislative, executive, and judicial. They are distinct but must work together. They do work together under a system of checks and balances as it has come to be called. These checks and balances are always at work as was plainly evident in the recent history of race relations in our country. The Supreme Court, by new interpretation of our Constitution, decreed that further progress must be made toward unsegregated schooling. A governor seems about to challenge that decision, by force if necessary, the President confers with the governor to see whether forward steps may be taken. Without exacerbation of public sentiment.

"Meanwhile, the President's Department of Justice sends to the Congress a law for its consideration which deals with the whole field of race relations. The Congress, after lengthy debate, decides that the measure is too broad and will lead to Federal inquisition and supervision over too great an area of the citizens' activities. The administration bill is therefore drastically amended by the Congress, it is passed as amended and sent to the President. He signs the bill and it becomes law.

"Such is our system of checks and balances, always fluid but continuously effective. This system is defined in our Constitution, drafted by the Founding Fathers in the years following our successful revolution. Sir Henry Maine praised this as the greatest application in history of the elementary principles of government to practical administration. It provides for amendments, which are made from time to time, but its structure sprang in full bloom from the fertile minds and devoted hearts of an assembly of American patriots and statesmen assembled in a constitutional convention. It has taken its place alongside the evolving British Constitution as an example to the world of political institutions which embody and preserve the will of the people as applied to the policies and acts of government.

"For these reasons, Mr. President, the American delegation cannot be satisfied with the narrow view of parliamentary powers as described in the resolution. It is necessary so to reward it as to compass a wider range of means for attaining the desired ends."

Speech of the Honorable HENRY O. TALLE at the 46th conference, Interparliamentary Union:

"Mr. President, fellow delegates:

"I now have the honor, or perhaps I should say the task, of addressing myself to one of the most important, most persistent, and most difficult of current international subjects: commodity prices and what to do about them.

"Innumerable debates on this question have been held in recent years. It is too much to expect that we in this room will reach unanimous accord on every aspect of the subject. Yet I believe that we can all benefit from the discussion. And I further believe that careful consideration of one another's views may possibly show that there is not so much disagreement as some may have thought.

"For example, I do not think there is any substantial disagreement as to certain basic facts:

"It is a fact that many foodstuffs and industrial raw materials are subject to sharp and sudden fluctuations in price and demand.

"It is a fact that these fluctuations are a matter of concern to all countries, both as exporters and importers.

"It is a fact that such fluctuations bring especially serious problems to a country which is so heavily dependent upon the production and exportation of 1 or 2 primary commodities—such as rubber, sugar, coffee, tea, cocoa, tin, copper, jute, cotton, rice, and coconut products—that such exportation is a mainstay of that country's domestic economic activity, of its tax revenues, and of its foreign exchange earning power.

"I am tremendously impressed with the seriousness of these facts, especially for countries that are less developed industrially and heavily dependent upon a small number of primary products for their livelihood. I think that all of us share this awareness and this concern.

"Thus there is no disagreement over the magnitude or the seriousness of the problem. The point at issue is whether it is desirable for governments to try to limit these fluctuations through agreements regulating trade.

"My own opinion is that, in general, it is not.

"Without in any way minimizing the problems of market instability, I believe that there are few situations in which strict regulaton is in the long-run interest of either the exporting countries or the importing countries.

"In the first place, it is my deep conviction that economic progress is best served by allowing maximum freedom to private enterprise, and by a minimum of government interference in world commodity trade.

"In the second place, I believe that many of the proposals that are made for broadly regulating commodity prices are impractical, and could not be made to work for a variety of complicated reasons—technical, economic, and otherwise—having nothing to do with ideology. I certainly do not blame people from casting in all directions for solutions to these very real and grim problems, but I do not think it is feasible to solve them through excessive regulation.

"Third, the problem of instability in a given commodity is not necessarily solved by establishing a commodity agreement. Close examination of a particular commodity situation often proves that a strong and stable market is in prospect without any special action by governments; or that measures other than a commodity agreement will suffice; or that a commodity agreement is not technically feasible; or that it is not negotiable because of an essential conflict of interests between importing and exporting countries; or the examination may show that a commodity agreement would not be in the real interest of the exporting countries.

"Commodity agreements, even though they may be necessary in some cases, have definite limitations. It is a mistake to expect miracles from them. I may point out that the existence of a sugar agreement, in which the United States participates, was no guaranty against a sudden increase in the world price of sugar and an equally sudden drop. The contribution which a commodity agreement can make to stability in prices, tax revenues, and foreign-exchange earnings is often greatly overrated.

"My fourth and final point is that there are certain dangers in commodity agreements which ought not to be overlooked. One danger that I have in mind is that if prices are stabilized at too high a level, this will only encourage shifts to substitutes and synthetics, or to cheaper sources. And the exporting countries may wake up to find that they have achieved their price objective at the cost of declining markets.

"I am giving some of the reasons why I believe that it is not wise for the nations to go all-out for commodity agreements or other machinery for strict regulation of trade. But I do not mean to suggest that our minds should be closed to exceptional measures in exceptional cases.

"In my view, the wisest approach to the problems of instability in world commodity trade is a case-by-case approach. The existing machinery for consultation and action in the commodity field seems entirely adequate. I am in favor of studying each problem on its merits and taking any necessary action, if action is warranted. I am not in favor of deciding in advance that all commodity problems should be attacked in a certain way.

"We all know that in the long view, the problems of instability become less and less serious as nations make progress toward the diversification of their economies. I do not say that this is the only thing that can be done, but I say it is the most effective thing that can be done toward a real solution. We of the United States share with the peoples of the nonindustrial countries a desire that they grow economically and become more diversified in their output. I believe that I can say without giving the appearance of boasting—since it is only a fact known to you all—that never before in history has a nation taken so substantial an interest in the economic progress of other sovereign nations, as has the United States during the last 10 years.

"Let us continue to attack our long-term and short-term problems together in good will and consideration for one another's needs and convictions."

Speech of the Honorable ESTES KEFAUVER at the 46th conference of the Interparliamentary Union:

"Mr. President, I think we are all in accord as to the spirit and objectives of the draft resolution which has been presented in regard to the stabilization of the prices of basic commodities.

"I must say, however, that the problem is a good deal more complicated than the draft resolution implies. The report of the rapporteur recognizes the complexity of the matter. It also recognizes the failure, or at best the only partial success, of previous efforts to stabilize world commodity prices through international agreements. The rationale of the resolution, however, is that the reasons for these failures lie in the fact that the efforts were not sufficiently comprehensive. The resolution therefore suggests that broader efforts be made.

"It seems to me that it could equally well be argued that the reasons for the lack of success of international commodity agreements lie in the method of approach—that is, in the agreements themselves. It would then follow that we would have no more success in the future with broad agreements than we have had in the past with narrow ones.

"Let me make just a few comments about the general problem.

"It is unquestionably true that sharp fluctuations in world prices of basic commodities work a hardship on all concerned, and that this hardship is particularly acute in the case of precipitous declines in the prices of commodities on which underdeveloped countries rely for a substantial proportion of their foreign exchange.

"It is, however, easy to exaggerate the effects of these fluctuations. Despite cyclical variations, there has been a long-term secular trend upward in practically all prices. This is to the benefit of underdeveloped producing countries, and as a representative of an in-

porting country, I am not complaining about it. I am merely pointing it out, because I think it is frequently overlooked.

"Let me cite just one example of a basic commodity which is not the subject of an international price stabilization agreement, yet which has been of enormous benefit to several underdeveloped countries. I refer to oil and to Venezuela and Iraq, both of which have profited greatly from oil and both of which are using their oil income to good advantage. All of us can think of other examples as well.

"However, I do not want to minimize the problem, because it is a very real one. I do venture to suggest that there is no panacea to be found, either in an international agreement on the stabilization of prices or in other means. This does not mean that the problem is hopeless. Rather, it means that we should not concentrate our attack on the problem in a single approach. We must approach it on many fronts.

"One of these is the development of world trade, commerce, and prosperity generally. The more prosperous the world is as a whole, the greater will be the demand for basic commodities and the greater will be their stability based on long-term market growth. This calls, I think, for mutual reductions in barriers of all kinds to world trade. I support such reductions in my Congress, and I hope you will support them in your Parliaments.

"Another avenue of approach to this problem is through the stimulation of private foreign investment. I have not always been uncritical of private business, but I do think that it has learned a good many things in its foreign operations and that, today, it goes into a country, not to exploit, but to develop. I have already cited the examples of Venezuela and Iraq. To those, I could add, so far as American business is concerned, most of South America, Brazil, Peru, Colombia, and Mexico, in particular, have benefited greatly from the investment of private American capital. There is no reason whatever why other countries could not similarly benefit if the local investment climate is made attractive. This involves many things, but two of the most important are political stability and sound economic policies.

"These twin approaches—through the development of world trade and of private investment—seem to me to offer a sounder long-range solution to basic commodity prices than a general international stabilization agreement. If such an agreement puts the price too high, it not only discourages consumption but also encourages the development of synthetic substitutes. This latter process is already well advanced in the case of rubber, for example. On the other hand, if an agreement puts the price too low, it means that the producing countries are not receiving full value and it will probably also discourage private development of the resources in question.

"I hold with Adam Smith that the best regulator of prices is the mechanism of the free market. This means, of course, that we must all take steps to see that the market is really free and that it is not manipulated by private or public monopolists for their own ends.

"In conclusion I would like to mention one device which I think is deserving of more attention than it has so far received—either in my own country or elsewhere. This is what is popularly known as the world food bank. This is my personal view and not necessarily the view of the United States delegation. It would involve the application, on a worldwide basis, of the ever-normal granary idea. Each country would put certain stocks into the bank in times of surplus, and each country would be entitled to draw certain stocks out in time of shortage. It would, in some respects, be analogous to the International Monetary Fund except that it would use food instead of money as its stock in trade.

"The United States Senate has called for a more detailed study of this problem. If the pending resolution is adopted by this Interparliamentary Conference, and if the international meeting which the resolution calls for comes about, I hope that this aspect of the matter will not be overlooked."

The efficient cooperation of our London Embassy staff in all projects, the regular early morning caucus meetings of the group at the Embassy, the assignment of staff and office space for the United States secretarial staff, the standby cooperation of the United States Navy, who were responsible for physical arrangements and for important briefings both at the opening and during the Conference, were unexcelled. The delegates returned home with the feeling of a job well done, looking forward to Rio de Janeiro July 24-31, 1958.

The resolutions enacted by the 46th conference of the Interparliamentary Union follow:

I. THE REFUGEE PROBLEM

Considering that the resolution adopted by the Istanbul Interparliamentary Conference (August–September 1951) on the Juridical Aspects of the Refugee Problem contains the following statement:

"Recalling that under the Universal Declaration of Human Rights everyone has the right to security of person; to recognition everywhere as a person before the law; to seek and to enjoy in other countries asylum from persecution; to equal protection against any discrimination; no one shall be subjected to arbitrary exile; everyone has the right to return to his country; everyone has the right to a nationality; no one shall be arbitrarily deprived of his nationality; no one shall be arbitrarily deprived of his property; and everyone is entitled to a social and international order in which the rights and freedoms set forth can be fully realized."

Considering that, from the point of view of protection of refugees, the convention of July 28, 1951, relating to the status of refugees, constitutes the most important initiative taken by the United Nations Organization and that, during examination of this convention, the Geneva Conference adopted:

1. The protocol relating to the status of stateless persons.

2. Several recommendations concerning (a) recognition of travel documents necessary to facilitate the movement of refugees and, in particular, their resettlement; (b) maintenance of the unity of the refugee's family and protection of refugees who are minors, in particular unaccompanied children and girls, with special reference to guardianship and adoption; (c) support of properly qualified organizations dealing with refugees;

The 46th Interparliamentary Conference—

I. Considers that the refugee problem should be examined on the basis of the following principles: (1) It is the duty of the States and of their respective peoples to be guided by a strong spirit of human solidarity in order to afford refugees asylum and work; (2) states should grant refugees the same treatment as that accorded to other foreign nationals; (3) refugees should, insofar as possible, be enabled to find an occupation corresponding to their stated experience. Young refugees wishing to specialize should be afforded every opportunity to do so in general schools or technical institutions, after having completed their normal course of primary studies; (4) governments and their respective peoples should facilitate the housing and resettlement of refugees; (5) with regard to the right of association, refugees should enjoy the same conditions as the nationals of a country; (6) regulations in regard to unemployment benefits, insurance, and social security should be applicable to foreigners in general; (7) article 13 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights is recalled: "i. Everyone has the right to freedom of movement and residence within the borders of each state"; "ii. Everyone has the right to leave any country, including his own, and to return to his country."

II. Asks that in all cases in which refugees are desirous of returning home, no obstacle shall be placed in the way of their repatriation by the receiving country nor by their country of origin and that every facility shall be given them to that effect; and invites the governments of all countries in which there are refugees, as well as all official or private international organizations concerned with the problem of refugees, to acquaint the latter with the laws and regulations applied in the different countries, with a view to facilitating their voluntary repatriation; condemns the use of refugees as an instrument of political struggle;

III. Recommends that the governments of all countries in which there are refugees take immediate steps to insure their speedy employment, while awaiting their voluntary repatriation, as well as all possible measures for the prompt repatriation of children and adolescents separated from their parents;

IV. Prohibits pressures upon, or intimidation of, refugees by the receiving country or by their country of origin with respect to repatriation. No language in any of the preceding paragraphs shall be deemed to express any contrary intent;

V. Recommends that the United Nations give to the Arab refugees the consideration which the justice of their case calls for and find a final solution to their problem by enforcing the resolutions already taken by that organization, and until such a solution is implemented to give adequate financial assistance;

VI. Requests the office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees to continue the study of the following questions: (i) Equivalence of degrees for refugees; (ii) exemption for political refugees, their wives, children and parents from the tax on registration certificates and renewal thereof, and on identity cards; (iii) financial assistance to countries which, as a result of special circumstances, receive a large number of refugees, particularly with a view to facilitating the construction of houses, this being an indispensable factor in the adaptation of refugees to the receiving country, a similar contribution also being made to encourage the acceptance of nonproductive persons whenever agreement has been reached on the immigration of a specific number of workers; (iv) further, to facilitate the voluntary repatriation of refugees by practical means.

VII. The conference invites nonmember states to become parties to the Geneva Convention of July 28, 1951, with the least possible delay, and to grant refugees the facilities laid down in this convention.

II. THE INFLUENCE OF AND CONTROL BY PARLIAMENT OVER THE GOVERNMENT

Considering that one of the fundamental aims of the Interparliamentary Union is the fostering of democratic parliamentary institutions and their development in the light of our experience.

Considering that it is inherent in the democratic system of government that the legislature should constantly and continuously control the conduct of government and that this requires the meeting of parliament at reasonably regular intervals with full facilities for information, particularly through questions, inquiries, interpellations, discussions and the adoption of resolutions.

Considering that, although the financial procedure and the procedure over the discussion of foreign affairs differ in various coun-

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

tries, it is essential for parliament to intervene unreservedly in and express itself vigorously on all domestic and foreign matters.

The 46th Interparliamentary Conference recommends that, within the framework of the different political and constitutional systems that exist, a serious effort should be made to consecrate the supremacy of parliament by making it the real elected instrument of the democratic will of the people.

III. THE STABILIZATION OF PRICES OF PRIMARY PRODUCTS

Considering that excessive fluctuation in the prices of primary products makes it difficult to frame and apply acceptable programs for economic development and leads to situations which are difficult both for producers, who, in view of this uncertainty, are never assured of equitable remuneration for their efforts, and for importers, who need a regular supply of products at reasonable prices.

Considering that these disadvantages are particularly felt in underdeveloped countries, which find the main source of their revenue in the production of raw materials and are more affected by fluctuations in prices than industrialized countries, which are normally better organized for the protection of their economic interests.

Considering that fluctuations in commodity prices in international markets upset the balance of payments position of the underdeveloped countries and therefore their prospects of economic development.

Recognizing that measures taken in the field of price support by nations responsible for the economy of underdeveloped territories have achieved only limited success and need to be supplemented by, and coordinated with, action on the international level to put an end at least to short-term fluctuations of prices arising mainly from temporary causes,

Recognizing the disadvantages of harmful operation by organizations acting under monopoly conditions and constantly paying to producers prices which are unduly at variance with those prevailing in international markets,

Appreciating that it is desirable to strive for terms which, while being fair to consumers, should not be to the detriment of producers, and to that end that organizations of producers, consumers, and traders should be associated in the discussions,

The 46th Interparliamentary Conference recommends:

That the formulation of international commodity agreements between the appropriate producer and consumer countries on the lines of those already in operation should be encouraged;

That the Havana Charter rules which are at present administered by the Interim Coordinating Committee for International Commodity Arrangements should be reviewed and put on a permanent basis;

That an international conference should be convened in order to carry this recommendation into effect.

Foreign Aid: A Study in Dollars, Delusions, and Deception

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL G. ROGERS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 27, 1958

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I request permission to have the following article printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Mr. Bernard Van Renssalaer, who has written a recent article which appeared in the Reader's Digest on the foreign aid program, made a very enlightening talk on the way some of the foreign aid moneys are being spent. Mr. Van Renssalaer points up the need for a critical reevaluation of this entire program.

The article follows:

This is a tale of misspent dollars. It is also a story of delusions and deception. This tale will not have a happy ending. In fact, it has no ending at all. It will continue, page after page, chapter after chapter, volume after volume, without purpose and without end, until aroused citizens put a check on what is becoming a humiliating and futile episode in the annals of our history.

I refer to the program upon which our Federal Government embarked 12 long years ago. Perhaps a better way of saying it, is billions and billions of dollars ago. It started, innocently enough and with the noblest intentions, as the Marshall plan. It has mushroomed in a little more than a decade to the second most expensive project in the overwhelming array of Government undertakings.

Under this program we are contributing to the economies of more than 60 countries in every part of the world at a total cost of $4 billion annually and the process of expansion goes on and on.

Foreign aid is a tale of dollars. Sixty billion dollars, to be exact. That is the 12-year cost to the American people. How much is it, in terms we can comprehend? It figures out to $350 for every man, woman, and child in our Nation; more than $1,000 for the average American family—more, I might add, than most families have in their savings accounts today. Sixty billion dollars—more than the total assessed valuation of the 17 largest cities in America.

Foreign aid is a tale of delusions. We have been deluded—there is no other word for it—into a mass belief that every dollar spent for foreign aid shoves our trusted allies, our not-so-trusted friends of the moment, and the outright fence sitters further and further away from the yawning precipice of communism. We've been told, retold, and told again—directly and by calculated implication—that the yardstick of the free world's collective security can be measured by the sum total of American dollars paid out in foreign aid.

The sad fact is, my friends, that we've been sold a bill of goods. We bought it—but we are not through paying for it. And if the present plans of our foreign aid bureaucrats materialize through the generosity of Congress, we can look forward to continuing payments for at least another generation.

Foreign aid is also a tale of deception. A tough word, to be sure—but it fits. How many times have you picked up your newspaper to read a dynamic pulse-stirring statement by a high-ranking Government official extolling the virtues of a mammoth program of foreign assistance? To justify the outlay of your dollars, he tells you: "Look what we've accomplished. A new factory in Iran, food for the starving Koreans, guns and tanks and planes for our good friends, the Turks. And just in the nick of time, too, to slam the door on the lurking menace of the Kremlin."

Is that what we've done? Have our dollars really and truly saved the world, or a good part of it, from communism? Believe me, if I was convinced, or even half-convinced, I'd never utter a word of protest. But as a free American, I reserve the right to examine the facts and reach my own decisions. When the facts plainly and indisputably contradict the propaganda, then I believe it's time to step in and set the record straight.

The record of 12 years shows this: America is now committed to a foreign-aid program indefinitely. The program is costing far more than it should because of the way money has been mismanaged and squandered. Dollars alone do not rescue countries from communism. It takes more than multipurpose dams, factories, and cash to save the souls of men. Properly conceived and managed, American assistance to the needy nations of the world could yield great benefits. But as conducted today it cannot fail to drain off tremendous amounts of our financial and material resources out of all proportion to the accruing advantage to ourselves and to the people we are trying to help. Moreover, it is not winning friends. The main beneficiary will be the entrenched and growing bureaucracy that is in the process of making a permanent career out of distributing American taxpayers' money to the four corners of the earth.

As long as this program stumbles and staggers without clear-cut policy direction, without realistic planning and competent management, without rigid discipline and control—so long as these conditions prevail, foreign aid shall remain the greatest international giveaway in the history of mankind.

Now let's examine the details of foreign aid, the various shapes it takes on the planning boards of the State Department, the Defense Department, and the International Cooperation Administration and as it grows to maturity in the sixty-odd nations currently involved.

First is military assistance. This refers to actual military hardware and training of foreign troops. For this purpose some $1.5 billion will probably be appropriated in the fiscal 1958 budget.

Next is a program bearing the dubious title of defense support. In a cold, bright light, this shows up as economic assistance, but we are told it is all part of our military aid because it is designed to bolster—probably some $700 million worth in fiscal 1958—the economies of countries receiving military assistance. This, however, fails to conceal the fact that defense support, as such, is nonmilitary in character.

Nevertheless, as our foreign-aid bureaucracy set out to justify its share of the proposed record-high budget for the next fiscal year, the American taxpayer was assured that at least 75 percent of the $4 billion to $4.5 billion sought for foreign aid was going into military assistance. This, of course, has popular appeal. We will support a military program because it contributes to our defense whereas we resent a huge volume of economic giveaways.

This percentage figure, however, does not quite square with the facts. Actually the aggregate of all nonmilitary aid consumes more than half of our foreign-aid expenditures, and if you add the value of surplus farm products we distribute abroad but which do not figure in the mutual security budget, the sum of nonmilitary assistance mounts up to more than 60 percent of our total foreign-assistance bill.

America also extends to its friends abroad a program of technical assistance, whereby we attempt to impart some of the know-hows and skills of superindustrialized society to the underdeveloped areas of the world. This highly commendable objective will probably command a budget of $160 million for the next fiscal year. Unfortunately this part of the program has run into great trouble by trying to do a little of something everywhere in all fields of human activity. There are now between 1,500 to 2,000 projects in more than 60 countries.

It has been impossible to obtain enough trained manpower to operate them and this sprawling, uncoordinated program is beyond the capacity of Washington to manage effectively.

Adding up the other components of this complex program we find something like this available for fiscal year 1958: $500 million for an economic development lending fund; $500 million in reappropriation of the funds remaining from last year's foreign aid budget; $300 million for the President's special or emergency fund; some $95 million of administrative and miscellaneous costs; and $750 million surplus agricultural commodities.

It all rounds out to a tidy $4.5 billion. Your share: some $80 to $85 for every family in the land.

Now this amount, while vast, would not in itself account for fears that there is a swollen budget, hidden waste, extravagance, duplication, and inefficiency. It is only when we relate the anticipated expenditures to past outlays and the record of accomplishments that the warning signal goes up.

We are informed—at least, it's printed there for all of us to read—in thousands of pages of testimony given in congressional hearings and in reports of congressional investigations and in other official records, that great waste and extravagance does in fact exist. We are told, for example, that—

1. We helped finance sugar plants in Iran where not enough sugar was grown to keep them operating.

2. We helped erect cotton plants in Korea—where there is no native cotton.

3. We helped put up flour mills in Korea and Formosa—where there is little or no wheat.

4. In Iran we paid out some $500,000 for American-made automatic looms to install in a textile plant which had never been properly engineered. The looms required high-grade cotton—of which there was very little—and skilled operators and maintenance men—of whom there were none in the native population. Then we failed to install the power to make the plant operate.

5. We put up a tremendous cowbarn in Lebanon—as a cost of $128,000—to display to Lebanese farmers with an average income of $100 or less a year, all the shiny, modern equipment they should purchase in order to really become prosperous.

6. In India, 2 weeks before unobligated appropriations were to expire at the end of a fiscal year, we decided to donate $1,539,000 worth of prefabricated steel for 52 grain silos and warehouses. Two years later the steel was lying around unused. Yet the International Cooperation Administration obligated $4 million more for additional steel warehouses.

7. We put up $450,000 for a tire plant in Korea, and then learned that it was extremely difficult to develop a market for this product.

8. We paid out $14.5 million to build 5 airports in Afghanistan and install electronic equipment in another airport which Russia is building—in a country with few roads and totally inadequate mass transportation facilities.

9. For 2 years 50 cents of every dollar we poured into Yugoslavia for economic aid leaked out for the payment of principal and interest on Yugoslavia's debts to other countries.

10. We spent several hundred million dollars in the purchase of British military aircraft that it was known would be obsolescent when delivered. Meanwhile our assistance enabled the British to release funds from their budget to subsidize the development and production of commercial jet transport airplanes in competition with American aircraft manufacturers and engine builders.

11. In one case a large military aid contract for ammunition to be produced in Europe was taken from the low bidder in one country and placed in another country without due regard for price in order to influence an election.

12. In South Vietnam and South Korea, we converted imported commodities and American dollars into local currencies at unrealistic and disadvantageous rates of exchange. The result: It required many millions of dollars more than was necessary to carry out our objective.

13. We obligated $19 million for the construction of a fertilizer plant in Korea without any engineering survey, specifications, or determination on such essential matters as types of fertilizer, plant location, and types of raw materials.

14. During the last few weeks of fiscal year 1956, in an effort to use up all allocated funds, we gave Iran $34 million in commodity procurement grants although we knew or should have known that Iran's capacity to receive and absorb these commodities did not exceed $1 million per month.

15. In South Vietnam, South Korea, and Iran, when we could not find enough projects upon which we could get rid of our aid funds, we handed the local officials, from time to time, United States Treasury checks running into many millions of dollars as a form of budget support. No one really knows how these funds were used and where they were spent.

16. In Iran we imported machinery and equipment of all sorts valued at $25 million. Three years later the International Cooperation Administration was still trying to find out where it had all gone, where it then was, and who had it.

17. In the suburbs of Manila, we built row after row of individual bathrooms on small lots—on the theory that people would buy the lots and build neat, little homes around the bathrooms. Unfortunately, the Filipinos didn't like the idea and so the rows of bathrooms just sat there. I might add that this landmark in our efforts to raise the living standards of backward people came to be known as Flushing Heights.

These documented incidents, unfortunately, are not isolated instances of errors in judgment, admittedly a very commonplace human failing. If we could forget that the record presents countless similar cases, then we might find it possible to adopt a tolerant attitude with the confidence that our foreign aid bureaucracy would learn by experience.

It hasn't developed that way. The same errors of judgment show up year after year. The list I recited to you covered very recent cases as well as cases dating back a number of years.

The record, while very bleak indeed, does contain bright spots. Our $60 billion investment is not a total loss. In spite of empire building, inefficiency and needless expense in many areas, the Marshall plan helped to restore Western Europe at a critical time. The anti-malarial compaigns in several countries have proved to be lifesavers. Certain technical cooperation projects in the fields of agriculture, health and education have more than justified themselves. Without substantial aid certain countries of Asia might have collapsed, but here again there was much waste and the recipients were often uncooperative.

Let me emphasize a point I made earlier. All of us can believe very strongly in the principles of American aid to needy countries. We have the immediate and important objective of gaining and holding trustworthy friends in the family of free nations. Viewed from long range, an effective foreign-aid program can do much to help our less fortunate neighbors help themselves. It is a lofty goal, and one to which we can all subscribe.

No; we cannot find fault with the principles. But we can—and must—take steps to correct the way our foreign-aid bureaucracy has chosen to carry out this mission. We can—and must—restore this program to manageable size, reflecting our own ability to pay for it and the ability of recipient nations to absorb and properly utilize what we are providing.

Are we on the path to better management? At this moment, there are few, if any, encouraging signs. In the face of overwhelming evidence of waste and extravagance, we are advised pointblank by our foreign-aid officials that, notwithstanding dollars down the drain, their management can be defended, because we are saving the world from slavery. We are not extended even the lamest excuses for our squandered dollars. Instead, every mistake is defended, and we are advised that the program's motives are the highest. That, we are told, is the only really important thing to consider.

So far removed from the somber conference rooms in Washington, you may very well find it hard to believe that such an attitude exists. Let me quote to you from a letter I received from one of the highest officials in the State Department, after I had called his attention to the record of staggering waste and just plain mismanagement attached to our program in Iran. He replied, and I quote:

"The story of our aid program to Iran is, in fact, a classic case in which the operation was successful, and the patient survived."

Had I lacked respect for this gentleman and his high office, and had I not been convinced that he, too, had been sold a bill of goods by the freewheeling planners and empire builders serving under him, I might have asked: "How about the patient in the room next door, the American taxpayer? Will he survive, too?"

At every level in the foreign-aid hierarchy, this bewildering attitude is pronounced. Consider for a moment the investigation conducted by the House Committee on Government Operations to pin down the blame for the unwholesome condition of our program in Iran. Let me quote from the committee's final report—mind you, this is the report filed by 29 Members of the House of Representatives and based upon 8 months of investigation and over 1,200 pages of testimony.

The committee recommended "that the Department of State and the International Cooperation Administration identify the individuals responsible for the waste and lax administration described in this report, and take prompt action to insure that they shall no longer occupy positions of trust and authority in the expenditure of United States aid funds."

That, my friends, is plain talk. And what happened? At this very moment the official who directed our aid mission in Iran is now chief of our mission in Korea where we are spending more than $300 million annually in economic aid. His former deputy was selected to succeed him in Iran. Others associated with the Iranian program are holding responsible foreign-aid positions in various parts of the world. In other words, all have received an outright vote of confidence for having squandered tens of millions of American dollars in useless and impractical projects.

Now where do we go from here? First, I believe that if more and more citizens come face to face with the painful realities in this gigantic international WPA, it will become more and more difficult to peddle a shoddy bill of goods. That's our first job—bringing this tale of dollars, delusions, and deception into every corner of the land, for citizens everywhere to consider in their own homes and communities, and reach their own decisions.

I have every confidence in the common sense and good judgment of the American people. Given the facts, Americans make up their minds in a hurry, and then stand

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

up for what they believe. It won't happen overnight, of course. We cannot scour out the follies and blunders and outright nonsense of the past 12 years without hard work, active interest, and unselfish devotion to the task at hand.

Equally important is setting our sight on a well-defined objective. Like it or not, our Nation has shouldered the burden of world leadership. Like it or not, we are committed indefinitely to a program of foreign aid. Now as practical people who want the job done as efficiently as possible and at the lowest possible cost, let's decide how we will go about it.

Let me offer, for your earnest consideration, a few ideas of the subject.

First, when we concede that foreign aid is something we must learn to live with indefinitely, let's also accept the fact that it must be rigidly controlled and kept within the bounds of our ability to administer it properly.

Competent administration is a primary goal. There's a place for idealists and visionaries and saviors of the world—but not in foreign aid. We must have experienced bankers, experts who can hold their own in the game of international finance, engineers and other technical authorities who can measure the value of our projects in terms of performance and proven results, not politics and soul-saving. Above all, we must have tough-minded administrators with the experience necessary to manage the greatest merchant banking and technical operation that the world has ever known. They must be wise enough to carry out our legitimate objectives and at the same time sufficiently hard bitten to insist that Uncle Sam gets a fair shake and a measure of cooperation from the recipients of our aid.

Further, we must create a rigid policy framework and stay within it. That means we must assess our foreign-aid plans from our own point of view as well as the other fellow's. It means facing up to the fact that some things, at least, simply cannot be justified in terms of a foreign nation's needs if they are clearly beyond its capacity to absorb and use the aid. The development of backward countries is a slow and painful process. Our assistance in this undertaking is not a project to be turned over to theoretical planners and promoters.

Next, I believe we should draw a clear, sharp line between military and nonmilitary assistance. The American taxpayer is entitled to know where one ends and the other begins. The practice of disguising purely economic projects as so-called military support, simply to appeal emotionally to the American public, is deception at its very worst.

Further, let's step back for a moment and take a good, hard look at foreign aid and all the responsibilities it carries. Let's size up our obligations to the rest of the world, and then take a new and tighter grip on a long-ignored concept: that foreign assistance must serve to strengthen and defend the giver as well as the receiver, and when giving becomes unproductive and wasteful, the waste must be ruthlessly eliminated or the giver will ultimately be badly hurt.

Our foreign-aid bureaucrats tend to lose sight of this fact and it is time that they face up to the realities.

One more point: Foreign aid, as it is conducted today or as we would like to see it conducted, can never become a substitute for diplomacy and a realistic foreign policy. In a world of proud and sovereign nations, we cannot purchase friendship or respect. Only a genuine interest in the welfare of others, as reflected in practical efforts to help others help themselves, will earn us any measure of international affection and trust. We must avoid creating any suspicion that we are employing foreign aid not as a means of helping other people but as a form of bribery, tribute or blackmail.

The underdeveloped countries of the world cannot be saved by the indiscriminate use of dollars. The only thing that can save them is an understanding of the spiritual values that have made America great and a desire to put them into practice. We cannot plan and regulate their lives. We can show them the way but they must do the rest. This is our real mission. To accomplish this we must revise both our thinking and our planning.

Finally, we must insist upon a straightforward and businesslike program of competence, control, and commonsense. Competence means that we must give the capable people within the International Cooperation Administration an opportunity to function under experienced leadership instead of bureaucratic promoters. Controls are needed to bring a measure of discipline and order to the administration of foreign aid. Commonsense is indispensable in deciding what should be undertaken and how it should be done. Until these three elements are introduced into the program, foreign aid will continue to deteriorate with the gravest consequences for the United States and the beneficiaries of our assistance. Only a vocal and vigorous public opinion can bring about these reforms.

The answer is up to you and every other American. Thank you.

A Blueprint for Action

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS P. O'NEILL, JR.

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 27, 1958

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Speaker, on October 29, 1957, the Democratic leader of the Massachusetts State Senate, the Honorable John E. Powers, of South Boston, addressed the Boston College seminar on fiscal, economic, and political problems of Boston and the metropolitan community. This was the opening address of the fourth year of the Boston College seminars.

The title of his discussion was "A Blueprint for Action." Senator Powers is considered to be one of the most able men who have ever been in public life in Massachusetts in the past decade—an able leader, a forceful orator, and an alert and progressive legislator. He has served in the Massachusetts Legislature as assistant minority leader, as majority leader, and as minority leader. He knows the problems of Massachusetts, and the problems of his native city of Boston. His sterling remarks have been accepted quite generally as a step forward toward improving relations between businessmen and legislators. He was introduced by Horace Schermerhorn, who is president of the National Shawmut Bank of Boston and served as chairman of the seminar with the following remarks:

Our speaker rounded out with the prorogation of the 1957 session of the legislature a total of 19 consecutive years in that body. He served in the Massachusetts House from his election in 1939 until 1946 and he has served in the Massachusetts Senate from 1947 until the present. On the floor of the Senate, he is officially recognized as the senator from the Fourth Suffolk District. We know him as the senator from South Boston.

His capacity for leadership was recognized after a single term in the House when he was chosen assistant floor leader. In the Senate he has been elected floor leader of the Democratic party by the members of his party through 8 years of sessions.

The senator from South Boston was called upon by former Governor Dever to act as his Suffolk County campaign manager 3 times, and his party made him chairman of the Democratic platform committee twice, in 1954 and 1956.

Just a few weeks ago, a Republican president of the senate—for the first time—appointed a Democratic member of the senate to the position of chairman of a special recess committee. The special recess committee was created to study the whole problem of railroad transportation. I think we can appreciate how critical is the work of this committee, and I think we can appreciate the honor and responsibility imposed on that Democratic senator, our next speaker, Senator John E. Powers, of South Boston.

The following is the address of Senator Powers:

Mr. Moderator, Reverend Father, gentlemen, I am pleased to share this platform with Mr. Hennessey today and to express my gratitude to the officials of the Boston College seminar for the courtesy of their invitation.

Our topic today is general in nature and its affords your speakers vast latitude as we attempt to formulate in accordance with the dictates of the topic, a blueprint for action.

That there may be total understanding of our purposes here today, it seems expedient that we lend our attention to the provocative challenge which lurks in the title of our discussion. A blueprint, in the strict application of the term, suggests the orderly formation of plans to be executed, usually by someone else, at some time in the future.

Action, however, possesses a far different connotation, for implicit in it is the clarion call for the urgent and immediate expenditure of energy to provide a solution for those problems which are made evident by the cold and uncompromising facts contained in the blueprint.

Thus, today, to fulfill the challenge of our topic requires substantially more than a recitation of all the ills and infirmities of the aged city of Boston.

Rather, we must address ourselves to the task of attempting to outline a course of action which possesses two cardinal attributes: (1) That such means or plans as are suggested here be capable of serving as the foundation for continued progress; (2) that such means or plans as are suggested here be capable of virtual immediate execution.

The magnitude of such a project is immense, so immense that certain preliminary statements are demanded of one who would profess to volunteer such suggestions.

The problems which beset Boston are extremely grave—and in some respects appear to defy or resist all efforts to correct them. Yet, to approach the task of solution with an attitude of futility is to foredoom the effort which has been undertaken. In a similar view, to consider such progress as has been made an optimistic signal to abate or abandon the intensity of the efforts directed toward the resuscitation of the city, is to consign Boston to the status of a municipality with no future other than its past.

Those elements which have contributed to the decline of the capital city are too well recognized to require extensive elaboration. The debilitating effects of a shrinking tax base and a soaring tax rate have been made

the subject of many academic discussions. The paralysis visited upon a city by a highway system, inadequate to absorb and service the demands of its traffic, are visible daily, and the economic holocaust which is created thereby is impossible to appraise.

The blight of decadent property which serves as a cancer, jeopardizing the value of contiguous areas, presents a severe test of a community's willingness to sacrifice in the present to insure its existence in the tomorrow to come.

These conditions, which, while they are not singular to Boston, are present here in such proportion as to negate any premature optimism which might be engendered by the prudential development, or other such evidence that the drowsy giant which is Boston is emerging from its century-long slumber.

Progress, however, has been made—and in sufficient proportions, to allow this small relief—the pace of our retrogression has been diminished and perhaps has been halted. This has been achieved not as a result of the decision of any 1 man or 1 concern, but because many men and many organizations have arrived at the inevitable conclusion that decay, devastation, and impending doom impels a cooperative effort—governed by the need to cease a Pollyanna-like quest for Utopia, and to commence the rebuilding of a city in conformity with the realities which confront it.

It is to this realism we aspire to contribute today.

Our problem is Boston—and the most vexing section of the city, and that afflicted most, is the downtown area.

To arrive at the core of the problem, let us utilize courageous realism, without which we cannot validly suggest a solution. The origin of all of Boston's problems is its size. It is a small city, shackled and confined. It is an enigma among the municipalities of this Nation and the world, for it encompasses but 47 square miles of land area. To those who seek to aid its growth is presented the complexity that Boston has but three boundaries, for its eastern border is the ocean.

There can be no doubt that those who see the inevitability of a regional government which will comprise the contiguous cities and towns on the remaining three borders are gifted with prophetic vision. But you will recall that realism was to be the common denominator of this discussion. Thus, while the integration of these communities with the capital city has a proper inclusion in a blueprint of the future—it is idle and fruitless to depend upon it in a blueprint for action.

The simple truth which marks this as necessary for discussion is the recognition that the residents of our adjacent communities are opposed to the concept of the metropolitanization of the area—and will resist every effort which might undermine the existence of their autonomous governmental structures.

This is the reality—and to discuss it in such terms is not to inhibit any efforts which are currently being made to overcome their opposition and resistence—but rather to bring to prominence some few suggestions which properly may be incorporated in a blueprint for action.

We are aware that the presence of a common water supply, the dependence upon the same public transportation—the established practice of mutual aid when fire threatens—all provide the basis upon which greater regional cooperation can be erected. Our ability to participate in a common sewerage system and jointly in supporting recreation areas again demonstrates the economically dictated inevitability of an expanded regional program.

However, let us consider, fleetingly, the factor which urges the citizens of these communities to resist extensive cooperation with the city of Boston. Momentarily, we shall ignore the circumstance which finds Boston bearing a disproportionate share of the cost of these mutually supported services. Instead, let us concentrate on their fear. Boston's steadily increasing debt, and soaring tax rate, cause these communities to fear that the metropolitanization of the area is merely a device to spread the onerous tax burden of the city to the citizens of the surrounding area. With this fear ever present in their minds—coupled with the reluctance to have their local form of government altered, any attempt to propound a metropolitan approach to some of Greater Boston's regional problems is destined for a frigid reception.

Unhappily, this is no surprise to any student of legislative activity. Year after year, the calendar of the general court contains many proposals which, if enacted into law, would, through statutory mandate, enforce cooperation in solving the regional problems. Yet, year after year, such bills are defeated, for they bear the appellation of a Boston bill. Now, why and how are they defeated? In recent years they have known their demise in the senate—and they have been defeated because the city of Boston does not possess total representation in the upper branch of our general court.

Ward 20, which is the West Roxbury section of Boston, houses 5½ percent of our total population.

Ward 22, which is the Brighton section of Boston, houses 4½ percent of our total population.

West Roxbury is linked in a senatorial district with the town of Brookline, and is represented by a senator from Brookline.

Brighton is included in a senatorial district with the city of Newton, and is represented by a senator from that city.

Consider the significance of this in relation with any legislative proposal of a regional nature, which would bring benefit or relief to the city of Boston. Invariably, the votes of these two senators reflect the thinking and the desires—and the fears—of the residents of Newton and Brookline, rather than the interest of the city of Boston.

Allow me to make reference to a recent example. The Highland Branch extension of the MTA was eclaimed and endorsed as an advantage to the city of Boston by virtually every organization and individual conversant with the nature of Boston's transportation problem. Yet, its most vigorous and articulate opposition emanated from the Senators who, although they represent 10 percent of the total population of Boston, also represent the town of Brookline and the city of Newton.

The bill which allowed this extension of MTA service was passed and signed into law despite the opposition led by these two senators. Parenthetically, permit me to add here that its legislative success is attributable in no small measure to the untiring efforts of one of your previous seminar speakers, the former trustee of the MTA, Robert Ryan.

It is not the intention of these remarks to serve as a criticism of the two gentlemen who represent these senatorial districts. In so conducting themselves, they are doing as they should—for they are giving expression to, and acting in harmony with, the desires of the majority of the people they represent.

It does, however, have this intention—at this seminar which aspires to contribute to a blueprint whereby the problems of Boston may know a solution—when next the topic of the redistricting of the senatorial district lines is considered—and such a discussion will occur in the foreseeable future—it is imperative for all who seek to aid Boston in the solution of its problems to unite to cure a condition which finds 10 percent, or 75,000 citizens, of the city deprived of a voice and a vote in a chamber of 40 members, on every matter in which the welfare of Boston is in conflict, however remote or problematical, with the wishes, the desires, and the fears of the residents of surrounding communities.

To do this—to insure that the welfare of the citizens of Boston, and the well-being of the city itself—is fostered by the greatest available legislative strength is going to create a problem among many well-intentioned men and organizations who desire earnestly to aid Boston. However, their conflict will arise from the political fact that such a redistricting might well affect the political domination of the senate which has existed since the two-party system came into being in Massachusetts.

This conflict, which I predict with certainty will occur, leads logically to an important factor in this blueprint for action which today we are attempting to draft. Business and the legislature must cooperate immed tely, for the needs of the capital city are so grave, so acute, as to demand of all of us that our partisanship and our prejudices be set aside, for the cost of retaining them could be the demise of a city.

Before we can cooperate we must eradicate many widespread deep-rooted misconceptions which currently exist.

Despite the solidarity of opinion which prevails in some very respected, if remote, quarters, your legislature is not populated by men and women dedicated to the harassment of business in Massachusetts. This concept is as erroneous, I hope, as the belief possessed by some that in a choice between material profits and human values, the business community will invariably select the former.

If there is to be the cooperation which we today seek to establish, it must first be realized that the doctrine of laissez faire has been entombed for many years. To the members of the Massachusetts Legislature it often appears that its requiem is still being sung by the local business interests in the forlorn hope that by repetition it may be revived.

Gentlemen, now as never before, business and government are linked—for the climate in which business is transacted is manufactured by the legislature. It is understandable that this change has not engendered the enthusiasm of everyone. But for Boston business to attempt to ignore or rail against it in the hope that it will go away is to further jeopardize our position as a city, to the detriment of all.

As I attempt to delineate the viewpoint of a legislator in this blueprint for action—it is imperative that these attitudes of the past be appraised in order that they may be avoided in the future.

We, today, state without equivocation that if Boston and its business community are going to prosper, then the business community and the legislators must work for this common purpose. The cooperation of which we speak is not an abstraction—rather it envisions the mutual development of plans—and the wholehearted support of business and industry as we, the legislators, attempt to effect them.

This means that our relationship must advance from its present status, which finds us, the members of the legislature, the recipients of mimeographic commands from business, usually with our names misspelled, emanating from people who have kept themselves as remote from us as men from another planet.

It means, also, that each individual must accept this premise as a necessary corollary to the achievement of this cooperation, which has for its end the solution of the problems of Boston. It will be woefully insufficient and inadequate if business believes that all that is necessary is to appoint another committee within the framework of an existing organization and authorize it to meet with the members of the legislature.

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

A legislator, gentlemen, be he a representative or a senator, a Democrat or a Republican, is first a politician. As such, unless he is most unique, he has had the experience of knocking on doors to enlist support of his candidacy and of his legislative proposals. In the process, it is inevitable that he finds some doors locked and bolted against his appeal. It is a pathetic commentary that the business leaders of the community, whose economic life could be destroyed by one line in a bill, are among those who consistently resist the opportunity to meet with the men who serve in government.

It would be no exaggeration to state that no 10 percent of the leaders of industry in this Commonwealth knew the names of their Senators and Representatives. Were a poll to be taken today, in this audience which is comprised of men conscious of the power of the legislature to either improve or destroy the economic climate of Massachusetts, not 50 percent could name the Senator and representatives from the districts which house your businesses.

If for one instant you feel this is an exaggeration, turn now and ask your neighbor if he can do it—and if he fails, then in charity, and in truth, acknowledge your own inability.

We are here to formulate a blueprint for action, which will bring benefit to Boston and assist the capital city in this her hour of need. Untold benefits can be accomplished through the legislature in the next session which commences in January. Legislation will be filed to ease the inequitable burden Boston bears in the cost of State government. Efforts will be made again to introduce morality and common sense into the apportionment MTA costs by revising the iniquitous formula which impoverishes Boston by a passenger count which ignores the geographical origin of the rider.

These are not new legislative proposals. They have been defeated in the past, and they met their defeat because the voices and the efforts of the Boston legislators did not have the support of the individual business man who earns his living in Boston but resides beyond the limits of the city. What is the proposal for action? Let every businessman who is affected by the tax rate of the city of Boston inform the elected officials of his home community of his interest in the success of these bills, and his reward will be a substantial decrease in the levies imposed upon Boston, with a resultant stabilization and ultimate reduction in the tax rate of the city.

This can be accomplished only by the action of the individual. Your various trade organizations and your chamber of commerce have able, efficient men representing them at the statehouse—but until each businessman in Boston makes its tax rate his personal concern, our blueprint will never leave the draftsman's board.

Thus far, my remarks have been critical of the business community's approach to legislative problems.

In so doing, I do not contend that the Members of your legislature possess infallibility. We, too, make errors. We, too, have our prejudices and perhaps are often guided by them. But we consider and act upon more than 5,000 individual bills every year, which encompass every phase of human endeavor—up to and including the dreams and the ideals of our citizens. If we err—our error is inadvertent—not deliberate. We, like you, make mistakes in our business, are uninformed or misinformed as to the total effects of every one of these 5,000 bills which are before us for decision.

Hence, since many of these matters can and do affect you and the business climate, prudence dictates that a special effort be made to communicate your ideas to the man who, in the final analysis, might well control your economic destiny.

I regret the necessity of devoting so much of my allotted time to a discussion of this topic. However, from personal experience I know that if you will make a gesture toward the removal of the barriers which presently separate us, your legislators will make cooperation an immediate reality. From this cooperation, legislative action, which will bring vast benefit to Boston, can be enacted within a period of months—and our blueprint can begin to take form.

Only one facet of this need for cooperation and the means of accomplishing it remains to be discussed. When you meet your legislators, and, parenthetically, it will come to the statehouse I will be happy to perform the introductions—leave in your offices the local interpretation of the concept that what is good for General Motors is good for the Nation.

You see, gentlemen, we are elected by popular vote to enact laws which promote the greater good for the greater number. In truth, there have been occasions when the wishes and the desires of the industrial community were, in the opinion of some of us, in conflict with the best interests of the greater number of our citizens.

While I do not wish to forestall or inhibit any questions which may be asked in the period which is to follow these remarks, let me anticipate one which most certainly would—and perhaps still will be asked.

I was, and am, opposed to the imposition of a sales tax in Massachusetts. This proposal had—and apparently still possesses—the support of the business interests. This is understandable, because their property is of such a value that it carries a high assessment. Consequently, assuming, without agreeing, that the revenue from a sales tax would reduce the tax rate, the owners of highly assessed property would receive a tax benefit. Accordingly, their support of it is understandable, and their motives are personal and economic. It is my duty to act on legislation in conformity with my opinion of how the greater number will be affected. It is apparent that if a property tax reduction was to be accomplished by revenue derived from a sales tax, then the purpose of the sales tax was not to eliminate the tax burden, but it was a device whereby it would be shifted. Accordingly, I opposed it because it was in conflict with the best interests of the greater number of our citizens.

I did not—I do not—because I cannot subscribe to a theory which seeks to have the residents of a community, after paying their own share of the tax burden, subsidize the business interests of the community in order that their costs of operation might be reduced.

Further discussion of the sales tax at this time will serve no useful purpose, for its enactment is more remote than a central government for Boston and its surrounding communities.

We are concerned with a blueprint for action—we are attempting to formulate endeavors which can be translated from the planning board into realities—thereby providing some immediate relief to the perplexing and myriad problems which beset Boston.

Earlier we said Boston is a small city—confined and shackled by a geographical limitation over which it has no control. Additionally, it has experienced a migration of industry in recent years. It stands now on the threshold of decision—and its future relies upon the vision and the courage of those who occupy positions of leadership.

As it is true that the success of the relationship between the legislature and the business community depends upon individuals acting with mutual respect and confidence—so, also, the vision and courage demanded for the task of effecting a renaissance in Boston requires the untiring constant efforts of the individual as well as the labors of the community's business organizations. Boston's salvation, in other words, requires much more of the businessman than his dues in the chamber of commerce.

The blueprint which is ultimately to serve Boston, its citizens, its business and industrial community, must be drafted in conformity with the economic role the city is to play in our future and with recognition of the city's most severe shortage. There is, as you know, an economic base study currently in progress. Its decisions and conclusions will be of vast and lasting benefit to the entire area. However, the events of the recent past give vivid indication of the role the downtown area will play in our future. It is apparent that this region will become a headquarters center, rather than the site of the total business operation. The construction of arteries and belt highways will dictate the removal of the manufacturing and warehousing aspects of a business to more convenient localities providing immediate access to the highway system.

Accordingly, our planning now—our redevelopment of areas should be in conformity with this apparent use. As Boston is a city with but three boundaries, and unable to expand on its other borders, we must, it seems evident, encourage our expansion to occur in the only direction in which it can be utilitarian for occupants, and of greatest lasting value to the city. Our most serious liability as a city is our lack of area. Therefore, the form of our expansion must be vertical. In this manner, more area will continue to become available for investment and the tax base of the city will be expanded. Permit me to digress here for an instant with a suggestion relative to this vertical expansion. Our tax base in the capital city is inhibited by many circumstances. One of the contributing causes, in recent years, has been the expansion and the extensive building programs of our educational institutions and our religious denominations. I strongly urge that a meeting be requested by the proper authorities with our leaders in the religious and educational life of our community. By the enlistment of their aid, the pattern for the new architectural development of Boston can take immediate form and serve as an example for others who will locate and build in our city. Simultaneously, by expanding vertically, the amount of area, already in critical short supply, can be budgeted to uses which are productive of tax revenue.

Many of the problems which confront Boston need not depend upon the State government for their solution, nor rely upon the investment of private capital to commence the revitalization of the city. I am aware that at the present time the municipal government, with the cooperation of the Federal Government, is participating in programs which have as their objective the modernization of the capital city.

However, acknowledging that the basis for most of our problems is our lack of growth and investment possibilities, I strongly recommend that an extensive survey be made within the framework of our municipal government of all the departments holding property within the downtown area. Such a survey should, of course, include a review of all foreclosed property through tax title takings, which numerically are usually clustered surrounding those areas already marked for renewal. These properties should be reserved by the city from sale and any contemplation of an integration of departmental activities which will occasion the abandonment of an existing facility, should, when public service will allow, be decided in consideration of the future use of the land by private investors.

To those who are currently harboring the thought that such talk of vertical expansion and private investment in commercial real

estate in Boston represents the attainment of a new peak in optimism, permit me to refer to the statement of Mr. Roger C. Wilkins, vice president of the Travelers Insurance Co. Mr. Wilkins was asked why Travelers settled in downtown Boston rather than a suburban location, and his response was—and I quote him—"There has been a strong trend toward recentralization in the last 10 years." Many—myself included—are in agreement with this analysis—and the decision of Travelers to invest $7 million and erect a 16-story building, is a cogent rebutfal to those who dispute his assertion.

Boston must now aggressively act to make of itself a desirable locale for this migration back to the city.

The funding bill, which was passed by the legislature in its closing sessions of this year, whereby Boston is authorized to borrow $45 million, was an emergency measure to avert disaster. However, it insures—unfortunately—a high tax level for some years to come—and a high tax rate discourages construction. As a temporary expedient, in order that Boston may compete for investment, I earnestly urge the consideration and the support of the business community, of a bill which I filed a year ago. This proposal is currently the subject of a study by the joint committee on ways and means, and will be considered and acted upon in the coming session. Under its terms, and these would apply to every city and town in the Commonwealth, not to Boston alone, the assessment placed upon new construction could not exceed, for a period of 10 years, 25 percent of the cost of construction. Since it is well recognized that property is not assessed at current values anywhere in the Commonwealth, this ceiling on valuation would not occasion a current hardship upon the existing taxpayer, and by serving as an incentive to build, it would broaden the tax base and redound to his ultimate benefit. This proposal would, of course, necessitate a constitutional amendment.

Any discussion of new construction, and suggestions as to the direction of its expansion, leads inevitably to the consideration of zoning, and particularly to its application in the downtown area.

Under the authority of chapter 665 of the acts of 1956, the administration is empowered, with the approval of the city council, to create a zoning commission. This commission will then propose new zoning requirements for the city of Boston. I recommend that all—each individual—every organization—sincerely interested in the city and its future—pay careful heed to these recommendations—for unless they permit the greatest utility of the meager land we possess in the city, Boston's future could suffer a severe reversal before it had an opportunity to commence. However, it has become apparent that any recodification of existing zoning laws, having as its purpose the adaptation of a city to modern demands, requires that the zoning ordinances require of a developer or investor some facilities for the parking of the vehicles of the occupants of the building. Thus, again, I urge that influence of the business community be directed to the task of insuring that any revision of the zoning requirements of the city be in conformity with the needs which are so abundantly apparent.

The concept of new construction, of urban renewal and of area revitalization, is exhilerating in the vistas to which these projects give rise. However, of equal importance is the protection of existing areas of value from the pernicious extension of an area of blight. Such a problem is evident on Tremont Street, from Park Street to Boylston Street. We cannot allow this area to deteriorate. Already it shows evidence that the atmosphere of Scollay Square is progressing uptown. Indeed, one more joke shop on Tremont Street and the entire city will look like the victim of some horrible hoax. To halt this deterioration, I recommend to the trustees of the white fund, which holds title to the E. T. Slattery Building, that they survey the possibility of renovating the building for office use. Such an endeavor is within the scope of the allowable activities and would, I submit, be a profitable venture. It would further introduce into the area a new employee corps of shoppers, benefiting the retail stores in the area which have suffered from the retail trend to the suburbs. The influence of the business community should simultaneously be directed to the immediate execution of the plans for beautifying the Boston Common side of this same area.

Reference to the Boston Common, of course, causes us to consider the effect and the benefit the proposed garage will bring to the area. In a similar manner, it encourages suggestions born of the fear that an already traffic-harassed city will be further paralyzed during the period of construction. To provide the opportunity for a study of the problem which might arise, and allow the formation of plans in advance of the time of crisis, I recommend that the area of the Common, on the corner of Boylston and Charles Streets, which is in summer months used as a ball field, be utilized during this Christmas festival and shopping season for the parking of cars, together with authority for angle parking on Charles Street between Boylston and Beacon Streets. Such a use will not interfere with any functions, for the area is never used for recreational purposes in the winter months. Such a use, however, would provide an opportunity to view and study the effects on the flow of traffic, and would be of material convenience to shoppers, with a resultant beneficial effect on the volume of business done by our retail stores during the Christmas season.

Before we end the discussion of the garage under the Common, may I urge upon you this suggestion: it is agreed that the tax base of the city of Boston must be expanded. Our desperate need is for more land in areas destined to attract construction. In accordance with the challenege contained in the title "Blueprint for Action" I ask this seminar to consider the inclusion in the contract under which the Common garage is to be constructed, either by private capital or by an authority, that all fill removed from under the Common be dumped in the Fort Point Channel. This will provide a start for the development of a new land area, contiguous with the New York Streets development, and will transform a liability into a tax producing asset. In addition, approximately one-half million dollars annually could be saved by the elimination of the need for bridge maintenance, and within the borders of the newly expanded downtown area a region can be developed which would merit the title "Miracle Mile."

It has, I am certain, become apparent that in my remarks today I have avoided a discussion of two salient topics, which must be included in any blueprint for action. In the introduction which brought me to your attention, the chairman made mention of my recent appointment as chairman of the special commission on railroads. Having accepted the responsibility of this chairmanship of this investigation, it is my opinion that any remarks I might make at this time relative to this subject matter could affect the harmony and the effectiveness of our commission. Accordingly, I ask your sympathetic understanding of my position.

The other topic concerns the administration of the affairs of the City of Boston. My desire to cooperate with the business community as a legislator, in providing a solution to the ills of Boston, is as sincere as the magnitude and the scope of the challenge which confronts us. Accordingly, I have purposely refrained from any discussion of this topic, lest the laudable intent and spirit of this seminar be scarred by an interpretation which could divert us from our purposes, which transcend personal ambition.

Gentlemen, I am grateful for the opportunity to share with you today this climate of recognition that, as it relates to the survival of our city, no man is an island. In our city ,for men who look to the future in common purpose, there exists no barrier which cannot be melted away by the fire of enthusiasm—no prejudices which familiarity cannot destroy—and having banished these destructive elements from our locality, no material problem will withstand the strength of our united efforts.

The American Merchant Marine in War—Contribution of United States Lines in World War II

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERBERT C. BONNER

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 27, 1958

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Speaker, on February 13, 1958, I inserted in the RECORD an article showing the importance of our American-flag merchant marine to the security of our country in time of need. This article, entitled "American President Lines' Role in World War II," graphically told of the reliance we must place on our privately owned merchant fleet in times of world conflict. I hope many Members had an opportunity to read it and found it interesting.

Today, I wish to insert another story. This time telling of the contribution made by another of our great American steamship companies in wartime. This is the story of the United States Lines Co. as written by Maj. Gen. John M. Franklin, its president. I hope and believe that this will be equally interesting as the American President Lines story:

THE AMERICAN MERCHANT MARINE IN WAR—CONTRIBUTION OF UNITED STATES LINES IN WORLD WAR II

(By Maj. Gen. John M. Franklin, president, United States Lines Co.)

The record of the United States Lines contribution to our country's World War II effort began long before war was declared between the United States and the Axis nations. In fact, it goes back more than half a century in building a worldwide organization of trained personnel both ashore and afloat. It goes back to 1927–32 when the company had the courage to plan and invest millions of dollars in five new large passenger vessels built in American shipyards—the *California, Virginia, Pennsylvania, Manhattan,* and *Washington.* It goes back to the Merchant Marine Act of 1936, when the United States Lines became the first company to sign an agreement with the Government for the construction of the largest and finest passenger liner to be built in an American shipyard under that statute. This was the 34,000 gross ton liner *America,* which was accorded the distinction of hull No. 1 under the act. The record must also take into consideration the 58 passenger and cargo ships owned or operated by the company before the war and the 16 additional ships on order and build-

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

ing in American yards. All, afloat, on the stocks or on the order books were taken over by the Government when the war came.

Threaded throughout the dynamic history of the company is a story of exceptional seamanship in peace and war; of heroic deeds in the face of raging seas and enemy action and of sturdy ships carrying the cargoes that were the lifeblood of the Nation in the dire emergency of World War II and the lesser but serious conflagration in Korea.

To recount the numerous outstanding events that stud the company's history would be impossible in such a brief summary as this. To do so properly would require volumes. Later in this report a few of the more remarkable exploits will be mentioned in detail.

In reviewing briefly the record of the United States Lines immediately before, during and after the war, these are the highlights:

WORLDWIDE ORGANIZATION

In the calm between the two World Wars the United States Lines built up a smoothly functioning organization that kept its ships serving with clocklike regularity the essential American trade routes to Ireland, the United Kingdom, continental Europe, the Far East, and Australia.

Its vessels were manned by a veritable wealth of trained and experienced officers and seamen, who had been tested in the winter Atlantic and the worst that the Pacific could offer in the way of typhoons and gales. Ashore, both in these United States and in far-flung offices around the world, on the docks and in the terminals were experienced men who knew how to move cargo and passengers with unmatched dispatch.

All this vast know-how was at the fingertips of the State Department when the dread pall of war began to spread across the world with Hitler's invasion of Poland in 1939. And, when 2 years later, this country was inevitably drawn into the conflict to preserve freedom and the democratic way of life this well-knit, experienced team of ship operators was in being to move today, not tomorrow, the troops and cargo necessary to victory. United States Lines personnel helped expedite the loading of men and war materials in ports from Maine to the Gulf of Mexico. It was company men in uniform or out, who helped to discharge the ships when they reached the war theaters and sailing the ships across the troubled seas were masters, other officers, and seamen who had been selected by the line over the years for their efficiency and devotion to their maritime calling.

EVACUATION OF AMERICANS FROM WAR COUNTRIES

In the short respite between the invasion of Poland and Pearl Harbor, United States Lines' ships such as the *Manhattan, Washington, President Roosevelt,* and smaller vessels evacuated more than 23,000 stranded American citizens from a war-torn Europe and from an Orient dominated by a belligerent Japan.

These American-built ships, privately owned and operated, were the salvation of these thousands of our citizens. The foreign-owned passenger liners, which normally operated in the North Atlantic trade, and on which many of these people had booked passage, had been withdrawn by their governments without warning to the passengers.

The sudden dearth of shipping put a tremendous strain on the shipping resources of the United States Lines and other American-flag companies. First the war came just when all ships, American and foreign, were booked to capacity for the normal westbound rush season. Second, more and more transatlantic tonnage was withdrawn from passenger service as country after country became involved in the war. Third, the war brought confusion to the normally efficient European terminals of the United States Lines as panicky nationals pleaded for space that was already doubly filled. And, finally, our our neutrality laws prevented the company's vessels from using these terminals and new ports of embarkation had to be found.

Here, training, experience, and the will to do a job in the American way came to the fore. Other ports of embarkation were found. Company stewards conjured up cots and mattresses seemingly from thin air. Promenade decks, swimming pools, lounge and recreational areas became dormitories. Officers gave up their quarters to mothers and small children. Meals were served in continuing shifts. And irate and nervous passengers were soothed into cheerful acceptance of the overcrowded and difficult conditions.

But, clearing a European port did not mean the end of tension for the masters and crews of the United States Lines' ships. There was still the submarine-infested Atlantic to cross, the risk of being mistaken as a ship of a warring nation.

RESCUES

Not far from the minds of the seamen and the passengers was the awful picture of the British liner *Athenia,* which was sunk by a German submarine on September 3, 1939, the day Britain declared war on Germany.

A United States Lines' freighter, the *City of Flint,* rescued 223 passengers from the stricken ship.

This was but the first of a long series of daring rescues carried out by the crews of company ships, who manned lifeboats in mountainous seas to bring exhausted foreign seamen to safety and the chance to fight again in a cause that soon was to be the cause of our Nation.

In September 1939, alone, ships of the United States Lines' fleet saved the lives of 130 seamen, whose ships had been torpedoed by Nazi U-boats. Sharing the honors for the rescues were the *President Harding,* which rescued the entire 36-man crew of the British freighter *Heronspool* off Ireland; the *American Farmer,* which saved 29 from the British freighter *Kafiristan* off the Scilly Islands; the *American Shipper,* which saved 32 from the British cargo ship *Blairlogie,* and the *Washington,* which saved 33 from the British-flag *Olivegrove.*

DRAMATIC INCIDENT

Perhaps the mot dramatic incident during the repatriation of Americans from war-scarred Europe involved the liner *Washington,* then commanded by Capt. Harry Manning. The *Washington* sailed from Lisbon on June 10 with 1,000 Americans. Early the next day while heading for Galway, Ireland, to pick up another 800 stranded Americans, the *Washington* was ordered to stop by a German submarine.

Captain Manning stayed on his course until the U-boat flashed by blinker signal the dread threat "torpedo ship."

"I will not attempt to describe my own reactions or those of the officers and crew," Captain Manning later told a nationwide audience over the facilities of the National Broadcasting Co.

"Picture, if you will, a great ocean liner a couple of hundred of miles at sea, with 1,500 or more souls aboard, most of them asleep—men, women, children, and babies.

"We watched for the next message and finally it came. It gave us 10 minutes to abandon ship. I immediately sounded the general alarm, closed all watertight doors, and ordered all passengers into the lifeboats.

"The efficiency of the crew was most gratifying and the calmness of the passengers was astonishing," the captain went on. "There was not a single incident of hysteria or confusion. Anyone aboard who witnessed how this American crew went about its work in this emergency must have felt proud to be an American.

"Every man went to his station. Women and children were assisted into the boats first. It gave one a splendid feeling of satisfaction to see with his own eyes that the old tradition of 'women and children first' was not dead."

Captain Manning told of keeping the blinker repeating the words: "American, *Washington;* American, *Washington.*"

The ship master said he believed the U-boat commander could not understand English well and apparently thought the *Washington* was an enemy ship. His only hope, he said, was to keep exchanging messages until visibility became clear enough for the large American flags on the liner's sides to be seen.

But the U-boat answer kept repeating "Ten minutes to abandon ship."

"While all this was going on, preparations to abandon ship continued," Captain Manning related. "We were about to secure the fire and engine rooms to prevent a fire which would naturally follow had the ship been torpedoed."

"Finally the message we were waiting for came, it said, 'Thought you were another ship. Please go on. Go on.' "

Captain Manning brought the *Washington* into New York safely with more than 2,000 passengers and crewmen.

"The one thought that will linger longest with me regarding this incident," the captain told the radio audience, "is the calm, intelligent fashion in which the American officers, the American crew and the American passengers met this emergency. Need I add, I am proud to be an American."

Repatriation of the last American citizen from Europe was completed on July 18, 1940, when the United States Lines *Manhattan* arrived in New York jammed far beyond capacity. The company ships had returned 21,000 persons to their homes.

The company also was active in the repatriation of Americans from the Far East returning to this country a total of 2,000 men, women, and children. The liner *Washington* carried the last shipload. She arrived in San Francisco in December 1940, with 1,342 passengers including 509 children. This was the largest number of Americans evacuated from the Orient on a single American-flag ship.

LINERS BECOME TROOPSHIPS

Because the United States Lines and its predecessor company had the courage to plan, invest millions of dollars, and build 6 large passenger vessels in American shipyards beginning in 1927, this Nation had a ready fleet of vessels to call on for troopship duty.

After quick conversion, these 6 vessels—fast enough to outrun a submarine and thus able to travel without convoy—carried more than 2,200,000 military personnel to and from every theater of war. They traveled more than 2,250,000 miles.

The ships were the *America* (*West Point*), *Manhattan* (*Wakefield*), *Washington* (*Mount Vernon*) and the *Brazil, Uruguay,* and *Argentina,* which were originally the *California, Virginia,* and *Pennsylvania,* and built by the United States Lines predecessor company for intercoastal service.

All six ships had outstanding records, but for the purposes of this summary we will review briefly only the activities of the largest United States Lines' ship—the *America.* This vessel was named the *West Point* when she donned her battle gray.

SS. "AMERICA" LARGEST AMERICAN TROOPSHIP

The 34,000-ton *America* served on every sea. Off Singapore, she was fired upon by Japanese shore batteries but was untouched. Off Rio de Janeiro, she eluded German torpedoes with her 24-knot speed. In Milne Bay, New Guinea, she fought off Japanese

airplanes. In the Red Sea, and again at Suez, she was attacked by Nazi torpedo planes, but her high maneuverability took her easily out of the way.

The *America's* wartime assignments sound like a geography lesson—Noumea, Bombay, Marseilles, Capetown, Guadalcanal, etc. During her enlistment she moved 400,000 troops a half million miles—roughly the equivalent of 14 times around the world.

Never once did her propulsion machinery break down.

Her contribution to the war effort can never be statistically evaluated, but we do think one little point in this connection might be mentioned here.

If her troop-lift had to be paid for, as was the case in the movement on foreign ships of many of our soldiers overseas, it would have cast the Government over $30 million, or twice the original cost of building the ship.

WSA REQUISITIONED ALL AMERICAN SHIPS

When the War Shipping Administration requisitioned all privately owned American flag ships they took possession of 55 vessels owned or operated at the time by the United States Lines. They also took over 16 new ships that the company had ordered and which were completed, nearing completion, or on the ways. Aside from the troop-carrying potential, this fleet in being at a time of acute emergency had a war-cargo lift of well over a half million tons. The fact that the WSA requisitioned these ships did not mean that they operated them. On the contrary, the United States Lines and other experienced American shipping companies were assigned these vessels on an agency basis to handle every phase of the terminal and voyage operations. During the war the United States Lines was assigned 332 ships for which they were responsible, including the furnishing of competent officers and crew members. In addition, the United States Lines, because of its experienced terminal and operating personnel ashore at its various ports from Maine to Florida and on the Gulf, acted as berth agents for 2,027 ship departures or arrivals.

Lacking in glamour, perhaps, but a substantial contributor to the Nation's war effort was the United States Lines freighter fleet. These ships traveled millions of miles and delivered the vital cargoes on schedule.

ONE OUTSTANDING CARGO SHIP

An outstanding example of a prosaic cargo carrier was the passenger-cargo ship *American Banker*. This 7,400-gross-ton ship made 38 crossings of the Atlantic in 2½ years up to late 1943. At least once she made the perilous run to Murmansk in the Russian Arctic, and on another trip she discharged supplies at Oran for the north African campaign. In this period she carried more than 100,000 tons of cargo overseas and returned with some 25,000 tons of highly strategic materials for the war effort in this country.

The *American Banker*, then in command of Capt. John F. Spears, had many encounters with enemy submarines but managed to elude the torpedoes every time.

UNITED STATES LINES PERSONNEL IN WORLD WAR II

The lines' contribution to the war in the matter of personnel must also be considered in terms of the years that went into the training and development of the highest type of experienced men, afloat and ashore—men familiar with the complex business of operating ships to every port in the world. The loading and unloading of ships, the efficient operations of docks and terminals, men fitted for duty wherever their country needed them, whether on combat or merchant ships.

Of the United States Lines personnel in the Armed Forces, 115 served as officers in the Navy and 27 in the Army, many of them in key positions. • • • Others used their knowledge of ocean transportation as officers at Army bases in various parts of the world and as Navy port directors both here and at advance bases. Most of our ships' officers who were called to active duty from the Naval Reserve served at sea, one of them, Capt. Schuyler Cummings, as commodore of convoys in the Atlantic area. Our records are bright with the stories of their achievements. It is significant that in the merchant service alone 449 of our ships' officers and men lost their lives through enemy action. Almost 100 officers and men were in enemy prison camps. It is safe to say that wherever Americans fought, ships and men of the United States Lines took part.

And the company's fleet did not escape unscathed from the ceaseless forays of the enemy. From May 1940 through July 1944, a total of 38 ships were sunk.

PERSONNEL HELPED TRAIN OTHERS

A little known but important contribution to the war effort was the United States Lines cooperation with the Maritime Commission's training program during the war. Rear Adm. Albert B. Randall, United States Navy, reserve, commodore of the United States Lines fleet before the war served as commandant of the United States Maritime Service in charge of training. Rear Adm. Giles C. Stedman, United States Navy, reserve, formerly commander of the *Washington* and the *American*, served as superintendent of the United States Merchant Marine Academy at Kings Point, Long Island, which turned out hundreds of ships officers during the war.

Comdr. Edward Closton, who served on the *Leviathan*, was commandant of cadets at the New York State Maritime Academy at Fort Schuyler. Commodore Harry Manning, who was capitain of the SS. *United States* when she established new speed records for the Atlantic on her maiden voyage in 1952, was the head of the maritime training school at Hoffman Island during the war. Capt. Alfred M. Moore, of the United States Lines, was commander of the training ship *American Pilot*. In all a score or more United States Lines' officers were engaged in training the much needed personnel to man our rapidly growing wartime merchant fleet.

SPEED UP OF CARGO LOADING

With speed in loading such an important factor in war operations, a plan for stepping up cargo loading was devised by the late Peter Fay, manager in charge of the United States Lines pier operations in New York. The idea of working out the deck loading plan of a ship well in advance by means of an exact scale model of the ship and scale models of the various items carried on deck as war cargo, was conceived. Members of the Chelsea pier staff in New York built a 9-foot scale model of a Liberty ship and scale models of tanks, bombers, fighters, scout planes, tugboats, landing barges, boxed airplane engines, locomotives, jeeps, automobiles. Before a ship arrived at a United States Lines pier for loading, the entire plan was worked out by placing models of the cargo the ship was to carry on the deck of the model in the most efficient way. The actual loading was then accomplished much faster and more efficiently. This system was so successful that other steamship lines with special loading problems sent representatives to the company's piers to use the models.

STEVEDORING SCHOOL

Another unique contribution of the United States Lines to the war effort was the stevedoring school set up in the passenger waiting room on Pier 59, North River, in association with the firm that had been handling stevedoring for the company for over half a century. At this school, Navy officers were trained in up-to-the-minute methods of handling and stowing cargo. The school was operated for the Navy's benefit to overcome the critical lack of officers experienced in this important field and capable of taking over the work at the Navy's advance bases. More than a thousand students—officers from the Davance Base training section of the Port Director, New York, and from the Navy Sea Bees Special Units received instruction.

The school was a fully equipped laboratory in which every operation of cargo handling could be performed in miniature on a 27-foot scale model of a Liberty ship that was complete in every detail of deck machinery.

Every piece of machinery could be rigged and operated with the precision of its counterpart on a fully sized vessel. The starboard side of the model was cut away so the students could see what happened to cargo after it was stowed in a hold. To complete the miniature set, the model ship was placed alongside a scale model of a pier complete with lower deck, loft, overhead span, catwalk, chutes, elevators and rigging. Small scale barges and lighters brought miniature cargo alongside and tractors moved cargo around the pier in realistic fashion. The model ship, 27 feet long and 43 inches in beam, was especially built for the school and was the only one of its kind in existence.

The school stressed rigging, and along the walls of the schoolroom were working models of cargo booms on which different methods of rigging were demonstrated and practiced. Because the students were likely to be called on to carry out, loading and discharging operations under fire, in harbors lacking proper facilities, and on beaches they were taught to rig emergency booms to take the place of damaged equipment and to substitute tractors for hoisting power when the ship had no steam up.

United States Lines' cargo experts and stevedoring associates formed the faculty of this unique school. In addition to the classroom work the students went out on the piers and participated in the actual work of loading war cargo for the fighting fronts.

POSTWAR ACTIVITIES

After the war the company proceeded to rehabilitate its fleet by purchasing the steamship *America* and many cargo ships from the Government under the Ship Sales Act of 1946. It was faced with the problem of reestablishing satisfactory passenger and cargo services on the many trade routes it had built up before the war. During the war Gen. John M. Franklin, president of the company, had observed how heavily our country depended upon the two *Queens* of the British merchant marine, to carry troops to the different theaters of war. With the war's end he decided to recommend to his board of directors that the United States Lines Co. propose to the Government construction of the finest and fastest passenger liner ever built in an American shipyard, it would be specifically designed for quick conversion into a fast troopship in case of another emergency. This ship was built and named the *United States*. On her maiden voyage in July of 1952, she established new speed records on the North Atlantic and brought prestige to our merchant marine and country. As a troop ship the steamship *United States* could carry approximately 14,000 troops to practically any port in the world and steam 10,000 miles without stopping for fuel, provisions or fresh water and she would speed to her destination at well over 30 knots.

At the present time the United States Lines owns and operates a fleet of 55 modern fast passenger and cargo ships, comprised of 44 C–2 vessels, 9 new mariner type vessels, and 2 large passenger ships, the steamships *United States* and *America*, all with steam up, in service and available for immediate use by the Government in case of another national emergency.

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

If necessary this fleet is capable of carrying on a single sailing from a given part, 23,000 troops and well over 600,000 tons of necessary military cargo to any port in the world.

Truman Doom and Gloom Fail To Impress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM C. CRAMER
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 26, 1958

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, I would call to the attention of the Members and the public the editorial reaction of two of the fine daily papers of the First District of Florida, the Tampa Morning Tribune, Tampa, and the St. Petersburg Independent, St. Petersburg, that dispels, in my opinion, the effectiveness of former President Truman as a salesman of doom and gloom. At the Democratic $100-a-plate fund-raising dinner in Washington the former President tried to add to the fires of those who would talk our country into depression for political gain. I firmly believe that those who take callous advantage of any such temporary situation are not only men of little faith but are rendering a disservice to the people of this great land. I am happy to see my opinion reflected in the two following editorials:

[From the Tampa (Fla.) Morning Tribune of February 25, 1958]

PAINTING THE CLOUDS

Harry Truman's attack and President Eisenhower's reply suggest that the 1958 political campaign will resolve itself largely into a contest to see whether the Democrats can blacken the economic clouds faster than the Republicans can paint them with sunshine.

In his speech to $100-a-plate diners in Washington, Mr. Truman made a characteristic assault upon the partisan enemy. The country, he said, is in terrible condition and it's all the fault of the Republican administration. Republican control means panic and disaster. Remember the economic collapses of 1873, 1893, and 1929? Better vote Democratic before this great Republic is irreparably damaged by the party of special privilege, etc.

President Eisenhower, who has a distaste for dealing in personalities, made an impromptu speech to the National Food Conference yesterday which was clearly intended as an answer to Mr. Truman. America is strong and healthy, he said, and has nothing to fear from temporary ups and downs—provided its people have the good sense not to listen to men of little faith and little spirit.

Harry Truman may not be gloating over the current rise in unemployment, as Republican Congressman SIMPSON of Pennsylvania charged. But, certainly, Mr. Truman and his fellow partisans will scare up all the votes they can be invoking the hobgoblins of the Hoover depression. The breadbasket issue is the most powerful in politics.

Similarly, Mr. Eisenhower and the Republicans can be expected to minimize unfavorable trends and speak optimistically of the new green pastures of prosperity which lie just over the hill.

These conflicting interpretations will leave many citizens wondering: What's the truth, anyway?

It helps to place things in perspective by comparing the present with the past.

Best estimates put the number of unemployed now at about 4½ million, or approximately 6 percent of the total labor force. (Some economists say that, except in wartime, there is a normal unemployment rate of about 4 percent, because of seasonal layoffs and individual job switching.)

Now a figure of 4½ million jobless sounds pretty bad—until you check the record books. At the bottom of the depression of the 1930's, this country had 13 million out of work, or 25 percent of the total labor force. Even as late as 1940, after strenuous pump priming by the Roosevelt administration, there were still 8 million job hunters. It took World War II to bring full employment.

The gloom hunters point to curtailed operations in such industries as steel and automobile manufacturing. True, these reductions are severe. Yet top economists estimate that the drop in the Nation's overall production, as compared with last year, is running only 2 to 2½ percent—hardly an alarming change.

Nonpartisan opinion holds that this country, after a period of roaring economic expansion, is undergoing a contraction much like the mild recessions of 1948–49 and 1953–54. Who is frightened by the memories of those years? The same opinion foresees an end to the readjustment in 1958 and the beginning of a new boom.

By all the evidence, Harry Truman is painting the clouds much too dark. True, President Eisenhower may spread the sunshine a little too broadly at times. But when he tells us that America is strong and healthy and has nothing to fear unless it follows men of little faith, history gives his words the stamp of truth.

[From the St. Petersburg (Fla.) Independent of February 25, 1958]

TRUMAN POLITICAL GADFLY

Although they may be able to withstand the slings and arrows of other critics without too much trouble, a give-'em-hell speech by former President Harry S. Truman never fails to get under the skin of the Republicans.

Thus the reaction to the former President's fund-raising pep talk in Washington over the weekend was both quick and violent. The stung Republicans are still tearing their hair.

Yet there was little in Mr. Truman's speech that he hasn't said on previous occasions. He charged the Republicans with producing a recession at home and a crisis of confidence abroad.

His speech was filled with jarring sarcasm on every front. Said he:

"And in spite of the Republican recession, the Republicans manage to keep prices going upward. This is quite a feat, to have price inflation and recession at the same time. We had a hard time getting a satellite off the ground, but it was no trick at all for them to shoot the cost of living into outer space."

On the foreign scene, Mr. Truman declared:

"One of the worst results of this period of economic misrule is its effects on the international situation. The present administration has acted like an overbearing banker with a glass eye, not like a loyal and faithful friend of the other nations, and the crisis of confidence in our leadership has sapped the strength and determination of the great alliance."

Mr. Truman, of course, conveniently overlooks the economic setback which occurred during his administration as he does the failures of his administration in the field of foreign affairs. At the same time he is not always careful with the truth.

But he does have the capacity not only of hitting the Republicans where they hurt, but of rallying the spirits of the Democrats.

It is a matter of conjecture of how many Americans, outside the bigwigs of both parties, are deeply affected or persuaded by his public utterances. We suspect that most stopped taking him too seriously long ago.

Nevertheless in the role of political gadfly he does seem to perform a good purpose. He serves as a rallying point to the Democrats who seem to have a built-in proclivity for riding off in all directions. And at the same time he regularly manages to arouse the Republicans from the bog of smug complacency in which they seem to spend a good deal of their time.

A Bill To Protect the Small Investor

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 27, 1958

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a bill designed to bring within the operation of the Securities Act of 1933 the sale of securities offered for sale and sold only in one State. The bill would thus prohibit deceptive practices which are currently victimizing small investors.

Of all the laws passed under the aegis of the New Deal, few if any have been as wholeheartedly accepted as the Securities Act of 1933 and the Securities Exchange Act of 1934, which established the Securities and Exchange Commission and today protect millions of American investors from fraud and deception in the sale of securities. The major stock exchanges themselves now welcome the standards for prospectuses and security offerings which the SEC, under these laws, requires. Confidence in the integrity of the security markets, so badly shaken in the debacle of 1929, and with reason, has been reestablished.

Nonetheless, we must face the fact that there are certain areas in which the small investors face a real peril, areas over which the SEC presently has no jurisdiction. One of the most insidious of these, and the one which my bill is intended to attack, concerns securities which are offered only within a single State, and which are often limited for original sale to the residents of that State. Heretofore these have been exempt from SEC regulation.

It is precisely here, free from the watchful eyes of the SEC, that unscrupulous promoters have victimized unwary small investors. Let me give you but one example of many that have come to my attention. In New York City, within recent months there has appeared a rash of advertisements offering returns of 7 percent, 10 percent, 12 percent, or more on various real-estate securities, with the offerings limited to State residents only. Such advertising, as the Better Business Bureau of New York City has

been at pains to point out, is frequently misleading and deceptive. Offering circulars are so artfully contrived as to confuse even a studious and informed person, much less an uninitiated and uninformed real-estate investor.

Unfortunately, under the laws of New York State, such offerings do not need to stand the advance scrutiny of analysts, accountants, engineers, and attorneys of the Securities and Exchange Commission. All that is required is the filing of a simple registration statement with the attorney general of the State of New York; and he has no effective regulatory power over these offerings.

New York State is by no means unique in this situation. In fact, many other States are much more lax in their supervision over the issuance of securities that are advertised and sold only within the State.

The bill which I am introducing seeks to put an end to these unscrupulous promotion schemes. Heretofore, under paragraph 11 of section 3 (a) of the Securities Act of 1933, security issues restricted to residents of one State have been exempt from Federal regulation. By striking out this paragraph, as my bill proposes, this exemption would be terminated. It would thereby be unlawful to use the facilities of interstate commerce unless a registration statement for the security was in effect.

Investors throughout the Nation would be assured that the fact that a security is not offered for sale throughout the country is no barrier to its meeting the requirements of the SEC for disclosure of all relevant information. There would remain, of course, certain kinds of securities, such as Government securities, building and loan securities, and those security issues aggregating $300,000 or less which would continue to be exempt from SEC regulation. Small investors would receive a substantial benefit from this bill. They would be less subject to scheming promoters issuing misleading, confusing, and deceptive prospectuses. This is a protection which our people deserve and need.

Farmers' Grain Cooperative

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ARTHUR V. WATKINS
OF UTAH
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, February 27, 1958

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, farmer cooperatives, which number over 7,000, move into our distribution system about 25 percent of all farm products which are marketed in the United States. Cooperatives are important handlers of many of our grains, such as wheat and corn, among other commodities.

With respect to the marketing of grain, cooperatives provide farmers with a longer marketing season, which permits them to take advantage of price fluctuations over a longer period of time than otherwise would be the case. In the fall, 1957, issue of the Grain Quarterly appears an article by Mr. Harold W. Poort entitled "Farmers' Grain Cooperative."

Because this very short article tells the success story of how one grain cooperative has served agriculture so well, I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FARMERS GRAIN COOPERATIVE
(Harold W. Poort)

A new attendance record was set when patron-members of Farmers Grain Cooperative held their annual stockholders' meeting at Ogden, Utah, on November 1.

Patrons of the Utah co-op heard General Manager Harold W. Poort report that during the past year Farmers Grain handled 5,698,000 bushels of grain. Approximately 80 percent of this total was wheat. Savings for the year totalled $241,000.

Now a healthy, going, fast-growing operation, this regional grain marketing cooperative is now entirely out of debt to banks on its facilities of 3 million bushels at Ogden. Farmers Grain has written off losses undergone in previous years in connection with a feed plan and a dehydration operation that did not pan out as originally expected. These trials have now been charged off as experience.

Under the aggressive leadership of General Manager Poort and President W. W. Leek, Farmers Grain has been built up to a strong, working capital position. The regional's working capital has been increased from $218,000 on May 31, 1953, to a present total of $741,000. Thus, the co-op has now reached that enviable position where it is not currently required to borrow operating capital. Its savings for the past year's operation worked out to about 4.5 cents per bushel, and it has taken up with cash its revolving fund certificates of 1943.

Earnings from storage and handling were down somewhat from last year, but gross margins on merchandising operations increased substantially.

The board of directors, which is headed by Mr. Leek who was reelected to that position, consists of 1 member from each of the local associations which are 100 percent shippers to the regional.

Crop volume in the area served by Farmers Grain was down during the past year because of adverse weather and the soil bank. Wheat in the area, at this writing, is selling over loan values. As a result, the regional has some empty storage space. It is intended that this be filled with milo from the Great Plains States.

The barley crop in southern Idaho this year is very large. Development of cattle feeding as an important industry in that section and northern Utah has meant that a greta deal of barley is marketed directly from farms to feedlots, bypassing both local and regional and competing facilities. Thus, truck transportation has complicated the co-op's problem of amassing and selling grain to some extent, and truck receipts and sales from the area continue to mount as nearly everywhere in the grain belt.

Mr. Dulles at 70

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN SHERMAN COOPER
OF KENTUCKY
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, February 27, 1958

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Mr. Dulles at 70," published in the New York Times of February 26, 1958. I call attention to two sentences.

Historials of the future no doubt will record that Mr. Dulles' tenure in his key position was a period of great controversy. But we hope they will leave no question that on his 70th birthday, Mr. Dulles had the gratitude of the American people for his efforts to secure the peace.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MR. DULLES AT 70

The physical and mental vigor that John Foster Dulles exhibits daily in his grueling post is so impressive that it probably came as a surprise to many Americans to learn that he was 70 yesterday. A much younger man might well be crushed by the burden of responsibility and the fatigue of frequent travel which are our Secretary of State's normal load, yet he seems to thrive with the passage of time.

Historians of the future no doubt will record that Mr. Dulles' tenure in his key position was a period of great controversy. But we hope they will leave no question that on his 70th birthday, Mr. Dulles had the gratitude of the American people for his efforts to secure the peace. We are sure we speak for the great majority of our fellow citizens in congratulating him as he enters the eighth decade of his life, and in wishing him many more years of good health, good cheer, and useful activity.

Legislation To Increase the Annuities of Retired Civil Service Employees

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS L. ASHLEY
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 27, 1958

Mr. ASHLEY. Mr. Speaker, I wish to speak briefly on behalf of a bill which I am introducing for the relief of our retired Federal employees—a bill which I am sure requires little or no justification in the minds of my colleagues. The more than 150 bills that have already been intrduced to provide annuity increases for our retired Government workers is ample evidence of the overwhelming support for this legislation.

Back in the fall of 1956, the 84th Congress, quite appropriately and commendably revised upward the schedule of retirement benefits of persons covered under the Civil Service Retirement Act. In so doing Congress acknowledged that the existing annuities were inadequate and unrealistic in terms of the grossly inflated costs of day-to-day living, which had seriously depreciated the purchasing power of fixed retirement income.

For some imponderable reason, however, the Congress failed to make the annuity increases in Public Law 854 applicable to those civil-service employees who had already retired—over 240,000 faithful civil servants whose average age is in excess of 68 years and whose economic burden is increased by the added cost of medical and health care, so necessary

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

with the inevitable infirmities of advancing years.

If by 1956 the already depreciated purchasing power of the dollar dictated an adjustment in annuity income for future retirees, how much more desperate must the plight today of those who had already retired when we stop to consider that the cost of living has risen steadily since the enactment of Public Law 854.

It is a stern but inescapable reality that the cost of food, clothing, rent, and medical care has reached such heights that whatever was envisaged as a reasonable pension income in the past is now altogether inadequate. To fail to provide these people who have given us years of loyal and conscientious service with this necessary economic relief is clearly to default on our moral responsibility.

I urge upon my colleagues prompt and favorable consideration of this long overdue legislation to increase the annuities of our retired civil-service employees.

Masters of Deceit

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. L. MENDEL RIVERS
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 27, 1958

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Speaker, I want to call the attention of my colleagues to a new book which is destined to leave a deep impact on the thinking of the American people. This book is Masters of Deceit by J. Edgar Hoover, Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, to be released on March 10, 1958, by Henry Holt & Co., of New York City.

In this book, Mr. Hoover discusses communism, national and international. I know of no man, either in governmental service or in private life, who has a more thorough understanding of communism than Mr. Hoover. For 40 years he has followed, step by step, the rise of this atheistic conspiracy. The FBI has become a vigilant tower of watchfulness, protecting the Nation against these rodents of Marxism-Leninism who would devour our institutions of free government. While many citizens slept, not recognizing the Communist danger, Mr. Hoover and his agency were working day and night to keep abreast of the party's nefarious activities. The Nation owes a great debt of gratitude to the FBI.

For this reason, in my opinion, Masters of Deceit is must reading for every patriotic citizen. All too often I have heard men and women say, "I wish I knew more about communism," or ask, "Where can I find truly authoritative information about communism?" In this book, they now have their answers. Masters of Deceit represents Mr. Hoover's opinions concerning communism, based on a lifetime of study. I know of no book where this information is more understandably and simply set forth.

Masters of Deceit opens with a discussion of the origin of communism, first in its international aspects and then in the United States. We see how the Communist Party, starting as a small, disorganized band in 1919, slowly gained in strength, influence, and power. Then Mr. Hoover goes into two questions which intrigue every person: "Why do people join the Communist Party?" and "Why do people leave the party?" The FBI Director sets forth a number of illustrative case examples which make these two chapters not only highly informative but also interesting.

One of the most valuable sections of the book is the discussion of the internal structure of the Communist Party: how the party is organized; how its leaders and members live; how the party's educational program operates; how Communist man is fashioned through Communist indoctrination, literature, and the party press. The reader can actually see the party in operation. This is one facet of the Communist movement which is little understood—just how the party functions from within.

Unfortunately, day after day we hear Communist propaganda, the fancy-sounding promises of what the party plans to do for the Nation. Many unsuspecting citizens are hoodwinked into believing that the party stands for American ideals. Mr. Hoover's discussion tells just how, within the party apparatus, the recruit is slowly indoctrinated in Marxism-Leninism and his allegiance is transferred to a foreign power.

Masters of Deceit tells also about the party's attack against non-Communist society through mass agitation, infiltration and fronts. Here we clearly see the deceitful tactics employed by the Communists to hoodwink our citizens. Again Mr. Hoover cites case examples to show the techniques which the party day after day employs to advance its evil cause.

The party attacks our society not only through aboveground channels—but also underground. In a most illuminating chapter the FBI Director describes the party's underground structure. In recent years the underground has played an important role in Communist strategy, hiding party fugitives, concealing its leaders and secreting confidential records. The reader can see the life of a member underground and the demands on his day-to-day existence.

Of special interest is the chapter on communism and religion. Here Mr. Hoover explains that communism is atheistic. Karl Marx bitterly denounced religion and all his followers, including Nikita Khrushchev, have continued this assault. The chapter details how the party is attempting to infiltrate churches in the United States and to influence church men and women to support the Communist cause.

Not only is the Communist menace described and analyzed, but Mr. Hoover throughout the book tells what patriotic citizens can do to combat it. He calls for vigilance, a knowledge of the true aims of the party and a willingness of Americans to work together in suport of freedom. After reading this book the citizen can say: "Here is a book of merit—a book which has meaning to my everyday life."

Masters of Deceit is recommended reading for the Nation. The author deliberately avoids sensationalism; the book, as Mr. Hoover states in the foreword, "does not pretend to disclose a body of material known exclusively to the FBI." It does attempt to explain the background and menace of communism in simple and understandable language. Seldom does a book come from such a distinguished pen with such a meaningful and timely message. In it we will find answers which will help us in our battle of survival with Soviet Russia.

Historical Test in Costa Rica

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM C. CRAMER
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 19, 1958

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, the Americas Daily is one of the better known Spanish language newspapers published in the State of Florida and dedicated to a better understanding between the Americas. A recent editorial in that paper pointed out the efforts of the people of Costa Rica to provide a method of nonpartisan observation of their coming elections to assure free and effective selection of a president. This is certainly a sound attempt to reach a great goal and I call to the Members attention several excellent points in regard to the Commission that have been brought out in the accompanying editorial which I ask to be included in the RECORD.

The editorial follows:

[From the Americas Daily of January 30, 1958]

HISTORICAL TEST IN COSTA RICA

According to reports from San Jose, the Government of the Republic of Costa Rica requested from the United Nations Organization a list of persons among which it could select a United Nations Observation Commission for the presidential elections to be held in that Central American Repuolic Sunday.

It is understood that the Organization, or one of its agencies, submitted several names of world personalities to the consideration of the Costa Rican Government and that the Government, after inviting the leaders of the different political parties to choose among these names, selected three gentlemen of recognized international prestige. They are Dr. Horace Read, dean of the Law School of Dalhouse University, in Canada; Mr. Tingsten, a Swede, director of an important Stockholm newspaper, and Dr. Paul Negro, president of the electoral court of Uruguay.

Although no hint has been given, at least abroad, of how the United Nations observation mission will operate, nor which will be its true functions, and how they will adjust within the juridical technique regulating the relations of a state member of U. N. O. with this world organization, it must be accepted that it is only a historical test taking place in Costa Rica, which may have enormous repercussions in the international life of the different countries.

The results of this observation mission cannot be known as yet, nor even immediately after the elections are held, because a

reasonable lapse of time will be necessary to know the effectivity of this measure, and its positive scope.

Of course, from the viewpoint of political morality, as an effort to demonstrate good democratic intentions on the part of the Costa Rican Government, this test has to be considered of marked importance. In any case, it is a precedent in America, which may be opening the way to adequate improvement in the future. After all, any institutional progress of that nature requires a process of maturity, of good judgment in the application and analysis of its consequences, so that it may some day become a reality that nobody will dare to dispute.

Those interested in the development of modern international law, in the moralization of international democracy, will have in this case, for sure, an excellent opportunity for meditation, for investigation and study, serene and constructive. They will say, in due time, the last word.

Spellbinder Truman Taken To Task by Press for Mishandling Facts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ELFORD A. CEDERBERG

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 25, 1958

Mr. CEDERBERG. Mr. Speaker, I am daily grateful for the free and independent press which prevails in this country to protect us from the "Hysterical Harry's" whose demogogic outcries do not always measure up with the facts. Some people are as immune to facts as a duck's back is to water.

Harry Truman, who dropped off in Washington with his cure-all political kit a few nights ago, has been taken to task by the Washington Star for his mishandling of the facts in connection with Republican efforts to increase rates for postage of the slick magazines. They referred to Harry's tub-thumping speech before depression-scared Democrats who forked up a hundred dollars each to break bread with the ex-President.

The following is the Star editorial:

[From the Washington Evening Star of February 24, 1958]

UNKINDEST CUT

When Harry Truman takes off his coat and starts swinging at the Republicans, as he did Saturday night, a man can do one of several things.

If he is really prudent he will dive into the nearest bomb shelter and stay there until the raid is over. If he is not prudent at all he can attempt to separate fact from fiction and undertake a point-by-point rebuttal of the Truman charges. If he does this he will wind up in a position roughly comparable to that of the man who tries to wrestle with a cement mixer. If he is just moderately prudent, and this is where we come in, he will try to deal with one point—and be glad to call it a day.

Mr. Truman's main theme revolved around the terrible things that the Republicans are doing to this country and its economy. After listening to him we would hesitate to try to borrow a dime from our best friend. But the audience liked it—an audience of some 3,000 Democrats who managed somehow, recession, depression, or what have you—to scrape up $100 a head for the privilege of being there.

The one point with which we would like to deal, however, is this business of the 5-cent postage stamp. Mr. Truman said that this was a category reserved by the Republicans for any American who, by some stroke of good fortune, had managed to escape the other GOP oppressions. If they haven't skinned you in some other way, Mr. Truman said, don't worry. You haven't been forgotten. You'll get a 5-cent postage stamp. And then he interpolated to the following effect: This is a painless way to subsidize the slick magazines with their whisky and cigarette ads.

It was this which struck us as being the unkindest cut of all. For if this Republican administration has done nothing else, it has striven mightily to raise the postal rates on the slick magazines. Mr. Summerfield, the Postmaster General, has tried five times. And what has stopped him? A Senate Post Office Committee controlled in all except one year by, of all things, the Democrats.

A small point? Perhaps so. But anyone who might try to engage Mr. Truman on a broad front in a free-wheeling political slugfest would be lucky to come out of it alive.

Trade Agreements

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILL E. NEAL

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 27, 1958

Mr. NEAL. The economy in my District, Mr. Speaker, is supported by a variety of industries producing commodities for domestic use. For the most part, these industries have provided abundant employment, paying wages equal to top American standards.

During the past several years, under the administration of the Trade Agreements Act, imported commodities of similar varieties allowed to enter our domestic market have frozen a great number of these plants out of business. Many other diversified industries upon which communities have depended for substantial payrolls are finding it increasingly difficult to remain operating. Glass, pottery, and ceramic plants, that formerly supported prosperous communities, no longer exist.

My attention has recently been called to injuries being experienced by manufacturers of dyes, tools, and porcelains. Let me produce a letter just received from the Porcelain Products, Inc., located in the second city of my district.

PORCELAIN PRODUCTS, INC.,
Parkersburg, W. Va., February 24, 1958.

To Our United States Senators and Our United States Representatives:

Porcelain Products, Inc. of Parkersburg, W. Va., manufacturers high voltage electrical porcelain for use by the electric power utilities in generating, transmitting, and distributing electricity.

Starting February 17, 1958, and continuing for about 5 weeks, the House Ways and Means Committee will hear presentations of various industries, including the high voltage insulator section of the National Electrical Manufacturers Association, on the Extension of Trade Agreements Act.

Competition to our electrical porcelain industry comes primarily from the Japanese, where wages are one-tenth ours.

Unless domestic manufacturers are given protection against such competition, our industry will stagnate and go out of business due to labor being 65 percent of our cost of products manufactured.

Insulators are as essential to our Nation as electrict power is.

Please, therefore, give us your assistance and influence in voting to protect domestic industries and domestic labor.

Sincerely,

G. M. RUOFF,
President.

I would like to refer to a statement which appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of July 6, 1953, page 8042, 83d Congress, 1st session, relative to a contract finally awarded to Japan in preference to a bid submitted by this company. Although the Japanese firm's bid was $29,000 under the Parkersburg Co.'s bid, we were able to show by careful estimates that the overall loss to the State of West Virginia through failure to realize its customary tax returns on the $100,000 wages required to produce the order plus the Federal Government's loss in witholding taxes, social-security tax, and unemployment-compensation payments reached a total of $100,000. Let me quote from my former statement:

Thus, we will subtract from the successful operation of a self-propelling American economy an overall sum approaching $100,000 to save $29,000 in a shortsighted belief that we can build up foreign competitors with no regard for our own industrial economy. The above figures reflect the situation locally as it applies to one American firm and does not go into the question of import duties. It certainly seems timely that terms and interpretations of the Buy American Act should be given careful scrutiny to explore and publicize its far-reaching effects on the American economy. Industrial workers are entitled to such review, and will demand it. In the meantime, this particular contract should be awarded to the American bidder.

Our opposition to this deal accomplished nothing. The contract was finally awarded to the Japanese bidder.

Positive Action Necessary To Limit Excessive Oil Imports

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES W. VURSELL

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 15, 1958

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Speaker, Secretary of Commerce Sinclair Weeks, chairman of a special Cabinet Committee To Investigate the Crude Oil Imports, recognized the serious matter of the oil-import problem in a statement released February 8. Secretary Weeks has been in close touch with this problem over long periods of time. His recognition that it has become increasingly serious is encouraging, and his announcement that it will have the immediate attention of the Cabinet Committee should be commended.

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

Immediate and vigorous action is needed to maintain a strong and dynamic oil-producing industry in this country. This is evident from the unhealthy conditions now permeating the entire domestic petroleum industry.

In the tristate oil producing area, where my own State of Illinois is the largest in production, oil-well drilling declined by 24 percent in 1957. So far in 1958, well completions are 23 percent below a year ago. Rotary rigs active in the tristate declined 31 percent in 1957, and have further declined by 20 percent in the first month of this year. This deterioration is not confined to any one State or area. It is evident throughout the 31 producing States. The results are reflected in serious impacts on our economy, and in drastic reductions in employment. Employment in the oil and gas producing industry, according to the latest figures of the Bureau of Labor Statistics, declined by 17,000 persons between August and November, 1957. Undoubtedly, employment has further declined with the worsening conditions in the industry.

More important than all else, a domestic petroleum industry which the Suez crisis only last year reminded us is our first line of defense for military fuels, is being undermined and is becoming stagnant.

In light of these circumstances, I hope the Cabinet Committee now recommends positive action to effectively deal with the import problem. Unless such action is forthcoming, the Congress will be compelled to provide legislative standards to effectively limit imports.

They Probe the Future

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PETER FRELINGHUYSEN, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 27, 1958

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an article from the February 15, 1958, issue of the Saturday Evening Post entitled "They Probe the Future":

THEY PROBE THE FUTURE

(By Clay Blair, Jr.)

The year 1957 may go down in history as the year of the sputniks. Not since the explosion of the first atomic bomb has man's imagination soared so high or his fears been so deeply stirred by scientific achievement. Yet one point must be clearly understood: the Russians have not conquered space. To be precise, they have made a tentative step into space, comparable in significance to the first flight of the Wright brothers' airplane.

Despite Mr. Khrushchev's boast that Sputnik I made the long-range bomber obsolete, the earth satellites indicate no shift in the balance of military power. The fact is that guided missiles with nuclear warheads—reliable, accurate missiles that can be flung from continent to continent—are still a long way off. For many years, the manned bomber will remain the principal carrier for nuclear explosives, and our fleet of bombers is still the largest and best in the world.

Now, after a late start, we have mounted a massive program to build a family of guided ballistic missiles. Several 1,500-to-2,000-mile missiles have been tested successfully. That we did not launch a satellite first is not the fault of our scientists. They had the technique and urged that it be done. Washington, failing to perceive the enormous psychological impact of such a device, lacked the will. We lost the satellite race by default.

Actually, the Soviets have won a battle, but if we proceed wisely and sensibly, the campaign can be ours. An important factor in this campaign will be the backing we give basic aeronautical research, which leans heavily on the corporate genius of the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics.

NACA, a potent Government agency almost unknown to laymen, is unique in scope and make-up. Founded in 1915 by President Woodrow Wilson, after it was clear that the United States lagged behind Europe in airplane development, NACA was charged with the responsibility of advising the President on aviation research. Since Wilson's day, NACA has grown into a research network manned by 8000 engineers and technicians, where most of the practical knowledge and much of the theory about aerodynamics in the free world have been spawned in the last forty-two years.

Our airplane and missile designers and manufactures seldom make a move without consulting NACA. Says A. E. Raymond, vice president, engineering, at Douglas Aircraft, "its work is used by us every day in the year and we could not very well get along without it."

Alexander Kartveli, Vice President, Reseach and development, Republic Aviation Corp., says, "I consider NACA as one of our most outstanding national scientific institutions. It has contributed enormously to the supremacy of American aviation."

NACA is boesed by 59-year-old Dr. Hugh L. Dryden, an internationally famous scientist who in his spare time is a lay Methodist preacher. Its engineers man three large laboratories: Langley Aeronautical Laboratory, in Virginia; a second aerodynamic facility, Ames, about 50 miles south of San Francisco; and Lewis, an engine and fuel lab in Cleveland. NACA does not design airplanes, nor is it the sole source of aeronautical theory. Universities such as M. I. T., Cal Tech, Cornell and Johns Hopkins contribute to the general body of knowledge, as do all aircraft, missile and engine companies, and the Armed Forces, which maintain their own aeronautical-research centers.

Most of the work in industry and the Armed Forces, however, is concerned with specific airplane designs—development work. NACA, on the other hand, concentrates on producing fundamental theories and concepts which have application to broad categories of airplanes and missiles. It is not pure research, in the sense of trying to find out what makes the grass green, to borrow one of Charlie Wilson's phrases. More precisely, it is what scientists call "directed" research; sooner or later, most of it evolves into projects that find their way into one of NACA's 53 wind tunnels and ultimately onto an airplane or missile.

Few of NACA's vast accomplishments become known to the public; some are too technically complex to describe, and many are classified for reasons of military security. Says a Navy admiral, "The Armed Forces and industry like to take credit for the big breakthroughs in aviation. But if you look into it closely, you can almost always trace them back to fundamental work at NACA."

To make certain that the needs of industry and of the Armed Forces are constantly kept in focus, and to avoid research duplication, the NACA staff is quarterbacked by no fewer than 29 committees and subcommittees manned by 500 of the Nation's leading aeronautical experts. They meet from time to time, without compensation, to monitor the agency's activities. The main committee—in fact, the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics—reports directly to the President. Its Chairman is retired Air Force Lt. Gen. James H. "Jimmy" Doolittle, who won fame in World War II when he led the first bombing raid on Tokyo. Less well known is the fact that he is a distinguished aeronautical engineer.

During the last 2 years I have visited 2 of NACA's laboratories—Langley, in Virginia, and the Lewis flight propulsion lab in Cleveland—half a dozen times. It was a fascinating but slightly bewildering experience. I recommend that anyone following in my footsteps first take a short course in aeronautical engineering.

Langley is the oldest of NACA's facilities. Its original buildings and first wind tunnel were decidated in 1920, and it was here that a handful of pioneers began laying the hard foundation of modern United States aeronautical science. In retrospect, the early work seems incredibly simple. A breakthrough, then considered major, occurred in 1929 when an engineer discovered that a plane's speed could be boosted 15 percent by encircling the exposed pistons of an air-cooled engine with a cowling. During the 1930's, the lab was expanded and Langley engineers began stock-piling data on every conceivable aspect of aircraft theory—location of engines, shapes of propellers, configuration of seaplane hulls, operation of cooling systems, and so on ad infinitum.

One of their greatest achievements was the development of a family of wings—called the NACA airfoils—that at the time of World War II were used by about 95 percent of the aircraft in the world. "It is notorious," the British journal of the Royal Aeronautical Society huffed in 1935, "that many of our most capable design staffs prefer to base their technical work on the results of the NACA."

Today Langley is a massive installation, manned by an army of 3,200 scientists and technicians, blasting away at the strongholds of the aeronautical unknown with the most modern laboratory weapons man can devise. Its buildings, interspersed among the bulbous, snaking tubes of 23 major wind tunnels, have the brick-and-ivy look of a college campus, but, inside, the work is pushed at a frenetic pace. NACA engineers try to keep one jump ahead of the airplane designers, and one jump in their business can mean as much as 3 or 4 years.

Many of the men I talked to were probing the baffling enigmas of flight at 500,000 feet in space at speeds of 20,000 miles per hour. This is no long-range pipe dream with them, but an immediate, pressing demand. Right now North American is building an experimental airplane, the X–15, that in a year or 2 may fly at better than 3,000 miles per hour.

The problems are enormous. At supersonic speeds, airplanes heat up like furnaces. Some means must be found to keep the temperature down and preserve the structure of the plane, which could warp or melt. The faster planes fly, the more difficult they are to control, especially at extremely high altitudes where the air is thin and conventional control surfaces are less effective. New control techniques must be devised. Turbojet engines seem impracticable for sustained operations above 100,000 feet, and beyond 2,600 miles per hour reliable ram-jets, rocket, or nuclear engines must be perfected if man is to fly higher and faster.

Since the basic aerodynamic problems of high-speed aircraft and missiles are the same, much of NACA's fundamental research has a direct application in the missile field. Recently, NACA revealed that one of its leading engineers at the Ames Laboratory, H. (Harvey) Julian Allen, had made a major breakthrough. Allen had attacked one of the biggest problems in the development of the ballistic missile—the design of a nose

cone, or reentry body, that would not burn up like a meteor when it plunged back into the atmosphere at speeds of 15,000 miles per hour or more.

Many laboratories around the United States had tried to design a suitable nose cone, and various materials, shapes and construction techniques had been advanced, tested and discarded. Most of these early experiments involved the use of a sharply pointed nose cone to mimimize drag.

After a detailed exploration of basic aerodynamic heating Harvey Allen concluded that a successful nose cone should be very blunt—seemingly, an aerodynamic absurdity. However, he had reasoned that the stronger shock waves of a blunt nose would actually carry off as much as 99 percent of the frictional heat. Today all of our long-range ballistic missiles have very blunt warheads.

NACA is one of the smallest Government agencies, and the work it turns out seems all out of proportion to its size and cost. Its annual budget is about $70 million, not including money for construction of new facilities. Its present plant is valued at more than $300 million. A visitor gets the impression that every dollar is spent wisely. Says George Trimble, vice president, enginering, at the Martin Co. "We hear much talk about how inefficient Government-run organizations usually are, and indeed I have found most of them that way, but this cannot be said of NACA. In my experience I have rarely seen a research outfit with more talent or higher morale."

Many engineers have been lured away by salaries in industry 3 to 5 times greater than NACA can pay. But most of the good men remain at their posts with rare dedication, men like John Stack at Langley; H. Julian Allen, Abe Silverstein, at Lewis; and Dryden, who makes $20,000 a year, and recently, according to an aviation-company executive, refused an outside offer of more than $100,000. Says Sir Roy Fedden, dean of British aviation, "I look upon them as one of the finest and most selfless bodies of men in existence today."

Although the primary emphasis at NACA is on basic research, in emergencies it runs tests for the Armed Forces on special projects which the services are not equipped to handle. "In these days," says an NACA staffer, "the emergencies seem to occur with alarming frequency."

A recent case in point is WS–110–A, a secret Air Force project which for many months absorbed the working hours of many of the top engineers at NACA. WS-110-A (short for Weapons System 110-A) is more commonly known as the Air Force's chemical bomber project, so-called to distinguish it from the nuclear-powered airplane, which has suffered delays both budgetary and technical, and consequently is still a long way off. WS-110-A is the fantastic, manned airplane that will be the future replacement for the B-52. It will have a speed in excess of Mach 3 (2000 miles per hour at operating altitude,) and high performance from ground level to 75,000 feet, with a range of eight or nine thousand miles. The chemical bomber will be the first United States Air Force plane to consume exotic or zip fuels, made from boron, which have been exhaustively tested and examined at NACA's engine lab in Cleveland.

Two large aviation companies—Boeing and North American—ran a grueling technical race for the WS–110–A prize, since in these times fat aircraft contracts are rare. Before submitting their final designs, engineers from each company closeted themselves with NACA engineers to gather up the latest basic aeronautical data, including some recent NACA breakthroughs, which cannot be described for security reasons. Then each company presented its design to the Air Force in the form of hundreds of blueprints and specifications. However, the science of aerodynamics has become so infinitely complex that there are few men in the Air Force, or anyplace else, who can study a set of plans and tell if the airplane will do everything the manufacturer claims. There is much educated guesswork involved. The old, sure-fire way of buying a few test versions from each company has been abandoned because it wastes time and is too costly. Development of a few hand-built test models can run up to $750 million. So nowadays the Air Force turns to NACA for technical help in making its final decision.

In a case like this NACA walks a tightrope of impartiality. It will provide answers to specific Air Force questions about first one design and then the other. However it will not directly compare the two airplanes, or come right out and say which one is better, nor does it reveal information to one company about its competitor's airplane.

In the end, the WS–110–A contract went to North American, but the decision was not an easy one to make, since both designs, based on NACA data, were very close in predicted performance. Many other factors entered into the decision. One was the availability of engineering and production facilities. Earlier in the year, during the defense-economy waves, North American had lost the F–107 and the Navaho missile; Boeing still has a huge backlog of orders for B–52's, KC–135 jet tankers, 707 commercial jet transports, Bomarc missiles and other items. In their various conceptions of the WS–110–A, engineers had stretched to the outer limits of know-how in supersonic aircraft design, and, as in the case of all new planes, there is an element of a gamble involved. With its F–100, F–107, and X–15, North American has actually had more experience in the production of supersonic aircraft, so that was another point in its favor.

NACA's most prolonged and demanding emergency period occurred during the years 1939–45, when the Nation's air arms expanded enormously for World War II. In 1938 NACA, pointing to the development in Germany of aeronautical research facilities better than our own, began begging Congress for money to expand its own aging installations. Maj. Gen. Oscar Westover, chief of the Army Air Corps, grumbled about the congested bottleneck at Langley. A valuable year slipped by before money was authorized for the new aerodynamic laboratory at Ames. In 1939, a special NACA committee warned of the superiority of European aircraft engines, and urged the immediate construction of a powerplant research center. But it was not until June 1940—after Belgium and Holland had been overrun—that funds were provided to start construction of the Lewis Lab in Cleveland.

Many years would elapse before NACA could fully exploit these new installations for basic aeronautical research. At the beginning of World War II, the decision was made at the summit to fight with the weapons in hand. Under pressure, NACA temporarily abandoned virtually all basic aerodynamic research and concentrated largely on applied research—that is, making existing aircraft faster and easier to control, and production engines more powerful.

Between December 1941 and December 1944, NACA engineers reworked and patched up 115 different types of airplanes. One of the biggest headaches was a succession of tail failures on most of the Army Air Forces' fighters and bombers. After exhaustive tests in NACA tunnels, a remedy was found for each plane. Other aircraft were sent to NACA labs to see what modifications could be made to reduce drag. The speeds of some 30 aircraft were substantially improved in this manner. For example, when the P–39 came in for drag tests, it had a top speed of 340 miles per hour. After NACA modification, its top speed was increased 54 miles per hour. The P–51, designed with a new NACA wing, turned out to be the fastest propeller fighter in World War II.

The late Secretary of the Navy Frank Knox summed up NACA's contribution to naval aviation: "The Navy's famous fighters—the Corsair, Wildcat, and Hellcat—are possible only because they were based on fundamentals developed by NACA. All of them use NACA wing sections, NACA cooling methods, NACA high-lift devices. The great sea victories that have broken Japan's expanding grip in the Pacific would not have been possible without the contributions of NACA."

At war's end, when United States intelligence experts moved into German aeronautical-research centers, they found that German engineers had made sweeping progress in the investigation of highspeed flight. Behind the Nazi superweapons, such as the V–1 pulsejet missile, the V–2 rocket, the ME–262 turbojet airplane, lay a large body of high-speed wind-tunnel and theoretical data, which was miles ahead of similar data in the United States.

In spite of the fact that NACA's war work had been dictated by the decision to fight with existing weapons, the agency was criticized. In a long series of postwar policy meetings, steps were taken to restore NACA to its traditional role of providing basic research. NACA engineers, groggy from the unrelenting pressure of World War II, got set to face the even greater challenge of supersonic flight, which some authorities considered impossible.

Engineers at NACA did not believe supersonic flight was impossible, but they were aware of the formidable obstacles to overcome, not the least of which was the gathering of basic aerodynamic data. The first trouble they ran into was choking, a peculiarity of the flow of air through wind tunnels at about the speed of sound; it was impossible to establish with any degree of certainty how an airplane would behave at transonic speed. To get on with the investigation, NACA engineers devised other techniques. Small models, packed with instrumentation, were taken aloft in a B–29 and dropped; at Wallops Island, Virginia, an offshoot of Langley, other models powered by rocket engines were fired down a controlled range.

The most ambitious approach was conceived by Langley's John Stack: the development of a family of small, experimental research aircraft that could actually be piloted through the speed of sound. They were to be powered by rocket engines or a combination of rocket and turbojet engines; at that time, engineers did not believe the turbojet alone could push a plane beyond Mach 1. These small aircraft, called X models, were built under a joint NACA-Armed Forces-industry program. On October 14, 1947, Air Force Capt. Charles E. Yeager, piloted the first of these planes, the Bell X–1, to a speed of Mach 1.05, acquiring fame for himself and destroying the myth of the sonic barrier. Since then the other X models, the Bell X–1A and X–2, the Douglas Skystreak and Skyrocket, have repeatedly smashed altitude and speed records. More important than the records established were the data collected from these flights by NACA's High-Speed Flight Station at Edwards Air Force Base. All of today's high-performance airplanes benefited in one way or another.

Gratifying as these flights were, engineers still clamored for controlled laboratory studies at the speed of sound. The irrepressible John Stack had been working on this deficiency, and in 1949 he came up with an ingenious slotted-throat tunnel which would dispel the choking and permit a transonic flow of air. This tunnel, the first of its kind in the world, was put into operation in 1951.

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

Some months later, a 31-year-old engineer at Langley, Richard T. Whitcomb, produced a revolutionary concept that had a dramatic effect on all our modern supersonic fighters. Whitcomb began by running drag experiments in the slotted-throat tunnel, and discovered almost immediately that the old methods of computing drag near the speed of sound were in error. The miscalculations had led engineers to underestimate grossly the total drag of an airplane. Perhaps, Whitcomb reasoned, that was why Convair's latest fighter, the delta-wing F–102, designed to be supersonic, had stuck just below the speed of sound. Having discovered a precise method of measuring drag and its effect on high-speed planes like the F–102, Whitcomb set about to find a way to minimize it. He succeeded in an astonishingly short time with a brain-twisting formula known as the area rule.

His concept called for a radically new approach to aircraft design. For those aircraft nearing completion Whitcomb recommended a treatment which would result in aircraft fuselages more nearly resembling Marilyn Monroe's torso than the traditional bullet. For that reason, his formula was quickly dubbed the Marilyn Monroe shape. If his ideas were followed, Whitcomb predicted, total drag could be reduced by as much as 25 percent. To aeronautical engineers, this was like saying he had found a way for man to run the mile in 3 minutes.

Whitcomb's concept was given a gimlet-eye going over by NACA experts and ultimately published in a secret NACA paper. Convair engineers came to Langley to investigate. The youthful Whitcomb asserted that with area rule the F–102 could be saved. Quite understandably, the Convair people were hesitant and slightly skeptical. Wind tunnels and theories had been wrong before; a modification of the F–102 would cost millions. However, to simulate an actual flight test, they built a one-fifth scale model of the F–102, with a Marilyn Monroe fuselage, and shipped it to NACA's Pilotless Aircraft Research Station at Wallops Island. Intricately instrumented, it was mounted on a booster rocket and fired. The tests confirmed Whitcomb's wind-tunnel results, and Convair decided to gamble.

The F–102 was hurriedly redesigned to incorporate area rule, and named the F–102A. On its first flight the plane zoomed through the sonic barrier while climbing, even before the pilot leveled off. The Air Force rushed teh plane into mass production, and today the F–102A is the backbone of the Air Defense Command. A later version, the F–106, with a more powerful engine, and even more area rule, is now coming off the production line at Convair.

Spectacular advances in the power of turbojet engines had made supersonic flight for military aircraft possible; Whitcomb's area rule, for which he was later awarded aviation's coveted Collier Trophy, made it practicable. Area rule not only shoehorned the F–102A through the sound barrier; it supercharged the performance of many jet planes then in the building or planning stage. With area rule, Grumman's F–11F–1 Navy fighter pierced the sound barrier with a third less thrust than other airplanes of equivalent power. It boosted the speed of Republic's F–105 and Chance Vought's celebrated F8U Crusader and enabled Convair's sensational B–58 Hustler, our first supersonic bomber, to barrel along at Mach 2.

Along with these dramatic achievements of the last decade, other NACA scientists have been churning out useful information by the basketful. NACA men have charted the entire field of vertical takeoff and landing. Though many authorities consider the seaplane a duck of the past, NACA investigation continues, and it has helped Martin in the design of its giant, jet-powered seaplane, the P6M. Just completed is a massive study of ways and means to control fire in an aircraft crash. Other engineers have been conducting aircraft structural tests to make sure that our upcoming jet transports do not fall in flight like the original British Comets.

Yet I returned from my visits to NACA's laboratories with the uncomfortable feeling that the agency ought to be doing much more. Each new breakthrough in areonautics opens up a new hornets' nest of problems that require skillful investigation. However, NACA lacks money, manpower, and equipment to meet adequately the demands of the jet-missile age. More advanced laboratory tools are required to explore fully the colossal problems of aerodynamic heating. A greater effort should be made in the field of exotic fuels, rocketry, and nuclear propulsion; but again it is a question of recruiting good people and building more sophisticated facilities. NACA's appropriations have increased from $24 million in fiscal 1946 to $71 million in fiscal 1958.

However, this increase has not been sufficient to keep pace with inflating salaries and the skyrocketing cost of complex equipment. For example, a modern wind tunnel in 1945 cost less than $1 million. Today, adequate wind tunnels cost more than 27 times as much. Now that vigorous steps are being taken to catch up with the Soviets in the missile field, NACA must have the tools it needs.

As Jimmy Doolittle says, "We have to plant the seed corn before we can harvest the crop."

Voices From Tokyo

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. HALE BOGGS

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 27, 1958

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Journal of Commerce and Commercial of February 14, 1958:

VOICES FROM TOKYO

On several recent occasions top leaders in Japan have spoken out on trade problems with an earnestness that does not appear to have been fully grasped in this country.

Premier Nobusuke Kishi, Foreign Minister Aiichiro Fujiyama and Masamichi Yamagiwa, Governor of the Bank of Japan, have all spoken gravely of coming events which could force a dramatic change in Japan's present orientation as a great trading power. In so doing they touched on a problem that poses a dilemma in Tokyo and something not much short of that for the United States.

Briefly stated, the dilemma is this: Japan feels she must achieve an export target of $3.2 billion this year. This amounts to an increase of 13 percent over the past year and its realization promises to be exceptionally difficult at a time when many markets are turning softer while export competition is turning harder. Yet, if Japan does not achieve this, she will be hard put indeed to absorb the expected increase of about a million people in her working force this year.

Japan has just emerged from the most successful trading year in her history. Just as this fact has attracted wide attention, it has distracted attention from the problems immediately ahead.

To maintain the growth of her economy at an annual rate of 5 or 6 percent, Japan must expand her exports. Her leaders have shown plainly that they want to expand them in the United States market. If they cannot expand sales here or, if worse, they cannot even maintain their present outlets here, they must look elsewhere. The word "elsewhere" has a particularly somber meaning in this connection; it means, primarily in China and Russia.

There is, of course, some room for trade expansion in other areas—notably in southeast Asia, the Middle East, Latin America, and even Western Europe. But the opportunities in these directions are quite limited by comparison with those in the United States and the Communist states. It would not solve Tokyo's problems to concentrate on these secondary areas alone. Nor would it solve them to depend on the United States market for sales of trinkets and specialty items. Japan needs outlets for her big export industries, by far the largest of which is textiles.

Demands for tariffs or quotas on Japanese goods in this country are seldom accompanied by any hint of the price this country might be called upon to pay for further curtailment of Japanese imports. Yet it can hardly be denied that any action likely to turn Japan's commercial interests from the free to the Communist world would be quite risky. Only trade might be involved at first, but it usually happens that where trade goes politics follows.

This newspaper does not, of course, maintain that the United States is under any obligation to open by artificial means markets here for any country that might otherwise turn to the Soviets. What we do maintain is that where the other country involved is competitive and energetic in promoting its own sales here, no artificial barriers should be placed in its path, especially when the security and well-being of that country is as vital to the security of the United States as Japan is today.

We feel it necessary to point out (though Japanese leaders have been careful not to say this in so many words) that Tokyo is rapidly approaching the hour when important decisions must be made relating to its future trade relations with the Communist bloc. Some, indeed, have already been taken, but none of these has been decisive thus far. The door still remains open. It is much less likely to be banged shut if Congress keeps the whole matter in its proper perspective this year when weighing this and that claim for more restrictions on Japanese goods.

Special problems have been raised in the United States, Great Britain, Canada, and elsewhere by imports of Japanese goods, particularly in the fields of textiles, chinaware and flatware. Some relate to cheap goods, some to charges of design piracy, and so on.

Japanese business leaders, as well as their customers, admit there has been substance to some of these charges. In other instances they have sought to meet criticisms from abroad, whether they thought they were justified or not.

In the case of cotton goods, Japanese producers agreed to place voluntary quotas on exports of certain categories to the United States (we put voluntary in quotes because the United States Government exerted too much pressure to make voluntary fit the circumstances). An attempt is now being made to negotiate a somewhat similar agreement on flatware.

Under the sponsorship of Jetro (Japan External Trade Recovery Organization), major exporters have been seeking with considerable success to upgrade the quality of their products, to pursue orderly methods of distribution, and to insure that there will be no basis in the future for foreign charges of design piracy on major items. The special design center for textiles, which has been working on this problem, is now entering its third year. The Government itself is sponsoring legislation to revise the patent law to this end on all products.

On the whole, Japan is approaching its critical decisions on future trade policy with the will to adjust her practices as far as possible to those in the American market.

Tokyo is making substantial progress in this direction. It is also continuing to buy a good deal more than it sells here. Congress would be making a serious mistake at high cost both to United States exporters and—more importantly—the national security if it should abruptly reverse this trend in the months ahead by yielding to protectionist demands for restrictions on Japanese goods advanced by local interests in this country.

The Arab Refugee Problem Is Still With Us

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 18, 1958

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, Ambassador Abba Eban, of Israel, has put forth compelling arguments in favor of a solution to the Arab refugee problem. I commend this lucid and carefully reasoned argument to all of our colleagues. The following is an abridgment of Ambassador Eban's statement made before the special political committee of the United Nations Assembly. This abridgment appeared in the Congress Weekly of December 16, 1957.

INTEGRATION VERSUS REPATRIATION

(By Abba Eban)

Some years have passed since the General Assembly adopted a resolution calling for the reintegration of the Arab refugees into the economic life of the Near East. Today, once more the United Nations confronts the frustration of its hope. Two hundred and seventy million dollars have been spent by the United Nations in 7 years, and the number of those receiving relief has increased and not diminished. Projects which would open new life for the refugees are held down by Arab governments in deadlock and suspense. The Arab governments which created this tragic condition by their invasion of Israel nearly 10 years ago now continue to prolong its existence and to withhold the constructive and merciful solution which lies within their power.

The refugees still inhabit a world in which the past dominates the future. This is also true of the General Assembly's annual debate. There is some merit in a careful reference to history; the more so after the far-flung accusations which we have heard from Arab States. Let us not cease to face the question of historic origin. Unless we understand how this problem was caused, we cannot rightly judge how it should be solved.

The Arab governments have again sought to remove themselves from direct responsibility for the refugee problem; to describe themselves as external to its history and its future; to lay its full burden upon the United Nations, upon Israel, upon the powers which have compassionately sustained the refugees for 9 years—upon all except themselves. Everybody knows in the depths of his heart that there is no hope of solving the refugee problem so long as the Arab governments pursue this line of disengagement. For the responsibility of the Arab governments is the central issue in the refugee debate; and their responsibility in the problem is threefold. Theirs is the initiative for its creation. Theirs is the onus for its endurance. Above all—theirs is the capacity for its solution.

The Arab refugee problem is a direct result of the war of aggression launched by the Arab States against Israel in 1947–48. If there had been no war against the people of Israel from the end of 1947 to the end of 1948, there would be no problem of Arab refugees today. Since the Arab governments have created this tragic problem it follows that the world community has an unimpeachable claim to expect their full assistance in its settlement. The claim is all the more compelling when we recall that the Arab governments, in their vast lands, command all the resources and conditions which would enable them to emancipate the refugees in full dignity and freedom.

There is nothing natural in the prolongation of this problem for 9 years. All the normal impulses of history would have promoted a rapid solution. No less than 40 million refugees have been created by military and political conflicts since 1945. In no case except that of the Arab refugees, amounting to less than 2 percent of the whole, has the international community shown such constant responsibility and provided such lavish aid. In nearly every other case a solution has been found by the integration of the refugees into their host countries. Nine million homeless Koreans; 900,000 refugees from the conflict in Vietnam; 8½ million Hindus and Sikhs leaving Pakistan for India; 6½ million Moslems fleeing India for Pakistan; 700,000 Chinese refugees in Hong Kong; 13 million Germans from the Sudeteniand, Poland, and other East European states reaching West and East Germany; thousands of Turkish refugees from Bulgaria; 450,000 Jewish refugees from Arab lands arriving destiute in Israel; and an equal number converging on our country from the remnants of the Jewish holocaust in Europe—these form the pathetic armies of the world's refugee population.

In no case but in that of Arab refugees have the countries in which refugees sought shelter obstructed their integration. The paradox is all the more astonishing when we reflect that the kinship of language, religion, social background, and national sentiment between the Arab refugees and their Arab host countries have been at least as intimate as those existing between any other host countries and any other refugee groups.

The discussion on the future revolves around two concepts: the one which is commonly called repatriation, and the other which is accurately described as integration. What is involved in the slogan of repatriation?

In 1948 the United Nations Economic Survey Commission estimated that there were 720,000 refugees. The number of those receiving relief has since grown to over 900,000, through various processes, many of them irregular, whereby nonrefugees have gravitated toward the aid facilities available under the United Nations relief program. These hundreds of thousands of Arabs are now in Arab lands on the soil of their kinsmen. Their hearts have been filled for 9 years with one single theme: hatred of Israel; disrepect for Israel's sovereignty; resentment of Israel's existence; the dream of securing Israel's extinction.

Repatriation means that these hundreds of thousands of people, or a significant number of them, shall be introduced into the state whose existence they hate and whose destruction they are resolved to seek. The refugees are all Arabs; and all the countries of the region, except Israel, are Arab countries. Repatriation means that these Arab refugees be settled in the only non-Arab country in the immediate region; in the only social and cultural environment which is alien to their background and tradition. Israel, which is the target of a state of war proclaimed by its Arab neighbors; Israel whose small domain of sovereignty is savagely begrudged by a people occupying a whole subcontinent; Israel facing threats to its security and integrity such as no modern nation has ever confronted, is to add to its perils by the influx from hostile territories of people steeped in their hatred of its very being.

This is what repatriation means. Can the mind conceive a more reckless and explosive course than this? Can there be any greater unkindness to the Arab refugee himself than to expose him to the invidious role of exploding Israel from within, perhaps reproducing the very circumstances which first made him a refugee? Every dictate of historic experience, the basic concern for a minimal stability in Arab-Israel relations, the impulse of compassion for the refugees themselves, and the most elementary respect for Israel's independence and integrity are violated by a solution on these lines.

It remains to compare the slogan of repatriation with the solution now advocated widely in world opinion: the solution by integration in Arab lands.

It is by integration in host countries of kindred culture and national sentiment that all the other refugee problems of our generation have been solved. With its 3 million square miles of free territory, its vast resources of mineral wealth, its great unharnessed rivers, its uncultivated but fertile lands, its swiftly expanding sources of economic wealth—the Arab world is easily capable of absorbing an additional population of relatively small scale.

Israel is convinced that all United Nations organs and agencies should henceforth be more assertive and consistent in proclaiming that the solution of the refugee problem lies in integration, and not in repatriation. No less important than its humanitarian work in sustaining the refugees is the duty of the United Nations to apply its moral influence toward an understanding and acceptance of the truth. The refugees should receive clear and emphatic guidance from the United Nations on the hopeful possibilities open for their salvation—integration in the Arab world.

Until 4-years ago there were thousands of Arabs displaced from their homes in Israel during the war of 1948, who were maintained at UNRWA's (United Nations Relief and Works Agency) expense in Israel. Israel then became the first country to integrate displaced Arabs. In his report to the 8th session of the General Assembly the director, recording the failure of Arab governments to follow a like course, spoke of this single ray of light:

"Had it not been for the assumption by Israel of responsibility for some 19,000 Arab refugees in Israel at the end of the previous year, the number would have been still greater."

By pursuing a similar program in the ensuing year and by developing its plan for the reuniting of families, Israel brought the total number of Arab refugees which were integrated into its economy and citizenry up to 48,500. If, in proportion to their own population and area, the Arab countries had adopted a similar attitude towards refugees on their own soil, this whole problem would have melted away.

The United Nations Palestine Conciliation Commission has paid a warm tribute to Israel's action in releasing bank accounts to the value of $8 million in favor of Arab refugees. While our neighbors maintained a ruthless economic warefare against us we have authorized the transfer of hard currency from Israel to hostile territory.

In the 10th session of the General Assembly in 1955, I reiterated my government's undertaking to pay compensation for abandoned lands as a contribution to Arab refugee resettlement. Two years ago my government responded formally and affirmatively

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

to a suggestion by the Secretary of State of the United States under which an international loan would be made to enable Israel to discharge its undertaking. It is evident, of course, that the payment of compensation would have to be accompanied by the solution and clarification of certain problems relating to compensation itself. We do not make this issue, however, dependent on nonfinancial or noneconomic considerations. The Research Group for European Migration Problems in enumerating the positive elements in favor of resettlement states:

"Another hopeful element for the host countries lies in the compensation from Israel for damages suffered, which the refugees will in all probability ultimately receive, and which they will spend or invest in these countries. As a first step in this direction the frozen accounts of Palestine refugees in Israel have been set free. When the blockade on Israel is raised, when its ships can sail through the Suez Canal and it is no longer exposed to continuous political pressure from the Arab states, it will certainly willingly pay adequate compensation for the abandoned property of the refugees, provided a loan can be raised for this purpose abroad."

This is an accurate summary of Israel's position.

The Arab governments cannot seriously envisage that they can simultaneously strangle Israel's financial capacity and at the same time make claims on Israel's financial capacity for the payment of vast sums in compensation. Surely the affirmative duty of enabling refugees to receive compensation must be held by them in greater honor than the dubious pleasure of blockade. A solution of these two interrelated problems can be approached at any time and need not await a solution of the broader question of political relations.

These are direct contributions by Israel to the alleviation of the hardships of refugees. But these contributions by compensation and other means, important as they may be, are, after all, marginal to the main issue. What would it avail if compensation were paid or some symbolic gesture were made by Israel, if, at the same time, the 900,000 refugees continued to live in their present dependence on the international community?

We were told that if we released bank accounts, integrated the 45,000 refugees in Israel, reunited families, announced our acceptance of the principal of compensation, these steps would not only bring benefits in themselves, but would also open the hearts of Arab governments towards their acceptance of integration. We must record that nothing done by Israel, by other governments, or by the international community, has so far had any effect in making Arab policies more flexible. We do a disservice to the refugees and to the Middle East if we turn away from the central issue toward its marginal aspects.

The central issue is that there can be no solution of the refugee problem unless Arab governments abandon resistance to integration. There may be little that the General Assembly can do this year beyond making provision for the financial operation of UNRWA. But every resource should be devoted to persuading Arab governments to change their obdurate attitude. Open your gates to your kinsmen as we have opened ours. Abandon the inflexibility toward your kinsmen. Let the barbed-wire barricades fall. Let the Arab refugees freely move toward the new economic opportunities opening out in the Arab world. Let newly liberated Arab governments see in these refugees—as many other countries have found refugees to be—not a burden, but a potential reinforcement of their new societies and cultures. Let Arab governments join with the world in a cooperative effort to remove this tragic Arab problem from the Arab world. Let this be done and great rewards and blessings will fall to the peoples of the Middle East and to all mankind.

Preparing for the Astronautics Age

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PETER FRELINGHUYSEN, JR.
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 17, 1958

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I should like to insert the following material at this point in the RECORD:

PREPARING FOR THE ASTRONAUTICS AGE

Approximately a decade ago Congress was faced with the problem of deciding how best to deal with the development of atomic energy. Should it be placed under military or civilian control? What type of agency was best suited to handle the problem? What role should Congress play in overseeing any program administered by the executive branch?

Today a similar issue is facing Congress, that is, how best to handle the problem of space technology. Should the Defense Department be given exclusive control in the field of astronautics, or should overall responsibility be placed in a civilian agency? If part or all of the program is to be placed in civilian hands, what agency should be given the responsibility? Or should a new agency be created? What should be the role of Congress in developing such a program?

BROAD SIGNIFICANCE

As was true with regard to the postwar debate on atomic-energy development, Congress is beginning to realize that space projects will have significance far beyond the military area. For this reason there is a growing feeling that responsibility for development of our space program should not be left entirely in the hands of the Pentagon.

Unquestionably the development and operation of military missiles, military satellites, and military space vehicles are a military function—and a function which the Defense Department should push vigorously. In addition, however, much will need to be done in the field of scientific research on space phenomena, and scientific exploration of the universe. A sound national program must include both nonmilitary and military aspects.

In my opinion, there is, furthermore, real danger that the nonmilitary aspects of space technology will be submerged if they are included as a mere adjunct to a military program. If this be true, the question then arises as to what would be the best civilian agency to take on this responsibility—or what type of new agency should be created.

NACA

Few people have ever heard of the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics. Fewer still could describe its work. Yet this Federal agency, established in 1915, has played a crucially important role in American aviation development. For example, NACA developed the laminar flow wing in time to enable P–51's to escort our heavy bombers into Germany at a critical point in World War II. It did outstanding work in the postwar period developing supersonic aircraft. It has solved key bottlenecks involved in the development of ballistic missiles. For more than a decade NACA has been conducting research in fields leading to man's conquest of space. Its work has, among other things, led to the development of the recently publicized X–15 aircraft. This is the plane which it is hoped will lead to manned flight beyond the atmosphere.

HARMONY

In all of these projects NACA has worked closely and in harmony with the military services, the scientific fraternity, and American industry. Its personnel is of the highest caliber. The chairman of NACA is Gen. James H. Doolittle, retired, who, in addition to his military fame, has an outstanding scientific and industrial record.

Considering these facts, it has seemed to me that NACA is the logical agency to be given the job of spearheading our space program. At the very least, NACA should form the nucleus of any new agency which might be developed. It would be a tragedy if NACA's large pool of talent and experience were wasted merely because its activities have not been sufficiently publicized.

In order to place this question clearly before Congress, I am developing legislation which would direct NACA to take overall charge of our astronautics program. This same legislation would establish a Joint Committee on Astronautics, made up of Members of both the House and Senate, which would act as a congressional watchdog over the space program.

This committee would be modeled after the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, which oversees our atomic-energy program. The proposal constitutes an attempt to promote in the astronautical field this same type of productive legislative-executive relationship.

TOO SIMPLE?

Far too often when acute national problems arise Congress creates complex new organizations which add to the Federal payroll, expand Government bureaucracy, but do not effectively attack the problems they were created to solve. Today, faced with a serious problem, Congress and the President have a ready-made solution which would save the taxpayers money and get the job done. Let us hope the solution is not so simple that it is overlooked.

The Urban Renewal Plan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 27, 1958

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I enclose a resolution adopted by the Boston City Council, Boston, Mass., memorializing the Congress to immediately overhaul the urban-renewal program with a view to expediting those programs now in hand and, secondly, for the purpose of placing additional funds in the urban-renewal program:

CITY OF BOSTON IN CITY COUNCIL

Whereas it appears that the economy of the United States is in the throes of a recession of unpredictable duration; and

Whereas the Federal Government is planning a program of public works for the purpose of stimulating the economy; and

Whereas the fund allotted by the Congress for the purpose of urban renewal is manifestly inadequate for the purpose; Be it therefore,

Resolved, That the Boston City Council memorializes the Congress to immediately overhaul the urban-renewal program with a view to expediting those programs now in hand and, secondly, for the purpose of placing additional funds in the urban-renewal program.

In city council February 17, 1958. Adopted.

WALTER J. MALLOY,
City Clerk.

An Appraisal of Dulles at 70

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALVIN M. BENTLEY
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 27, 1958

Mr. BENTLEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend and revise my remarks, I wish to include the text of a column by David Lawrence from the February 26 issue of the Washington Evening Star, entitled "An Appraisal of Dulles at 70." I am certain that all Members of the House, regardless of party politics, will unite in extending congratulations to our Secretary of State upon reaching the golden age of 3 score years and 10.

AN APPRAISAL OF DULLES AT 70

(By David Lawrence)

John Foster Dulles has just reached his 70th birthday, and naturally it is an occasion for appraisal of his accomplishments as Secretary of State. His dedication to the highest ideals of the American Republic has not faltered in the slightest because of the barrages of criticism often fired at him.

The controversy over what Mr. Dulles does and says is not really concerned with him as an individual. It is basically a conflict over rival ideologies in America.

The criticism is inspired for the most part by a little clique here of so-called liberals whose heroes are Messrs. Truman and Stevenson and whose left wing sensibilities have been aroused because Mr. Dulles will not take the Red Chinese to his bosom or draw into the high councils of the State Department those diplomats whose policies and advice would mean appeasement of the Communist regime throughout the world.

This clique has been so persistent that it has actually persuaded many uninformed onlookers in the Republican ranks that there must be something wrong with the Secretary of State. The constant repetition of the charge that Mr. Dulles allegedly has lost the confidence of our allies makes an impression, especially upon Americans who visit Europe from time to time and come in contact with persons of wide influence in the press. Many Europeans, indeed, dislike Mr. Dulles because he has not been either pro-British or pro-French, but, to their dismay, has insisted upon being pro-American.

The critics frequently make fun of phrases used by Mr. Dulles in his speeches. They single out and ridicule, for example, the phrase massive retaliation. It would have been tragic, however, if the Communist rulers in Moscow had become convinced that America was not back of the policy of massive retaliation. There might have been a serious miscalculation and a third world war except for the realistic pronouncements by the Department of Defense here, and especially by the Strategic Air Command, which has proclaimed unequivocally its readiness to back up the doctrine of massive retaliation.

Despite the sarcasm heaped on the Secretary for his policy of massive retaliation, it has stood the acid test of time. Only 2 weeks ago the British Government, itself, announced a policy of massive retaliation in warning the Communists that if they ever fired on British territory there would be no hesitation to use nuclear bombs in retaliation against Soviet territory.

There has been, also, a lot of satire about the so-called promised liberation of the states of eastern Europe. The critics argue that the talk of liberation did not help the Hungarians when they revolted and that, in effect, Mr. Dulles had promised to use military force to help liberate the peoples of eastern Europe.

Mr. Dulles, himself, however, in the 1952 campaign, when he first used the word "liberation," declared that what he had in mind was a peaceful liberation through the channels of peace and moral force. He never said America would go to war for such a purpose. There never has been any question, of course, that the moral force of the United States has been and will continue to be exhibited on the side of the oppressed nations. This has been revealed again and again in the United Nations forum.

Then there is criticism because Mr. Dulles a few years ago, at a time when the western alliance faced a crisis in Europe, said there would have to be an agonizing reappraisal by the United States of its policies if France failed to join with America and Britain in an accord in western Europe. The French Government actually did reappraise its own situation and did finally permit Germany to enter the North Atlantic Treaty Organization. The words of warning used by Mr. Dulles were persuasive—they had their effect.

The true test of the worth of a Secretary of State—who is really a secretary of peace—is whether he keeps his country out of war and whether, when other nations push America to the brink, a skillful policy averts war and deters attack.

The United States today isn't fighting a war, large or small, anywhere in the world. John Foster Dulles, with the unflinching support continuously given him by President Eisenhower, has fulfilled the basic mission of a Secretary of State—to keep his own country out of war. He has stood up for America. That's why the Democratic chairman of the House Committee on Un-American Activities, FRANCIS E. WALTER, of Pennsylvania, calls Secretary Dulles "a sincere, courageous, and dedicated American" and describes much of the criticism of him as un-American. This is true bipartisanship.

American Lithuanian Council, Lake and LaPorte Counties, Ind.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RAY J. MADDEN
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 27, 1958

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, on Sunday, February 16, 1958, the American Lithuanian Council of Lake and LaPorte Counties, Ind., held a meeting and banquet at East Chicago, Ind. This gathering was attended by a large delegation from northern Indiana and the following resolution was unanimously adopted:

The Lithuanian Americans of the Calumet region located in northwestern part of Indiana, assembled to honor with proper commemoration services the 40th anniversary of Lithuania's Independence Day, Sunday, February 16, 1958, passed unanimously the following resolution:

Whereas Soviet Russia, in utter violation of the international treaties and her solemn obligations, occupied the territory of the Republic of Lithuania and imposed upon the population the ruthless regime of a police state; and

Whereas despite the condemnation of these Soviet acts of aggression by the great powers of the free world, including the United States, Lithuania, as well as the other Baltic countries, is still subjected to the unscrupulous Kremlin rule of terror, murder and deportations; and

Whereas the Soviet Union by offering the so-called peaceful coexistence to the United States strives to achieve the recognition of her domination in eastern Europe, therefore, be it

Resolved, That this meeting urges the United States not to trust the Soviet rulers talk about peaceful coexistence, because the basic aims to conquer the world did not change; be it further

Resolved, That this gathering urges the United States not to enter into any new pacts or any new agreements with Russia, unless the Soviet Union agrees to restore freedom and sovereign rights to the enslaved nations of eastern Europe.

ALBERT G. VINICK,
Chairman.
Rev. PETER CELESIUS,
Secretary.

The House of Lords Debates Disengagement

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HENRY S. REUSS
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 13, 1958

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, discussion of a troop disengagement in middle Europe as a means of bringing about the peaceful liberation of the captive peoples behind the Iron Curtain is healthy. A significant contribution to that was made recently on the floor of the House of Lords by the distinguished Peer, Lord St. Oswald. Under permission to extend my remarks, I include important portions of Lord St. Oswald's address on January 22, 1958—Parliamentary Debates—Hansard—House of Lords, volume 207, No. 24, pages 129 to 135:

Lord ST. OSWALD. I most ardently hope that as the outcome of this debate the Government will formally take into account the possibilities, the opportunities, of a neutral belt in Europe, and, having taken them into account, will turn them to account.

I see here a chance to take the initiative, a dynamic initiative, in peace proposals. I think that most of your Lordships would agree that the great political absurdity of this epoch is that Soviet Russia, the only great power that in reality threatens the peace of the world, that has a whole string of savage, successful and unpardonable aggressions to its debit, can take on the guise of the paragon among peacemakers. Admittedly, even the Kremlin cannot hope "to fool all of the people all of the time" and many are now wise to the Russian pattern of peace manoeuvre. But the remorseless fact remains that the Russians know how to play upon the deep, the sometimes desperate, craving for peace of the majority of humanity. By threatening at one moment and placating the next, they maintain the war of nerves, and by every separate operation tighten or extend their hold upon the

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

freedom of some part of humanity. They have taken the bully's licence to declare: "You want the best peace; we can refuse it."

My Lords, I have never been personally, individually brainwashed—indeed, I doubt if anyone would find it worth his while. But it seems to me that collectively the West is being subjected to the technique of brainwashing. As I understand it, a victim of N. K. V. D. is not continually tortured or terrified during a treatment. After a period of incessant pain and terror there is a period of relief, of apparent kindliness and solicitude. And the victim, having hardened himself almost by habit against incessant pain and mockery, is softened by solicitude, by the unexpected but calculated benevolence of his tormentors. And, once softened, another period of torture awaits him. I have spoken to survivors of this process and they have told me that by the end they even wished to believe the lies that were being put into their heads.

No one will regard this allegory as picturesque, and I hope that not many will regard it as being farfetched. I sincerely believe that it would be perilous for us to want to believe the Russians too intensely in this period. But is that possibility very far removed? The sputniks were employed as cunning instruments of torture, to inflict fear and uncertainty, to sap the assurance of the western peoples. They were accompanied by boasting and mockery from the Kremlin. Did they fail in their purpose? There was near panic in Washington and an immediate deflection in American foreign policy. Now comes the period of solicitude. I am sure that we must beware of that solicitude.

But, having said that, I am by no means led to the conclusion that summit talks should be avoided. They should be welcomed. They should be taken as an opportunity, not to swallow the Russian proposals but to expand them, an opportunity to take the initiative and put forward a plan that will dwarf the Russian plan. I believe that the instrument lies at our hand and is under discussion in this debate—an opportunity, not just to ban rocket bases, but to withdraw Russian forces from the satellite countries and NATO forces from Western Germany.

* * * * *

When I spoke in favor of the plan 6 months ago, the Government's technical objection, uttered by my noble and learned friend the Lord Chancellor, was that we should be sacrificing defense in depth. With all respect—indeed, with all reverence—to the noble and learned Viscount, I cannot help feeling that if we are reckoning defence in depth, today, in terms of 200 to 300 miles, the breadth of Western Germany, then we are indeed preparing to fight the last war, instead of prevent the next—a criticism which has been often enough levelled against our military pundits in the past. Surely, if defence in depth is to have any meaning at all in the nuclear age, it must be reckoned in thousands of miles.

My own perhaps rather primitive calculations discover that a neutral belt, that is to say, any neutral belt acceptable to ourselves as well as to the Russians, would provide a warning area some 800 miles wide at its narrowest point; and that is to say 500 miles more than the distance between the Iron Curtain and the channel ports. I am assuming that any treaty establishing such a neutral belt would give the right to Russia and to NATO to have civilian observers on the frontiers concerned; that is to say, the western and the eastern frontiers of the neutral belt.

The main disparagement of the plan is contained in the question of what would be done if the warning were given from the other side of this neutral belt; if the Soviet Army in force crossed the eastern frontier and swept back into the liberated territories. Again, I think it must be assumed that anything less than a major offensive could be halted and contained by the armies of the neutral countries themselves; and, my lords, we can take it that the newly freed nations would be vigorous and valorous in repelling any minor incursion with conventional weapons by their former masters after the free elections, written into the treaty, had been held.

* * * * *

The general argument advanced against the plan is the hypothesis that the Russians would never accept it. Apart from seeming to me no valid argument against trying it, that looks a dubious argument in itself. What, in fact, would Russia be giving up? An asset or a liability? From the Soviet point of view, the Warsaw Pact is worse than dead; it is actively dangerous. Economically, the whole satellite area is a burden. On the previous occasions, I offered your lordships figures to show that Russia was having to subsidize every satellite except Albania at tremendous cost. Since then Albania has been added to the list, and the all-round cost has been enormously increased. But the most commanding factor is the simple factor that Russia does not want a nuclear war in Europe. I think that that is generally recognized. Russia is quite as aware as anyone else of the devastation that nuclear war would bring upon the conqueror and the capitulated alike. The Soviet Government also has a vested interest in any plan which renders such a war less probable. Here is a plan, and here, I think, is a fair and feasible way of presenting it.

There is another reason that moves me considerably in supporting this plan. It would mean the release from bondage of 110 million human beings.

* * * * *

Your Lordships need no reminding that we have a duty toward these people. If we forget that duty, we are failing ourselves as human beings. By their valor in Poland and Hungary, by the everyday heroism of people living in those countries and refusing to give in, they have earned the admiration of the human species. In all conscience, it is only right that this admiration should be translated into practical understanding. While we speak today, a new anxiety is infecting those peoples, as they read of summit talks and nonaggression pacts to come. Needlessly, I hope, but inevitably, they are chilled by the fear that a nonaggression pact might include the recognition of a status quo in Eastern Europe; that they may be written off, dismissed as they were dismissed from western calculations until the risings in Poland and Hungary so little time ago. They are hungering for some western assurance on this point, before the summit talks begin. Because without it they are ominously aware of Khrushchev's persistent statement, that no problem of Eastern Europe exists, and the danger that he might demand it as a premise in summit talks. That danger is, I think, pointed in the interview he gave to the Daily Express a week or two ago. If ever we were to accept that premise, for convenience or to smooth the path of negotiations, apart from the human offense itself we should, to our own cost, be abandoning more than 100 million friends to cynicism and final slavery.

A positive alternative is a neutral belt, and I believe this neutral belt plan has a real chance of enactment if presented with courage and with its motives clearly stated. I disagree entirely with the argument I read the other day that the Soviet Government can well afford to enter protracted and superficially promising negotiations which in reality are unlikely to succeed. I believe precisely the opposite. Once such negotiations are entered upon, once the wholesome possibility of their fruits appears within reach, that whole vast population behind the Iron Curtain will be demanding a fruitful conclusion. No Government, however powerful, however ruthless, could afford to delay artificially, or to reject, that conclusion.

It may be thought by some noble lords that I have raised points outside the immediate subject of defense. But I have catechized myself on each point, and I am convinced that each is directly related to defense. Surely, in this age prevention is not only the first line of defense, it is the only true line of defense. We have within reach not only the opportunity to establish a warning area and to remove the current peril of spontaneous combusion leading to war; we have the opportunity to release into freedom those many millions of fellow Europeans and, by our concern for them, to prove, in terms of history, that what we have here ourselves is worth defending.

The Foreign Aid Symposium

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES B. UTT
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 27, 1958

Mr. UTT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I would like to insert the following editorial which appeared in the February 26 issue of the Los Angeles Times:

THE FOREIGN AID SYMPOSIUM

A satirical novel of a couple of years ago—The Golden Bazoo—foretold a United States presidential campaign waged by rival advertising agencies. Not a pitch was overlooked in the titanic battle of computer-conditioned imaginations, not even motherhood. The electronic score gave one of the candidates a great lead when the tender lie was spread that his wife, in her middle 50's, was pregnant.

MARATHON SESSION

Now, motherhood has not yet been introduced into the battle for foreign aid, but almost everything else has, and yesterday's marathon performance, in which lambs rose up to roar like lions, and Mr. Truman killed no more Republicans than were needed for his daily meat, was a masterpiece in the most advanced technique of the opinion engineers.

Still, something essential was lacking in this unprecedented appeal of the Government to its constituents. It was not sincerity, for in spite of the format of the show the proponents of foreign aid were unquestionably sincere, even very frank, as Secretary Dulles was when he brought into open discussion a point that is usually left to inference: he said foreign aid provides jobs for 600,000 American workers.

NO TALK OF CHANGES

What is missing from the daylong exhortations by everybody from A to Eisenhower—that essential thing—was any talk about what Government people call implementation. The speakers were persuasive about the need for foreign aid but nobody, so far as we could follow, had much of anything to say about improvements in its administration. Indeed, there were no apologies for the failures of administration in the past, and from this one might infer, although perhaps he shouldn't, that no changes are contemplated for the future.

This has nothing to do with the arguments on the principle of foreign aid. Everybody knows these arguments, and almost everybody accepts the principle. The arguments were given in their classic form by Vice President NIXON in his televised press conference at the Press Club and they were repeated next day by President Eisenhower in his foreign aid message to Congress. Most of the

speakers at yesterday's grand forum repeated them again, excepting Adlai Stevenson, who added a fillip about the chicken inviting the weasel to supper: he wanted Russia to join us in aiding the backward peoples. And Mr. Truman wanted some new ideas.

The opposition to foreign aid, which the demonstration was intended to smother, is concentrated chiefly on economic assistance, and for this kind of spending Mr. Dulles was as concise a spokesman as the day produced. He said: "There is a tremendous expectation among the developing peoples of the world that something is going to happen to lift them out of the morass of hopeless poverty. Unless something can be done about that within the free world, inevitably they will be caught in the trap of communism to their own disaster and the ultimate undoing of the United States itself."

DIFFICULT TO FIND

With or without foreign aid to "developing peoples" ("undeveloped" now appears to be an offensive word) the United States could come to disaster. But foreign aid wisely used might very well save us trouble, as Mr. Dulles suggests. To administer it wisely requires a small army of well-prepared fieldworkers of a special breed, people who have art as well as understanding, practicality as well as sympathy. Like good teachers, such fieldworkers will be hard to find. But if they are found, they may prevail against communism. The rare ones who are now employed in aiding the developing peoples have been singulraly successful, a little candle of hope gleaming in the dark snafu of a wasteful bureaucracy—the bureaucracy which has been going around the world building roads where there is no traffic, dams where there is no working force, reduction furnaces where there is no fuel or metal, and ponds for edible fish a few hundred yards from the sea which is full of edible fish. Millions, yes, billions, of our money has been wasted by people who have not skill enough to persuade other people to buy stamps at the post office window, and as the suppressed stories of their misfeasances and nonfeasances come to light, the disgust with foreign aid as it is grows.

RUSH ACT FOR FUNDS

Yesterday's rodeo was intended to stampede the people and the Congress into granting money in the old way. The money is supposed to come first and after it the order, the plans and the constructive work. We had such a stampede after the Russians launched their first sputnik; Congress rushed into its chambers and, whenever anybody proposed an appropriation, doubled it. And nobody knew exactly what the money could be used for right away—unless somebody found a formula for converting wads of it into solid rocket fuel or for giving it to the Navy as heart balm for its Vanguard sorrows.

To cut off foreign aid would be as unwise as to grant all that was asked without question. Yesterday's pressure party would be damaging if it accomplished its purpose, but in spite of the purpose it may be useful if it induces a larger number of people, including Members of Congress, to think of foreign aid in terms of how as well as why.

Smut Protested, Mail Laws Asked

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWIN H. MAY, JR.
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 13, 1958

Mr. MAY. Mr. Speaker, Mr. William A. Garrett, Washington correspondent for the Gannett News Service and the Hartford Times, has put his finger upon a subject that should be of interest to parents throughout the country. The flooding of the mails with pornographic literature must not be permitted to continue. So that my colleagues can have the benefit of the information developed in Mr. Garrett's article, I am placing it in the RECORD, as follows:

SMUT PROTESTED, MAIL LAWS ASKED

(By William A. Garrett)

WASHINGTON.—Parents, and even teenagers, in and around Hartford, have forwarded hundreds of complaints about pornographic matter being sent to young people in the mails.

A postal inspector said today that the Post Office Department has received bushels of such complaints, accompanied by demands that something be done to remove all this filth from the mails.

A long time ago a Kefauver subcommittee witness estimated that promoters of obscene or near-obscene pictures—not all using the mails—have built a $1-billion-a-year racket.

Postal authorities think it still is that, but their hands are tied. Last week some of them asked a congressional committee to do some untying.

The inspector read to this reporter passages from a few of the letters his department had received from Hartford. One was from a 17-year-old lad who sent along the stuff he was complaining about. "Look at this dirt," he wrote. "Please do something to stop it."

A Hartford mother with a son of 14 spoke of the undesirable letters he was getting "I am completely at a loss as to how to stop this thing."

A Hartford father concluded: "The advertisers are not only guilty of peddling filth but some even brag * * * that they are breaking the law."

Messages like that number well over 50,000 from all the States. But the volume is barely a trickle compared to the amount of lewd material in the mailstream.

Sometimes, the inspector said, this trash is what a boy gets even when he sends away for a cowboy suit or a model car or a missile kit.

This is just the beginning. To the young fellow now comes a torrent of lewd circulars. He is on the mailing list of numerous pitchmen.

Most of the trash, he noted, comes from the Los Angeles area.

The department gets orders against the distributors, barring their output from the mails as unlawful, but they go to court and get an injunction, and they stay right in business.

The bulk of the filth is destroyed by its receivers, but the inspector thinks they ought to save it and send it in—preferably to their Congressmen. That's the way to get action.

The inspector said there are 15 "major peddlers" in the racket, plus "hundreds of small timers who get in and out of trouble." Few are left in the New York area.

The department figures that 50 million direct-mail ads for pornographic junk are now going into homes annually priced at from $2 to $80—and often less obscene than the circulars themselves.

Prosecution is virtually balked, the inspector said, by a 1952 court ruling that a case may be brought only where the matter is mailed—not where it is received. If it is mailed in Hollywood, then, the United States Attorney in Connecticut where the matter is delivered can't do anything about it.

Post Office and Justice Departments have joined in asking Congress to let them prosecute the dealers where the complainant lives. They reason that parents on juries where the pornography is received would take good care of the promoters.

"Postmen," one inspector asserted, "are forced to carry mail they don't want to carry at a loss to the Department, into homes that don't want it."

In Hartford, Postal Inspector Thomas A. Peckenham said his office has been receiving "2 or 3 complaints each week" for the past several months on obscene literature sent to youngsters.

His office forwards the complaints and samples of the literature to Washington.

Postmaster John F. Heneghan said many complaints go through his office.

"Something should be done about it," said Mr. Heneghan. "It's a disgrace."

Hazleton Industrial Development Program Receives National Recognition

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 27, 1958

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article which appeared in the Hazleton (Pa.) Plain Speaker of February 21, 1958, on the award presented to the Hazleton industrial development program called Can-Do by the Freedoms Foundation:

NATIONAL RECOGNITION DUE AT VALLEY FORGE CEREMONIES SET FOR SATURDAY

(By Charles Catherman)

Hazelton's restless urge for industrial development and the ensuing success of Can-Do have won a Freedoms Foundation award which will be presented to the Greater Hazelton Chamber of Commerce tomorrow at historic Valley Forge, it was learned today by The Plain Speaker.

The award, which will heap national recognition onto statewide publicity the city recently obtained through a Pennsylvania Chamber of Commerce award, is composed of a second-place honor medal and $100.

Hazelton, still basking in favorable publicity obtained from a community-development award from the Pennsylvania Chamber of Commerce, will be one of 54 individuals, organizations, and schools which will receive honors to be announced tomorrow.

PRESENTATION LATER

Tomorrow's ceremonies, which will draw the attention of the entire Nation, actually will include only the announcement of the award winners. The actual presentations are made on a regional basis at a later date.

Hazleton's selection as a winner brings added prestige to a city which boasts the fact it is the first in the United States ever to have two of its citizens serve on the Freedoms Foundation award jury.

Assisting in selecting the 1957 winners this year were Attorney Conrad Falvello, an international director of Lions International, and Attorney Louis G. Feldmann, junior vice commander in chief of the Veterans of Foreign Wars.

Because both men are residents of Hazleton, they disqualified themselves in the judging of the division which included the Hazleton entry.

The two local attorneys were among 31 judges on a panel which included State supreme court justices and executive officers of national patriotic, veterans and service club organizations.

TOTAL AWARDS

The awards, totaling $100,000, will go to individuals, organizations and schools for

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

their projects, programs, writings, and other activities which contributed to a better understanding of the American way of life during 1957.

In the case of Hazleton, it will be an award for things done in 1957 through the energetic Can-Do industrial campaign which, at Valmont Industrial Park, has formed a nucleus of industry that is continually growing into an assurance of economic independence for the Greater Hazleton area.

But Can-Do's glorious successes would never have won a Freedoms Foundation award if the story hadn't been effectively presented to the award jury.

STORY PRESENTED

This was done through elaborate scrapbooks prepared by the chamber of commerce. The scrapbooks pointed out that more than $740,000 was raised through the combined efforts of service clubs, labor organizations, military groups, and other groups within the area.

This sum could never have been realized if hundreds of men and women working in the various industries of the region hadn't responded to the rescue cry and purchased the 3-percent, 15-year debenture bonds, the chamber pointed out.

FIRMS LISTED

The acquisition of the General Foam Corp. for the first speculative industrial building at Valmont Industrial Park was a direct result of the drive, the award jury was advised.

The location of Beryllium's Nuclear Division plant at Ashmore also was hailed as a significant advancement in the area's fight to ease unemployment.

The chamber of commerce scrapbooks also pointed out that 192,500 seedlings were planted in 1956 and 1957 in strippings, culm banks, and on other marred land in an effort to beautify the city entrances.

Other winning points:

The operation home improvement committee's fourth month publicity campaign on remodeling and repairing homes both inside and out helped create a new look in the Hazleton area.

AIRLINE SERVICE

The acquisition of scheduled airline service, the public's support at CAB hearings, and the installation of additional equipment at the Hazleton Municipal Airport by the chamber of commerce.

The city's enthusiastic endorsement of the Keystone Shortway and the chamber of commerce transportation committee's supplying legal advice, financial support and manpower to the Keystone Shortway Association.

The scrapbooks on the years 1956 and 1957, which included newspaper clippings, pictures, folders, and other descriptive material, also called attention to the city's exuberant centennial celebration, which was directed by the chamber of commerce through the centennial association.

Another award tomorrow will go to Pennsylvania State Chamber of Commerce, which will be recognized for its State community development contest in which Hazleton was a winner.

They Can't Say They Don't Know

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT W. HEMPHILL
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 27, 1958

Mr. HEMPHILL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Rock Hill Herald of February 24, 1958:

THEY CAN'T SAY THEY DON'T KNOW

If Congress doesn't take any action to rid the big Federal agencies of pressure it won't be because the lawmakers are not aware that the pressure exists.

Last week Democratic National Committeeman Jerry W. Carter of Florida gave an investigating House subcommittee as frank a picture of wire-pulling as the group is likely to get if it meets for a 'coon's age.

"The only thing I done," said Carter, "was pull, under cover, all the wires I could." And he added, "I seldom pay my own way."

The subcommittee investigation undoubtedly will uncover more information about pressure on Government agencies. Undoubtedly there will also be heated denials and evasive answers.

Chapter and verse proof of cases where pressure has been used in the past is relatively unimportant. The important thing is for Congress to recognize that heavy pressure does fall on any big agency having the power to make regulatory decisions involving hundreds of millions of dollars.

Several Congressmen say they think the testimony shows a need for laws setting up a code of ethics for all regulatory agencies—such as the Federal Communications Commission, Civil Aeronautics Board and Interstate Commerce Commission.

This is a step in the right direction. The next step would be a law providing tough penalties for anyone who tries to use improper influence on a regulatory Government agency.

An Explanation of Our Mutual Security Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. F. JAY NIMTZ
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 27, 1958

Mr. NIMTZ. Mr. Speaker, I recently received a letter from a constituent in South Bend, Ind., proposing that consideration be given to the following three-point program for sending surplus foods, clothing, and farm implements to underdeveloped countries of the free world:

1. During World War II it was a slogan in our country that "Food would write the peace." If that be so, why couldn't food preserve the peace? In lieu of sending our dollars, send our surplus farm produce as food. Our dollars aren't enough, as they still need our CARE packages. Also food, in the quantities we have to ship, could not be sidetracked, without reaching the masses in these countries. This too, would help farm prices at home, and a price-support program might not be necessary.

2. Send clothing in lieu of dollars, again taking care of farm surplus, also this would create employment for many textile worker's who are now unemployed.

3. Send farm implements in lieu of large cash grants, to be distributed there by trustworthy organizations, to those whom it could help to become self-sustaining.

The above points would create employment in our country, take care of farm surplus, both of which would increase our tax revenue in sufficient amounts to meet or surpass our disbursements, thereby eliminating further deficits at this time.

There would be less chance of our aid being of any material help to any organization or people, suberversive in their thinking to our type of Government, if it should be misdirected or mismanaged. Too, the people who receive this type of aid will in general feel better toward the donor than if they received an outright cash grant, and if ever there was a time during peace, that we need to keep the moral of the people of the free world on a high level, it is now.

I am not a farmer or businessman, I am a supervisor at a plant in South Bend, Ind.

Mr. Speaker, I discussed the proposal of my constituent with officials of the International Cooperation Administration, and on February 24 I received a reply from Guilford Jameson, Deputy Director for Congressional Relations.

Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include herewith Mr. Jameson's comments:

INTERNATIONAL COOPERATION ADMINISTRATION,
Washington, D. C., February 24, 1958.

Hon. F. JAY NIMTZ,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. NIMTZ: This in in further reply to your referral of January 31, 1958, of a letter proposing a 3-point foreign-assistance program to send abroad (1) surplus foods, (2) clothing, and (3) farm implements.

Before discussing these specific proposals, perhaps it might be helpful to point out that the foreign-assistance program is not carried out by sending "hundreds of millions of dollars" to foreign countries. The great bulk of mutual-security funds are used to finance procurement of goods, including military hardware and consumer goods, needed to fortify the economic and military strength of the underdeveloped countries of the free world.

The people of these countries do not receive "outright cash grants" as a result of the mutual-security program, nor do they receive commodities free of charge. They pay for them with their own currencies, and the amount they buy is determined by what they earn in their own country and the extent to which goods that they need are available. Many of the commodities that these people need are in scarce supply in their own country or are not produced at all. Foreign exchange is therefore necessary if they are to be imported, and most underdeveloped countries are short of foreign exchange. The United States may decide to help countries in this situation because it is to our advantage that they develop economically in a free society and that they maintain adequate military forces. We may do so by agreeing to make funds available to the foreign government on a grant or loan basis. Such funds are then used to finance procurement of consumer goods; capital goods required for industrial expansion which will, in turn, increase employment and purchasing power; or military goods.

A large part of United States foreign assistance is furnished in the form of surplus foods and fiber. From April 1948 to December 31, 1957, $7.6 billion worth of agricultural commodities have been authorized for export from the United States under programs administered by ICA and its predecessor agencies. Since fiscal year 1954 the Congress has required that certain specified amounts of dollar funds appropriated for the mutual-security program could be used only to finance the export and sale of United States surplus agricultural commodities for foreign currencies. In fiscal year 1957 the minimum requirement was $250 million, and total sales of $286 million exceeded this target by 14 percent. The minimum requirement for the current fiscal year is $175 million, and we expect to achieve this by the end of the year.

Emergency programs administered by this agency include the Emergency Food Aid Act of 1951, under which a loan of almost $200

million of wheat to India was authorized. Currently, ICA is responsible for administering title II of the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954 (Public Law 480, as amended). This provision of the legislation authorizes the use of up to $900 million worth of surplus commodities held in stock by the CCC to help friendly foreign people to meet famine or other urgent or extraordinary relief requirements. Unlike goods supplied under the mutual security program, these commodities are usually given free to needy people in foreign countries who are unable to pay for them because of natural disaster, such as floods, earthquakes, drought and the like.

United States surplus agricultural commodities are also being furnished to friendly foreign countries under title I of Public Law 480. Agreements providing for sale of well over $2 billion worth of United States surplus agricultural commodities have been signed under this legislation in the 3½ year period ending December 31, 1957. The opportunity to purchase United States food and fiber for their own currencies, rather than with scarce dollars, has been of material assistance to foreign countries and at the same time has helped to reduce the size of United States agricultural surpluses.

Donations of United States surplus foods to CARE and other United States voluntary relief agencies to assist needy persons outside the United States are authorized under title III of Public Law 480. This program, initially authorized under other legislation, has been in effect since 1948 and by December 31, 1957, donations of approximately $1 billion worth of United States surplus foods have been authorized.

It is not practicable to finance purchases of American-made clothing for foreign countries because consumers in these countries simply could not afford to buy them. If a country has adequate spinning and weaving equipment, shipments of United States surplus raw cotton may be financed. If manufacturing facilities are not available, procurement of cloth may be authorized. In order to stretch mutual security funds as far as possible, authorizations for procurement of cloth provide that it may be procured from the cheapest source in the free world, including the United States.

ICA has financed procurement of a few agricultural hand tools and some of the voluntary relief agencies have also distributed these tools. On the whole, however, these programs have not produced worthwhile results. Most of the people in the underdeveloped countries are reluctant to change from the tools to which they are accustomed. The new tool, particularly one which requires a radical change in position and the use of different muscles, is likely to be discarded before the operator becomes experienced enough to appreciate the advantages which might be gained from it. Successful introduction of American or European types of tools or any universal tool requires that patient and persevering instruction be given in their use until the operator becomes familiar enough with them to appreciate their advantages. Such a program would be very costly in relation to the benefits derived.

American-made animal-drawn implements are not practical in many countries because horses or similar draft animals for which such machinery is designed are not available, and this equipment is not suitable for oxen or the type of animal power which is used.

Please let us know if we can be of further service.

Sincerely yours,

GUILFORD JAMESON,
Deputy Director for Congressional Relations.

Economic Conditions in the United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN LESINSKI
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 24, 1958

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Speaker, America today is facing a grave situation in which firm and positive leadership must be exerted immediately if we are to maintain our Nation's economy and security at a high level. This is not a situation to be handled by platitudes and rosy promises of better things to come, such as President Hoover attempted to do 27 years ago. It is odd that the former President, during whose administration our Nation suffered the greatest depression in history, should at this time repeat his prosperity-is-just-around-the-corner speech, in an attempt to dismiss the present recession as he did the previous one. Let us hope and pray that forceful leadership and definite action will deliver us from the Hoover administration type of prosperity.

I believe that it is time for President Eisenhower to exert the leadership the American public expects of him. He has from time to time, but not often enough, evidenced the qualities of leadership the country needs, the most recent example of which is his letter to the Premier Bulganin. However, I feel that at this time the President must give careful thought and action to the needs of America, for whatever decisions he makes regarding Russia, a prolonged depression in our economy, without measures to correct it, could so weaken the Nation that the stand he takes could not be supported.

The recent proposal to initate a $2 billion Post Office Department renovation and construction program to alleviate the current depression has merit, because these projects have been needed in many areas for quite some time. However, such a program should have been conducted sooner, for the lack of facilities has made many operations slow and cumbersome.

Our economy has, since the Korean war, been supported by some twenty to forty billion dollars a year for defense purposes. In the light of those expenditures, the $2 billion which is proposed is a mere drop in the bucket for, while providing some relief, it is not sufficient when you consider that it will be spread out over 3 to 5 years. We must take action immediately to survey the needs of the entire Nation and provide forceful measures to improve and strengthen the economy.

The President and his deputies should come down to earth and take definite action to meet the actual needs of our economy today, instead of talking about possible future improvements.

One of the steps I suggest is an immediate cut in taxes, not for the privileged few—whom the administration seems to favor—but for the small taxpayers, the ones who will put the additional money right back into circulation. I believe that, with the Presidents' leadership, measures to remove the loopholes and special concessions in our present tax laws could be enacted. My bill, H. R. 9683, is a move in that direction and would not result in the loss of any money to the Treasury. In addition to cuts in income taxes, excise taxes, such as the one on automobiles, should be eliminated.

I would also suggest that definite steps be taken to improve the income of our Nation's farmers. Surely the President and his Secretary of Agriculture are aware of the fact that throughout history, whenever the farmers' income has declined, the rest of the economy also becomes depressed. The present policies fostered and promoted by the present Secretary of Agriculture should be abandoned and a progressive and constructive program established. Because of technical advancements in agriculture which enhance production, I do not believe that acreage control is the answer to the farm-surplus problem. I therefore strongly urge that a measure, similar to my bill, H. R. 6157, be enacted to place limitations directly upon agricultural commodities.

In addition, proper programs of public works for civil defense, reclamation, flood control, irrigation, soil conservation, and other needed projects be initiated without further delay. Defense contracts should be channeled into those areas where unemployment is widespread.

Another helpful move would be to increase the annuities of the retired folks so they will not have to go out and obtain jobs to make ends meet.

I would again emphasize that the need for implementation of these programs is urgent; and, while we all have faith in the future of America, we should take action today to prove that faith. It is of little comfort to a man who has been out of work for 5 or 6 months, who has exhausted his unemployment benefits, who is facing foreclosure on his home, and who is worrying about how he is going to feed, clothe, and provide needed medical care for his family, to be told that in the months ahead things will be better. He and the 4.5 million like him need help now.

I have been noting the reports on the upsurge of the number of crimes and incidents of juvenile delinquency and would raise the question as to what extent the unemployment situation has contributed to those conditions. A man facing the situation mentioned in the paragraph above, could very easily be tempted to resort to illegal means to maintain himself and his family.

The President has surrounded himself with men of business, many of whom are of high caliber and ability in their respective fields. However, one thought must be kept in mind, a businessman as such is out to make money either for himself or for the stockholders in his company. So at the expense of the buy-

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

ing public, he must show a profit. And the approach of the various members of the administration has been just that, to sacrifice the good of the public for the benefit of special interests. There is a need in Government for business advice and ability, but the leadership should be in the hands of those who are aware of the overall problems of the Nation, for we in Government must give due consideration to all segments of the economy if we wish to act for the welfare of the entire Nation.

In view of present conditions I would suggest further that the President replace the majority of the members of his Cabinet with men of high caliber who have their feet on the ground, are aware of the total picture within the country, and will produce forceful and practical solutions to the problems not only of defense but of our Nation's prosperity and well-being. Lack of coordinated effort, inefficiency, and laxity should not be condoned by any President.

Many people are saying that history will condemn the Eisenhower administration for failue to exert leadership when it was most urgently needed. If the President wishes to retain in the eyes of the American public the fine reputation he gained during World War II. unblemished by the actions of his chancellor, Mr. Adams, and the other leaders in his administration, he must exercise the leadership the American public expects of him.

If the President should, perchance, get by the censors and read these remarks, I would assure him that I offer my comments sincerely and honestly, and would suggest that he invite some of the small farmers and businessmen around his Gettysburg farm to talk with him about their problems. I am sure that if he spoke frankly with some people other than those associated with big business, he would find that, with few exceptions, their respect for him has declined. I make this observation as a result of conversations I have had with individuals who had admired and voted for him.

Recognizing that the President does need relaxation away from the burdensome duties of his great office, I believe a few minutes apart from his putter, bridge table, or easel to exert the leadership the people of this Nation expect of him would bring back his prestige, not as a Republican President, but as an American who believes in the future of America and is willing to provide leadership for action to insure that future.

The Late Mr. James B. Post, Sr., of Wilkes-Barre, Pa.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 27, 1958

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Wilkes-Barre Record of February 20, 1958, upon the passing of James B. Post, Sr., leading businessman and civic worker:

JAMES B. POST, SR.

Death has come to James B. Post, Sr., Lee Park, Hanover Township, while his career as a businessman and his service as a civic-minded citizen were still in the ascendancy. His initiative in the commercial field was an asset to his associates and to his community. He was essentially a builder, as evidenced by the progress and the expansion of the enterprises he helped organize and which he directed.

He had many connections in the fields of business and industrial enterprise and as a member of clubs, fraternal orders, veterans' and civic organizations. His business career built along sound lines, his devotion to the public welfare, and his many personal services to his friends and the community can well be an inspiration to others.

He was a pioneer in the manufacture of ice and developed his early routes in the horse-and-buggy days. In recent years he had been one of the few local large ice distributors. Likewise, as a Glen Alden agent, he became a leader in the retail sale of anthracite. He was on the national board of Manufactured Ice Association of America. In recent years, he, with Harry Nicholson, had done the appraisal work for Hanover National Bank of Wilkes-Barre. He was one of the oldest directors of Franklin Federal Savings & Loan Association.

Firwood Methodist Church knew him as an active worker and a member of its official board. Although he was a member of a number of clubs, he was particularly interested in helping to carry out the program of Wilkes-Barre Kiwanis Club.

Mr. Post took an intensive interest in all his undertakings and his associates will miss him as an agreeable companion and one whose counsel was held in high esteem.

The Archbishop of Cyprus

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM C. CRAMER
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 26, 1958

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, a recent article in World Outlook, a publication of the Methodist Church, clearly brought to the attention of many people the supreme dedication and outstanding work of the archbishop of Cyprus, Makarios Kykkotis, who once was a student in America. Today he is a leader among the people of the world. Archbishop Makarios—and the name means "shepherd"—is the subject of an article by Amy Lee. I think this story brings out much of the man who is behind the continuing struggle for freedom, spiritual and political leadership of a dedicated people. I include this article in the RECORD for the attention of the Members of the House and all who would support the cause of an ancient and great people:

ARCHBISHOP OF CYPRUS

(By Amy Lee)

A decade ago the man who is now spiritual and national leader of an island that has been front-page news in the last 2 years—Cyprus—was studying at Boston University School of Theology on a grant from the crusade scholarship fund of the Methodist Church.

Recommended for the scholarship by the World Council of Churches, Makarios Kykkotis was one of a group from the Greek Orthodox Church so honored. He was in his second year of the 3-year study course when he was notified of his election as Bishop of Kition of the Church of Cyprus, an independent branch of the Eastern Orthodox Church. In a letter dated April 23, 1948, to the late Dr. R. E. Diffendorfer, then executive director of the division of world missions of the Methodist Church, he wrote: "Even though from the time I learned that my name had been placed on the list of candidates for this position I made many attempts to withdraw it from the list, my attempts were in vain. The voting of the people resulted in putting on my weak shoulders this great and heavy responsibility, and upon receipt of the news I felt sorry because I am forced to stop my studies as a crusade scholar of the Methodist Church * * * I plan to leave the United States on May 8, 1948."

The weak shoulders of the former crusade scholar, now Archbishop Makarios, since his election in 1950, have borne far heavier responsibilities than their possessor probably foresaw—one of the heaviest being his 13-month exile by the British in the lonely Seychelles Islands, northeast of Madagascar in the Indian Ocean.

The archbishop is still in exile from Cyprus, but a beautifully appointed suite in New York's St. Moritz Hotel overlooking Central Park is a less arduous form of isolation than was the coconut-covered Seychelles where life is, he says, "very primitive. The people know nothing of what is going on in the world. There are no newspapers, no magazines, no radio—and no cinema. Once a month a ship stops." He speaks carefully, as if mentally translating his thoughts from Greek to English before expressing himself. A slight accent lends charm to his words. "The people are so naive. They couldn't understand why we wanted to leave." He gets up from the little sofa by the windows that face the park and picks up a coconut from a table. It has been polished to a dark luster, almost like mahogany. Two covers cut in the top open on little hinges and show two roomy compartments.

The archbishop's delight in this souvenir of a trying period in his life is characteristic of the simplicity and grace of his nature. It is the same sort of delight he finds in revisiting the places he knew as a crusade scholar at Boston University School of Theology. "I always go back to the old building," he says. "I visit the dormitory where I lived, and the cafeteria." This is the archbishop's third visit to the United States, and he is seeing quite a bit of it as he officiates in several Greek Orthodox churches—in New York, Boston, Philadelphia, St. Louis, San Francisco. "I couldn't accept all the invitations that have come," he explains, almost apologetically, "but I am going to as many as I can." There are about 350 Greek Orthodox churches in this country and 1 million Greek people. One of the first things he insisted on doing after his arrival in New York was to pay a visit to Methodist headquarters at 150 Fifth Avenue and express thanks to the Methodists for his crusade scholarship. The intricate schedule juggling this visit demanded might have daunted a less insistent—or less grateful—man.

Oldest of four children, Archbishop Makarios from his youth wanted to serve the church. Other than his paternal grandfather, who was a priest, there were no clerics in his immediate family. "My father was a shepherd," he says, and tells with gentle glee about the time his father, now 72, came to see him in Athens. Reporters

asked him what he thought about his son's being a bishop and he answered, "I thought he'd be a shepherd like me."

In a sense Archbishop Makarios is a shepherd, for as archbishop he is not only the spiritual shepherd of his flock but national leader as well: there is no separation of church and state in Cyprus. "The Archbishop of Cyprus is not appointed by an ecclesiastical hierarchy," he explains, "but is elected by the people. Ours is the only church which elects an archbishop in that way."

As to possibilities of future separation of church and state in Cyprus he has this to say: "I will not be the national leader after Cyprus gains its freedom and the people set up their own government, whatever it is—whether the island becomes a member of the British Commonwealth or unites with Greece." When he speaks of his homeland there is a note of longing in his voice, and hope, too, that soon the trouble will be over and the island free to decide its own fate.

The picture that stays in mind of this shepherd of the Cypriotes—is not one of an embattled political and church sovereign but of a gentle, soft-spoken man whose eyes light up when he smiles (and he smiles often), with a copy of the Times of Cyprus open in his lap to pictures of his father, the humble dwelling where he was born, the little school he attended, the village church. His name, Makarios, mean blessed.

Government Agency Ethics

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS M. PELLY
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 27, 1958

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, the house of delegates of the American Bar Association, which is the governing and policymaking body of the association, has just approved a supplemental report on administrative law. Their resolution expressed opposition to off-the-record extraneous representations or pressures on Federal administrative agencies engaged in the exercise of their adjudicatory powers. It emphasized that the bar association had repeatedly urged a separation of functions in adjudicatory proceedings, and that hearing officials in Government be assured of an opportunity for fair, impartial, and independent judgment in the trial of agency cases. Also it urged that the integrity of the judicial process at all levels in the agency be protected by confirming decisions to the record taken at a public hearing free from any ex parte representations, influences, or pressures from any source, public or private, official or unofficial.

Mr. Speaker, the bar association's position which coincides with what I have repeatedly said in recent remarks in the well of the House is that it is desirable, in the interest of public confidence, to establish a code of ethics by statute to cover Government agency operation. The association asks for an appropriate code of administrative-tribunal ethics comparable to the canons of judicial ethics binding upon all persons engaged, interested, participating in or seeking to affect the result of the adjudication of agency-tribunal cases. Furthermore, the association has pointed out that in connection with an amendment in procedure and practice, the fundamental basis for improvement rests in legislative and agency implementation.

On a number of occasions, Mr. Speaker, I have urged consideration by the appropriate House committee on legislation including H. R. 10631, introduced by myself, to establish codes of ethics of Federal elected, appointed, and career public servants.

To indicate that there is widespread support for passage of such a measure to promote integrity in Government, I include the following resolution adopted by the house of delegates on February 25, 1958:

Resolved, Whereas the American Bar Association has repeatedly urged that the organization and procedure of Federal administrative agencies in the exercise of adjudicatory powers provide: (1) That hearing officers be assured independence of judgment and impartiality in the trial of agency cases; (2) that the integrity of the judicial process at all levels in the agency be protected by confining decisions to the public hearing-record in an environment totally free from any ex parte off-the-record representations, influences or pressures from any source.

Now, therefore, this association records its opinion that more effective agency and congressional action to those ends would improve and inspire greater public confidence in agency adjudicatory determinations, and believes it desirable that an appropriate code of agency-tribunal ethics comparable to the Canons of Judicial Ethics be established by statute binding upon all persons engaged, interested, participating in, or seeking to affect the result of the adjudication of agency-tribunal cases.

The Nation's Mental Minutemen

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDITH GREEN
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 27, 1958

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, in years past, an educated person was one accorded deep respect by the community. Lampooning individuals because they had brains and used them was not fashionable.

We have come to place more emphasis on and regard for athletic prowess than on mental prowess. We have come to regard moneymaking prowess as the thing and have downgraded the ability to teach, to learn, and to know.

Brains must be upgraded in the United States. Respect for learning must be restored not because of any race with Russia but, rather, because it deserves to be recognized and respected, and because it is important to the preservation and protection of the American way of life.

I was particularly pleased to note in a recent column by the noted columnist, Malvina Lindsay, in the Washington Post and Times Herald, an allegorical description of an appeal which should be made to our Nation's youth not only to respect learning and learners but also to enlist in what she calls the Nation's mental minutemen.

Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include this column in its entirety:

SHOCK TROOPS FOR AGE OF THE MIND
(By Malvina Lindsay)

The speaker at the recruiting rally wore no uniform, only a civilian suit, not especially well tailored. But the youthful audience stiffened to attention at his first ringing words: "Men and women, your country needs you. Who will volunteer?"

Then he lifted his hand in a warning gesture. "But understand, I am not asking for recruits to man spaceships or to set off for the moon. I am not asking for volunteers to handle long-range missiles, or even to take basic GI training. The enlistment to which I am calling you is not spectacular or even tangible. It is not a service that you can get over and done with.

"It is something more difficult, more arduous, even in some ways more hazardous. It is something that goes on forever.

"I am calling you to enlist in the Nation's shock troops for a mental combat that will determine whether man lives free or regimented on this planet. I am calling you to be volunteers in a mental vanguard that will determine whether this Nation leads or lags in the now-dawning age of the mind."

The audience stirred uneasily. "I will be more specific," continued the speaker. "First, will you volunteer to shorten your now prolonged adolescence? Will you start being men and women at college instead of boys and girls? This country can no longer afford to be regarded as the world's headquarters for Joe College and his feminine counterpart. Who will take the lead in bringing a more adult atmosphere to the American campus?"

A score of hands went up. "But wait. More is asked of you. How many of you will work harder, step up your studies and push ahead faster with the long professional and technical training required today of those who must give the skilled service the country is waiting for?"

Again halting a response, the speaker continued: "Who will volunteer for the most heroic operation of all? Who will dare to be a brain? Who will dare to study so seriously his mind will be stretched to its fullest capacity? Who will dare to speak correctly, to show respect for learning—and the learned—in all fields; to take the lead in giving knowledge and culture prestige among youth?

"Who is brave enough to risk being jibed at as a 'highbrow,' a 'grind,' a 'square,' because he is a member of the Nation's mental minutemen? Remember, this may be harder than carrying a pack on a long march, or facing physical danger. But also remember this country can only be saved from decadence—if not destruction—if a big enough army of both young and old smash the self-inflated forces of ignorance and institute a revival of learning.

"Now for the rewards to those who volunteer. I cannot promise you foreign travel, dashing uniforms, or physical adventure. But I can promise you a mental box seat at some of the most exciting dramas in man's history.

"Besides the lifting of the curtain on the space age, there is now occurring what may prove to be an even greater revolution in human thought. I am referring to new discoveries in physics, including the recent upset of previous concepts of the law of parity, and the accompanying implications of an antimatter universe.

"But I can also promise dramatic breakthroughs of knowledge on other fronts—perhaps new revelation of the origin of life. If there is any red blood in your brain cells, does it not throb at promise of such exciting adventure?

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

"I can promise you the thrills of new knowledge and new opportunity in whatever fields your talents and interests lie. Your country needs you not only as scientists but as teachers as well, as scholars, public officials, other professionals. It needs you in every phase of the mental offensive which it must mobilize now that physical warfare is becoming obsolescent.

"Your Nation now is seriously challenged mentally by its Communist competitors. But beyond that, knowledge is on a new march in the world. If your country is not to drag its feet in this, it will need your minds—the best of them that you can give. Run; don't walk—to the nearest source available to strengthen them."

Fast Action Needed on Social Security Amendments

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS L. ASHLEY
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 27, 1958

Mr. ASHLEY. Mr. Speaker, every day my mail brings scores of letters from old folks who reside in my district. All of them recount in pathetic terms their personal struggle to make ends meet on their small social security pensions. Theirs is by no means a new story, but rather a sad and worn tale of trying to stretch a static income to cover the inflated price levels of food, clothing, shelter, and essential medical care.

For more than 2 years now inflation has driven the cost of living steadily upward, whittling away the real income of the American people, wage earners, and businessmen alike. But our retired citizens living on fixed pensions which are uninsulated by either escalator clauses or profit markups, have been the sorriest victims of inflation.

Despite repeated protestations on the floor of both Houses, no effective action has been taken to relieve the mounting pressure on individuals and families caught in the painful squeeze between fixed income and ever-rising prices. And despite the fact that our national economy has been undergoing a general recession in recent months, the cost of living has continued on its upward trend to an all-time high now of 122.3 as reported for January 1958.

Some effective action must be taken and it must be taken soon to provide relief for our social security recipients. My call to action is contained in H. R. 10664 which I introduced recently to increase social security benefits by 10 percent and to provide insurance as well against the cost of hospital, nursing home, and surgical service.

The spectacular rise in life expectancy has vastly increased the number of older and retired persons in our society. At a time when their health needs inevitably increase with the infirmities of advancing years, their income is sharply curtailed while the opportunity of taking out health insurance is either denied or the premium rates are prohibitive. Our social-security laws must be amended to provide better methods of meeting this problem.

I believe the provisions of my bill are as sound and humanitarian as they are necessary. In a country that boasts to the rest of the world of our high standard of living, the long neglected and serious economic plight of our retired citizens cries out for immediate attention.

Since old age is the likely fate of all of us, the welfare of the aged should be the concern of all of us. We can no longer ignore the problems of the aged or postpone action to resolve or alleviate them. I urge the House Ways and Means Committee to undertake immediate consideration of this legislation so that both the House and Senate can complete the necessary action to inscribe it into law during this session of the Congress.

Postal Pay Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALBERT W. CRETELLA
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 26, 1958

Mr. CRETELLA. Mr. Speaker, as a member of the Post Office and Civil Service Committee for the last 5 years and during which time the committee has acted several times on postal salary bills, I, like all of the other members have received a tremendous amount of mail from the postal employees and their families, urging my support for a salary increase.

Many of the letters were in the nature of form letters, others were factual, devoid of barbs, insults and castigations, but the following letter which I received from a postal employee of New Haven, Conn., a personal friend of mine and a loyal and patriotic Government worker, relates in concise, intemperate language not only his own plight but that of other postal workers in support of a postal pay bill.

The House committee did report out, on Tuesday of this week, a pay bill which I was happy and proud to support, and it is with pleasure that I insert the letter in the RECORD because of its outstanding, able and clear presentation:

NEW HAVEN, CONN., *February 26, 1958.*
Hon. ALBERT W. CRETELLA,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN: My deepest apologies for taking up your valuable time with my seeming unimportant letter which I hope will, nevertheless, merit your kind attention and possible consideration.

Twenty one years ago, I entered the postal service, believing at the time, as anyone else might expect, that employment in the Federal service should be of such dignity and fair remuneration that it should be the pinnacle of desire for employment by every American citizen. The constant turnover in Federal agencies has proved the reverse has been true. People have been leaving the Federal services for jobs in private industry, which have, during all these so-called prosperity years, been offering better pays and fringe benefits which Uncle Sam hasn't even touched yet. Why has such a condition existed? You and the other Members of Congress know the answer. With only one small pay increase in about 7 years, and the cost of living rising year after year, month after month, some Federal employees lacked the faith that we have had each year that Congress would grant us a pay raise, and left the services for greener and more profitable pastures. We, who remained loyal, stayed to see each bill for a salary increase fade out like a summer romance.

I cheered with others when Congress voted itself a $7,500 pay increase, not only for the obvious reason and assumption that Congress would naturally use the same conscientous reason to vote a pay raise for Uncle Sam's little nephews as it did for its Members, but also because I knew that a better salary for Members of Congress, somewhat comparable with salaries in private employment, would encourage men of high caliber to seek the opportunity to serve in Congress so that the people could be assured that our Congress was made up of future statesmen.

Everybody knows, from the President down, that we have only received one small pay increase in the past 7 years, and yet, we have been referred to as the cause for inflation. Our accusers seem to forget that private industry has been granting yearly wage increases to its employees to help them meet the continuous rise in the cost of living while Uncle Sam's nephews have become the sacrificial victims of political artifices, as we have had to beg for crumbs from the table of plenty. Our purchasing power went lower and lower while official United States Government records will show everything was costing more and more. It's been the trend. Even my water company found some reason to raise the water rates again, even though I am sure that Mother Nature isn't charging any more for water than it has since the world began.

I married as soon as I entered the postal service, adhering to that basic marriage precept that the wife's job is homemaking, and the job of the breadwinner belongs to me, the husband. I graduated from high school in 1928, so I, like millions of others, experienced heartaches and misery of the depression, and my job in a Government agency looked like utopia, in 1936. The records available to you at the United States Department of Labor can tell you better than I can what has happened to my pay, as compared to the increased cost of living during the past 20 years. The pay that once seemed adequate enough to prepare a better tomorrow, has steadily decreased in purchase value. With the good Lord sparing me some of the misfortunes that have been happening to my fellow workers, plus sacrifices here and there, I have been able to keep my wife at home since we've married, even though I have worked at only my post office job. You are wondering how I lived? I haven't been living—just existing.

Without trying to seem sanctimonious, and with no offense intended to those who do—neither my wife nor I drink, smoke, or gamble. I am 47 years old, and I haven't yet been able to put enough aside to enjoy a vacation with my wife and daughter. I can't drive, and never own a car. I have not replaced my aerial which fell down about a year ago, because a new one would cost about 1 week of my take-home pay. Anyway, my TV, which supplanted our movie-going for years, needs more repairs than a broken heart. Right now it is just a magnified radio, just voice, no picture. I've had doctor and dentist bills, not too rough up to now, but enough to just about keep my nose above the waterline so I could breathe. Compared to the kind of tough luck the others have had, I still say that I have been a lucky fellow. Yet, I ask you, is this the kind of American way of living that we so proudly talk about? Or is it necessary in

order to keep up a good front that we sacrifice the basic foundation of our democracy, the home? We certainly won't get rich on any postal-pay increase. You must agree that something is very wrong when we have to sacrifice so much of tomorrow to get along today. Let me make a prophecy—if we get back to full employment, as I hope, we'll be just as far behind in take-home pay as compared to private industry as we are now, if not worse off, unless Congress decides to make the raise large enough to offset the wage increases private industry is going to demand. We certainly can't catch up if it takes 7 years for the postal employees to get the same kind of a raise private industry can get in 1 year. A pay should certainly have something left over to prepare for a better tomorrow, and when the cost of ordinary living exceeds the take-home pay, then somebody is asleep at the switch.

I've always considered myself a pretty fortunate fellow because the Good Lord has spared me and my family any serious illness during the years I have been at the post office. How much more fortunate than I imagined was brought out last August, when my wife was taken to the hospital for examination for a serious operation. The operation was so difficult and dangerous that after the X-rays, it was decided to try to create a cure through X-ray therapy, at least until it became vital to operate. No cure was effected but it is believed that further danger has been arrested. Not including the doctors' bills which will be billed under separate cover, the bill for the first week alone was $333, for room and services. Just imagine that, for one week for one person, $333. Do you think that such bills can be paid on a take-home pay of $139.13 every 2 weeks? Don't forget, Federal employees do not enjoy paid up hospital plan as given to employees in private industry. Uncle Sam is urging the high school graduates to continue on to college. Every father wants to send his child to college so that his offspring can be better prepared to meet the challenge of tomorrow, but you will have to admit that there isn't much more left of tomorrow that we can mortgage. The Good Lord in His infinite wisdom sent me only one child, so I have been able to struggle on a little better than some of my fellow workers. Can you imagine the financial plight of some fellows with three or more children, who through misfortune and illness, have become old friends with the four walls of a hospital sick room?

We love our country, and the postal employee, too, has fought and died to preserve our way of living. Yet, we have had to play on a losing pay raise cause because of political expediencies. It is about time that we receive a pay raise comparable to our long overlooked needs, and not comparable to ill advised political promises. We are having the highest budget in peacetime history, and yet, when it comes for Uncle Sam to take care of his little nephews, we are treated like the kids who are left home starving while papa invites everybody in the tavern to the bar for a drink.

Involved are not ships, planes, missiles, or submarines; not the dangerous oil lines in the East; nor those panhandlers who keep asking for more and more of our table of plenty—no—involved are Americans, who unlike those I have mentioned, have a deep and sincere reverence when they kneel in prayer, and thank God that there is an America.

Respectfully submitted.

JOSEPH J. VIGLIOTTI,
Legislative Chairman, Local 237, National President, Postal Press Association.

Fate of Employee, Service in Hands of Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOEL T. BROYHILL
OF VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 30, 1958

Mr. BROYHILL. Mr. Speaker, I request permission to insert in the extension of remarks the following article written by W. O. Rittenhouse, which will be published in the March 5 issue of the Government Employees' Exchange, a newspaper for employees of all Governments:

FATE OF EMPLOYEE, SERVICE IN HANDS OF THE CONGRESS

(By W. O. Rittenhouse)

Two months have elapsed since Congress convened. Hearings on pay legislation proposed for postal and classified employees could have been completed. One of the many bills submitted during the early days of this session could have been approved. Prompt relief could have been provided for these deserving employees.

During these 2 months, the cost of living has continued to rise and the buying power of the Federal employee's pay check has continued to shrink. Last week the Government announced the cost of living hit another new high in January. It reached a level six-tenths of 1 percent above December, and 3.5 percent above January 1957. This occurred while unemployment climbed to 4,500,000 in January and while steps were taken to burden the American taxpayer with increased foreign aid.

Everyone, including the present administration, seems agreed that some form of pay legislation, providing across-the-board increases ranging from 6 percent to 11 percent, is merited. There will be no repeat performance of the prolonged and dramatic hearings that characterized last year's pay bills. Yet, there will be unnecessary delays. The Senate and House Committees on Post Office and Civil Service must agree on several essential points. An increase acceptable to the administration must be determined. The two committees must agree on whether the pay increase will be retroactive and whether the pay bill will be tied into the pending postal rate bill. While a pay bill will be approved sometime this session of Congress, it, like similar previous legislation, will be too little and much too late.

The statistical data furnished by subscribers to the Exchange and summarized in this column in the preceding three issues have demonstrated the extent to which increased pay is urgently needed by employees in all pay brackets. Information volunteered clearly portrayed how Federal employees have lived upon expedients and capricious measures until they can live no longer.

TAKE-HOME PAY

Generally, response to the cost-of-living survey conducted by the exchange has come from career employees in position to speak with authority. Their comments emphasized the need for Congress to consider what is merited in the way of actual take-home pay. Their gross salaries have increased, but their take-home pay has shrunk during the past 18 years through increasing payroll deductions for retirement and insurance purposes, Federal income taxes, and, more recently, State income taxes. For example, the District of Columbia income tax was almost doubled last year; this year, it will be twice the amount levied last year. These items are deducted before the employee receives his pay check.

The buying power of the take-home pay has been reduced through ever-increasing taxes on practically every commodity and service purchased, including food and other essentials. These and other significant items are not considered in establishing the Consumer Price Index frequently discussed during previous hearings on pay legislation. There are two questions to be considered in establishing an adequate percentage increase and an appropriate effective date of the increase. How much take-home pay does an employee receive? To what extent has the buying power of his pay check been reduced by every factor that causes him to spend more for goods and services in 1958 than he did in 1939?

An employee in Falls Church, Va., who reported no savings or ownership of property, computed that the administration's proposed 6.4 percent pay increase would give him $6.67 every 2 weeks above what he now receives and observed: "If Congress wants to give us a raise, it would have to be after taxes in order to meet the cost-of-living increase. The pitiful little raise this would give us would be spent in a food store in 5 minutes, and then only buy enough for one dinner." One in the District of Columbia in similar circumstances stated: "I have to work on Saturdays on an outside job to keep my head above water. I suggest that they pass the law on a percentage increase of the take-home pay. This would help us more." Another in Los Angeles, Calif., wrote: "My wife and I worked full time last year and I did part-time work. Our gross income was impressive. Last week I figured my Federal and State taxes. I found that more than one-third of our hard-earned income went into taxes. Our united effort accomplished no more than to pay these and other taxes, keep a roof over our heads, keep us from starving, and provide us with essential clothing and medical care. A pay increase based on gross income will not help our plight."

INCREASING DEBTS

Relatively few employees, in the high or low pay brackets, have saved money or own their homes. It is evident that many occupy higher grade positions than they did in the 1930's; as they were promoted, their standard of living necessarily rose. Many were unable during the housing shortage that existed during the 1940's and later to purchase homes at the inflated values then and still prevalent. Some were forced to use savings to pay rent and meet other essential expenses, and others went hopelessly into debt. When their financial problems were relieved to some extent by delayed and small pay raises, the increased income soon was nullified by higher taxes and prices for goods and services they and their families needed.

An employee in Vienna, Va., who reported no savings or ownership of property, wrote: "Every year I fall behind in amounts of $150 to $200 in debts or taxes." One in Indianapolis, Ind., wrote: "We are in debt up to our ears. Owe doctor and even have to charge our children's medicine till the next payday. We are not in debt for anything foolish—just necessities." Another in Nashville, Tenn., listed his several debts, and voiced the opinions of many by asking: "Why are we being taxed to death to exploit the resources of our Nation to send money to foreign people who don't want what we

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

send, who don't believe in our form of government, who despise us and who would be the last to help us in time of need?"

JOINT EFFORT

In spite of their low incomes, Federal employees apparently feel they are expected to maintain a decent standard of living. Many found they could not do this on the reduced buying power of their take-home pay. First, the wife found full or part time employment. Next, in many cases, the husband found a part-time job. Proportionate increases in expenses resulted for understandable reasons. To make matters worse, the higher gross income placed these employees in a higher tax bracket. Increased taxes and expenses quickly siphoned off what actual profit might have been realized through their joint effort.

An employee in Hyattsville, Md., observed: "If my wife didn't work, just could not exist. Takes close living on both salaries." One in Dallas, Tex., wrote: "I feel that I am a very efficient person, but I could do a much better job if I did not have to work myself to death on a part-time job to make ends meet." Another in the District of Columbia stated: "Work 4 nights a week, 6 p. m. to midnight, to cover the bills and loans that get bigger all the time."

WAGE BOARD RAISES

Quite a few employees stated that postal and classified employees have been discriminated against, while wage-board, or blue-collar employees of the Federal Government have received frequent wage increases based on periodical wage surveys. For example, an employee in Ogden, Utah, wrote: "Last year blue-collar workers in our area received 7 percent raise. This year, they received 10 percent raise, making a total in the past 2 years of 17 percent. Then, President Eisenhower had the effrontery to say he had to veto our raise in order to curb inflation. We have news for him. Inflation has arriverd, but we certainly can't be blamed for it because of any pay raise we received."

This general opinion appears to be confirmed by figures released by the Navy Department showing the national average rates paid to its wage board employees as of January 1, 1958. These figures show that almost a third of the classified employees are paid below the average rate received by laborers. The average rate for a laborer is $3,702 a year, and the entrance salary now authorized for a GS–5 classified employee is $3,670. The services of a laborer are valuable, but should they have a higher market value than those of an employee in a shortage category, such as a skilled stenographer?

The plight of the Federal employee, as it exists today and as it will exist on his retirement, will not inspire the growing generation to seek Federal employment. It presents a picture that has never been appreciated by the Members of Congress whose sole idea of economy is to cut the Federal payroll and keep wages down. Members of Congress today hold in their hands the fate of the Federal employee, as well as the efficiency of the Federal service in years to come.

The Late Mrs. Louis A. Dessen, of Hazleton, Pa.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 27, 1958

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following news story which appeared in the Hazleton Plain Speaker of February 20, 1958, announcing the passing of a leading citizen of Hazleton, Mrs. Louis A. Dessen:

MRS. L. DESSEN TAKEN IN DEATH

Mrs. Louis A. Dessen, 711 West Diamond Avenue, civic worker and leader in Beth Israel Temple, died this morning at Harston Hall, Chestnut Hill, following an illness of several months. Her husband, Dr. L. A. Dessen, pioneer radiologist, died in 1945.

Her son is Dr. Edgar L. Dessen, president of Can-Do, Inc.

The Visiting Nurses' Association of Hazleton and vicinity was organized at Mrs. Dessen's home in 1940 when she, together with E. Jeanette Morse, headed a committee to separate the organization from its prior position with the Red Cross. A charter VNA member, she served on the board of directors since its inception, was a past president, and held other offices.

Mrs. Dessen was a member of the board of directors of the local Red Cross during World War II. As its chairman of volunteer services, she organized all wartime services, including motor corps, nurses' aids, production, surgical dressings, and staff aids. She represented the chapter at various Red Cross national conventions.

An active member of the Beth Israel Temple Sisterhood, Mrs. Dessen was a past president and a member of the board for more than 30 years. She also was a past president of the local medical auxiliary and a member of the State Federation of Temple Sisterhoods.

Born in Philadelphia, the deceased was the former Bertha Clara Weise, daughter of Mr. and Mrs. Martin B. Weise. She came to this city in 1911.

Surviving are three children: Dr. Edgar L. Dessen, this city; Mildred, wife of Lester Shapiro, Wilkes-Barre; and Reba, wife of Aaron Goldman, this city. Five grandchildren survive.

She also has a sister, Mrs. Anne Fromm, Los Angeles, Calif., and three brothers, Edward, Maurice, and Leo Weise, all of Philadelphia.

AFL–CIO Demonstrates Moral and Intellectual Maturity

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 19, 1958

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, Gerald W. Johnson, writing in the New Republic of February 3, 1958, points out that the AFL–CIO has not publicly been given its due credit for its house-cleaning actions. I believe that Congress and the American people should take note of this. Mr. Johnson's article follows:

VIRTUE'S PROFIT

(By Gerald W. Johnson)

When a man or a group perpetrates a villainy and gains profit and praise thereby, a wrong is done to every honest man. Everybody understands this. But when a man or a group does a good deed, and it is met with silence or damned with faint praise, another wrong is done every honest man.

This some people deny. Virtue, they say, is its own reward and a clear conscience is ample compensation for rectitude. Which is baloney.

The point is of contemporary interest by reason of the marked restraint shown by the public prints in praising the leadership of the AFL–CIO for throwing out the teamsters and other unions guilty of practices tainted with corruption. The press generally concedes that they did the right thing, but usually intimates that there was small merit in it because they had to do it to avert a scourging at the hands of the lawmakers.

They didn't have to do it. They could, and John L. Lewis says they should, have weasled out of it. When it is a matter of retaining an income of a million dollars a year, any second-class law student can produce one specious argument to justify it, and really learned counsel can produce 30. If you are willing to live as a self-constituted lovechild there are always excuses to be found.

The fact is that when the AFL–CIO gave the teamsters the old heave-ho the American labor movement exhibited a moral and intellectual maturity that signalized its coming of age. It is no longer in socage, villein or free; and the lords regnant of this world are never too pleased at having to make room for an addition to their company.

This is enough to account for the languor of the applause with which the deed was received. Bishops and bankers and able editors are uneasily aware that henceforth whenever they adopt a top-lofty tone in addressing Messrs. Meany and Reuther, some voice at the back of the hall will inquire, "And when did you ever sacrifice a million a year rather than be associated with crooks?"

As far as the individuals involved are concerned this is perhaps a matter of no importance, but it is important from the standpoint of the rest of us. The fact is that in this action organized labor has given an exhibition of honesty and courage that goes far to allay the apprehension excited by the sheer dimensions of the AFL–CIO—an apprehension that is shared by many true friends of labor.

Expulsion of the teamsters demonstrated that the present leadership of this giant organization is imbued with a decent respect to the opinions of mankind, and has the nerve and the energy to maintain that respect. Such men are fit to be entrusted with power, for in their hands power does not threaten, it safeguards the state.

That is the record. It is written, and it cannot be erased. But it can be deprived of much of its potential effect by coolness on the part of those who should praise it warmly. Expulsion of the teamsters was extremely costly to the AFL–CIO, and can be justified only by the credit that should accrue to honorable and responsible leadership. If no credit accrues, then the effort was wasted.

Labor can ill afford wasteful leadership. If the courage and honesty of the men who ejected the teamsters result in nothing but loss of income, then the logical course for the AFL–CIO will be to throw out Meany and Reuther, replacing them with leaders willing to strike hands with Judas Iscariot as long as he pays his dues.

The enemies of labor, of course, hope for just that. Committed to the proposition that any labor leader because he is a labor leader is presumably a scoundrel, they are left in an awkward position when the facts give them the lie. They are confident of their ability to deal successfully with scoundrels, but to be compelled to face able and honorable men would be a disaster.

That sentiment is shared by all self-seeking parasites who may have wormed their way into comfortable berths down the line of labor organizations. The teamsters seem by long odds the worst, but they are not the only union suffering from an infestation of such vermin. If the effort to delouse the teamsters gains little or no public applause, the present terror of all the

others will quickly subside, and with it the hope of strong, honorable, and responsible leadership not at the top only, but throughout organized labor.

The lukewarm reception of the extraordinary effort in the case of the teamsters is therefore at least as important to the public as it is to the individuals. Meany and Reuther are not our responsibility; let them look after themselves. But the encouragement by strong approbation of integrity and decency in any phase of public life is our responsibility, very much so. In this instance the mediums of general information have not discharged that responsibility with what a superficial observer is inclined to call conspicuous success.

Whose Money?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT W. HEMPHILL
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 27, 1958

Mr. HEMPHILL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from Manchester Union Leader of February 25, 1958:

WHOSE MONEY?

Using money from your and our taxes, President Eisenhower last Sunday used the presidential Government plane to fly his wife, Mamie Eisenhower, her sister and a lady friend to Phoenix, Ariz., where Mrs. Eisenhower is visiting the Maine Chance Farm of beauty expert Elizabeth Arden for "sun and rest" and not for beauty treatments, which reputedly cost $400 a week and up.

When White House Reporter Lawrence Burd of the Chicago Tribune asked Presidential Press Secretary Hagerty why the President had decided to go to Phoenix—a trip which takes a very considerable number of flying hours and which would cost $12,600 at commercial airline charter rates—instead of going directly back to Washington from his quail-shooting expedition in Georgia—Hagerty snapped, "I think that when the President of the United States wants to go any place that he wants to with his wife, that's his business and nobody else's."

When Burd said he thought he had a perfect right to ask the question Hagerty angrily continued: "Well, there's the answer. And when he has to account for that or make any reporting, I think you are getting a little out of bounds with your questions."

Hagerty sounded more like Hitler's press agent, Goebels, than the press secretary of a democratically elected President of the United States. But now, anyhow, we voters know that it is none of our business to have anyone ask questions about how President Eisenhower spends our money.

Almost 5 million Americans are unemployed, yet Eisenhower fools around shooting quail on millionaire George M. Humphreys' Georgia plantation, the reason presumably being that the ailing, aging President of this Nation in its greatest crisis needed a rest.

But there was nothing restful about flying 3,000 miles out of his way to Phoenix and back to Washington at the taxpayers' expense, while 5 million of them are out of work and counting their pennies.

And then look at the impropriety of Mrs. Eisenhower's visit to the Maine Chance farm of Elizabeth Arden, proprietor of a chain of beauty parlors.

If Mrs. Eisenhower wants to go to Maine Chance farm, that is her affair, but Business Manager Maydelle Bankston explains that "Mrs. Eisenhower and her party are guests of Miss Arden and will not pay any bills." Incidentally the First Lady and her party are staying at a cottage adjoining the resort where the rate is normally $600 a week.

The newspapers used to jump all over Harry Truman and the Democrats when the White House secretary showed up with a gift mink coat. But it is all right, apparently, for the Republican President's wife to freeload on Elizabeth Arden and give that smart lady thousands of dollars of free publicity in return.

What a scandalous picture of irresponsibility, not only to be witnessed by 5 million unemployed but every American who is seriously concerned with the future of his country.

Contrary to Mr. Hagerty's arrogant assumption, this is our business. It is our money that President Eisenhower is using to fly Mamie Eisenhower to a beauty parlor in Arizona, and it is our country that is being neglected while this sick, tragic old man stays away from his job in the White House.

What an example to the Government officials in Washington and in the cities and towns of our Nation. When they see the President throwing people's money around in that fashion, why should they think it was up to them to economize in Government spending.

Walter O. Noreen

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EUGENE J. McCARTHY
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 27, 1958

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, the St. Paul AFL–CIO Trades and Labor Assembly has recently elected a new president. My good friend, Walter O. Noreen, has been elected to fill this post, the highest elective position in the St. Paul labor movement. Wally Noreen is devoted to the improvement of labor conditions; he is a student of government and legislation; he is indefatigable in his service to those he represents. I am pleased to call to the attention of the House this article from the St. Paul Pioneer Press on Wally Noreen.

The article follows:

CITY LABOR CHIEF—NOREEN A NATURAL FOR TOP OFFICE

(By Kathryn Boardman)

Walter O. Noreen, 38, who holds the top elective job in the St. Paul labor movement, has been a union member only 11 years.

He is the first elected president of the new AFL–CIO St. Paul Trades and Labor Assembly. By his personal merger of two interests—he likes to talk and he is a student of labor—he is practically tailored for the job.

Robust and aggressive, he has covered a good deal of union ground since he joined the National Federation of Post Office Clerks, St. Paul local 65, in November 1947. He now works in the postal savings division of the St. Paul post office.

Noreen, who has reddish hair, a carrying voice, and an extensive vocabulary, has been president of his 700-member postal clerks' union 6 years. Before that he served 3 years as secretary, and he has been on the board of the St. Paul Postal Employees Credit Union 5 years.

He is 5 feet, 6 inches tall, and keeps his weight between 170 and 175 pounds, not by playing games but by moving quickly around his office and walking fast—mostly to union meetings.

NO 5-DAY WEEK

To be president of the assembly, Noreen had to give up 1 of unionism's great boons to workers—the 5-day week. Before he became a double president he had Saturdays off from his job in the postal savings department at the main post office.

Through a special arrangement with Postmaster Sigurd A. Berteisen, Noreen now works every Saturday morning from 4 to 5 hours. He then is able to use this time during a week or a month, Mondays through Fridays, for civic or assembly lunch sessions.

It works fine for the postal savings department and Noreen, but it means he is away from home on Saturdays now. His wife, Catherine, and 2 sons, Edward, 11, and Jeffrey, 20 months, are not too enthusiastic about it. On his present schedule he seldom spends more than 1 evening a week at his home, 351 West Hurley.

Walter Noreen is known as a "great talker" and he is needled about being the man of "a few thousand well-chosen words." But he does not mind.

"Walter's a great talker, all right," Ed McKinnon, secretary-treasurer of the assembly, said, "but he knows what he is talking about. And he has the gift of making other people care about what he is talking about."

LIVE WIRE DESIRABLE

Some of the older assembly officers and delegates think it is fine to have such a "live wire" as president.

"He reads the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD every day of his life, and the labor press," one of them said. "Then he puts it in capsule form and gets the information around. He doesn't waste a minute of his time, but he doesn't give you the uneasy feeling that he's panting from one crisis to the next."

Noreen is the first post office clerk union member to be president of the assembly. Previous presidents have been pressmen, meatcutters, pipefitters, boilermakers, and drivers.

He was born in St. Paul, September 25, 1919. The family home, where his parents, Mr. and Mrs. Oliver Noreen, still live, is at 768 East Maryland. Mr. Noreen, Sr., now retired, was a member of the Brotherhood of Railway Carmen of America 47 years and worked for the Northern Pacific Railway 47 years.

Walter Noreen was graduated from Johnson High School in 1937 and from the Globe Business College in stenotype. He has taken extension courses at the University of Minnesota.

He spent 4 years in the Army during World War II. He has been a delegate from his union to the Trades and Labor Assembly 9 years.

He follows labor legislation with an eagle eye and has made frequent trips to Washington. He is active in a number of community affairs.

UNITED STATES APPROVES

He intends to use the hours he works on Saturdays and his vacation time for his assembly business, he said. The Federal Government encourages its employees to take part in the life of their home communities, and assembly members believe that Mr. Noreen is the only Federal employee to hold the presidency of such a labor body in a city the size of St. Paul.

There is one conflict in his position, however, but it is not new to him. As a Government employee he is under the Hatch Act, which means he may not make political speeches or campaign. The Hatch Act allows him to belong to a political party and to contribute to a party if he wishes.

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

"I have plenty to talk about without making political speeches," he laughed. "That won't handicap me." He never expected to be president of the assembly, the highest honor labor has to offer a leader, but he is as happy with the situation as are the rest of the members.

He presides at two meetings a month in the labor temple. About 125 locals send between 150 and 200 delegates to these meetings on the second and fourth Wednesdays of each month. They represent some 50,000 union members.

Our Thoughts Go Back

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 26, 1958

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include a very interesting editorial which appeared in the National Tribune-Stars and Stripes, on February 27, 1958, as follows:

OUR THOUGHTS GO BACK

Every now and then our thoughts go back to the exciting days of 1917–19 when for the first time in the history of the United States we became engaged in a global war.

The Civil War was long past—the Spanish-American War was becoming a tradition and only those who fought through it remembered it.

In 1917 something new had been added to our history. After turning the traditional cheek time after time, the moment had arrived when we could no longer suffer the arrogance of an aggressive nation and we determined to throw our lot in with the defenders of what we had always considered the right.

As a consequence, after a stalwart exhortation by President Woodrow Wilson, the Congress of the United States declared war on the Central Powers.

The young men of 1917 knew little about warfare. In fact, they had schooled themselves along peaceful lines, asking only to be permitted to work out their lives in the happiness and prosperity afforded them in their native land.

However, a draft law was passed and every young man in a certain age group was ordered to register himself for the draft by June 5, 1917, or suffer the consequences.

Very few of the youth of that draft failed to respond to the draft. Yes, there were a few Bergdolls and others of his mentality who sought, by some means or other, to avoid service. But, thanks to the patriotism with which these young men of 1917 were imbued, the response was terrific.

Many volunteered, many awaited their draft call, but the result was so great that by the time the war was over some 4,800,000 youths had donned the uniform of their country, in the Army and Navy and the Marine Corps, and were in service.

At least half of the number saw service overseas and endured hardships which had never been suffered prior to World War I. Those who remember sunny France of those grim years smile now with a grim sense of humor at the thoughts of the muddy trenches of the western front, the long marches with full packs, the lack of food and medical care, the occasional gift of hot chocolate or coffee from the Salvation Army and the Knights of Columbus.

Yes, for those who survived without mishap, other than having their lives and their prospects broken up, they can get together now and then and joke about the days of long gone by and forget the suffering in the memories of the few good times they enjoyed, though so far away from home.

As we have said at the beginning of this editorial we often think about those young men of 1917–19 and wonder how they are getting along now.

Some have done well, some not so well, and some, for whom the breaks of fortune failed to turn up are now finding themselves wondering how they are going to get along in their later days.

Without hesitation, they did not fail to serve their country when their country called, and it is not strange that they should look to that country for some particular help when they find themselves, through age or disability, unable to care for themselves.

It must be remembered that these were proud young men who marched away in 1917 and 1918 to the tune of Over There, with the promise to their loved ones "We won't come back till it's over, over there."

We are reminded of an initiation scene by a fun group of a major veterans' organization. Without betraying any secrets we recall an elderly man, exhorting the young men of the day to join up in the service of their country.

Among other things he told them "Remember, we are all behind you now, and, the farther you go, the farther we'll be behind you."

Well, that's about the size of it now. A good many years have passed since the youth of World War I marched away to the cheers and tears of those they left at home, and sad to say, it would appear that "the farther they went, the farther their countrymen who stayed at home remained behind them."

A recent news item tells us that a good many of our older Representatives in the House and Senate are contemplating retirement. They can well afford to do so, having voted themselves sufficient retirement pay to, at least, permit them to live in comfort, if not luxury.

It is true they have contributed to this retirement fund from their salaries but it is also true that their salaries were not too small—much smaller were the returns a good many veterans of World War I received, with nothing to look forward to, at the best, than an extremely modest retirement on social security, if, indeed, they had been able to work long enough to secure that.

The major veterans' organizations of our land have long held as their prime reason for existence the welfare of their comrades of an early war and for their dependents.

Most of them have stood by that—sometimes wholeheartedly, sometimes halfheartedly. In the meantime, the vast majority of our people have gone about their own personal business without much thought of the very men who made their prosperity possible.

As a result there was organized only a few short years ago a new group, known as the Veterans of World War I of the United States of America. After some struggle they really got underway and now number among their members more than 100,000 veterans of the first World War.

This group, realizing that sight had been lost of their comrades of early days in the complex life which we now live, determined that their entire effort would be put forth toward seeing that their friends of the long ago, now old or incapable by reason of physical disability, should be cared for and they have asked Congress to grant this aid.

It might be said that their demand—no, not demand, but request—is exceedingly high. This group of veterans of World War I are not too demanding. As a matter of fact, judging by the millions and billions we have wasted away on more undeserving folks, including some of our enemies, it might be said that their request is a modest one.

At the last annual convention of this group they were authorized to seek what might be considered a more reasonable request, though adhering to their original petition to Congress.

Practically the only other request this group has made of Congress is the granting of a congressional charter which would permit their recognition by the Veterans' Administration of their right to represent their comrades before the various claims boards of the VA.

The request for monetary aid for their comrades is not too great nor is their request for congressional recognition of this swiftly growing group of representative veterans of our first World War one to be denied.

The money side is inconsiderable compared to the funds we have frittered away in behalf of strangers and should not even be considered when we recall the debt we owe these fighters of our earlier battles.

If we are going to stand behind these warriors of the past, let us not do so with irony, as did the elderly gentleman in the initiation scene we have referred to but, rather let us stand behind them with all the kindness and understanding of a grateful nation.

Let us show the world that while seeking to aid those abroad, we have not forgotten our own and do not intend to do so.

An American Ideal—Winning Essay, by Douglas Ellis, Sponsored by Longmeadow, Mass., Men's Club

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD P. BOLAND
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 27, 1958

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, Longmeadow, Mass., is one of the finest towns in the Commonwealth of Massachusetts. It is a beautifully picturesque rseidential community that combines the best of the past with the modernity of the present and future. Its people take justifiable pride in this well-governed and well-kept town. A number of civic and cultural organizations contribute to its spirit and soundness. One of these is the Longmeadow Men's Club. Since its organization, it has played an important part in the betterment of the town. By its acivities and its programs, it has in the past and will continue in the future to make Longmeadow a better and happier place in which to live.

For 10 consecutive years, the Longmeadow Men's Club has sponsored an essay contest for pupils of the ninth grade in its schools. The subject matter is derived from the broad classification of the American way of life.

Mr. George D. Malkasian, chairman of the program, writes me that—

We have been most fortunate in having the wholehearted support and the unreserved endorsement of Mr. Howard Herrschaft, superintendent of schools, and Mr. Alfred Wood and Mr. Hugh MacFarlane, principals of the junior and senior high schools, respectively—and the town school committee.

This essay contest is a part of the regular curriculum of the students and the entire class participation makes this project not only unprecedented but unparalleled in the annals of our public schools—so we are informed. Our club bylaws are so amended as to insure the permanency of this project.

Mr. Speaker, I desire to congratulate the Longmeadow Men's Club for sponsoring this excellent program. It seems to me that there is no better way for students at this age and stage in life to get a better understanding of our way of living and the real meaning of America. For effective essay contests require study and research that necessarily imbue the contestant with a fuller and deeper appreciation of the subject of which he writes.

Mr. Speaker, I am happy to bring to the attention of the Congress the winning essay for 1957, titled "The American Ideal," by Douglas Ellis. I congratulate him on a job well done.

Under unanimous consent I include the covering letter from the Longmeadow Men's Club and Douglas Ellis' essay in the RECORD as part of my remarks.

The letter and essay follow:

LONGMEADOW MEN'S CLUB, INC.,
Longmeadow, Mass., February 24, 1958.

Hon. EDWARD P. BOLAND,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. BOLAND: The newspapers, magazines, and other mass communication media of this country devote so much time and space to the problem and results of juvenile delinquency that many Americans must find it difficult to properly understand and appreciate our American youth.

We thought you might be interested in the enclosed essay written by one young American, Douglas Ellis, for an annual essay contest sponsored by our men's club for the ninth-graders in our Longmeadow schools.

We feel this essay and the many that competed with it are eloquent testimony that our youth is still the most precious asset we possess for the task of continuing the American ideal and insuring a future world of peace and justice.

Respectfully,

EDWARD M. CLARK.

THE AMERICAN IDEAL

(By Douglas Ellis)

"I regret that I have but one life to lose for my country." These famous words were spoken by Nathan Hale in New York in the autumn of 1776, before he was hanged by the British for spying during the Revolutionary War. Hale and men like him have made America the greatest country in the world today. During the course of time, from the Revolution up to the present and undoubtedly in the future, this country has been and will be confronted with problems that have tried the strength and willpower of our citizens, but always, no matter how dark the situation, or how hard the problem may seem, men have distinguished themselves and those around them and rallied to the cause, whatever it might be. Why, one might ask, do men always seem so willing to give so much to their country even in the face of danger or personal injury? Men do this not for personal glory or for material gains, but they do these things because they realize what this country stands for. It is a symbol of democracy and a memorial to other men who fought for her well-being. These famous men all wanted the same things for this country, freedom from foreign control, equality for all men, freedom to speak out against unfair government, freedom to worship God as they saw fit. For these ideals men died, two world wars were fought, a civil war between the southern and northern parts of our country, wars with Great Britain, Spain, and others—all to protect the rights of our people.

However, it is not just through wars and actions of men like Nathan Hale that patriotism is shown. It is through the contributions of men and women of science, industry, business, and many other fields that America has become the greatest land in the world. Great American inventors like Edison, Einstein, Fulton, Whitney, Bell, Duryea, Ford, the Wright brothers, etc. have given, in the form of their work, a patriotism that is not measured in blood as that of war, but in help to all mankind. Recently, a doctor, Dr. Jonas E. Salk, was commended by all the world for discovering and perfecting a vaccine which was deemed almost completely effective in combating the dread disease, polio. It is men like Dr. Salk that have made and will make this country and its people great.

People all over this country live without fear of a police state or Government condemnation, they are almost all literate, they have, for the most part, good homes, they are protected from undesirable members of society; they usually work a 40-hour week, and attend church on Sundays. These things are all the work of the people and the will of the people. The people exercise one of their patriotic rights when they elect someone to a public office, whether it be the dog catcher or the President of the country. These people, living in a free country they created for themselves, are making a decision that comparatively few people in the world have the chance to make. Why do they have this chance? Because, they and their forefathers before them worked for this and other privileges.

Men like Franklin, Washington, Lincoln, Edison, Salk, MacArthur, Eisenhower, and ever so many others, soldiers, statesmen, inventors, and common workers have worked so long, for so much, for so many, and we are now enjoying the rights and products of their labors. As long as there are men who are willing to work long and hard with others this country will never perish from the face of the earth, unless a force mightier than that of man interferes.

It would take much longer to observe all the many factors that make America great but, outshining all the other factors is the American himself working continuously to make the world he lives in better for himself and those around him.

DeButts Rebuts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS G. ABERNETHY
OF MISSISSIPPI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 27, 1958

Mr. ABERNATHY. Mr. Speaker, during the last session I took occasion to draw the attention of the House to the refusal by Mr. Harry DeButts, president of the Southern Railway, to join other railroads in demands for freight rate increases.

Since increases in freight rates have been a major factor in the upward trend of prices, I was of the opinion that Mr. DeButts should be praised for his restraint and his wisdom.

That the course he took was in fact a wise one is attested in the brief item in the New York Times of February 26. The item is as follows:

DEBUTTS REBUTS

Last year when the Nation's railroads were pressing the Interstate Commerce Commission for increases in freight rates to help offset rising costs, Harry deButts, president of the Southern Railway, found himself on a lonely stretch of track.

He said the Southern was weary of losing traffic to trucks, and that rail freight rate increases would just make matters worse. He announced that his road would increase rates only when it would not result in more losses to trucks. Mr. deButts' critics in the rail industry were many. But the criticism became fainter as the Southern issued relatively good monthly income statements.

The January report came out yesterday. The Southern's earnings for the month were 40 cents a share, compared with 41 cents in January 1957. Meanwhile, most rails were reporting earnings much lower than a year ago, and in some cases big losses.

Administration Thinks of Reclamation, Resource Development, and Flood-Control Projects Only as Slump Curbs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. COYA KNUTSON
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 25, 1958

Mrs. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, a headline in yesterday's paper reads "Reclamation Projects Studied as Slump Curbs." I think it very interesting that reclamation projects should be classified as "pump primers" by this administration, completely ignoring the half-century-old policy of this country to develop its natural resources, improve its industrial facilities, and store and increase its water and power resources. Giving away to private interests the great dam sites and resources, a heritage of all the people, is unforgivable. It is too sad to be a joke, this big-business administration's failure to think big enough to understand the great power potential of these sites and water resources if fully developed by the people rather than half-developed by private interests for quick profits. The contrast between Russia's understanding of this potential and the administration's lack of understanding is clearly pointed up in the January 24 Washington Window; Will Khrushchev Be Right?

Under permission to extend my remarks, I insert this lucid article in the RECORD:

WILL KHRUSHCHEV BE RIGHT?

Recently, in his annual budget message to Congress, President Eisenhower revealed that his administration would not seek or permit the start of any new water-resource development projects in the fiscal year starting July 1, 1958.

The President placed his primary emphasis on military spending and a reduction of domestic outlay in his $73.9 billion program.

Some 2 weeks prior to his budget message the President received a little-publicized letter from Senator JAMES E. MURRAY, Democrat, of Montana, chairman of the Senate Interior Committee, explicitly warning

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

against any cutbacks in reclamation programs.

MURRAY enclosed a copy of a study on the relationship of river and related water-resources-development programs of the United States, Soviet Russia, and Communist China.

This report was prepared by a well-known authority in the field, Michael W. Straus, former United States Commissioner of Reclamation and Assistant Secretary of the Department of Interior.

MURRAY wrote the President that this report "establishes authoritatively that our country is rapidly losing out to the Communist leaders in the vital area of river development which is prerequisite to economic, industrial, military, and national strength."

The Straus study is a compilation of unclassified information showing what has happened in the three countries in the river-development field.

The author recalled the statement of Nikita Khrushchev, chief of the Soviet Communist Party: "The Soviet Union can in the next 15 years not only catch up with the United States in the production of basic items but also outstrip it."

The Khrushchev forecast, Straus believes, certainly includes hydroelectric energy, food grown by irrigation, water transportation, flood control as basic items in Soviet production.

Khrushchev, in an interview with William Randolph Hearst, Jr., American publisher, was positive as to what will happen in the next 15 years:

"We declare war on the United States in peaceful production. We declare that war. We will win over the United States. The threat to the United States is not the intercontinental missile. We are relentless in this."

Straus, in his study, sought to determine whether Khrushchev had any substance to his challenge.

He found that there was considerable variation, mathematically, in reports from various sources but that there was general agreement as to the trend.

He devoted considerable space to a study of kilowatt availability because, he said, there are recognized relationships between kilowatt availability and national strength—economic, industrial, or military.

Twenty-seven years ago, Soviet energy output was low but in the last three decades the nation has been on an all-out drive of unprecedented proportions, continuity, and results to attain world leadership in national kilowatt output.

Writes Straus:

"There is general agreement currently that the United States overall power-production capacity has in recent years been doubling by the decade. The Federal Power Commission's last authoritative figures (1948 through 1956) show a United States increase of 96.8 percent, while the same Agency's calculation for the same span gave the Soviet Russian increase as 137.8 percent.

"British sources give Soviet actually installed capacity (in megawatts or million watts) over a 38-year span as 1,000 for the year 1917; 11,000 for 1940; 10,700 for 1945 (reflecting World War II plant destruction); 36,900 for 1955; and add that at the end of 1960 (the end of the current 5-year plan) it is expected that the total U. S. S. R. installed capacity will be 75,000 megawatts, which would indicate slightly more than doubling U. S. S. R. capacity in 5 years contrasted with current doubling of United States capacity in 10 years."

An independent report of the Indian Government shows actual production of kilowatt hours in the Soviet Union rising from 2 billion in 1913, to 50 billion in 1948, to 118.6 billion in 1952, to 149 billion in 1954. This shows an increase of nearly 350 times the 1913 figure.

In the field of irrigation, the United States and the U. S. S. R. are virtually equal in the number of acres under irrigation. In 1951 the U. S. S. R. had 24 million under irrigation while the United States had 26 million. By 1956 the Soviet Union had 30 million to the United States 31 million. During the 5 year period Soviet increase was 24.8 percent while United States increase was 21.6 percent.

A similar story is told in water transportation—United States leads but the Soviet Union is coming up fast, endeavoring to achieve inland water transportation through multipurpose river and canal development.

Straus also studied the vast strides being made in Communist China which, generally, reports tremendous gains. China's total kilowatt-hour production, he reports, jumped from 7.2 billion in 1952 to 15.9 billion in 1957.

These are some of the facts that will determine the future of the world—a future that could be bleak for the United States if no new starts or limited resource development continue to be national policy.

CHANGE OF RESIDENCE

Senators, Representatives, and Delegates who have changed their residences will please give information thereof to the Government Printing Office, that their addresses may be correctly given in the RECORD.

PRICE OF THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

The Public Printer is authorized to furnish to subscribers the daily RECORD at $1.50 per month, payable in advance.

Remit by money order payable to Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D. C.

PRINTING OF CONGRESSIONAL RECORD EXTRACTS

It shall be lawful for the Public Printer to print and deliver upon the order of any Senator, Representative, or Delegate, extracts from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the person ordering the same paying the cost thereof (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 185, p. 1942).

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board, or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D. C., at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer plus 50 percent: *Provided*, That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized bookdealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by bookdealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. No sale shall be made on credit (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).

RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD is located in Statuary Hall, House wing, where Mr. Raymond F. Noyes is in attendance during the sessions of Congress to receive orders for subscriptions to the RECORD at $1.50 per month, and where single copies may also be purchased. Orders are also accepted for the printing of speeches in pamphlet form.

Appendix

Labor's Responsibility for Human Rights

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JAMES E. MURRAY

OF MONTANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, February 28, 1958

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, on Monday, February 3, the National Conference for Human Rights was held at the Bellevue-Stratford Hotel in Philadelphia. The conference was cosponsored by the Honorable George M. Leader, governor of Pennsylvania, and Mr. David J. McDonald, president, United Steelworkers of America. This was a momentous milestone in the efforts of our country to meet our problems in the field of human rights.

It was the privilege of those of us who attended the general session Monday afternoon to hear perceptive speeches by three outstanding leaders in the field of government, labor, and management. The speakers were Governor Leader, Mr. McDonald, and Mr. Joseph J. Morrow, personnel director of Pitney-Bowes, Inc.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the Appendix of the RECORD the text of Mr. McDonald's speech, entitled "Labor's Responsibility for Human Rights."

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LABOR'S RESPONSIBILITY FOR HUMAN RIGHTS

(By David J. McDonald, president, United Steelworkers of America)

First of all, I wish to express my deep appreciation to all of you for coming to Philadelphia today to join Governor Leader and me and our colleagues in this National Conference for Human Rights.

It is indeed rewarding to know that so many prominent leaders of our national community, representing almost every facet of American life, have been willing to take this time to come from many places to help make this conference an historic step in America's progressive effort to solve the problems of human relations.

This is a novel experiment, perhaps the first of its kind to be conducted under the auspices of the government of a great industrial State and the leadership of a large labor union.

The problems, for which we seek solutions, affect the lives of every citizen of our country and are in some way related to the things that affect the people who live in all the other countries of the world.

Governor Leader and Mr. Morrow have spoken on the responsibilities of government and industry in protecting human rights. I propose to outline what I believe to be labor's role in this field.

The whole broad subject of human relations and the protection of human rights is one that labor must of necessity give attention to daily. It is broad in the sense that we are obligated to negotiate contracts with employers which incorporate within their framework certain provisions which govern wages, hours, and working conditions. In essence, these contracts provide equality of treatment for all employees regardless of race, creed, color, or national origin.

And within this framework we have made real progress, particularly during the last 20 years. During this period the American trade-union movement has grown from 3½ million to over 17 million members. It is obvious that these workers are now in a position to include provisions in their agreements which will guarantee equality of treatment for the people under contract.

And it is significant to note that in our own union racial and intergroup relations have continued to improve from year to year as the workers' economic status has improved.

It is also significant that there have never been any outbreaks due to racial conflict in any of the plants where we have labor contracts. And this, in spite of the fact that serious breakdowns in race relations have occurred in the very communities where the plants are located.

As a member and officer of the United Steleworkers, I am justly proud of what we have done to date to free the steelworker from the economic and social restrictions which combine to prevent the full enjoyment of a happy life.

I would like to enumerate some of these accomplishments:

1. We have established equal pay for equal work in the steel industry.

2. The North-South wage differential which existed for so many years has been eliminated.

3. We have negotiated pension and insurance plans which permit steelworkers to retire under conditions providing substantial financial security.

4. We have developed educational facilities for training our members to assume the responsibilities of holding local union office and for participating in community service work.

5. Our Committee on Civil Rights, which was created in 1948, has played an important role in carrying the union's policy and program against discrimination into the local, State and national community. It has promoted a program within the union to prepare our members for dealing with the multitude of human-relations problems which are a part of everyday union life. We have no segregated local unions, and many Negroes hold local union office.

6. Enforcement of the union's basic policy of equal rights and representation has opened up many categories of employment heretofore closed to members of minority groups. Moreover, regional progress is now being made to establish on-the-job apprentice-training programs in the crafts.

7. Union support and guidance have played an important part in the enactment of fair-employment-practices legislation in 15 States and 40 cities—the majority of which are located in heavily industrialized areas.

8. We have participated in almost 100 district and national conferences on matters of human relations since 1954. We are affiliated with 25 State and national committees and organizations whose programs on human rights, civil rights, and civil liberties conform to the policy of the union.

9. Our nationally televised monthly union meetings have served to direct public attention to many of the things we are here to discuss today.

Now you have an idea of what we have been doing in this field. But we do not propose to stand on our record. Up to now we have attacked only the fringes of the problem as it affects the average citizen.

It is largely true that segregation ends when men and women enter the mill or factory, and for that we feel that the energies we have expended have not been in vain.

But the other 16 hours of a man's day are also important. Constitutionally and psychologically can a man be expected to work equally if he is not permitted to eat equally, reside equally, relax equally, improve his knowledge equally, play equally, travel equally—in short, live equally?

This is where we are falling short in America. This is the chink in our armour. Right-thinking and compassionate people everywhere feel the pull of this tainted weight. But the need for action has not manifest itself in those who are right-thinking and compassionate. And unless it does, we will not carry out our purpose.

Unions have their frailties because they are human in nature and in character—just as human as the leaders in the business world, and in religion, and education, and other walks of life.

There is still too much idle talking about what kind of a country we should have and the way society should be organized, and too little done in the practical application of the things which make freedom and justice meaningful.

I do not mean to infer that any one segment of our society is solely responsible for our failure to measure up to our role as leader among the democratic nations of the world.

For while I am the nominal head of a strong trade union numbering over one million men and women, I would be guilty of misrepresentation if I said there was complete unanimity of opinion among all our members on the subject of human rights. Unfortunately, we still have in our union those who get quite vocal about equality of opportunity, but never practice it themselves.

We have not been able to break down completely employment practices and community patterns which still deny minority members of our union the opportunity to work and live as full-fledged, law-abiding citizens.

Let me say with emphasis that the United Steelworkers of America and other great trade unions have dedicated themselves to the orderly attainment of equality of opportunity for all Americans. We are pledged to work for the elimination of discrimination in all its ugly manifestations and the prejudice upon which it feeds. We are going to attain this goal if it is humanly and legally possible to do so.

But while the responsibility of the forces of labor in America looms large in this enterprise, ours is not the sole responsibility. We have done what we have done because we believe in the fatherhood of God, the brotherhood of man, the tenets of the constitution of our union and of the United States.

Still the big job lies before us.

I have said this before, and I say it again today. The National Association of Manufacturers and the National Chamber of Com-

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

merce, together with the local bodies of these associations, must speak out firmly and give their support for compliance with the Supreme Court's ban on segregation, for fair practices in employment and in housing, and in supoprt of legislation which will guarantee all Americans equal protection under the law.

I call upon those who formulate the policy for the great industries of our country to use their wide influence to help set the pattern in which these things can be realized.

The policy and administrative procedures under which they operate are largely made in the North. It is the obligation of those who formulate and enforce these policies to institute an educational program for management personnel so that they can join with us in helping to establish real American democracy, in the North as well as in the South.

We have already shown that men, all categories of men, work well together if given a chance. With the help of industry, we can make the mills and factories of this country the real classrooms of democracy.

If we are losing our prestige and our position of leadership among the countries of the world, we can attribute it in part to the fact that we have failed to avail ourselves of the tremendous human resources we have at our disposal.

In the light of our failure to practice what we preach, people in other countries tend to forget the things that are truly America. They forgot the magnificent contributions of individual initiative and cooperative enterprise. They forget the engineering and scientific skills that have made our way of life the goal of all men. They forget the enormous economic assistance we have poured into their countries. And they forget that this nation, twice in the past half century, has risen up as one to help defeat potential world dictatorship.

They prefer to look at our weakness.

Our treatment of minorities is one of the chief obstacles we face in our efforts to achieve world peace.

World peace is a moral ideal and our highest political ambition. It can be established only on the basis of high moral principle.

A nation's morals is not conjured up in legislative halls and judicial chambers. Morals is a substantive thing, rooted deep in the lives and homes of every citizen. On a moral issue, in world councils, our diplomats can be only as effective as the moral standards of the people they represent.

Consequently, our elected and appointed government officials in their efforts toward world peace, are being hamstrung by our national attitude toward minorities.

If we are losing the battle in the court of world opinion on this point, what is the effect upon ourselves here at home?

Race and religious prejudices are a cancer on our social, economic, and political fortunes. The problem of the Negro is especially acute. Negroes unwanted in the south are moving to the North, where they are equally unwanted. School districts in many parts of the country are being gerrymandered to assure the separation of whites and nonwhites. Newly built suburban developments are restrictively white. Older urban sections are filled to overflowing with nonwhite and foreign born—through their sheer inability to go elsewhere.

No Negro in America has full social, economic and political freedom. He may acquire one, or even two, of these freedoms. But never all three. The Civil War made his political freedom attainable. FEP laws make a stab at economic freedom. One doubts that social freedom can ever be legislated.

The northerner takes a smug attitude as he ponders the Negro situation in the South. He has nothing to be smug about. To all intents and purposes, there is as much segregation in the North as there is in the South. In general, the northerner accepts the Negro as a race, but not as an individual. In the South the Negro is accepted as an individual, but not as a race. From a Negro's point of view, he is as bad off in one section as another.

In spite of all the serious questions that demand our attention today, the problem of racial minorities is still our number one problem—as it was 95 years ago when the Emancipation Proclamation was signed.

We have failed to meet the challenge of building good human relations and establishing strong moral values, in keeping with our unprecedented material and technological progress.

In failing to provide equality of opportunity and equal protection under the law for all Americans, we have contributed to a tragic waste of manpower, talent, intellectual and moral energy, all of which are so necessary if our Nation is to continue to progress and to remain strong.

Our crying need today is for strong, courageous, intelligent leadership which realizes that we face the most weighty problem of the century, a problem so complex that it can only be dealt with by men and women who are dedicated to the principles of justice and freedom.

As the leaders of American culture, religion, education, industry, labor, and affairs of state, we have willingly or unwillingly inherited this responsibility. The problem is here, now, and alive. And it needs immediate attention.

We in labor accept our responsibility. Some measures we can take alone. And we will take them. In others we will need the help of everyone gathered here today and all your constituencies.

In brief, let me review our program:

1. We propose to set up a million-dollar-a-year scholarship reservoir. These scholarships will not be restricted to science and engineering, but will embrace a wide range of educational opportunity. Students will be selected from every walk of life without regard to creed, color, or origin.

2. We propose to select representatives from our membership to visit NATO nations as ambassadors of good will.

3. We propose to work out a program with industry which will insure upgrading the qualified employees without respect to creed, color, or origin. We propose to broaden the in-plant training programs for apprentices to qualify members of minority groups to work in presently restricted categories.

4. We shall expand opportunities in the union for minorities, making more positions of leadership available.

5. We shall support demands for Federal aid and finance for additional aid to education and equal educational opportunities.

6. We propose to work more closely with community leaders in broadening the influence of minority groups.

7. We shall support a program to abolish slums and provide badly needed low-cost and middle-income homes.

8. We propose to see to it that all citizens are accorded equal protection and justice under the law.

We believe these eight points are sound, reasonable, honest, and worthy of attainment. We pledge ourselves to their fulfillment.

Never before have so many influential leaders met to deal with this grave and urgent problem. Is it too much to hope that we will do more toward solving the problem than at any other event in our history.

Of course, the spelling out of precepts and a heightened understanding of human relations by leaders are only the preliminary steps toward achieving the objectives we discuss today.

But we all have a solemn obligation to convert sound precept into effective practice among those we represent. Now, more than ever before, the American people are looking for valid leadership. The very fact that you, as leaders of vastly influential American groups, have assembled here today in the search of means to perfect our desire is reassuring evidence. Evidence that we still have faith in our ability to establish domestic stability and to contribute to the achievement of permanent peace in the world.

The opportunity is ours.

In the words of my good friend, Dr. Howard McClusky, at our first human relations seminar at Penn State University in 1951:

"No one knows how much time we have, but it can't be long. It would be fatal to assume that somehow we will muddle through our inhumanities into some form of ultimate accommodation. Fate will not be so kind. On the contrary, it must be the responsibility of free men of good will to work increasingly for satisfying relations among people everywhere.

"It would not be extravagant to hope that the experience and example of our meeting here today will contribute materially to that goal."

Finnish People Celebrate Kalewala Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM E. PROXMIRE

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, February 28, 1958

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, today marks the anniversary of an important day for an important segment of the population of my State of Wisconsin. On February 28, 1835, the Finnish national epic, Kalewala, was first published in book form. This anniversary is an appropriate time to recognize the contributions made to the Nation and to my State by the Finnish people, and I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement which I have made in connection with the date.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR PROXMIRE

The Finnish national epic, Kalewala, consists of folk verses dealing with the deeds of three semidivine brothers of gigantic stature who lived in Kalewala, a mythical land of happiness and abundance. Its style was followed by Longfellow in his Hiawatha, and the epic and its rich mythology has had a strong influence on all Finnish art. It is a special source of pride to Finnish people everywhere.

Finland today is a strong ally of this Nation in the cold-war fight against international communism, and it is an important western outpost before the U. S. S. R. Finland has a fine record as a friend of democracy and of the United States. Indeed, it is the only country which has paid its World War I debts in full to this country. Today this northern democracy finds itself in need of economic aid, particularly in consumer goods as well as military assistance. In view of its past record of friendship and traditions of democracy, Finland should certainly receive a sympathetic consideration of its needs from this Nation.

Here in this country, Americans of Finnish descent are mostly employed in skilled building trades, as miners, in heavy industry, and as farmers. These are the fields which are hit especially hard by the growing and

threatening recession, and the Finnish-Americans, as all of us, are alarmed about rising unemployment in these fields.

Finnish people in Wisconsin have earned their reputation as a hard-working, hardy, self-reliant group. This is notable in their participation and leadership in the cooperative movement. Finnish people were primarily responsible for founding Central Cooperatives, Inc., of Superior, Wis., and many local cooperative groceries, service stations, bulk-oil distributors, creameries, insurance companies, and even burial associations. Sons and daughters of these cooperative pioneers have gone into almost every State in the Union, serving as experts in cooperative enterprises organized by other Americans.

Finnish-Americans are among the most independent, liberty-loving, and stubbornly free of all the people of our great country, yet they know and practice the virtues of mutual aid and cooperation to its finest degree. Their contributions to our Nation have been great, and it is most fitting that the Congress should give recognition to them on this day of cultural importance to them.

Funds for John Day Dam Project

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD L. NEUBERGER
OF OREGON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, February 28, 1958

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, an editorial was published in the Portland Oregonian of February 26, 1958, which admirably highlights the obvious path for the administration to follow in trying to check the current recession.

This editorial emphasizes that the great John Day Dam project on the Columbia River would not only put idle men to work on construction jobs, but would also provide industry-feeding, wealth-creating hydroelectric power to bring permanent employment in new industries in the vast Pacific Northwest. I ask unanimous consent that this excellent editorial, entitled "John Day: Jobs, Power," be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JOHN DAY: JOBS, POWER

With both Congress and the Eisenhower administration now talking about public works to absorb the unemployed and stimulate the general economy, prospects for reasonable appropriations for John Day Dam and other Northwest projects are looking up.

Congress gave a technical start to John Day Dam by appropriating $1 million last year. The President accepted that but included only $2 million in his fiscal 1959 budget. Senator WAYNE MORSE says he will try to get $10 million. He also seeks $7 million for Cougar Dam, instead of the budgeted $5,500,000, and $2 million for Green Peter Dam instead of $310,000 for planning.

In his off-the-cuff talk to the National Food Conference Monday, President Eisenhower said:

"Naturally, we have to provide for our own security, but we have today on the shelves of Government all sorts of worthy projects, some of which have been already approved by Congress—or indeed where annual or partial appropriations have been made. If those things are useful—and we know they are because they have been approved both by the Congress and by the executive studies—then let's use this time of slack employment to push these projects."

Obviously, the industry-feeding, wealth-creating hydroelectric projects of the Columbia Basin, an area of depressed employment, fit perfectly into the kind of projects the President mentioned. Also, construction delays at John Day and other big projects would almost inevitably mean a power crisis in the Northwest in the mid or late 1960's. John Day Dam should have No. 1 priority.

Cotton Still Has To Be Competitive

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BARRY GOLDWATER
OF ARIZONA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, February 28, 1958

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, we in Arizona who depend on cotton, both short and long staple, for much of our livelihood are very happy indeed to see that the cotton growing sections of the South are beginning to realize, very slowly, that the present agricultural legislation is not working to their best interests, and that the way to get better income and better productivity for the farmer is in keeping with the suggestion which Secretary Benson has repeatedly made, namely, to get the farm problem out of politics and into the economic field, in which it belongs.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Cotton Still Has To Be Competitive," published in the Cotton Digest for February 22, 1958. The article deals with the problems of the cotton producer.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

COTTON STILL HAS TO BE COMPETITIVE

Nero fiddled while Rome burned. The Congress is similarly fiddling around with several bills, while the cotton industry of the United States is rapidly going to pot.

Admittedly the Congress has gotton itself into an untenable position. When it is recognized by all concerned that the time has come to expand the cotton acreage in order to produce a sufficient supply of white cotton, the Congress can do little or nothing unless they want to look nothing short of ridiculous.

On the one hand they are paying the farmers to take their land out of cotton, and the demand for these payments has exceeded expectations. There is now a clamor in Congress for more money for the soil bank so that all the farmers that want in, can do so. There seems a reasonable probability that this additional money will subsequently be appropriated.

On the other hand there is a demand from the industry for an increase in acreage in order to provide the supply of white cotton that everyone knows will be needed before too long. That is the pocket that the Congress finds itself in. In its desire to "help" the cotton farmers, they are more than likely to create a situation so bad that the country will not recover from it for several years.

Probably the Eastland bill has the best chance of passage, but this will not go into effect for this crop. This bill would give the farmer an option of having his acreage reduced to the minimum, but will be given 81 percent of parity or thereabouts in the form of a loan. The alternative is to get a 30 persent increase and a 75 percent of parity loan.

On the face, this would seem to be a pretty good proposition for the farmer. If he had good land, and was a good farmer, he would take the 30 percent increase in acreage and the 75 percent of parity loan, and make himself a little more money. If he is a poor farmer on poor land, then he would take the 81 percent of parity and the smaller acreage and let nature take its course.

But the bill is not all that it seems. In the first place, the most important thing is to get the price of cotton down to competitive levels; competitive with other cottons but also competitive with manmade fibers. A loan of 75 percent of parity will not do this. It will result in a price too high to compete with manmade fibers, and little or nothing will be accomplished.

There is no question but that American cotton will sell throughout the world, when the price is down to a competitive level. This has been demonstrated conclusively by the surplus sales. Even now with these sales not yet discontinued because there is still some spinnable cotton available, exporters are bidding an average of about 28½ cents for this cotton.

What will happen under the present plans and progress on cotton legislation, if by chance we should have a very bad growing year? Weather throughout the old Cotton Belt, including Texas and even New Mexico has been very bad. Persistent rains have kept farmers out of the fields. Land preparation is far behind the average for this time of year. Even in the Rio Grande Valley, where cotton planting starts on February 1, only a relatively small amount of planting has been done.

Of course, the weather could become almost ideal at any time. With modern methods of cultivating and planting, the time consumed in preparing the land and doing the planting is much less than it was only a few years ago.

But we are just supposing. Suppose that the same thing happened to cotton that has happened to the vegetable crops in both the Rio Grande Valley and in Florida. Suppose we produced a crop of no more than 8 million bales.

This would create a very dangerous situation. There wouldn't be enough cotton to go around. Exports would have to be stopped, perhaps entirely, so that the proposed export subsidy would be of little or no use.

Still the Congress continues to fiddle much like Nero did. Senator ELLENDER is against any legislation at all, judging from the way he has been quoted in the public press.

It is indeed a sad commentary that the Congress should be willing to take the attitude that it does. It is manifestly for political reasons. Secretary of Agriculture Benson has told the Congress just what is needed. He hasn't minced his words. Last week we reported his four freedoms for the cotton farmer. But the Congress continued to fiddle around.

It is not a question whether the needed legislation could be adopted or not. There is no question but that it could be, if there were a genuine desire on the part of the Congress to do something worth while for the cotton industry.

They had rather limp along with a soil bank that is nothing more than a dole and that will be taken up only by the inefficient cotton farmers, who shouldn't grow cotton anyway, and with some form of an export subsidy with payment in kind to attempt to retain our export market.

The country needs more intellectual honesty in Government.

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

We Reach One Agreement With the Russians

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANCIS CASE
OF SOUTH DAKOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, February 28, 1958

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, amid the shouting and the headlines one of the most significant steps toward international understanding in recent years has received less attention than it deserves. I refer to the agreement recently signed between the United States and Russia for the exchange of certain cultural, scientific, and industrial information.

Notice was taken, however, by the editor of the Washington Sunday Star in the issue of February 16, 1958. I ask unanimous consent that there may be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the Star's comment and excerpts from the speech by United States Ambassador William S. B. Lacy. I commend the reading of the article to all students of international relations.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A DIPLOMAT VIEWS DEALING WITH REDS

One of the few concrete accomplishments in Soviet-American relations in recent years has been the exchange agreement, covering individuals, publications, entertainment, science, industry, and other fields, signed last month. Ambassador William S. B. Lacy, who headed the American negotiating team, gave a revealing picture of dealing with the Russians Wednesday at a National Press Club luncheon. The following is excerpted from his speech:

"There were present in these negotiations, as there always are at some stage of the practice of old-fashioned diplomacy, two essentials. The first of these was privacy.

"Anyone who successfully handles affairs of any sort learns quickly that all business cannot be transacted in the middle of Main Street at high noon. Few, if any, major industrial mergers are consummated without at some point a quiet, man-to-man, straight-talking session, where final differences are resolved, and rough edges removed. Governing bodies, be they city councils or committees of Congress, find it necessary from time to time to go into executive session, either to get to the bottom of some delicate matter, or simply to discuss what to do next, without opening themselves to pressure to take one course or another.

"Any employments of privacy may be abused, just as any means of publicity may be abused, but this does not mean that either privacy or publicity are evil things in themselves. And if privacy is necessary for discussion of matters of business or government within nations, it is wholly indispensable for discussing matters between nations, especially at a time when any difference standing between us has in it the potential of our preservation or destruction."

CAREFUL PROGRESS

"The second essential to the success of this negotiation was that it was from our side a step-by-step affair.

"The approach of diplomacy varies with the nature and difficulty of the problem faced, of course, much as the approach of a mountain climber would vary with the type of slope he wishes to climb. But with an agreement difficult of achievement, as with a rock face difficult to climb, a realist must as a rule make his beginning at whatever point offers the least difficulty and the most promise, and then must work his way ahead, step by patient laborious step. If he approaches the matter carelessly or hastily, if he tries to skip any important steps, he at best will fail to reach his goal, and at worst may have a bad fall.

"We opened our side of the negotiations with a very simple, limited proposal, the proposal for radio and television exchanges. At that time voices were raised to say we were not proposing enough. But with patience and effort, and with continuous negotiation, an agreement was hammered out to cover that point and a great many others as well.

"And just as one proposal can provide the seed of an agreement, so we can hope that one agreement can help eventually to pave the way for other, broader discussions, on a meaningful and realistic basis.

"In addition, we needed patience, not only in getting through the negotiations, but in getting to them. This is perhaps the most important lesson of all to be learned from these negotiations."

LONG, LONG ROAD

"As we face dealings with the Soviet Union, we must be prepared if necessary, and our people must be prepared, to live through a generation, 2 generations, 10 generations, with no further progress toward a settlement between us. Indeed, the more willing and able we are to wait, the less waiting in the long run we will be required to do. Our opponent is skilled at knowing the limits of our patience. If he comes to see that he cannot exhaust them, he will be less tempted to try. He is a realist.

"And just as we must be capable of waiting as long as waiting may be required, so we must be prepared to make another attempt at negotiating whenever a legitimate meaningful opportunity presents itself. If necessary, we must be able to make a hopeful beginning a thousand times, and be disappointed a thousand times, and still be ready to try again.

"But as we must be hopeful, so we must be cautious. There is a wide difference between legitimate negotiations conducted in an effort to reach an agreement, and a negotiation conducted for other reasons. Any trader, whether in stocks or bonds, or horses and mules, can testify to that.

"Negotiations can be used for delay, for deception, for dividing friends, for discouraging and disheartening populations. We must separate the wheat from the chaff in these matters, for there is more grief than profit in threshing straw."

PITFALL OF EAGERNESS

"And one final thought on the matter of patience: Once any negotiation may be entered, we must recognize that a bad agreement could be worse than no agreement, in weakening our alliances, in compromising our defensive position, in creating false confidence or disillusion. It is too easy, when talk has dragged on long and fruitlessly, to be overeager to end it with some agreement, any agreement.

"So if the first lesson of this agreement is that old fashioned diplomacy, high-level horse trading, if you like, can pay off, the second lesson is that it will pay off only if employed with enduring patience. This patience includes the willingness to wait, the capacity to continue to hope and try again, the caution to avoid false and dangerous approaches, and the restraint from agreement until a meaningful agreement is to be reached.

"This is perhaps a grim picture. This Nation broke its frontiers, and built its industrial might, not so much through patience as through impatience. Buffalo Bill, Horatio Alger, either one, always had to be pushing ahead. But we were a young land then, and impatience is a luxury youth can indulge. We have occupied this position we hold in the world for less than half a generation. It is a position for which maturity is the first and most essential trait, and patience is the sine qua non of the sort of maturity we need."

CAPABLE NEGOTIATORS

"Recently there has been dramatized before the world the fact that Soviet scientists and engineers rank with any in the world in skill and knowedge. Their diplomats are not less capable, and we had better not forget it in our haste to train more engineers.

"Yet the fact that we could come together to bargain at all, and the fact that the bargaining did result in an agreement, indicates, we hope and trust, that the Soviet are coming to recognize that some bridging of the gap between us is both necessary and possible.

"Before I close let me touch on one further aspect of these negotiations for international exchange. By the fact of negotiating itself we were conducting an exchange of sorts. Ambassador Zaroubin and colleagues were tough bargainers, formidable negotiators, and neither side won all it wanted. But for all the battle of wits, no one irretrievably lost his temper and certainly we learned a mutual respect.

"And for all the restraints necessarily imposed upon us by our positions, it was inescapable that we should come to see each other not merely as representatives, or as forces, but as people—human beings.

"We served opposing interests, but we were also serving each according to his lights, the common cause of humanity's search for peace."

Income Tax Problems

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM LANGER
OF NORTH DAKOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, February 28, 1958

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a letter dated February 15, 1958, which I have received from Mr. John Cascione, a certified public accountant, of New York City, dealing with certain income-tax problems.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JOHN CASCIONE CO.,
New York, N. Y., February 15, 1958.

Senator WILLIAM LANGER,
United States Senate Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: Income taxation has become a form of legalized political larceny. It is a trap baited for recalcitrant citizens; blackjacking and coercing them into submission to the crazy policies of some political leaders.

For nearly 20 years we have been scared out of our pants and had our shirts taxed off our backs; with Federal per capita taxes increasing 2,000 percent since 1933, when the New Deal arrived in Washington.

Repeated additions tao the already numerous tax deductions, to quiet and cater to special groups or individuals, have been one of the causes of high tax rates, and the main reason for the maze of rulings and regulations. A complete overhaul of the tax structure is necessary, beginning with the elimination of all personal deductions, leaving only exemptions.

Deductions have reached the saturation point of diminishing benefits; in the long run taxpayers are now in the same relative position, all receiving some special tax benefit. A 5-percentage-point tax reduction should replace the eliminated personal deductions.

In the past 5 years, there has been a gradual easing of the tensions between the East and West, which had reached a high point with the Berlin blockade and airlift. The low point was reached last fall, when prominent American politicians, newspapermen, industrialists and scientists entered Russia under the uplifted Iron Curtain; some of them to witness the pyrotechnic display of the sputnik skyrocketing into outer space.

The stupendous peacetime military outlays of the past can now be reduced to normal proportions, eliminating the arms race between former allies, and make possible an additional 5-percentage-point reduction in tax rates. Rates would then start at 10 percent instead of the present 20 percent and American taxpayers would be relieved of a burdensome tax load as well as the preparation of complicated evasion inducing tax forms.

The pernicious narcotic effects of taxation, its ever-mounting craving demands, is as dangerous to our body politic as dope to an individual. Continued at its present harmful degree, evasion, bribery, and corruption will become rampant and chronic. This will destroy the moral fiber of the Nation and American power to resist will become but a shell unable to withstand internal and external attack.

Sincerely,

JOHN CASCIONE.

The Need for a Tax Cut

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM E. PROXMIRE
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, February 28, 1958

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, many of us in the Senate of the United States believe that a tax cut will be one of the most salutary steps that we can take toward recovery from the current economic recession.

This morning the syndicated column of Stewart Alsop has a thoughtful discussion of the reluctance of the administration to take this step, and the growing awareness that it probably will have to be taken.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the article, entitled "The Ides of March," which was published in today's Washington Post and Times Herald.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE IDES OF MARCH

(By Stewart Alsop)

Next April 10 is a day to circle on your calendar. For on that day, or soon thereafter, the President and Secretary of the Treasury Robert Anderson are going to have to make a decision which will rather intimately affect every adult American. They are going to have to decide whether or not to propose to Congress a massive tax cut to revive the sagging economy.

On the delicate subject of a tax cut, the administration has been talking out of both sides of its mouth. A couple of weeks ago, the administration line, as put out by Senator WILLIAM KNOWLAND and others, was that there would be no tax cut. This week the line has changed. Secretary Anderson and other administration spokesmen (including KNOWLAND) have said that there would be a tax cut "if circumstances warranted"—which means, if things go on getting worse.

The reason for this backing and filling is, of course, that the administration has not yet made up its collective mind. From the President on down, all concerned want very much to avoid a big tax cut, which would bring a huge deficit in its train. But the pressures, political and economic, for drastic action to reverse the present economic trend, are steadily mounting.

The present intention in the administration is to put off the dread day of decision until after April 10. The reason why April 10 is a magic date is simple. On that day (or possibly the 11th) the Commerce Department will announce the total of unemployed in the month of March.

On February 12, the President optimistically predicted in his first economic chinsup statement, that unemployment would go down in March. In normal times, such a prediction would be entirely safe. There is a regular seasonal upswing in employment in late winter and early spring.

But these are not normal times. Many economists, including some of the President's own economic advisers, are beginning to suspect that the President should have recalled the warning to Julius Caesar to "beware the ides of March." Unemployment figures for February, which are due to be announced in the second week of March, are expected to show another sinister rise, perhaps to over the 5 million mark.

If the March figures announced on April 10 show another rise in unemployment, the moment for decision will be at hand. For besides proving the President a poor economic prophet (which will give the Democrats another stick to beat him with) a March increase in unemployment will have a further unhappy meaning.

It will mean, inescapably, that the recession has gathered enough steam to override the normal March upturn. That in turn will involve the clear threat that the recession is getting out of hand, and turning into a real depression. In that case, it can be considered at least a 5-to-1 bet that the President will propose a massive tax cut to Congress.

It is still possible, of course, that the President will prove a good prophet after all. The administration's economic soothsayers put hopeful emphasis on the increase in housing starts, the fairly steady level of retail buying, and the upward trend in spending for military hardware.

Yet there is a certain whistling-in-the-dark note audible in such expressions of optimism. And from Secretary Anderson on down, all those who have the President's ear on economic matters agree that a big tax cut is the most powerful antidepression weapon remaining in the Government's economic armor.

Just how powerful is the tax cut weapon? The majority view among the economic soothsayers seems to be that a tax cut, besides putting money immediately into people's pockets, would have an important psychological effect. It should thus be powerful enough to reverse the tide and lead to a sluggish but certain recovery.

There is also a minority view among some economists and businessmen that we are in a much worse jam than anyone has publicly acknowledged. The pessimists see the vast load of consumer debt as the great danger. Millions of people have become used to buying everything from their vacations to underclothes on credit, and a lot of banks have plunged heavily in consumer credit paper. Thus, the pessimists believe, the national economy has a much more rickety base than appears on the surface, and there is no guarantee that a tax cut will set things right. For even a $5 billion tax cut will affect less than 1 percent of the total economy.

Thus the pessimists see the danger of a real bust, reminiscent of the thirties. But the pessimists, it should be hastily added, are in the minority. They have been wrong in the past, and on at least two occasions since the war, in 1947 and 1954, tax cuts have had an almost miraculously revivifying effect on the economy. And if the news is bad on April 10, a tax cut can be counted as next to a certainty.

Management's Responsibility for Equal Opportunity

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES E. MURRAY
OF MONTANA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, February 28, 1958

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, on Monday, February 3, the National Conference for Human Rights was held at the Bellevue-Stratford Hotel in Philadelphia. The conference was cosponsored by the Honorable George M. Leader, governor of Pennsylvania, and Mr. David J. McDonald, president, United Steelworkers of America. This was a momentous milestone in the efforts of our country to meet our problems in the field of human rights.

It was the privilege of those of us who attended the general session Monday afternoon to hear perceptive speeches by three outstanding leaders in the field of government, labor, and management. The speakers were Governor Leader, Mr. McDonald, and Mr. Joseph J. Morrow, personnel director of Pitney-Bowes, Inc.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the Appendix of the RECORD the text of Mr. Morrow's speech, entitled "Management's Responsibility for Equal Opportunity."

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MANAGEMENT'S RESPONSIBILITY FOR EQUAL OPPORTUNITY

(By Joseph J. Morrow, personnel director, Pitney-Bowes, Inc.)

The theme of responsibility for human rights, shared equally by the people of our Government, labor unions, and industrial managements, is a concept of which our conference planners should be proud. It represents an approach which is fundamental and at the same time usually comprehensive. To me, this theme is also deeply stirring, because it implies—and may very well help prove—that government, labor, and industrial management do not always go their separate ways but are quite capable of working together, as well as separately, toward solution of a problem which belongs to the entire Nation.

When we accept a share of the responsibility for the cure of our racial problems we are also accepting our share of responsibility for the problem itself. Whenever and wherever this happens, it means that American citizens are growing up—looking our shortcomings straight in the eye and resolving to do something about them. When we can do this with the weight and influence

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

of government, labor, and industry behind us, we are on the road toward the kind of action which can someday end racial prejudice and the ills it has visited upon us.

"E pluribus unum" is a familiar motto which we see every day on the coins in our pockets. It refers, of course, to the unity of the 48 States: "one out of many." Maybe a more emphatic meaning might be evident from a translation as "out of many—one." This concise phrase can also be interpreted as a summation of our objective as a nation, our creed, our ideal: the creation of a single, integrated people out of many different people, of different cultures. The motto ought to be a reminder that if we are to remain one nation we must work to really become one people, discarding the divisions and prejudices which hamper us.

Under the pressures and anxieties of these times we live in, we have begun to realize that the philosophy of unity, equal opportunity, and freedom out of which the United States was born is not just an idea to be given lipservice and ignored whenever it gets in the way of immediate self-interest. Challenged by foreign ideologies and the complexities of a technological age, our own taken-for-granted philosophy is emerging for us as a practical blueprint for living—our greatest strength and best defense when we put it to work.

Perceptive leaders of business and industry, for instance, have realized that our way of doing business is a prime expression of freedom and equal opportunity in action which—adaptable as it may be to this or any other age—will cease to exist in its present form if we lose our other freedoms. They realize that the people who keep our industries running become a strong right arm for industry when their needs are respected and they are regarded as intelligent partners instead of mere working mechanisms. Finally, business leaders realize that their organizations are an integral part of the social and economic picture in their communities, with a responsibility not only to earn a profit for the stockholder but also to assume the kind of leadership which will further the well-being of the community and all those who comprise it. Through these combined realizations, industry's so-called social conscience has been awakened.

When we relate this awakening to our race relationships, a mixed picture presents itself. We know, for example, that a great majority of employers hire Negroes only for unskilled work. Whether they hire large numbers of Negroes or only a few, they are still following discriminatory practices which prevent the Negro from enjoying, as other citizens do, the equality of opportunity on which we pride ourselves.

The ratio of unemployment among Negroes runs higher than among whites—about 5 percent for Negroes as against 3 percent for whites—but the main difficulty in a healthy economy is not so much that of obtaining simple employment as that of obtaining good employment—the same kind available to a white man of similar ability. Although there is a proportionately higher percentage of Negroes than whites in the work force, Negro family income is only 56 percent as large as that of the average white family. The number of Negroes employed in agricultural work, and as laborers and domestics, has continued to decline while the number filling professional, managerial, white-collar, and skilled or semiskilled factory jobs has increased. In some cases, the percentage has almost doubled; but the greatest proportion of Negro workers can still be found in menial and low-paying jobs. In the North and West, more than 70 percent of employed Negroes are working in the lowest nonfarm classifications, while fewer than 33 percent of employed whites are in these occupations. And fewer than 1 in 10 northern Negro women hold clerical or sales jobs, compared to 2 out of 5 white women.

There are plenty of examples which prove that virtually no field of work is closed to Negroes. There are exceptional Negro men working in specialized fields everywhere; and while they may have found it hard to reach their present level, the great ability and drive common to unusual men have helped them push their way through the obstacles. Unfortunately, the average person—including the average Negro—has no such gifts. The reasonable degree of success within the reach of the average white man is far beyond the grasp of most average Negroes. Only when this large group, with abilities which lie between the unqualified and the exceptional, is utilized in average occupation—in equal proportion to whites—will we have real grounds for claiming that Negroes are enjoying equal economic opportunity.

We see much more on the credit side when we look at what has happened to the Negro's work opportunities in the past 40 years. His first real opportunity in industry occurred during World War I, when Negroes moved north in sizable numbers to take jobs in construction work, packing plants, and the steel industry. These employment gains nearly disappeared after the war and during the depression; but, with the coming of World War II, production needs and manpower shortages produced about 700,000 industrial jobs for Negroes, at least half of which were skilled or semiskilled. This time, a large percentage of Negroes who entered industry during the war stayed on at better paying industrial jobs. During the years of postwar adjustment there were opportunities for cutbacks and layoffs which might again have put the Negro worker back where he was before. The fact that most employers didn't use cutbacks as an excuse to remove Negroes from their payrolls indicates that they had really been assimilated into the work force, producing well, adjusting to their environment, and being accepted by their white coworkers.

The most significant gains in the employment of Negroes in skilled and semiskilled jobs have occurred since the war. Topflight industries have set an outstanding example in the utilization of trained and competent Negro workers—companies like International Harvester, General Motors, General Cable Corp., Standard Oil of New Jersey, Daystrom, Sylvania Electric Products, St. Regis Paper, Bristol-Myers, Doehler-Jarvis. This is only a partial list of the industries which, over the past 15 years, have helped along the progress of fair employment practices in industry.

So what we have today is a beginning, a groundwork for the job of securing economic equality for Negroes.

How fast and how far the trend toward fair employment goes will depend on all our employers; on their sense of what is right and fair, their courage, their degree of concern over what is going on outside the factory gates, their vision. More than any other group, business leaders have it in their power to invalidate Communist charges of injustice toward our nonwhite minorities, charges which have left their influence in all the corners of the world where nonwhites live, and have seriously reduced our prestige and leadership potential outside the Western World. Businessmen have it in their power, through a policy of equal employment opportunity, to serve the economy on which they depend, and this is becoming a recognized responsibility which goes along with modern corporate power.

While economic justice may be only half the battle for America's Negroes, it is the greater half. Improving the Negro's economic lot will breed social improvement and reduce the high price we pay for slum-bred crime, disease, and poverty. If industrialists really believe in the ability of our economic system to provide enough opportunity for everyone according to qualifications, then they must also believe that wasted ability is costly at a time when, according to Secretary of Labor James P. Mitchell, there are only 9 million skilled workers in a total civilian labor force of 66 million, a quantity insufficient for present needs, let alone for the future. Industry can help develop at least some of this latent ability by opening training, apprenticeship, and other educational programs to all qualified applicants, regardless of color.

If goods and services constitute our real wealth, then it follows that the more people we permit to create and consume that wealth, the better off we are. If we let Negroes find their true level on the basis of ability, joining with us in the creation of wealth, their increased earnings will give us one of the best consumer markets we can hope for.

But this won't happen while the Negro is denied skilled employment, a chance at promotion, and equal wage scales. Nor will the Negro achieve social, environmental, or educational equality until he has had a genuine opportunity to increase his income.

Since the employer is "after all" a human being, and in business to make a living, his fears of a fair employment program might understandably outweigh the broad advantages to the Nation—if the fears were justified. But in actual experience in most parts of the country, the personal difficulties and problems anticipated with an integration program just don't materialize to any appreciable extent. This would be understood by many more businessmen if they could shake themselves free of prejudices, habits, and apprehensions, examining the prospect of equal opportunity as they have traditionally, and skillfully, analyzed their business problems. Then—measuring the political and economic stakes against the risks—they would find themselves able to map out a program of action based on facts and realistic thinking, instead of heresay and emotion.

It is fundamental to American business to believe that if something needs doing, and we really want to do it, that it can and will be done. The problem of minority integration is essentially no different. The employer who has always just "understood" that Negroes are lazy, overaggressive, or unreliable on the job more than likely applies scientific personnel techniques in measuring the individual abilities and traits of white job applicants and supplements this with constant ratings of his white employees' actual performance. Some facts about Negro performance which would surprise the reluctant employer were unearthed through a National Urban League survey of 300 industries in 25 States during the last war. These plants employed altogether about 150,000 Negro workers.

In 215 of the 300 companies, management reported complete satisfaction with Negro performance. In 50 plants, the managers were fairly satisfied. In only 9 plants did management claim that Negro workers were not so good as whites. While 67 of the 300 plants reported higher absentee rates for Negroes, and 13 plants had found the Negro turnover rate to be higher than for whites, this type of difficulty occurred, for the most part, during the period of the Negro's adjustment to factory work and to urban life in general.

The chief objection voiced against integration is, of course, the employer's conviction that there will be discontinue or open trouble in the plant and community if Negroes are employed on an equal basis with whites. While avoiding or minimizing conflict does take careful planning and spadework, I know of no company with an integration program which hasn't made the transition success-

fully. In some cases the obstacles have been trifling; in others there have been some minor crises. Threatened work stoppages or walkouts have been rare. The important fact is that the crises or walkouts can be and have been avoided or averted by the application of principles basic to any good industrial relations program anywhere, and by getting good, professional advice and help right in the beginning from specialists in the field. The National Urban League—a nonprofit service with branches in a number of cities—will, for instance, send consultants at its own expense to talk over specific steps with businessmen who want to utilize Negroes in their work force.

First and foremost, top management must make a firm decision to employ Negroes at skilled work; consult with supervisors and the union about it; and be sure that everyone—including employees themselves—understands the new policy. When and if troubles arises, management must stick to its commitments, handling complaints or threats firmly, fairly, and consistently.

It is particularly important that supervisors be well indoctrinated and understand management's stand, for they will frequently be the first to cope with tensions or objections if these arise. Careful selection and briefing of the first skilled Negro employees, and strategically planned placements, are important too. No difference should be made in the treatment of Negro and white workers in the handling of complaints, promotions, or washroom and eating facilities. By avoiding the idea that it is involved in some kind of crusade or battle in the Negro's behalf, management will keep an objective, flexible approach to integration, treating each Negro employee as an individual who must stand or fall on his own merits.

Asking employees to accept Negro coworkers on an equal basis strikes deep at some of our most unreasoning human emotions; and doing the job right the first time is vital. But no policy, no matter how carefully planned, will be thoroughly successful unless the overall industrial relations house is in order. Employees have to be, in a sense, ready for integration. They will be ready if a background of harmonious relations already exists. Mutual trust and good will help along employee acceptance and enable them to feel respect for management's decision to establish a democratic work climate.

Every corporation which uses the tools of policy planning and effective communications in carrying out a successful integration program is, as we know, helping provide long-range benefits to the Nation and the economy. But there are more immediate benefits too. For one thing, the company will gain a certain amount of respect in the community and will, at least indirectly, influence community race relationships through its example and through the revised or modified attitudes white employees will bring back into their homes and social circles.

When employees' loyalty and feeling of partnership can be extended to cover the integration program as well as other management activities, they will have an added reason to take pride in being part of their company, and that is important to the way we humans work together. Equal employment opportunity is at least a start toward raising the living standards of Negroes in the community. Management, too, will gain employees who are in no way inferior to their white coworkers. Some Negro workers will be disappointments, some will be distinctly superior; but, more significant than failures or standouts is the great majority who, over the long pull, will do a good, conscientious, effective job just as do other employees.

The Negro's capacity to contribute to our economy is far greater than we realize, although social, economic, and educational patterns formed by prejudice and by our history still limit this contribution. The potential is nevertheless there, waiting to be released. This is the opportunity and the responsibility of our industries and businesses. The time for decision is now, and the time for action is growing short.

Protectionism and Stagnation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HALE BOGGS
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 24, 1958

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Wall Street Journal of February 28, 1958:

PROTECTIONISM AND STAGNATION

Does this country believe in the free trade it preaches?

The question is often asked by foreigners as though the answer were negative. Actually the honest answer cannot be clear cut. On one side, the United States has cut tariffs, in return for comparable concessions from other lands, an average of some 80 percent in the 24-year history of the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act. In that period American exports and imports have multiplied many times.

In recent years, however, the protectionist tide has been rising again and now threatens to swamp the administration's request to extend the act for 5 years, with authority to cut tariffs 5 percent a year. The request may be killed, or the extension may be so loaded with amendments it will be a protectionist, not a freer-trade, measure. The other day Secretary of State Dulles termed one such amendment "totally disastrous."

That language is doubtless too strong. Neither the United States nor world trade will collapse overnight if the trade act is not extended. All the same, the new protectionist trend is unfortunate and in the long run dangerous. That is so far the most concrete of practical reasons.

First, this is a competitive economy, and in that is the secret of much of its startling success. It is axiomatic that in such an economy businesses must either meet competition or go into other businesses or get out of business. Domestic businesses have been making these adjustments—technological competition alone has forced many of them—as long as there has been an America, and the result has been great and rapid economic growth.

Those firms and industries who complain that, for whatever reason, they cannot meet foreign competition are simply trying to rationalize their own failure. That is bad enough. What is worse is that to the extent their complaints are heeded the American economy loses its competitive character. Instead we get industries sheltered by the Government for no better reason than that they refuse to adjust to the logic of a competitive economy. And that augurs stagnation rather than expansion.

Second, this is a consumer-directed economy, which is another reason it is the richest in the world. If the consumer is to remain sovereign, he must have freedom of choice among all competitors. His choice must not be restricted, and his prices raised, by the pressures of a few. That way lies a different, and far less productive, economy than we have known.

Third, this economy is not self-sufficient; the United States must depend on trade for many necessary materials. To fail to follow the course of expanded trade could prove very short-sighted indeed.

Protectionism, then, strikes at the real bases of American wealth; it temporarily protects a few at the eventual expense of the many. But protectionism does even more. In the long run it strikes at the United States own interests in the world and in the peace of the world.

In self-interest the United States must be concerned with the political fate of other nations. It now expreses this concern largely in an expensive, indiscriminate and generally ineffective program of foreign aid. By encouraging trade expansion it could eliminate much of this and help provide the actual bases of wealth elsewhere, thus giving other nations tangible reasons for shunning communism.

The United States overriding world interest, however, is peace—and peace historically travels the route of trade. It is when the commercial arteries are choked that the economic causes of war are generated.

We do not suggest that the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act is a perfect vehicle. But at least it moves toward the goal which should be this country's in its own most hard-headed interest. That ultimate goal is not simply freer trade, but free trade in practice as well as preaching.

Waterway Tolls Opposed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK E. SMITH
OF MISSISSIPPI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, January 8, 1958

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include the following resolution adopted by the Legislature of the State of Mississippi:

House Concurrent Resolution 122

A concurrent resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States to refrain from placing tolls or restrictions upon the use of river waterways

Whereas the suggestion has been made whereby the water transportation industry of the United States of America would be restricted and burdened by the imposition of Federal tolls and controls; and

Whereas in the judgment of the Legislature of the State of Mississippi any river waterways' tolls would be detrimental to the economic development and prosperity of the people of the United States and should not be imposed: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives of the State of Mississippi (the Senate concurring therein), That the Congress of the United States be and it is hereby petitioned and requested to refrain from any imposition of restrictions or tolls on the free use of the river waterways of the United States and leave same free for unimpeded development and use; be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be mailed by the clerk of the house of representatives to Senators JAMES O. EASTLAND and JOHN C. STENNIS and to Congressmen THOMAS G. ABERNETHY, JAMIE WHITTEN, FRANK SMITH, JOHN BELL WILLIAMS, ARTHUR WINSTEAD, and WILLIAM COLMER.

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

Senator Kennedy's Address at the Golden Jubilee Banquet of B'nai Zion

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 24, 1958

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts, the Honorable JOHN F. KENNEDY, delivered an outstanding address at the golden jubilee banquet of B'nai Zion, held at the Hotel Commodore in New York City on February 9, 1958.

Sharing the platform with Senator KENNEDY on that occasion were Simcha Pratt, Consul General of Israel, in New York; Dr. Harris J. Levine, president of the Jewish National Fund of America, who was the toastmaster of the evening; and Nathaniel S. Rothenberg, president of B'nai Zion. As dinner chairman, I had the honor of making the opening remarks.

Members of Congress who attended this important event were the honorable VICTOR ANFUSO, EMANUEL CELLER, ISIDORE DOLLINGER, LEONARD FARBSTEIN, JAMES HEALEY, LESTER HOLTZMAN, EDNA KELLY, EUGENE KEOGH, ALFRED SANTANGELO, and LUDWIG TELLER.

Senator KENNEDY's remarks were as follows:

ADDRESS BY SENATOR JOHN F. KENNEDY AT 50TH ANNIVERSARY DINNER, B'NAI ZION, HOTEL COMMODORE, NEW YORK CITY, FEBRUARY 9, 1958

It is a great pleasure to be here tonight in tribute to the 50 years of B'nai Zion and in honor of the special mission of the Jewish National Fund.

It is heartening to spend an evening where the focus is set on works of peace and social improvement, on the courageous and far-sighted efforts your organization has made to alleviate deep human needs. For the years of crisis, through which we have been passing for more than two decades, have left no more bitter heritage than the homelessness and landlessness of millions. Your works constitute one of the great social achievements of our time, combining the highest idealistic vision with the greatest practical vigor. And what work could be more heartwarming or more enduring than the great forest at Jerusalem. Your children and grandchildren when they visit Israel will find your monument.

There have always been skeptics scoffing at the possibility of making deserts bloom and rocky soils productive. In this regard, our own history as a nation and Israel's have many parallels—in the diversity of their origins, in their capacity to reach the unattainable, in the receptivity to new ideas and social experimentation.

In this country, throughout much of the 19th century, warnings were repeatedly proclaimed that mid-America and its plains beyond the 100th parallel could never be settled and made productive. One writer, traveling from Illinois to Oregon in 1839, spoke of the Great American Desert "burnt and arid * * * whose solemn silence is seldom broken by the tread of any other animal than the wolf or the starved and thirsty horse which bears the traveler across its wastes." The sterility of the plains, and their implacable resistance to civilizing influence or settlement, were themes of major writers, such as Francis Parkman in The Oregon Trail or Washington Irving in his Astoria. At best, these writers argued, a kind of nomadic existence could be salvaged from the mid-American land mass, from these "bare" and "wasted" plains with their "level monotony."

But on the Great American Plains—as decades later in the great Palestinian plains and valleys—determined settlers learned the truth of the epigram that "Rain follows the plow." By 1881 a great western town builder and scientist, Charles Dana Wilber, was saying: "In this miracle of progress, the plow was the advance messenger—the unerring prophet—the procuring cause."

These words sound deep resonances in the minds and memories of those who have observed the gradual Zionist fulfillment in Israel. History records several such breakthroughs—great efforts in which spiritual conviction and human endurance have combined to make realities out of prophecies. The Puritans in Massachusetts, the Mormons in Salt Lake City, the Scotch-Irish in the western territories were all imbued with the truth of the old Jewish thought that a people can have only as much sky over its head as it has land under its feet.

The Jewish National Fund, which for 47 years foreshadowed the existence of an independent Jewish state, and assembled long in advance a perpetual trust in land for the Jewish people, symbolizes this magnificent achievement. Just as our own West has sustained progress against the impacts of serious farm depressions, crop failures, credit crises, and droughts, so, too, Israel has had to exist on narrow margins of survival, on a constant climate of hostility and outside danger. Yet it has endured and its integrity remains unimpaired, and this success can be in a large measure attributed to the National Fund.

I cannot hope—nor pretend—to solve tonight all of the complex riddles of the Middle East. But I would like to suggest some perspectives which might help to clarify our thinking about that area and to indicate what lines our longer-range efforts might take. To do this requires, first of all, that we dispel a prevalent myth about the Middle East.

This myth—with which you are all too familiar—is the assertion that it is Zionism which has been the unsettling and fevered infection in the Middle East, the belief that without Israel there would somehow be a natural harmony throughout the Middle East and the Arab world. Quite apart from the values and hopes which the State of Israel enshrines—and the past injuries which it redeems—it twists reality to suggest that it is the democratic tendency of Israel which has injected discord and dissension into the Near East. Even by the coldest calculations, the removal of Israel would not alter the basic crisis in the area. For, if there is any lesson which the melancholy events of the last 2 years and more taught us, it is that, though Arab States are generally united in opposition to Israel, their political unities do not rise above this negative position. The basic rivalries within the Arab world, the quarrels over boundaries, the tensions involved in lifting their economies from stagnation, the cross pressures of nationalism—all of these factors would still be there, even if there were no Israel.

The Middle East illustrates the twin heritage of modern nationalism. In one of its aspects it reflects a positive search for political freedom and self-development; in another, it is the residue of distintegration and the destruction of old moorings. The Arab States, though some have had significantly varying lines of development, have all too often used Israel as a scapegoat and anti-Zionism as a policy to divert attention away from the hard tasks of national and regional development, and from special area problems.

One of these problems, that of the Arab refugees, which has lain like a naked sword between Israel and the Arab States, is a matter on which the books cannot be closed and which must be further resolved through negotiation, resettlement, and outside international assistance. But to recognize the problem is quite different from saying that the problem is insoluble short of the destruction of Israel, or only by the unilateral repudiation of the 1949 borders, or must be solved by Israel alone. Israel today stands as an example for all the Middle East, in spotlighting how economic modernization may be spurred and accelerated against high odds, great physical barriers, and constantly growing populations, as well as against all Communist blandishments. The growing influence of the Soviet Union in the Middle East and the further diminution of direct western influence in that area as a whole, we shall in all likelihood have to face as realities. And it is sheer delusion to underestimate the cutting force of Arab nationalism or hope to create puppet regimes or pocket western kingdoms in that area. This would only intensify antiwestern feeling in the Middle East and imperiled western relations with all uncommitted states.

Israel, on the other hand, embodying all the characteristics of a Western democracy and having long passed the threshhold of economic development, shares with the West a tradition of civil liberties, of cultural freedom, of parliamentary democracy, of social mobility. It has been almost untouched by Soviet penetration. Some of the leadership groups in the Arab states also draw inspiration and training from Western sources. But too often in these nations the leadership class is small, its popular roots tenuous, its problems staggering. In too many of the countries of the Middle East the Soviet model holds special attraction, the more so since the United States and its Western allies have not been able to develop more than tentative and often only expedient policies which hardly come to grips with the root causes of political disintegration and economic backwardness. To countries with relatively primitive or top-heavy economies and low industrial capacity, the Russian and even the Chinese passage to modernity in a generation's time inspires confidence and imitation—even as does Egypt's move in less than 10 years from a seemingly subjugated state to at least a strategic power. We now know that Soviet attraction is not grounded on threat or bluster alone, and that there are tensions and a critical restlessness which would exist even if there were not a Communist threat. Communism presents to many in that area the glamor of novelty, the breaking of fresh ground, of seeming to offer a disciplined, coherent, and irresistible answer to the overwhelming problems of economic management and progress.

In this light a simple military response is not adequate. For, apart from bequeathing to the United States latent anti-colonial resentments, military pacts and arms shipments are themselves new divisive forces in an area shot through with national rivalries, without historic frontiers, without, for the most part, skilled classes and political administrators who can pilot new states through the treacherous tides running through the Middle East.

Military pacts provide no long-term solutions. On the contrary, they tend dangerously to polarize the Middle East, to attach us to specific regimes, to isolate us very often from the significant nationalist movements. Little is accomplished by forcing the uncommitted nations to choose rigidly between alliance with the West or submission to international communism. Indeed, it is to our self-interest not to force such a choice in many places, especially if it diverts nations from absorbing their energies in programs of real economic improvement and takeoff. In the Middle East we are moving perilously close to an arms race which, in the long run, will be of benefit to no one. No other area

stands more in need of a real disarmament effort. The real mutual advantages for gradual demilitarization rather than buildup are unequalled. Already we have used the area for a pilot test of the United Nations Emergency Force; and this might well be supplemented by a similar international device to regulate arms traffic.

The contours of the outstanding economic and political issues in the Middle East lend themselves uniquely also to a regional approach. The project-by-project, county-by-country pattern of assistance is particularly ill-adapted in this area. The great river basins of the Middle East are international—the Jordan, the Nile, the Tigris, and the Euphrates. And there are other nations in the West besides the United States which can make important contributions in economic and technical assistance. There has been no lack of pointers toward what a regional policy might include—a multilateral regional development fund for both economic improvement and refugee resettlement, the Jordan River multipurpose scheme, a food pool making imaginative use of our agricultural surpluses, and, as a coordinating agency, a Middle East Development Authority to pool capital and technical aid in that area. This would encourage and provide incentive for realistic and constructive plans and projects, encourage a higher and more diversified level of private investment, and enable Arab leaders to participate in economic planning and administration.

Unfortunately, all these and other plans have so far lacked the active political leadership which can break the paralysis of purpose. Only external Soviet aggression, which is only one danger to the Middle East, has been the subject of high-level policy planning. No greater opportunity exists for the United States than to take the lead in such an effort which could diminish the internal bickering in that tense and troubled area, and bend new energies to new more promising, and more constructive ventures.

Needless to say, such proposals and programs should not be used as veiled techniques for placing new economic sanctions and pressures on Israel. Nor should they detract from our support of Israel's immediate needs. There is no reason why the United States should not conclude at once the $75 million loan promised through the Export-Import Bank, and make it clear that we will not sanction any barrier to free shipping on the Gulf of Aqaba, which is an international waterway. The choice today is not between either the Arab States or Israel. Ways must be found of supporting the legitimate aspirations of each. The United States, whose President was first to recognize the new State of Israel, need have no apologies—indeed should pride itself—for the action it took. But neither should we foreclose any effort which promises a regeneration of a much wider segment of the Middle East.

The Jewish state found its fulfillment during a time when it bore witness, to use the words of Markham, to humanity betrayed, "plundered, profaned, and disinherited."

But it is yet possible that history will record this event as only the prelude to the betterment and therapy—not merely of a strip of land—but of a broad expanse of almost continental dimensions. Whether such a challenge will be seized, cannot be determined by the United States alone. But as we observe tonight the inspiring experience of Israel, we know that we must make the effort—and that we can once again demonstrate that "rain follows the plough."

In his book One Man's America, Allistair Cooke tells the story which well illustrates our point. On the 19th of May 1780, as he describes it, in Hartford, Conn., the skies at noon turned from blue to gray and by midafternoon had blackened so densely that, in that religious age, men fell on their knees and begged a final blessing before the end came. The Connecticut house of representatives was in session. And as some men fell down in the darkened chamber and others clamored for an immediate adjournment, the speaker of the house, one Colonel Davenport, came to his feet, and he silenced the din with these words. "The day of judgment is either approaching or it is not. If it is not, there is no cause for adjournment. If it is, I choose to be found doing my duty. I wish, therefore, that candles may be brought."

Members of B'nai Zion, you who are here gathered tonight deserve thanks, for you have in truth brought candles to illuminate your people's way.

Human Rights Responsibilities in the Field of Government

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES E. MURRAY

OF MONTANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, February 28, 1958

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, on Monday, February 3, the National Conference for Human Rights was held at the Bellevue-Stratford Hotel in Philadelphia. This conference was cosponsored by the Honorable George M. Leader, Governor of Pennsylvania, and Mr. David J. McDonald, president, United Steelworkers of America. This was a momentous milestone in the efforts of our country to meet our problems in the field of human rights.

It was the privilege of those of us who attended the general session Monday afternoon to hear perceptive speeches by three outstanding leaders in the field of government, labor, and management. The speakers were Governor Leader, Mr. David J. McDonald, and Mr. Joseph J. Morrow, personnel director of Pitney-Bowes, Inc.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the text of Governor Leader's speech, entitled "Human Rights Responsibilities in the Field of Government."

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HUMAN RIGHTS RESPONSIBILITIES IN THE FIELD OF GOVERNMENT

(By Hon. George M. Leader, Governor, Commonwealth of Pennsylvania)

Dr. McClusky, reverend clergy, President McDonald, Mr. Morrow, and friends, I saw this film for the second time today and I want to say that the impact on me was just as great as it was the first time I saw it.

I think the steelworkers and all of the writers, the directors and actors, and all the folks who had anything to do with the production of this great film deserve congratulations. I think they have put a series of situations on the table for our consideration, situations which all too often we have attempted to sweep under the rug.

I am honored to welcome this distinguished group to the Commonwealth.

It is appropriate, I think, that this conference for human rights should meet in Pennsylvania, whose tradition of tolerance, of brotherhood, of live-and-let-live, dates back to the time of William Penn.

Represented at the conference are four main groups which between them span a vast part of the American spectrum.

There are the representatives of labor; the spokesmen for business, industry, and farming; the leaders of civic, religious, and educational agencies; and the men and women who work in government.

All of you know the contributions made to human rights by each of these groups. You know what the unions have done to bring about equal rights in employment, and how the statesmen of labor, like David McDonald, have kept the faith. You know how much has been accomplished by enlightened management. You know the contribution made by America's clergy, and by the leaders of our civic and educational groups.

And all of you know how far we have yet to travel.

I have been asked to talk with you today about the responsibilities of Government in this, our combined effort. There seem to be two schools of thought on what that responsibility is.

One school believes that Government can do the major part of what needs to be done. The other believes that you cannot, by Government action, put an end to discrimination, prejudice, and the inequities they produce. The truth, I suspect, lies somewhere in between these two viewpoints.

Let me give you an example. The 15th amendment says that no citizens's right to vote shall be abridged or denied on the ground of race, color, or previous condition of servitude. And it adds that Congress shall have the power to enforce this article by appropriate legislative action.

That amendment was added to our Constitution nearly 90 years ago. Yet it did little or nothing, for many years, to prevent the disenfranchisement of Negro voters in most of the Southern and border States.

Then some 20 or 30 years ago, Negro registration in the South began to increase by leaps and bounds. As of this moment, southern voting rolls admittedly include only a fraction of those Negroes eligible to cast a ballot. But just the same, the increase has been substantial.

My point is that an amendment to the Constitution of the United States was disregarded for decades, and heeded only when public opinion caused it to be heeded. As public opinion grows stronger, as I think it will, Negro voters will undoubtedly increase in numbers.

But remember that the law did only part of the job, and can only do part of the job. The rest must be done by people who respect the law.

Following reconstruction days, American Government did little to protect minority interests until World War II came along. From 1941 on, however, Government has done much. It was in that year that the first Presidential Executive order of its kind was issued. It required that all companies contracting with the Federal Government to manufacture arms and defense materials should employ workers regardless of their race, national origin, or creed.

In all likelihood, this would not have been done voluntarily, notwithstanding the demands of war and defense, unless the President had acted. This was the beginning of Government action in the field of fair-employment practices.

There have been other actions, many other actions.

(a) The civil-service requirements of the Federal Government have resulted in a substantial increase in the number of Negroes holding white collar and supervisory jobs in Federal employment.

(b) The military services have been integrated.

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

(c) Antidiscrimination commissions established by law have been responsible for at least 800 colleges removing questions regarding race, national origin, and religion from their admission form.

(d) The Supreme Court decision outlawing segregation in the public schools had been resisted in many areas, but there has already been a vast improvement toward greater integration in many of our schools throughout the Nation.

(e) Public and public-assisted housing are no longer on a segregated basis, and New York City has just passed the first law outlawing discrimination in private rental housing.

(f) Thirteen States—Pennsylvania among them—have now enacted laws creating FEPC's, or antidiscrimination commissions, with administrative and enforcement powers. And many cities, including Philadelphia, have adopted antidiscrimination measures and empowered administrative units to carry them out.

(g) The recent act of Congress creating a Federal Civil Rights Commission is a tremendously significant thing in itself, even though its scope is limited primarily to voting rights.

And so there is much being done by Government of real importance and value. But discrimination is still very much with us. It doesn't stop north of the Mason-Dixon line. We find it in Maine as well as in Mississippi; in South Dakota as well as in South Carolina.

In varying intensity, it blankets the Nation.

It makes little difference where the Negro lives in the United States, for he cannot change his problem simply by changing his address. In one part of the country his immediate hurdle may be an equal chance at education. In another it may be an equal chance to vote. And in another it may be an equal chance for decent housing, and still another it may be a chance for a decent job.

So this conference must have a knowledge of all the Nation's shortcomings, not simply the shortcomings of a particular area.

I have always thought that we construed civil rights too much in the negative sense. We seem to think of them as protective devices, as defense against the invasion of our individual freedoms, as subjects better left to the courts, to the lawmakers, to the lawyers, and to the due process of the law itself.

But must the individual citizen turn over his conscience to the legislators, to the lawyers, to the courts? If that were true, why would God have given every man a conscience?

A respect for the law is all very well; but it is even more important that we have a respect for the right. Recognizing injustice, it is not enough to hope that the law will some day get around to remedying the evil. There must always be the clear individual duty of opposing injustice.

Take the present situation in the South, where a majority of the voters fear, distrust, and oppose the concept of equality. They are indeed a majority; nobody can argue that point. But they are a majority in the wrong. And they are just as wrong legally as they are wrong by the yardstick of Christian morality.

Should the Southerner who believes in equality be shackled, therefore, by the majority opinion? I say that he should not. Knowing his cause to be just, knowing that he is right, he must stand alone if need be, and make himself heard. It is the easy way out to shrug helplessly and wait for the opposing majority to dissolve.

And so men of good will must do what they can, when they can, and where they can to make their viewpoints known, understood and ultimately accepted.

In the process, they are helping to create the climate of liberty, they are helping to keep this democracy honest.

Judge Learned Hand, one of America's great jurists, has said something very pertinent about this:

"What do we mean when we say that first of all we seek liberty? I often wonder whether we do not rest our hopes too much upon constitutions, upon laws, and upon courts. These are false hopes. * * *

"Liberty lies in the hearts of men and women; when it dies there, no constitution, no law, no court can save it; no constitution, no law, no court can even do much to help it. While it lies there, it needs no constitution, no law, no court to save it."

As Governor of this Commonwealth, I know a good deal about nationality groups. Within our State we have more than three-quarters of a million foreign-born citizens, and another 2 million who are either of foreign or mixed parentage.

I know something about the Pennsylvanians of other ancestry, other religions, other races than my own. For my part, I am a Pennsylvania Dutchman whose ancestors came to America nine generations ago. But I am still a Pennsylvania Dutchman and I pride myself upon it.

My identity as such is only part of my complete identity as an American, of course. But this is equally true of the newly naturalized citizen. He may speak accented English; he may read a newspaper printed in his native language; he may affiliate himself with a group made up of other Americans sprung from the same stock; he may preserve his language, his customs, his inheritance of national culture and folk wisdom.

He may have a darker skin or a different religion. But he is yet as much an American as I am, or anybody else is. The thing that counts is the actuality of citizenship.

American citizenship is given without reservation and without disclaimer. There are no strings attached. No trick clauses are hidden among the fine print. And no one is expected to start out with a fractional degree of citizenship and build it up to the complete whole over a period of years by seniority or bureaucratic endorsement.

By what right, then, do we discriminate? Obviously, by no right; and yet we do.

Recognizing that sad truth, we are attending this conference because we believe that all of us, working together, can help speed the day when discrimination will vanish from America, when the Constitution will be, in fact, what the Constitution was designed to be.

A world in which white people are in the minority watches and listens with critical intentness as we seek, after almost two centuries, to purge this Nation of its inequities. Indeed, a world which yearns for human freedom, for tolerance and brotherhood, will always watch the United States.

At the moment it sees a nation which eloquently professes its belief in equality while, at the same time, it seeks to bridge the yawning gap between profession and performance.

This is what we must change.

In the effort to make our deeds match our words, Government will continue to play its part. Government will continue to act whenever action will help. But in the long run, attitudes are more effective than laws.

The fight for equal rights will not be won until all Americans—regardless of where they live, where their ancestors came from, what God they worship—hold the basic attitudes of tolerance and understanding.

And fundamentally, that entails unremitting effort in our schools and churches, in our homes and places of employment, in our individual hearts and consciences.

"What then is the spirit of liberty?" asked Judge Learned Hand:

"I cannot define it; I can only tell you my own faith. The spirit of liberty is the spirit which is not too sure that it is right; the spirit of liberty is the spirit which seeks to understand the minds of other men and women; the spirit of liberty is the spirit of Him who, near two thousand years ago, taught mankind that lesson it has never learned, but has never quite forgotten, that there may be a kingdom where the least shall be heard and considered side by side with the greatest."

As we gather here, let us resolve that no differences of ancestry, no differences of race, color, or creed, are half so important as that which we share in common: Our belief in liberty, quality, and fraternity as the necessary conditions to an enduring republic.

All of you here today are leaders. You are the people who help mold opinion, who help create the climate in which human rights can thrive.

But whether you represent labor, or business, or industry, or farming; whether you influence your church, your civic, or your educational group; whether you work in government as an elected official or as a career public servant, remember this: No segment of this conference can work effectively alone. We must work together, in unison. We must work continuously and tirelessly if we are to achieve the best results. Otherwise, the progress we make for human rights will be slow and halting and uneven, like the 8-cylinder engine with 3 or 4 cylinders misfiring.

Let us stand together, then, believing that "the conscience and courage of Americans" can create that spirit of libery of which Judge Hand spoke so well; and let us pray that the "conscience and courage of Americans" will safeguard the very liberty they have created.

To this task, then, let us pledge our talents, our consciences, and our efforts, realizing that whatever this conference can accomplish will help armor the Nation more safely in the freedoms we cherish; will bring closer the day when the brotherhood America professes will be no different from the brotherhood we practice.

Distribution of Surplus Commodities

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK E. SMITH
OF MISSISSIPPI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 20, 1958

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include the following resolution adopted by the House of Representatives of the State of Mississippi:

House Concurrent Resolution 123

Concurrent resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States and the United States Department of Agriculture to give thought and study to a plan for the distribution of surplus food commodities in disaster areas through retail grocers rather than by and through the county departments of public welfare and the county governments

Whereas 60 counties of the State of Mississippi have now been declared disaster areas and approval for the distribution of surplus commodities has been given in these areas of Mississippi; and

Whereas the county welfare departments and the county governments have heretofore cooperated in a program for the distribution of surplus food commodities to needy families in the State of Mississippi by accepting said surplus commodities and thereafter storing, caring for and distributing the same at county expense; and

Whereas the large portion of such surplus food commodities are staple commodities such as flour, meal, rice, powdered milk, cheese, and other basic staple commodities, and the distribution of such, as heretofore distributed, has caused serious distress to small retail grocers in that the business of such small retail grocers is largely staple food commodities, and the distribution of same, as heretofore had, reduces the potential of distribution of foods by said retail grocers; and

Whereas the Legislature of the State of Mississippi recognized that the distribution of such surplus food commodities is of great service to needy families within the State of Mississippi, but believes that the same good results could be obtained through some plan of distribution of such commodities through the local retail grocers and would thereby keep leveled off the usual business of distribution of staple commodities by the small retail grocers; and

Whereas the Legislature of the State of Mississippi, after consideration, believes that the problem should be presented to this State's representatives in the Congress of the United States with request that thought and consideration be given by the proper committees framing modes of distribution of surplus food commodities through the United States Department of Agriculture, or other agencies, so that such distribution of such commodities may be made through the channels of retail grocers' trade, rather than through the existing method now provided for such distribution of such surplus food commodities: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives of the State of Mississippi (the State Senate concurring therein), That the representatives of this State in the United States Congress give thought and study to a plan for the distribution of surplus food commodities by the United States Department of Agriculture and allied agencies through retail grocers rather than through the county departments of public welfare and the county governments of the State of Mississippi.

Threat to Textile Industry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HERMAN E. TALMADGE
OF GEORGIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, February 28, 1958

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "A Just Complaint," which originally appeared in the Nashville, Tenn., Banner and was reprinted in the current issuee of Southern Textile News.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A JUST COMPLAINT

America's textile industry—not just the South's, but the Nation's—is imperiled by increasing inroads of Japanese cotton products. Unless its just complaint is heeded by Congress, it faces disaster.

To state that fact, and condemn a policy so detrimental to basic American interest—as it applies particularly to this field—is not to disavow the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act. The Banner has upheld the latter and urged its extension as a practical formula for expanding mutually beneficial world trade.

As originally conceived by the late Cordell Hull, who fathered the program, the reciprocal agreement was reciprocal. Under it a foreign nation would sell to us what they had in abundance, and which we needed, and take their pay in commodities that we had in overabundance and which they needed. Briefly and simply that is its basic theory.

What of Japanese textiles, however? Japan takes United States cotton (which she needs) at a cutrate price, and ships back cotton goods which the United States does not need; products manufactured at wage rates approximately a tenth of those in the United States plants. The cotton is acquired for 7 cents per pound less than American manufacturers have to pay for it. In the American plants, wages, hours of work, minimum age standards, and the cotton prices are all regulated by the Government—and finally, the United States industry is asked to permit this unfair competition.

There are over a thousand cotton mills in the United States, all of them sharply competitive, and they can note proudly that there are no lawsuits pending for antitrust agreements.

The fact is that these Japanese inroads, subsidized by this formidable drain on United States resources—and a basic difference of production costs—are putting the American industry out of business.

No one is suggesting the crippling of Japanese industry. She is free to find her markets where she can. But an ounce of Good economic sense would emphasize that first consideration of America, policywise, is the American interest. That isn't selfishness; it is the natural objection of any industry or people to getting its throat cut.

The United States textile industry does not fear fair competition. It has thrived on that, making millions of jobs. Very properly it opposes unfair competition, created artificially, and subsidized by millions of the tax dollars it has helped supply.—The Nashville Banner.

Negotiation With the Soviets That Accept the Status Quo of Present Communist Conquests Will Increase, Not Decrease, the Likelihood of War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER H. JUDD
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 25, 1958

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Edgar Ansel Mowrer:

ANTISUMMIT SCHOOL PUTS FREEDOM BEFORE PEACE

(By Edgar Ansel Mowrer)

Every right-minded westerner desires a settlement with the Kremlin. It is obvious that the advent of new weapons has made the already urgent need of eliminating war doubly urgent. This is why a majority of the people approached recently by Gallup in 13 western cities were in favor of a summit meeting.

Now obviously, the best way to obtain this would be by an inner transformation of the human individual. The nuclear age demands a different sort of man. But no serious person believes any such transformation can be achieved overnight. Since the need is immediate, statesmen have to do the best they can with the kind of people now on earth. Therefore, they must approach a Soviet appeal for a settlement with extreme caution for past experience with the Kremlin liars is anything but reassuring.

SOVIET CHOICE

Starting with the assumption that both sides today desire a settlement, one may ask what divides the Soviets (and those in the West ready to accept their view) from those westerners like Secretary Dulles who emphatically do not?

An editorialist in the ardently pronegotiation-minded Washington Post recently summed this up succinctly:

Khrushchev's speech in Minsk presents the West with a choice. Are the Allies willing or unwilling to accept the status quo in Europe, or do they intend to continue pressure for Soviet withdrawal?"

This indeed is the issue. Roughly speaking, those who favor immediate negotiations with the U. S. S. R. on almost anything believe the one issue is peace. They may—academically—admit the only obstacle to peace is the Soviet's intention of keeping and spreading their conquests by nonviolent means. Some of them have twinges of conscience when they think of allies like Poles and Czechs being subjected against their will to the monstrous Hitler-like inhumanity of Communist rule.

But in their opinion avoiding a further war is far more important than any insistence upon freedom for Soviet victims. Therefore they are for as much peace as they can get right away and would be happy to accept the status quo as the price for it.

To be sure, they bolster their wish by further arguments about the equality of strength between the United States and the U. S. S. R., about the probability that Russia will fairly soon surpass the United States in productive power and even about the American wickedness in using A-bombs against Japan in World War II. But that is just window dressing.

LIBERATION FIRST

Opponents of immediate negotiations take another idea. They are both ethically and politically opposed to any settlement that does not mean a free and united Germany and the liberation of at least the European captive countries. (Some of them add China.)

Ethically they believe it was monstrous for FDR and Churchill not to do everything they could during World War II to prevent the Soviets from extending their blight over any European countries. To them, doing nothing to save the revolting Hungarians hurts far more than A-bombing Japanese who had treacherously sunk the United States fleet. For they have been trained to put freedom above peace—not the other way around.

Politically, they believe there can be no real peace through a settlement that (a) leaves Germany divided or united and unfree; (b) leaves the East European peoples under the Soviet yoke; and (c) permits the U. S. S. R. to continue to spread subversion and local strife throughout the Middle East. In fact, they believe such a settlement would make world war III more, and not less, probable.

They believe such a settlement on any but our terms to be worse than a continuation of the cold war. For they are convinced the West, once it puts its mind to it, can win the cold war.

Only the other day, Allen Dulles, director of the Central Inteligence Agency, stated publicly that "the U. S. S. R. has a national product of some 40 percent of our own"—not counting that of west Europe. With a little

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

effort the West can outproduce the Communists in all vital weapons and still maintain a high living standard.

Why then accept a settlement that holds in itself the all but certain germs of a future war, when by holding out for another 10 or 20 years, we can drive the U. S. S. R. back into those Asian fastnesses where it obviously belongs?

Here, I suggest, is the gist of the argument on immediate negotiations with the Soviets at the summit or even in the cellars of secret diplomacy.

Warning No. 4

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 24, 1958

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I wish to call to the attention of our colleagues the desperate unemployment situation which has developed in the State of Connecticut and the leadership which Democratic Gov. Abraham A. Ribicoff is exercising. When will our Republican President take seriously the warning signs and the human hardships which exist throughout the country?

The following article is from the New York Herald Tribune of February 9, 1958.

LEGISLATORS TO DISCUSS JOB CUT WITH RIBICOFF

HARTFORD, February 8.—Leaders of the legislature will confer Monday with Gov. Abraham A. Ribicoff to discuss the State's growing unemployment situation and decide whether or not a special session should be called.

The meeting will be held at 9:30 a. m., Monday, at the capitol. During the conference the legislative leaders and the Governor will receive reports on unemployment by the State Labor Department and reports on future employment prospects by the State Development Commission. Top officials of these two agencies have been invited to the conference.

Growing unemployment in Connecticut has become a serious problem in the State, Governor Ribicoff said today. This week, according to the latest reports of the labor department, the so-called hard core of unemployment rose to 64,000. This does not include about 23,000 others temporarily out of work because of plant shutdowns.

HIGHEST SINCE 1949

The number of unemployed in the State at present is the highest since the summer of 1949 when 108,000 persons were out of work.

Also to be filed with the conference on Monday is a slate of recommendations drafted last Thursday by the mayors of 9 Conneticut cities. The mayors' group, which wants a special session of the legislature called, has suggested elimination of the 1-week waiting period before any jobless person becomes eligible for unemployment compensation, extension of the number of weeks compensation may be paid beyond the present 26-week maximum and consideration of increasing the compensation rate above the present $40 a week maximum. The mayors also are asking that State public works projects be speeded up to provide employment and that the Federal Government channel both public works and defense contracts into Connecticut.

The State development commission has been working on a survey of employment prospects in the State and the report will be given to the Governor Monday morning. Officials of the commission recently returned from Washington where they discussed Federal defense contract plans with officials and the State's Members of Congress.

COURSES OF ACTION

If a special session of the legislature is called it is likely it will be asked to consider 2 courses of action: elimination of the 1-week waiting period and extension of the number of weeks for compensation payments.

The labor department reported this week that in the past 52 weeks 22,500 persons exhausted their unemployment compensation benefits before finding new jobs.

Governor Ribicoff has already ordered the State public works and highway departments to speed up their construction projects to provide more employment.

The legislature is controlled by Republicans. Governor Ribicoff is a Democrat.

Student Needs and Responsibilities in American Education

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, February 28, 1958

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, the distinguished young president of the National Student Association, Mr. Ray Farabee, on leave from the University of Texas, recently made a statement here in Washington on Student Needs and Responsibilities in American Education. I think Mr. Farabee's statement deserves the attention of all Members of Congress, and I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STUDENT NEEDS AND RESPONSIBILITIES IN AMERICAN EDUCATION

(A statement prepared by Ray Farabee, president of the U. S. National Student Association, on leave from the University of Texas)

What is the role of the student in this period of widespread concern about American education? First, the student must become the center of a more adequate educational program that better meets his individual needs and the demands of a new age. Second, the student must assume a greater responsibility in his own education. Third, the student and his college must receive support from private and government sources which insure both opportunity and quality of education.

THE STUDENT IS THE CENTER OF EDUCATION

Amid talk and proposals for American education is the student—often a forgotten man, save for criticism of his failure to conform to preconceived concepts of what a student should be. Education suddenly demands the spotlight of attention, unfortunately by shock and crises, rather than leadership or rational conclusion. Let us hope that considerations of education will now go beyond the cliché and convention—that the student and his intellectual development will become the primary concern—and that our development of educational policy will be more than temporary solutions which fail to consider the basic and ongoing problem: the development of our most valuable resource—the human mind.

Technological influences on our society require a greater knowledge of science by all college students. This does not mean that we should abandon our traditional concepts of liberal education in order to mass produce engineers, but it means that our colleges must produce a better educated citizenry for world leadership in the sciences as well as in the humanities.

GREATER STUDENT RESPONSIBILITY

The student must assume a greater responsibility for his own education. American students are willing to meet greater academic demands, if higher standards mean more than increased quantity of memorization or greater doses of spoon-fed facts soon to be forgotten.

The United States National Student Association is sponsoring a series of campus programs across the Nation in order to bring resources of the student population to the solution of certain key problems facing colleges and universities. These include programs to—

1. Stimulate interest in teaching through information programs, student-run counseling services, and greater involvement of the student in the teaching experience.

2. Increase the effectiveness of teaching through student study of teaching methods, teacher evaluation, and student-faculty committees to consider improvement of teachings.

3. Improve the quality of curriculum through student-faculty study of curriculum, recommendations for improvements, and greater involvement of students in educational policymaking.

4. Enlarge counseling and guidance services through a greater use of students.

5. Increase greater equality of educational opportunity through campus human relations activity and conferences of southern student leaders to consider student responsibility in light of recent Supreme Court decisions and racial incidents.

6. Create greater awareness of academic freedom and the purposes of education through the sponsorship of a National Academic Freedom Week, April 20-26.

NEED FOR GREATER PRIVATE AND GOVERNMENT SUPPORT

The student and his college must receive support from community and government which will insure opportunity and quality for higher education.

Rising costs, growing numbers of students, and higher academic standards obviously have direct effects on the student. His ability to financially afford education beyond the high school is lessened. The student's opportunity to attend the college of his choice is diminished. It is harder to stay in college and do satisfactory academic work, especially if one does not have the advantage of a good high-school background, or if one must work part time.

There is an immediate need for a realistic program of Federal scholarships which will indicate that educators and legislators are concerned about the American student rather than the mere production of manpower for an international science competition. Students are not asking for a handout; but, they more than any other segment of the educational community, are aware of the increasing financial barriers to college attendance.

Elected student delegates from 250 colleges across the Nation called for the establishment of a Federal Government sponsored scholarship program at the 10th National Student Congress this past summer at the University of Michigan in a resolution which stated:

"United States National Student Association believes that such a program, if properly established and administered, would aid

greatly in overcoming the financial barriers which now prevent many qualified students from attending college, and would constitute an investment in America's future well-being.

"1. A Federal scholarship program should be adequately large so as to substantially alleviate existing financial barriers to college attendance.

"2. The scholarships should be awarded on a State-quota basis. When determining the number of scholarships to be given, both the number of high-school graduates in the State and the financial status of the State should be considered. The Territories of Hawaii and Alaska as well as the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico will be allotted quotas on the same basis as the States.

"3. The scholarships should be granted to students in all fields on the basis of a single examination, designed to predict success in college. A prerequisite for eligibility shall be a predetermined minimum percentile score on the single national examination. The exams should be distributed to the States by the Federal Government. No person shall be denied the opportunity to take the examination because of race, religion, color, creed, national origin, political belief, or sex.

"4. The amount of the scholarships will be determined for each individual based on his financial need.

"5. Each recipient shall be authorized to use his scholarship at any accredited institution of higher education in the Nation, subject to his admission."

Many of the bills now before Congress are encouraging in their provisions for meeting the needs of students and American higher education. The national executive committee of the United States National Student Association heartily endorsed the $1 billion program recommended by President Eisenhower, though it was felt that 10,000 scholarships a year would not be adequate. The defense-education program sponsored by Senator LISTER HILL and Representative CARL ELLIOTT which provides for 40,000 scholarships per year seems more realistic in light of the estimated 100,000 able high-school graduates each year who do not go to college because of financial reasons.

The United States National Student Association hopes that the 2d session of the 85th Congress shall rise to the challenge of more than immediate necessity and authorize a program of tax-supported aid to education which will provide the leadership to deliver us from present crises and insure future opportunity for able students who cannot afford higher education without financial assistance.

A Salute to Finland

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 24, 1958

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, February 28 will be a celebrated Finnish cultural holiday. I wish to take this opportunity to offer a salute to this brave nation which is the outpost of the West.

The origins of this outstanding cultural heritage are most interesting. In the early 19th century a Finnish doctor, Elias Lonnrat, would wander off from his practice to travel among the common folk, collecting the acient runes or folk lyrics which had been passed from generation to generation by word of mouth for over a thousand years. It began simply as a labor of love, but when the collected work, the Kalevala, was published, it became the outstanding symbol of all Finland.

The Kalevala proved to the Swedish-dominated intelligentsia that there was an original Finnish culture and a literature in the distinct Finnish language. It became and remains the focal point of Finnish nationalism. Coming at a time of deep psychological need when the people had suffered under both the Swedish and Russian yokes, this poetry was a gift straight from heaven, the epic of the Finnish people written in their own language. The Kalevala provides the key to all that is Finnish. It is the mainspring for all Finnish creative activity. It is most fitting that the cultural holiday celebrated on February 28 should be named Kalevala Day.

Today Finland celebrates her proud cultural heritage, a record of outstanding continuous progress. Finland is one of the few countries that never experienced the institution of serfdom; her people have a strong tradition of independence that is reflected in the culture. In the 17th century an adult Finn who could not read often suffered public humiliation in the stocks; nor could anyone be married until he had learned his A B C's. This policy of education enforced by the church resulted in the fact that Finland's time of literacy is counted in centuries. Today with the influence of a modern system of education instituted after independence in 1918, Finland's literacy rate is almost 100 percent, one of the highest in the world. Higher education dates from the founding in 1640 of Helsinki University, which today has an enrollment of 10,000.

Most of the important cultural activities of Finland today can be traced in inspiration to the Kalevala which by now, through additional efforts of collectors, is a huge treasure house of folk literature. In the works of Jean Sibelius, Aleksis Kivi, and J. L. Runeberg, names famous for their contributions to world music and literature, can be traced the motifs of the Kalevala.

But the cultural heritage of Finland does not lie alone in her great names. It lies, as the Kalevala did for so many years, with the common people. Finland celebrates this holiday as a recognition of the cultural achievement of individual citizens. Books, foreign as well as Finnish, enjoy a huge circulation in Finland. There is a thriving legitimate theater fed by over 3,000 amateur theatrical groups. Helsinki boasts a ballet and an opera, as well as sharing symphony orchestras with several cities. Choirs and choral groups are a national activity. The native film industry produces about 20 films per year and imports a large number of others, chiefly from the United States. In the practical arts Finland, with the rest of Scandinavia, has established a worldwide reputation for modern crafts in glass, wood, and stone.

The United States is happy to acknowledge the heights of Finland's achievements and add congratulations on this day of celebration. We feel close ties with this courageous nation. In the period extending from 1893 to 1914 more than 200,000 Finns settled here in this country, enriching our own culture. Unfortunately, today, under our discriminatory immigration policy, the Finnish quota is only 569 annually. We should take immediate action to correct this unenlightened policy.

When Finland became independent in 1918, encouraged by Woodrow Wilson's 14 points, their constitution was modeled partly on the United States Constitution. We in the United States watched breathlessly the unequal struggle between Finland and the U. S. S. R. and cheered the pluck of the smaller country that lost some of its territory but not any of its freedom. Living in the daily shadow of the Soviet world, Finland gives a clear example to the free world of democracy on guard.

Economically, Finland is as proud and independent as it is culturally and politically. In 1919, facing starvation, Finland received aid under the Hoover plan; they continued to repay every cent of that loan. In 1949 the 81st Congress of the United States decided to use the repayments to support a cultural exchange program between the two countries.

Even after World War II and the terrible devastation visited upon Finland by both Germany and Russia, Finland has steadfastly declined to ask for grants-in-aid, choosing instead loans which are being steadily repaid.

We of the United States are proud to claim Finland as a friend and partner in the free-world community. On this day of celebration it is well to again renew those ties of friendship that draw us closer together in this smaller, ideatorn world.

Milwaukee Foremen's Safety School

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, February 28, 1958

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I was pleased to receive an announcement this morning concerning the convening, on March 19, of the largest employee safety training school in the Nation—the Milwaukee Foremen's Safety School.

Last year, more than 300 firms in greater Milwaukee enrolled 10,800 employees for this excellent training course.

The program is, of course, designed as a service in the never-ending battle for human life and welfare.

It is a service to labor, to management, and to the families of every individual involved.

The State of Wisconsin, and Milwaukee in particular, have long had a fine tradition in industrial safety. The school, itself, has been in continuous operation since 1920. Milwaukee, as a community, is the birthplace of the National Safety Movement. In Milwaukee, occupational accidents have been reduced to less than 50 percent of the national level.

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

That has meant a saving, last year, of no less than 57 lives and 6,000 crippling injuries. Had these occurred, there would have been an economic loss of $12 million additional in lost wages, medical costs, and lost production.

But, more important, who can reckon the toll in human happiness which might have been taken had these injuries resulted?

I want to congratulate the Milwaukee Association of Commerce for its inspired leadership in conducting this school. I am sure that 1958's participation and attendance will be the best ever.

I want, in particular, to commend the chairman of the association's industrial safety division, Mr. Joseph Cairnes, who is, incidentally, president of the Milwaukee Braves; Mr. James G. Dickinson, superintendent of accident prevention for the Wisconsin Electric Power Co., who is chairman of the school; and Mr. Clarence J. Muth, manager of the industrial safety division for the association of commerce, itself, who handles the overall program.

I send to the desk a bulletin announcing the various sections of the program and the schedule of events, and ask unanimous consent that its text be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the bulletin was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MILWAUKEE FOREMAN'S SAFETY SCHOOL, 1958—CONDUCTED BY MILWAUKEE ASSOCIATION OF COMMERCE

DEDICATED TO THE CONSERVATION OF HUMAN LIFE

The tragic killing in America each year of 95,000 men, women and children on our streets and highways, in our homes and in the workshops of the Nation can and must be curtailed.

The Milwaukee Foreman's Safety School—in continuous operation since 1920—is dedicated to this objective—the conservation of human life through instruction in the basic principles of safety.

Since twice as many employees are killed and injured away from the job—in homes and in traffic—these same principle must now be applied to the growing "off-the-job" accident problem.

Milwaukee—the birthplace of the national safety movement—is setting a shining example of the effectiveness of safety education through the training annually of more than 10,000 supervisory employees in the fundamentals of accident prevention.

As a result, occupational accidents in metropolitan Milwaukee have been reduced to less than 50 percent of the national level—with a saving last year of 57 lives and 6,000 crippling injuries and an economic saving of $12 million in lost wages, medical costs and lost production.

The Milwaukee Association of Commerce through its industrial safety division welcomes your active participation in this training school—dedicated to the challenging objective of life conservation.

Enrollment last year, 10,800 persons representing 300 business firms in America's largest safety school.

THIRTY-EIGHTH ANNUAL SESSION, MILWAUKEE FOREMEN'S SAFETY SCHOOL, MILWAUKEE AUDITORIUM

Joseph F. Cairnes, president, Milwaukee Braves, chairman, industrial safety division.

James G. Dickinson, superintendent of accident prevention, Wisconsin Electric Power Co., chairman of school.

Clarence J. Muth, manager, industrial safety division, Milwaukee Association of Commerce.

Conducted by industrial safety division, Milwaukee Association of Commerce.

INFORMATION

Purpose: A safety training school for all interested employees of metropolitan Milwaukee industries and mercantile establishments.

Instruction: In the fundamentals of plant and manpower protection, causes, and control of occupational accidents.

Features: Addresses by outstanding safety authorities, films, discussions, and demonstrations.

Schedule: March 19, April 30, May 21, Milwaukee auditorium; 7:45 p. m., eight occupational sections; 8:45 p. m., general assembly.

Enrollment: No registration fee. Employees should be registered in section closest allied to occupation. Advance registrations should be sent by company to industrial safety division, Milwaukee Association of Commerce, 611 North Broadway. Those individuals not previously enrolled before opening of school may register on meeting nights at Milwaukee auditorium, Fifth Street lobby.

Certificates: Will be awarded to those who attended a minimum of 2 of the 3 monthly sessions of the school (including both sectional and general assembly meetings). All attendance cards will be collected at closing sessions.

Reception and ushering committee: Chairman, Robert E. Gess, Employers Mutuals of Wausau; Edward L. Hanley, Wisconsin Society of Professional Engineers; Arnold W. Rosmann, Norris, FitzGerald & Russell Co.

For further information call BR. 3-3000 or write Clarence J. Muth, manager, industrial safety division, Milwaukee Association of Commerce, 611 North Broadway, Milwaukee.

ELECTRICAL AND PLANT MAINTENANCE SECTION

Chairman, Thomas F. Hedglin, General Electric Co., X-ray department.

Vice chairman, Francis T. Murphy, Ladish Co.

The Louis Allis Co., Daniel Harper.

American District Telegraph Co., Lloyd O. Hanson.

Badger Meter Manufacturing Co., George W. Malen.

Downing Box Co., Robert F. Tallmadge.

Hotpoint Co., Phillip W. Kuehn.

Interior Woodwork Co., Rudolph H. Mertin.

George J. Meyer Manufacturing Co., Milton A. Ollmann.

Milwaukee School of Engineering, Harold E. Lowe.

Milwaukee and Suburban Transport Corp., Carl J. Andersen.

Mueller Climatrol, Wm. Smith Malloy.

Pittsburgh Plate Glass Co., Walter A. Kringle.

Ed. Schuster & Co., Inc., Charles E. Billenness.

Square D Co., Russell W. Allman.

Wisconsin Electric Power Co., Peter M. Cartwright.

Wisconsin Telephone Co., Jerome C. Kinville.

(North) Kilbourn Hall

Turn right, first floor. Sectional meetings commence promptly at 7:45 p. m.

1. Wednesday, March 19, 1958: Radiation—Friend and Foe, Howard H. Fawcett, safety engineer, research laboratory, General Electric Co., Schenectady, N. Y.

2. Wednesday, April 30, 1958: Industrial Codes and You, John H. Rouse, commissioner, Wisconsin State Industrial Commission, Madison, Wis.

3. Wednesday, May 21, 1958: Knowing's Not Enough, film, courtesy of United States Steel Corp. (Combined meeting with foundry section and food and beverage section).

FOOD AND BEVERAGE SECTION

Chairman, Franklin A. McVety, the Borden Co.

Vice chairman, Cyril V. McDonald, Froedtert Malt Corp.

Blatz Brewing Co., Gregg R. Meyers.

Blochowiak Dairy Co., George S. Rydzewski.

Continental Baking Co., George Prusynski.

Patrick Cudahy Co., Norbert R. Sherman.

Dairyland Cooperative Association, Hilmer F. Uttech.

Independent Milwaukee Brewery, William O. Schwan.

Miller Brewing Co., J. Lloyd Cantrell.

National Food Stores, Inc., Thomas C. Prohaska.

Pabst Brewing Co., William R. Forrestal.

Plankinton Packing Co., Eugene K. Winter.

Joseph Schlitz Brewing Co., Edward J. Steinkellner.

Sperry Candy Co., Frank P. Lenske.

Fred Usinger, Inc., Carl Usinger.

(South) Kilbourn Hall

Turn right, first floor. Sectional meetings commence promptly at 7:45 p. m.

1. Wednesday, March 19, 1958: Practice Safety First—at Home, Miss Margaret Wiesner, registered nurse, Milwaukee Sentinel, Milwaukee, Wis.

2. Wednesday, April 30, 1958: Back the Attack—at Work, Walter A. Weisleder, Wisconsin district manager, Liberty Mutual Insurance Co., Milwaukee, Wis.

3. Wednesday, May 21, 1958: Knowing's Not Enough, film, courtesy of United States Steel Corp. (Combined meeting with foundry section and electrical and plant maintenance section).

FOUNDRY SECTION

Chairman, Richard D. Lutz, the Falk Corp.

Vice chairman, Ralph J. Fiskow, Chain Belt Co.

American Optical Co., Arthur W. Nero.

Ampco Metal, Inc., Robert R. Tews.

Crucible Steel Casting Co., Ralph C. Steinmeyer.

Employers Mutuals of Wausau, Leroy S. Talbot.

Grede Foundries, Inc., S. Water Division, Alvin S. Nadolski.

Koehring Co., Bernard M. Schubert.

Maynard Electric Steel Casting Co., Leonard L. Bartell.

Motor Castings Co., Donald R. Tenley.

Nordberg Mfg. Co., Donald F. Possell.

Sivyer Steel Casting Co., Leo S. Nogalski.

Universal-Rundle Corp., Edward J. Schroedter.

Universal Safety Equipment Co., Thad J. Starszak.

Vilter Mfg. Co., Donald J. Baird.

Wehr Steel Co., Eugene C. Huebner.

Walker Hall

Turn right, first floor. Sectional meetings commence promptly at 7:45 p. m.

1. Wednesday, March 19, 1958: It's Happened—Now What? Gordon Lemke, research engineer, home accident prevention, Employers Mutuals of Wausau, Wausau, Wis.

2. Wednesday, April 30, 1958: Who's Going To Do It? Arthur Agostini, plant manager, south water division, Grede Foundries, Inc., Milwaukee, Wis.

3. Wednesday, May 21, 1958: Knowing's Not Enough, film, courtesy of U. S. Steel Corp. (combined meeting with electrical and plant maintenance section and food and beverage section.)

MILWAUKEE FOREMEN'S SAFETY SCHOOL, GENERAL ASSEMBLY, BRUCE HALL, MILWAUKEE AUDITORIUM

1. Wednesday, March 19, 1958: Selling Safety—It's Your Job, Gene Flack, New York

City, N. Y. "Sunshine Gene"—known from coast to coast as one of the most dynamic speakers in America—presenting a powerful, dramatic message as the lead-off speaker of our school. Presented through courtesy of Sunshine Biscuits, Inc., New York; Allis-Chalmers orchestra and ensemble; director, Leroy Vick; manager, Henry A. Mielcarek.

2. Wednesday, April 30, 1958: Safety Is a Way of Life, Dr. Carl S. Winters, Oak Park, Ill. World traveler—former crime commissioner of Michigan, current skid-row chairman of Chicago—two-fisted, hard-hitting, he-man with a double barreled challenge for action. Presented through courtesy of General Motors Corp., Detroit; Johnson Wax Men's Glee Club, Racine, director—Frederick Schulte; Milwaukee Police Band, Director, Dr. R. O. Brunkhorst.

3. Wednesday, May 21, 1958, special graduation program: Human Life at Stake, Hon. R. G. Knutson, chairman, Industrial Commission of Wisconsin, Madison, Wis.

Honorary 25-year awards to be presented to those enrollees who have actively participated in the school during the past quarter century. Lester S. Olsen, president, Milwaukee Association of Commerce.

Cutler-Hammer Band: Director, Arthur F. Gehrke; manager, Elmer F. Lewitz.

Hotpoint Choristers, Chicago. Director, John T. Engstrom.

An enchanting half-hour musical treat on the graduation night of America's largest safety school.

MACHINE SHOP SECTION

(Including erectors and assemblers of machinery)

Chairman, Wilbur J. Berard, Koehring Co.

Vice chairman, John R. Joerg, Harley-Davidson Motor Co.

A-C Spark Plug division, General Motors Corp., Edward P. Ebert.

Blackhawk Manufacturing Co., Albert C. Stevens.

Bradley Washfountain Co., Rudolph L. Tank.

Briggs & Stratton Corp., Anthony T. Dirksmeyer.

Caterpillar Tractor Co., R. H. Hennarichs.

Evinrude Motors, Lester C. Bloedorn.

Kearney & Trecker Corp., Edward D. O'Keef.

The Oilgear Co., Ralph L. Hansen.

Perlick Brass Co., Howard H. Perlick.

Smith Engineering Works, Kenneth J. Bowen.

The T. L. Smith Co., Kent M. Quantius.

Unit Crane & Shovel Corp., Frank J. Glisch.

Plankinton Hall

Turn right, second floor. Sectional meetings commence promptly at 7:45 p. m.

1. Wednesday, March 19, 1958: The Human Element, Joseph J. Banach, safety manager, Ansul Chemical Co., Marinette, Wis.

2. Wednesday, April 30, 1958: Sputniks and You, Carl Graeber, professional engineer, Milwaukee, Wis.

3. Wednesday, May 21, 1958: Fate in '58, Les J. Mangin, personnel director, Manitowoc Shipbuilding, Inc., Manitowoc, Wis.

MANAGEMENT AND SUPERVISORY SECTION

Chairman, James G. Reilly, Cutler-Hammer, Inc.

Vice chairman, Philip W. Behling, Pittsburgh Plate Glass Co.

A-C Spark Plug division, General Motors Corp., Dorr C. Snoyenbos.

Allen-Bradley Co., Murdoch G. Pryor.

Allis-Chalmers Manufacturing Co., W. C. Van Cleaf.

American Motors Corp., Robert P. Lang.

Bucyrus-Erie Co., Henry W. Fels.

Harnischfeger Corp., Robert O. Losse.

International Harvester Co., Jean G. Dapp.

Plankinton Packing Co., Walter E. Meyer.

Western Union Telegraph Co., Raymond H. Underwood.

(An advanced section in which attendance is limited to supervisory employees selected by each company—enrollment not to exceed 10 percent of company registration.)

Engelmann Hall

Turn right, second floor. Sectional meetings commence promptly at 7:45 p. m.

1. Wednesday, March 19, 1958: Safety Leadership Milwaukee Wide, Chief Howard O. Johnson, Milwaukee Police Department, Milwaukee, Wis.

2. Wednesday, April 30, 1958: Safety Leadership—In Modern Management, F. S. Cornell, executive vice president, A. O. Smith Corp., Milwaukee, Wis.

3. Wednesday, May 21, 1958: Safety Leadership in Multiplant Operations, Joseph A. Anderson, general manager, A-C Spark Plug division, General Motors Corp., Flint, Mich.

MATERIAL HANDLING AND TRANSPORTATION SECTION

Chairman, Clarence R. Seybold, Smith Engineering Works.

Vice chairman, Fred J. Ladwig, the Milwaukee Road.

American Can Co., Harold L. Rahn.

Chicago & North Western Railway Co., Carl A. Stark.

Cleaver-Brooks Co., William T. McGarry.

Globe-Union, Inc., Robert W. Schindler.

Harnischfeger Corp., Frederick C. Krieger.

Chas. A. Krause Milling Co., Walter D. Hooks.

Milsco Manufacturing Co., Rudolph E. Vetter.

Milwaukee Gas Light Co., Warren E. Fuhrman.

Northern Refrigerator Line, Inc., Norman J. Orlinski.

Northwestern-Hanna Fuel Co., Ray W. Rodgers.

Pfister & Vogel Tanning Co., Byron C. Goodman.

A. O. Smith Corp., Fred J. Salmon.

Socony Mobil Oil Co., Carl J. Mertins.

Union Refrigerator Transit Lines, Albert R. Erdmann.

Wauwatosa Fuel & Supply Co., Richard F. Kuether.

Wisconsin Ice & Coal Co., Jacob J. Makutz.

Woerfel Corp., Nick Doka.

Wrought Washer Manufacturing Co., Albert Cee.

Juneau Hall

Turn right, first floor. Sectional meetings commence promptly at 7:45 p. m.

1. Wednesday, March 19, 1958: What's on Your Mind? Dr. James Rohrer, consulting psychologist, Rohrer, Hibler & Replogle, Milwaukee, Wis.

2. Wednesday, April 30, 1958: Make Safety Your Satellite, M. J. McCarthy, safety consultant, Columbus McKinnon Chain Corp., Tonawanda, N. Y.

3. Wednesday, May 21, 1958: Safe-T-Formation, Dr. Howard Wilson, assistant director, management center, Marquette University, Milwaukee, Wis.

METAL TRADES SECTION

(Stamping, forging, welding, fabrication)

Chairman, E. Clark Woodward, A. O. Smith Corp.

Vice chairman, Joseph E. Carone, Pressed Steel Tank Co.

American Motors Corp., Edward Haverberg.

Babcock & Wilcox Co., Lee J. Hinyta.

Dings Magnetic Separator Co., Harry N. Wold.

Geuder, Paeschke & Frey Co., Chester J. Ziolkowski.

The Heil Co., Charles A. Baumann.

Inland Steel Products Co., Curtis B. Gallenbeck.

Interstate Drop Forge Co., Russell F. Lauer.

Ladish Co., George P. Dunn.

Lakeside Bridge & Steel Co., Eldridge W. Kieber.

A. J. Lindemann & Hoverson Co., Paul J. Dzierski.

Master Lock Co., Robert A. Kreilkamp.

Perfex Corp., Cornelius J. Kallas.

Reinke & Schomann, Inc., William Schomann.

Unit Drop Forge, division of Fuller Manufacturing Co., John Kavanaugh.

E. R. Wagner Manufacturing Co., William H. Horder.

Wisconsin Bridge & Iron Co., Herman J. Peters.

Market Hall

Turn right, downstairs. Sectional meetings commence promptly at 7:45 p. m.

1. Wednesday, March 19, 1958: Sight Security, Milton M. Bowman, safety coordinator, city of Cleveland, Ohio.

2. Wednesday, April 30, 1958: Teach Your Child To Be Safe, E. Clark Woodward, director of safety, A. O. Smith Corp., Milwaukee, Wis.

3. Wednesday, May 21, 1958: Anxiety and Frustration as Causes of Accidents, Dr. Paul J. Mundie, Humber, Mundie & McClary, Milwaukee, Wis.

ALL TRADES (MISCELLANEOUS) SECTION

(This section is intended for all trade groups not included in previous classifications)

Chairman, Herbert H. Koepke, Johnson Service Co.

Vice chairman, Edward G. Goldbeck, Milwaukee Solvay Coke Co.

Max Branovan Shoe Co., Max Branovan.

Cornell Paperboard Products Co., Henry Kvintus.

Evert Container Corp., Robert T. Wolter.

A. F. Gallun & Sons Corp., William R. Fritze.

Gaylord Container Corp., George W. Heckle.

M. A. Gerett Corp., Norman R. Will.

J. J. Jones Co., Chester C. Link.

Lakeside Laboratories, Inc., Albert A. Pickering.

Merchants Police, Inc., Edward R. Swanson.

Milwaukee Vocational School, George W. Farndale.

Northwestern Mutual Life Insurance Co., Richard A. Bergemann.

Nunn-Bush Shoe Co., Elmer E. Rexin.

John Oster Manufacturing Co., Harold J. Maury.

Weyenberg Shoe Manufacturing Co., Robert W. Nelson.

Bruce Hall

Milwaukee Auditorium. Sectional meetings commence promptly at 7:45 p. m.

1. Wednesday, March 19, 1958: Facts, Figures, and Frustrations. Thomas J. Cleland, director, industrial relations, National Paperboard Association, Chicago, Ill. (Sponsored by Cornell Paperboard Products Co.)

2. Wednesday, April 30, 1958: What's Your Hurry? Raymond A. Dahl, deputy inspector; director, police training school, Milwaukee Police Department, Milwaukee, Wis.

3. Wednesday, May 21, 1958: Are You Safe at Home? Mrs. Arno R. (Marie) Fischer, volunteer worker, American Red Cross, Milwaukee, Wis.

MILWAUKEE FOREMEN'S SAFETY SCHOOL PROGRAM ADVISORY COMMITTEE

IMMEDIATE PAST CHAIRMAN, INDUSTRIAL SAFETY DIVISION

1954–57: John H. Kopmeier, president, Wisconsin Ice & Coal Co.

PAST CHAIRMEN OF SCHOOL

1955–56: Michael F. Biancardi, Allis-Chalmers Manufacturing Co.

1953–54: Erwin C. Brenner, Milwaukee Gas Light Co.

1950–52: Myron E. Jolidon, Standard Oil Co.

1948–49: Arnold O. Olson, Wisconsin Motor Corp.

All sessions begin promptly at 7:45 p. m.

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

Certificates will be awarded at close of school only to those enrollees who attend a minimum of 2 of the 3 monthly sessions.

Honorary 25-year awards to be presented at closing session on May 21 to those who have actively participated in the school during the past 25 years. Qualifications must be cleared through and authorized by the personnel and safety director of your company.

MILWAUKEE ASSOCIATION OF COMMERCE

President: Lester S. Olsen, Olsen Publishing Co.

Executive vice president: Ray H. Weisbrod.

INDUSTRIAL SAFETY DIVISION OPERATING COMMITTEE

Chairman of division: Joseph F. Cairnes, Milwaukee Braves.

Chairman of school: James G. Dickinson, Wisconsin Electric Power Co.

Philip W. Behling, Pittsburgh Plate Glass Co.

Wilbur J. Berard, Koehring Co.

Michael F. Biancardi, Allis-Chalmers Manufacturing Co.

Erwin C. Brenner, Milwaukee Gas Light Co.

Joseph E. Carone, Pressed Steel Tank Co.

Jean G. Dapp, International Harvester Co.

Henry W. Fels, Bucyrus-Erie Co.

Ralph J. Fiskow, Chain Belt Co.

Robert E. Gess, Employers Mutuals of Wausau.

Edward G. Goldbeck, Milwaukee Solvay Coke Co.

Edward L. Hanley, Wisconsin Society of Professional Engineers.

Edward Haverberg, American Motors Corp.

Thomas F. Hedglin, General Electric Co., X-ray Dept.

John R. Joerg, Harley-Davidson Motor Co.

Myron E. Jolidon, Standard Oil Co.

Herbert H. Koepke, Johnson Service Co.

John H. Kopmeier, Wisconsin Ice & Coal Co.

Fred J. Ladwig, The Milwaukee Road.

Richard D. Lutz, The Falk Corp.

Cyril V. McDonald, Froedtert Malt Corp.

William T. McGarry, Cleaver-Brooks Co.

Franklin A. McVety, The Borden Co.

Walter E. Meyer, Plankinton Packing Co.

Francis T. Murphy, Ladish Co.

Arnold O. Olson, Wisconsin Motor Corp.

Donald F. Possell, Nordberg Manufacturing Co.

Murdoch G. Pryor, Allen-Bradley Co.

James G. Reilly, Cutler-Hammer, Inc.

Arnold W. Rosmann, Norris, FitzGerald & Russell.

Clarence R. Seybold, Smith Engineering Works.

Dorr C. Snoyenbos, A-C spark Plug division, General Motors Corp.

E. Clark Woodward, A. O. Smith Corp.

Clarence J. Muth, manager, industrial safety division, Milwaukee Association of Commerce, 611 North Broadway, Milwaukee.

CHANGE OF RESIDENCE

Senators, Representatives, and Delegates who have changed their residences will please give information thereof to the Government Printing Office, that their addresses may be correctly given in the RECORD.

PRICE OF THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

The Public Printer is authorized to furnish to subscribers the daily RECORD at $1.50 per month, payable in advance.

Remit by money order payable to Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D. C.

LAWS AND RULES FOR PUBLICATION OF THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

CODE OF LAWS OF THE UNITED STATES

TITLE 44, SECTION 181. CONGRESSIONAL RECORD; ARRANGEMENT, STYLE, CONTENTS, AND INDEXES.—The Joint Committee on Printing shall have control of the arrangement and style of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and while providing that it shall be substantially a verbatim report of proceedings shall take all needed action for the reduction of unnecessary bulk, and shall provide for the publication of an index of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD semimonthly during the sessions of Congress and at the close thereof. (Jan. 12, 1895, c. 23, § 13, 28 Stat. 603.)

TITLE 44, SECTION 182b. SAME; ILLUSTRATIONS, MAPS, DIAGRAMS.—No maps, diagrams, or illustrations may be inserted in the RECORD without the approval of the Joint Committee on Printing. (June 20, 1936, c. 630, § 2, 49 Stat. 1546.)

Pursuant to the foregoing statute and in order to provide for the prompt publication and delivery of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the Joint Committee on Printing has adopted the following rules, to which the attention of Senators, Representatives, and Delegates is respectfully invited:

1. *Arrangement of the daily Record.*—The Public Printer will arrange the contents of the daily RECORD as follows: First, the Senate proceedings; second, the House proceedings; third, the Appendix: *Provided*, That when the proceedings of the Senate are not received in time to follow this arrangement, the Public Printer may begin the RECORD with the House proceedings. The proceedings of each House and the Appendix shall each begin a new page, with appropriate headings centered thereon.

2. *Type and style.*—The Public Printer shall print the report of the proceedings and debates of the Senate and House of Representatives, as furnished by the Official Reporters of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, in 7½-point type; and all matter included in the remarks or speeches of Members of Congress, other than their own words, and all reports, documents, and other matter authorized to be inserted in the RECORD shall be printed in 6½-point type; and all rollcalls shall be printed in 6-point type. No italic or black type nor words in capitals or small capitals shall be used for emphasis or prominence; nor will unusual indentions be permitted. These restrictions do not apply to the printing of or quotations from historical, official, or legal documents or papers of which a literal reproduction is necessary.

3. *Return of manuscript.*—When manuscript is submitted to Members for revision it should be returned to the Government Printing Office not later than 9 o'clock p. m. in order to insure publication in the RECORD issued on the following morning; and if all of said manuscript is not furnished at the time specified, the Public Printer is authorized to withhold it from the RECORD for 1 day. In no case will a speech be printed in the RECORD of the day of its delivery if the manuscript is furnished later than 12 o'clock midnight.

4. *Tabular matter.*—The manuscript of speeches containing tabular statements to be published in the RECORD shall be in the hands of the Public Printer not later than 7 o'clock p. m., to insure publication the following morning.

5. *Proof furnished.*—Proofs of "leave to print" and advance speeches will not be furnished the day the manuscript is received but will be submitted the following day, whenever possible to do so without causing delay in the publication of the regular proceedings of Congress. Advance speeches shall be set in the RECORD style of type, and not more than six sets of proofs may be furnished to Members without charge.

6. *Notation of withheld remarks.*—If manuscript or proofs have not been returned in time for publication in the proceedings, the Public Printer will insert the words "Mr. ——— addressed the Senate (House or Committee). His remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix," and proceed with the printing of the RECORD.

7. *Thirty-day limit.*—The Public Printer shall not publish in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD any speech or extension of remarks which has been withheld for a period exceeding 30 calendar days from the date when its printing was authorized: *Provided*, That at the expiration of each session of Congress the time limit herein fixed shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee.

8. *Corrections.*—The permanent RECORD is made up for printing and binding 30 days after each daily publication is issued; therefore all corrections must be sent to the Public Printer within that time: *Provided*, That upon the final adjournment of each session of Congress the time limit shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee: *Provided further*, That no Member of Congress shall be entitled to make more than one revision. Any revision shall consist only of corrections of the original copy and shall not include deletions of correct material, substitutions for correct material, or additions of new subject matter.

9. The Public Printer shall not publish in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the full report or print of any committee or subcommittee when said report or print has been previously printed. This rule shall not be construed to apply to conference reports.

10. *Appendix to daily Record.*—When either House has granted leave to print (1) a speech not delivered in either House, (2) a newspaper or magazine article, or (3) any other matter not germane to the proceedings, the same shall be published in the Appendix except in cases of duplication. In such cases only the first item received in the Government Printing Office will be printed. This rule shall not apply to quotations which form part of a speech of a Member, or to an authorized extension of his own remarks: *Provided*, That no address, speech, or article delivered or released subsequently to the final adjournment of a session of Congress may be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

11. *Estimate of cost.*—No extraneous matter in excess of two pages in any one instance may be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD by a Member under leave to print or to extend his remarks unless the manuscript is accompanied by an estimate in writing from the Public Printer of the probable cost of publishing the same, which estimate of cost must be announced by the Member when such leave is requested; but this rule shall not apply to excerpts from letters, telegrams, or articles presented in connection with a speech delivered in the course of debate or to communications from State legislatures, addresses or articles by the President and the members of his Cabinet, the Vice President, or a Member of Congress. For the purposes of this regulation, any one article printed in two or more parts, with or without individual headings, shall be considered as a single extension and the two-page rule shall apply. The Public Printer or the Official Reporters of the House or Senate shall return to the Member of the respective House any matter submitted for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD which is in contravention of this paragraph.

12. *Official Reporters.*—The Official Reporters of each House shall indicate on the manuscript and prepare headings for all matter to be printed in the Appendix, and shall make suitable reference thereto at the proper place in the proceedings.

SENATORS WITH RESIDENCES IN WASHINGTON

OFFICE ADDRESS: Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.

[Streets northwest unless otherwise stated]

Vice President, Richard Nixon

Aiken, George D., *Vt*.....Carroll Arms
Allott, Gordon, *Colo*.....Cleveland House
Anderson, Clinton P., *N. Mex.*, 6 Wesley Circle
Barrett, Frank A., *Wyo*.....The Woodner
Beall, J. Glenn, *Md*.....
Bennett, Wallace F., *Utah*...
Bible, Alan, *Nev*.....
Bricker, John W., *Ohio*.....The Mayflower
Bridges, Styles, *N. H*.....
Bush, Prescott, *Conn*.....
Butler, John Marshall, *Md*..
Byrd, Harry Flood, *Va*.....The Shoreham
Capehart, Homer E., *Ind*.....The Westchester
Carlson, Frank, *Kans*.....Sheraton-Park
Carroll, John A., *Colo*.....
Case, Clifford P., *N. J*.....
Case, Francis, *S. Dak*.....4635 Mass. Ave.
Chavez, Dennis, *N. Mex*.....3327 Cleveland Ave.
Church, Frank, *Idaho*.....
Clark, Joseph S., *Pa*.....
Cooper, John Sherman, *Ky*..
Cotton, Norris, *N. H*.....
Curtis, Carl T., *Nebr*.....
Dirksen, Everett M., *Ill*.....
Douglas, Paul H., *Ill*.....
Dworshak, Henry C., *Idaho*..
Eastland, James O., *Miss*.....5101 Macomb St.
Ellender, Allen J., *La*.....
Ervin, Samuel J., Jr., *N. C*...
Flanders, Ralph E., *Vt*.....
Frear, J. Allen, Jr., *Del*.....
Fulbright, J. William, *Ark*..
Goldwater, Barry M., *Ariz*...
Gore, Albert, *Tenn*.....
Green, Theodore Francis, *R. I.*, University Club
Hayden, Carl, *Ariz*.....
Hennings, Thomas C., Jr., *Mo.*
Hickenlooper, Bourke B., *Iowa*, 5511 Cedar Parkway, Chevy Chase, Md.
Hill, Lister, *Ala*.....
Hoblitzell, John D., Jr., *W. Va*.....
Holland, Spessard L., *Fla*...Sheraton-Park
Hruska, Roman L., *Nebr*....
Humphrey, Hubert H., *Minn.*
Ives, Irving M., *N. Y*.....
Jackson, Henry M., *Wash*...
Javits, Jacob K., *N. Y*.....
Jenner, William E., *Ind*.....
Johnson, Lyndon B., *Tex*....
Johnston, Olin D., *S. C*.....
Kefauver, Estes, *Tenn*.....4929 Hillbrook Lane
Kennedy, John F., *Mass*.....
Kerr, Robert S., *Okla*.....
Knowland, William F., *Calif.*
Kuchel, Thomas H., *Calif*...
Langer, William, *N. Dak*....2101 Conn. Ave.
Lausche, Frank J., *Ohio*.....
Long, Russell B., *La*.....
McClellan, John L., *Ark*....
McNamara, Pat, *Mich*.....
Magnuson, Warren G., *Wash.*, The Shoreham
Malone, George W., *Nev*.....The Mayflower
Mansfield, Mike, *Mont*.....
Martin, Edward, *Pa*.....
Martin, Thos. E., *Iowa*.....4545 Conn. Ave.
Monroney, A. S. Mike, *Okla.*
Morse, Wayne, *Oreg*.....5020 Lowell St.
Morton, Thruston B., *Ky*....
Mundt, Karl E., *S. Dak*.....122 Schotts Court NE.
Murray, James E., *Mont*....The Shoreham
Neuberger, Richard L., *Oreg.*
O'Mahoney, Joseph C., *Wyo.*, Sheraton-Park
Pastore, John O., *R. I*.....
Payne, Frederick G., *Maine*..
Potter, Charles E., *Mich*....
Proxmire, William E., *Wis*...
Purtell, William A., *Conn*...
Revercomb, Chapman, *W. Va.*
Robertson, A. Willis, *Va*....
Russell, Richard B., *Ga*.....
Saltonstall, Leverett, *Mass*..2320 Tracy Pl.
Schoeppel, Andrew F., *Kans.*
Scott, W. Kerr, *N. C*.....
Smathers, George A., *Fla*...
Smith, H. Alexander, *N. J*...Sheraton-Park
Smith, Margaret Chase, (Mrs.), *Maine.*
Sparkman, John J., *Ala*.....4928 Indian Lane
Stennis, John, *Miss*.....
Symington, Stuart, *Mo*.....
Talmadge, Herman E., *Ga*....
Thurmond, Strom, *S. C*.....
Thye, Edward J., *Minn*.....
Watkins, Arthur V., *Utah*...
Wiley, Alexander, *Wis*.....2122 Mass. Ave.
Williams, John J., *Del*.....
Yarborough, Ralph W., *Tex*..
Young, Milton R., *N. Dak*...Quebec House So.

OFFICERS OF THE SENATE

Secretary—Felton M. Johnston.
Chief Clerk—Emery L. Frazier.
Sergeant at Arms—Joseph C. Duke.
Secretary for the Majority—Robert G. Baker.
Secretary for the Minority—J. Mark Trice.
Chaplain—Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D.

STANDING COMMITTEES OF THE SENATE

Committee on Agriculture and Forestry

Messrs. Ellender (chairman), Johnston of South Carolina, Holland, Eastland, Humphrey, Scott, Symington, Talmadge, Aiken, Young, Thye, Hickenlooper, Mundt, Williams, and Schoeppel.

Committee on Appropriations

Messrs. Hayden (chairman), Russell, Chavez, Ellender, Hill, McClellan, Robertson, Magnuson, Holland, Stennis, Johnson of Texas, Pastore, Bridges, Saltonstall, Young, Knowland, Thye, Mundt, Mrs. Smith of Maine, Messrs. Dworshak, Dirksen, Potter, and Ives.

Committee on Armed Services

Messrs. Russell (chairman), Byrd, Johnson of Texas, Kefauver, Stennis, Symington, Jackson, Ervin, Saltonstall, Bridges, Flanders, Mrs. Smith of Maine, Messrs. Case of South Dakota, Bush, and Barrett.

Committee on Banking and Currency

Messrs. Fulbright (chairman), Robertson, Sparkman, Frear, Douglas, Monroney, Clark, Proxmire, Capehart, Bricker, Bennett, Bush, Beall, Payne, and Case of New Jersey.

Committee on the District of Columbia

Messrs. Bible (chairman), Morse, Frear, Clark, Proxmire, Beall, Morton, Javits, and Hoblitzell.

Committee on Finance

Messrs. Byrd (chairman), Kerr, Frear, Long, Smathers, Anderson, Douglas, Gore, Martin of Pennsylvania, Williams, Flanders, Malone, Carlson, Bennett, and Jenner.

Committee on Foreign Relations

Messrs. Green (chairman), Fulbright, Sparkman, Humphrey, Mansfield, Morse, Long, Kennedy, Wiley, Smith of New Jersey, Hickenlooper, Langer, Knowland, Aiken, and Capehart.

Committee on Government Operations

Messrs. McClellan (chairman), Jackson, Symington, Ervin, Humphrey, Thurmond, Lausche, Mundt, Mrs. Smith of Maine, Messrs. Martin of Iowa, Curtis, Revercomb, and Capehart.

Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs

Messrs. Murray (chairman), Anderson, Jackson, O'Mahoney, Bible, Neuberger, Carroll, Church, Malone, Watkins, Dworshak, Kuchel, Barrett, Goldwater, and Allott.

Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce

Messrs. Magnuson (chairman), Pastore, Monroney, Smathers, Bible, Thurmond, Lausche, Yarborough, Bricker, Schoeppel, Butler, Potter, Purtell, Payne, and Cotton.

Committee on the Judiciary

Messrs. Eastland (chairman), Kefauver, Johnston of South Carolina, Hennings, McClellan, O'Mahoney, Ervin, Carroll, Wiley, Langer, Jenner, Watkins, Dirksen, Butler, and Hruska.

Committee on Labor and Public Welfare

Messrs. Hill (chairman), Murray, Kennedy, McNamara, Morse, Thurmond, Yarborough, Smith of New Jersey, Ives, Purtell, Goldwater, Allott, and Cooper.

Committee on Post Office and Civil Service

Messrs. Johnston of South Carolina (chairman), Monroney, Scott, Neuberger, Church, Yarborough, Proxmire, Carlson, Jenner, Langer, Martin of Iowa, Morton, and Hoblitzell.

Committee on Public Works

Messrs. Chavez (chairman), Kerr, Gore, McNamara, Neuberger, Scott, ———, Martin of Pennsylvania, Case of South Dakota, Kuchel, Cotton, Hruska, and Revercomb.

Committee on Rules and Administration

Messrs. Hennings (chairman), Hayden, Green, Mansfield, Talmadge, Curtis, Cooper, Javits, and Case of New Jersey.

UNITED STATES SUPREME COURT

Mr. Chief Justice Warren, of California, Hotel Sheraton-Park, Washington, D. C.
Mr. Justice Black, of Alabama, 619 S. Lee St., Alexandria, Va.
Mr. Justice Frankfurter, of Massachusetts, 3018 Dumbarton Ave.
Mr. Justice Douglas, of Washington, 4852 Hutchins Place.
Mr. Justice Burton, of Ohio, the Dodge.
Mr. Justice Clark, of Texas, 2101 Connecticut Ave.
Mr. Justice Harlan, of New York, 1677 31st St.
Mr. Justice Brennan, of New Jersey, 3037 Dumbarton Ave.
Mr. Justice Whittaker, of Missouri, 6920 32d St.

OFFICERS OF THE SUPREME COURT

Clerk—John T. Fey, 2931 Cathedral Ave.
Deputy Clerk—Edmund P. Cullinan, 4823 Reservoir Road.
Deputy Clerk—Richard J. Blanchard, 427 St. Lawrence Drive, Silver Spring, Md.
Marshal—T. Perry Lippitt, 6004 Corbin Road.
Reporter—Walter Wyatt, 1702 Kalmia Rd.
Librarian—Helen Newman, 126 3d St. SE.

UNITED STATES JUDICIAL CIRCUITS

JUSTICES ASSIGNED

TERRITORY EMBRACED

District of Columbia: Mr. Chief Justice Warren. District of Columbia.

First judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Frankfurter. Maine, Massachusetts, New Hampshire, Puerto Rico, Rhode Island.

Second judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Harlan. Connecticut, New York, Vermont.

Third judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Brennan. Delaware, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Virgin Islands.

Fourth judicial circuit: Mr. Chief Justice Warren. Maryland, North Carolina, South Carolina, Virginia, West Virginia.

Fifth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Black. Alabama, Canal Zone, Florida, Georgia, Louisiana, Mississippi, Texas.

Sixth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Burton. Kentucky, Michigan, Ohio, Tennessee.

Seventh judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Clark. Illinois, Indiana, Wisconsin.

Eighth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Whittaker. Arkansas, Iowa, Minnesota, Missouri, Nebraska, North Dakota, South Dakota.

Ninth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Douglas. Alaska, Arizona, California, Idaho, Montana, Nevada, Oregon, Washington, Guam, Hawaii.

Tenth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Whittaker. Colorado, Kansas, New Mexico, Oklahoma, Utah, Wyoming.

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

Appendix

Investigation of Conditions in Labor-Management Relations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JAMES O. EASTLAND

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, March 3, 1958

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address delivered by the senior Senator from Arkansas [Mr. MCCLELLAN] at the annual dinner of the Traffic Club of New York City on February 20, 1958.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS BY SENATOR JOHN MCCLELLAN AT THE ANNUAL DINNER OF THE TRAFFIC CLUB OF NEW YORK, NEW YORK CITY, N. Y., FEBRUARY 20, 1958

Mr. Chairman, it is a very great honor to be your guest this evening. It is a high privilege indeed to have this opportunity to address such a magnificent audience. I have looked forward to this delightful occasion with keen pleasure and anticipation.

I have long heard that your annual dinners are distinguished by the fact that they attract large numbers of outstanding leaders who are truly representative of the transportation industry and the traffic systems of our great country, and this one is no exception.

Before this informed group it would be fruitless for me to talk about the vital importance of transportation as it is related to the growth, economic power, and security of our Nation. You who are directly associated with, and who are so thoroughly acquainted with, the history and outstanding achievements of our transportation industry could hardly be impressed by any statistics that I might quote, nor could you be entertained by, or benefit from, any glittering generalities in which I might indulge.

Although I am in a general way familiar with pressing problems now confronting some segments of transportation, it would be most presumptous of me, with my limited knowledge, to undertake at this time any informative discussion of them, or to offer any suggestion of a legislative program for their solution.

Some of your difficulties I know need legislative attention. The Congress is aware of that, and I am persuaded that it will give early consideration to bills that are designed to remove discrimination and to eliminate inequities wherever they may now exist. To that end, I shall gladly cooperate with my colleagues who serve on the respective committees having jurisdiction over those measures and who have the initial responsibility for processing and recommending appropriate corrective legislation.

But tonight my remarks shall be addressed, not to matters of peculiar interest to the transportation industry alone, but rather to subjects of grave concern to all of our citizens everywhere.

I do not believe it is an overstatement of reality to say that we stand today at a crucial turning point in world history. International tensions, it seems to me, mount rather than diminish. Our security continues to be threatened; our safety endangered; our freedom and our very survival challenged.

No Congress within my service or memory has been confronted with graver or more urgent problems demanding attention and action. These problems involve intricate, complex, and highly controversial issues that must be resolved. Their proper solution will require wisdom, courage, and statesmanship of the highest order.

During the past dozen years in the cold-war struggle with atheistic communism, we have spent (under the stress of compelling necessity) more than $300 billion for an arsenal to keep ourselves and our allies prepared for any eventuality. The Defense Establishment we have built has been, up to now, sufficient to deter Communist aggression.

Our aim has been to maintain such control of the land, of the sea, and of the air as would provide us protection and security. But a fundamental revolution has recently taken place. Science and technology have been advanced to such unprecedented dimensions that dominance of the land, of the sea, and of the air is no longer militarily sufficient to insure our safety.

The new frontiers projected on the horizon of this satellite age are fraught with hazards and dangers that force us into a contest with Russia for the mastery of outer space and for supremacy in ballistic missiles. Our survival may well depend upon—and I believe it does—our ingenuity and capacity to not only keep pace with, but ahead of, the totalitarian world in those areas of science and technology. Should the Communist powers prevail in this contest, they will dominate this planet on which we live and have all humanity at their mercy.

Such a potentiality is horrible to contemplate, but such a possibility must be kept uppermost in our minds during the months and years ahead. In this cosmic duel we must be the victors, else we may well become the vanquished.

Let us not be deceived. The struggle on which we have embarked has no end in sight. It is a desperate, unrelating conflict of indeterminable duration. In the days gone by we have not been indifferent, but neither have we been sufficiently alert.

Made complacent by the knowledge of our incontestable superiority in the past, and by our overoptimism for the future, we have taken too much for granted. We relaxed our guard and miscalculated and underestimated what Russia was doing. Thus we have failed to assess properly the overall effort and progress she was making. We have simply been too slow to grasp and acknowledge the full import and significance of the Communist tyranny and its international conspiracy.

Recent Soviet successes present harsh and irrefutable proof that in some vital areas of science and technology Russia has gained, at least, a temporary lead and advantage. To me, this cold fact has somber implications of military peril which we cannot ignore except at the risk of our own destruction. We must recapture as quickly as possible that which we have lost. It is imperative that we do so. We cannot permit any considerations to interfere; we cannot brook any delay in our efforts to speed progress in that direction.

Our highest hopes and aspirations, our ultimate goals, are, and have always been, to preserve freedom, to promote tranquillity among all nations, and to establish an honorable and lasting peace. These ends cannot be achieved by our reverting to a posture of military weakness, or by our lagging second best to the totalitarian powers in our scientific and technological achievements. Such a decline in our international stature, if permitted to occur, would promptly expose and subject the whole free world to ruthless aggression and conquest.

The attainment of our objectives poses problems and necessitates projects that transcend in magnitude and importance all other tasks and issues awaiting resolvement. They must remain the top priorities of our labors and ingenuity.

To meet the exacting demands they have, and will, thrust upon us, we shall need to develop, conserve, and prudently use our economic strength and resources. Sound fiscal policies are vital if we are to keep our economy strong. The economic power that we shall surely need in the long and titanic struggle ahead is not reposed, nor can it be found, in an insolvent government and a bankrupt national treasury.

Nor can we tolerate, in this era of challenge and crisis, anything in our domestic affairs which has an adverse impact and a weakening influence upon the vigor and strength of our national economy. In my opinion, any improper practices, criminal activities, or oppressive conditions that prevail in labor-management relations definitely fall within that category.

When I first became chairman of the Senate select committee charged with the duty of investigating improper practices in management-labor relations, I had only a limited concept of the scope and the importance of the assignment that the committee was undertaking. Little did I realize then the full nature of the intimidation, coercion, force, violence, dictatorship, and corruption which were to be revealed, and the extent to which they had pervaded labor-management relations. The grim truth and ugly facts of the unwholesome conditions that prevail are now being brought to light before the bar of public opinion.

As you may know, the committee is now preparing, and will soon submit to the Senate, an interim report covering its work during the first year of its labors. When this report becomes available to the public, I strongly commend it to each of you as must reading. Although the press has given the committee's revelations fine coverage, it has been impossible for it to present the full story in all of its sordid details. I believe that when you read the report you will agree with me that the combined talents of our best fiction writers could not have created or contrived a more fantastic story.

The crime, corruption, and improper activities we have uncovered, as shown in the report, are so recurrent, shameful, and shocking as to constitute a national disgrace. It is almost incredible, almost unthinkable that such exploitation of the laboring man, of management, and of the general public as the committee has unearthed could happen in America, and, worse still, that it has occured, and still exists, with impunity.

I do not believe there can be found in the annals of Congress a record of any com-

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

mittee that ever labored more faithfully than this select committee, or that developed more factual and valuable information for legislative purposes.

Last year we held 104 days of public hearings in which we heard 486 witnesses whose recorded testimony covered 17,489 pages of transcript. In addition, the committee held many executive sessions and conferences. For each witness who appeared before the committee, the staff interviewed another 20 or 25 people; and the staff also examined, checked, and screened literally thousands of letters, records, documents, and accounts. Nearly 100,000 letters were received. Seventy-five percent or more of these were from union members or their families. Thousands of complaints have been filed with us. Many of them have real merit and warrant committee action. It will never be possible, however, for this committee to process all of them.

From these facts alone, you can judge that the committee's task is stupendous. To describe it as colossal would be no exaggeration. It is certainly most arduous, difficult, and often unpleasant.

Necessarily, we have had to deal in many instances with people of low character, or of no character at all: manipulators and conspirators (both in labor and management), crooks, hoodlums, thieves, thugs, extortionists, and murderers. From such witnesses we try to get evidence—facts within their knowledge that would reveal what the public and the Congress have the right to know. Many of them resort to willful perjury; others invoke, capriciously use, and flagrantly abuse, the privilege of the fifth amendment; some sink into a coma of forgetfulness, and their memory faculties completely collapse when they are interrogated. Some of these witnesses who have appeared before us are among the Goliaths of the underworld and organized crime.

Professional criminals, racketeers, gangsters, and other assorted disreputable types have infiltrated the union movement—in some unions and some areas—to an extent that is alarming and dangerous. They have seized key positions from which they have been able to exploit labor-management relations for their own personal greed, gain, and profit.

Such infiltration has by no means been accidental. It has been the result of a deliberate and calculated effort by hoodlum and criminal elements to entrench themselves in the labor movement as a means of grabbing money and power. This infiltration constitutes one of the most critical problems which confront honest unionism. It poses one of the greatest threats to law and order, to our free economy, and to the civil and human rights to all of our citizens.

These elements not only flout the laws of common decency, equity, and justice—they have defied the AFL–CIO's enforcement of its ethical codes and standards and they will finally, if not stopped, challenge the very supremacy of our Government. These ruthless, evil men would, and will, unless prevented, create and perpetuate a gangster economy in this country.

Just take a look at the teamsters, the largest and most strategic labor union in the country, the one with which you in the transportation industry are directly concerned, and which wields tremendous power over the transportation services and facilities of our entire economy.

Notwithstanding the exposure of the corrupt and criminal activities of a number of its leaders, who befouled this great union with a racket-ridden, hoodlum-infested, scandal-packed administration, the Hoffa and O'Rourke elements still reign supreme, although the Teamsters International Union has been expelled from the parent federation, the AFL–CIO.

To illustrate the vicious and contemptible attitude of the rulers of the union, and their depravity of intellect and character, we need only quote from the remarks of Mr. Hoffa in an interview given to Mr. Clark Mollenhoff, and published in the January 12 issue of the Des Moines Register and Tribune and the Nashville Tennessean. In this interview Hoffa baldly declared that Glenn W. Smith, the teamster chief of Chattanooga, who served 2 penitentiary terms for robbery and burglary, and whom the committee exposed as 1 of the 3 men largely responsible for the violence and depredations committed in the Tennessee area, is the "kind of a guy needed to kick those hillbillies around" (referring to teamster union members in Tennessee and the South). Hoffa also is quoted as referring to truckers in the South as "them lice," and saying that the unprincipled employers with whom the union deals in Tennessee, and the "hillbillies" who are union members, make it necessary to keep men like Glenn Smith, "Hard of Hearing" Smith, and Don Vestal in official positions in the union.

Hoffa then, in effect, brazenly announced his purpose and intention to keep unreformed exconvicts, thieves, extortionists, hoodlums, racketeers, gangsters, and musclemen at the head of important local unions, and to rule and dominate by force and violence.

Another union comparable to the teamsters in the low stature of its leadership and administration is the International Union of Operating Engineers. There are a number of other unions—some of which the committee has already probed, such as the Bakery and Confectionery Workers International Union, and the United Textile Workers of America—which have a most unsavory record of dictatorial and corrupt operations. Preliminary investigations are underway by the committee preparatory to public hearings on still other unions which I am convinced will suffer in public esteem and confidence when their practices and conduct are bared to the spotlight of public inquiry.

The labor movement in this country has grown up. It is no longer a struggling infant. It is now big business. Labor organizations control billions of dollars of our national wealth. Their annual income from initiation fees, dues, and assessments exceeds $600 million. Their welfare and pension funds contain some $25 billion to $30 billion, with an inflow in excess of $5 billion annually.

This colossal and growing economic power must never fall under the management and control of this gangster element, which would make it a dynamic force for evil with a devastating effect on the economic, social, and political health of this Nation.

The rights of working people, the due-paying members of unions, and the public interest must be protected from the character of infiictions and exploitations to which I have referred.

The AFL–CIO can expel from its organization unions under corrupt leadership. It can condemn improper practices and place a stigma of disrepute on unions and leaderships that defy the laws of decency and integrity as prescribed by the AFL–CIO ethical practices code. But that is about the limit of what it can do. Notwithstanding the excellent and courageous efforts of Mr. George Meany and by his colleagues of the ethical practices committee, and the AFL–CIO executive board to drive these elements out of the parent federation of labor, strong remedial legislation is needed. It is imperative.

However commendable the action of the AFL–CIO with regard to such unions, mere expulsion lacks adequate corrective force.

The teamsters, for example, still operate as before their expulsion, with the same power, the same authority, the same arrogance. The union continues under the same corrupt leadership, with the announced purpose of continuing the shameful practices and criminal activities that brought dishonor to it. It can still impose dictatorial rule over its rank and file, denying them their proper rights under recognized democratic processes. It can continue to exploit management and the public. It is not out of business. It has not reformed, and no reformation is in sight.

Can Hoffa get away with this? Can others of his ilk get away with similar acts of defiance of the public welfare?

They can, unless the rank-and-file members show the courage to rebel against dictatorship, gangsterism, collusion, and thievery in their unions.

They can, unless the Congress of the United States enacts laws to liberate hundreds of thousands, if not millions, of American workers from the oppression and bondage to which they are now subjected by such malevolent, amoral men. Only the instrumentality of corrective legislation is left as a defense and protection against those segments of organized labor and their leaders who persist in their efforts to gangsterize the economy of this country.

The emphasis of responsibility in the legislative field is now shifting from the select committee to the Congress. During the committee's first year in existence, while it was in the initial process of factfinding, such congressional action was not feasible. Now, however, enough evidence has been amassed by the committee so that the Congress can, and should, legislate in those areas where the facts have been developed and evils have been brought to light. Otherwise, the intensive labors of the committee will not have reaped their rightful harvest.

I believe the Congress will take action; encouraging signs point in that direction. The President has submitted the legislative recommendations of his administration. They are reasonably good as far as they go. I support in the main their general objectives, but they are inadequate in scope and strength to meet the full legislative responsibility.

Some 14 separate bills proposing legislation in this field have been introduced in the Senate since Congress convened. Other bills, I am confident, will be presented during this session. Before, or simultaneously with, the filing of the committee's interim report I shall, myself, introduce a measure covering some of the areas in which the committee has already made startling disclosures.

In general, we must enact laws that will, among other things, clearly define and prescribe basic standards and requirements for the administration of union affairs. Such standards and requirements must include the establishing of firm democratic processes that will restore to the rank-and-file members the right to choose their officials by secret ballot in elections at stated intervals, and also to determine and resolve major-policy issues by like method and procedure.

A complete and accurate accounting for, and a full report of, all union, welfare, and pension funds must be required; the investment of such funds regulated and the willful destruction of the financial and other pertinent records of unions prohibited, with criminal penalties invoked for any willful violation of such requirements.

Unreformed exconvicts, gangsters, and racketeers must be declared ineligible to hold any official or representative positions in any labor organization. The expenditure of union, welfare, and pension funds for nonunion purposes; organizational picketing of certain types; the use of force and violence; the arbitrary imposition of trusteeships on locals for an indefinite period; and collusion in management-labor relations

must be prohibited; and the laws with respect to extortion and bribery must be strengthened.

Some sources are charging that it is the committee's purpose to induce Congress to enact restrictive, oppressive, and punitive legislation. That is not true. I shall never knowingly vote for a law designed simply to suppress or to oppress decent, honest unionism; but I am prepared to support legislation that is necessary to restrict, prohibit, and prevent the improper practices to which I have referred, and every law that I have suggested here tonight is definitely for the protection and in the interest of the rank-and-file members of organized labor and their families.

The arrogant, dishonest, crooked, and dictatorial leaders and the disreputable elements that have infiltrated some unions, and who are now engaged in the iniquitous exploitation of working people, of management, and of the public at large should not only be restricted, oppressed, and punished, but with the help of decent unionism and its leadership, we need to drive those characters out of the labor movement and keep them out.

With the cooperation, support, and good will of all honest and respectable elements of American citizenry, within labor and management, and without, the committee will continue its searching effort to bring to the Congress all of the information it needs upon which to predicate remedial legislation; and I have faith that the Congress will enact laws which will bring about badly needed reforms in labor-management relations, and thus render a lasting and constructive service to our country.

Benson Is Right

SPEECH
OF
HON. PERKINS BASS
OF NEW HAMPSHIRE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 27, 1958

Mr. WAINWRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BASS of New Hampshire. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. WAINWRIGHT. I would like to associate myself with my friend and colleague and say that he has done two things here today. Not only has he stood up—I might say this is in effect a nonpartisan matter—in defense of the Secretary of Agriculture and his policy, which is a courageous thing to do, but he has also spoken for the American consumer. The American consumer, for some reason, despite the fact that he is represented in Congress by 80 percent of the membership, is the true forgotten man. Certain segments of the farm population of America have been receiving the equivalent of a handout for any number of years, and no one has stood up in recent times to criticize this until you have done so today.

I may say, speaking for the largest potato-growing county of New York and one of the largest in the United States, that my farmers are behind the Benson theory of no handouts. They say that at least he is making an attempt to correct the situation. As the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CURTIS] said, maybe he does not have the correct answer, but at least he is attempting it.

I want to congratulate the gentleman for bringing this to the attention of the House.

Mr. BASS of New Hampshire. I thank the gentleman for his contribution.

Address by Hon. Clifford P. Case, of New Jersey, at Fifth National Conference on International Economic and Social Development

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. H. ALEXANDER SMITH
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, March 3, 1958

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, on Wednesday, February 26, my distinguished colleague from New Jersey [Mr. CASE] made an important address before the Fifth National Conference on International Economic and Social Development at the Statler Hotel here in Washington.

This address made a valuable contribution to our thinking on the subject of the importance of our mutual aid program. Because of the timeliness of the subject and the contribution which it makes to the mutual security legislation which we will presently be considering in this body, I ask unanimous consent that the address be published in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS BY SENATOR CLIFFORD P. CASE, REPUBLICAN, OF NEW JERSEY, AT LUNCHEON SESSION OF THE FIFTH NATIONAL CONFERENCE ON INTERNATIONAL ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL DEVELOPMENT, AT THE STATLER HOTEL, WASHINGTON, D. C., WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 26, 1958

For some years now the United States has provided various types of assistance to other nations, both on a bilateral and a multilateral basis. These programs, under a variety of names—Marshall plan, point 4, mutual aid, mutual security, not to mention the various international or institutionalized programs—have generally enjoyed wide support. Of course, each year the request for appropriations has set off a debate. But overall, both parties have given their support and much of the argument has been over matters of detail rather than basic substance. Nevertheless, it is not news to suggest that this year the going for those who believe in the worth of the assistance programs is going to be much harder. This is particularly true of the economic and technical assistance programs.

Yet I think there is little doubt there will continue to be an assistance program in these areas. The reason is simple. There has to be. Basically we really have no choice as to that, though the form and the types and the amounts of assistance are another, and vitally important, matter.

It is not just the menace of communism that impels us. Certainly, that is important. Few will quarrel with the purely military assistance program. And most will recognize, too, that the military effort that our allies can put forth, especially those like Turkey, for example, in an exposed position, is directly affected by their economic situation. Hence the name of "defense support" for what is in effect economic aid to those countries with whom we are linked in defense pacts. The mutuality of interest in such activities is clear.

Neither is the threat of Communist economic penetration in the so-called uncommitted or neutral nations the whole justification for a program of economic assistance. Though the fact that the Communist bloc is now launched on an ambitious program of economic aid—and gives every indication of carrying it through—does indeed lend special urgency to our own efforts in this field.

In my own deep belief, were communism to disappear entirely from the world, we would still find ourselves impelled to help other nations in their efforts toward economic advance. For no nation, no less than no man, is an island entirely to itself, in Donne's famous phrase.

To turn an indifferent back to the struggles of other nations to realize their economic potentialities, and thereby to improve the well-being of their citizens, would be to go directly against all that is deepest and best in our tradition, to reject a basic precept of the heritage on which our society is built. It would also, of course, be to go against our own long-range material interests. But I stress the inherent rightness of our course because to debate the question solely on the basis of what's-in-it-for-us does injustice to our people, I believe. And it ill serves us in the eyes of others who are likely, not unnaturally, to take us at our own valuation.

As I see it, therefore, the real question we face is not whether we shall have an economic and technical assistance program, but how much and what kind of a program.

Most of the argument over economic assistance in the past has centered about the how much. No one who pays taxes can fail to have an interest in it. Last week the President submitted to Congress a program calling for $3.9 billion in mutual security funds for the next year. Of this, $1.8 billion is for direct military assistance and another billion for defense support and special assistance to allies, $788.5 million would be allocated to economic and technical assistance to other nations. (This excludes both the contingency fund and contributions to certain relief and other iiternational programs.)

These are large sums. Yet the need to which they are directed is far greater. Indeed it is estimated by reputable economists that 1 to 3 billion a year from all capital sources is needed to accelerate the economic growth of the underdeveloped nations. Obviously, the United States cannot finance all the capital needs of the underdeveloped nations. But the disparity in the figures suggests that at least part of our concern should be, not how we can cut the program further, but, considering the stakes involved, is it enough?

Nonetheless, money is by no means the only or the chief of our problems.

It comes as something of a shock to most Americans to realize that in many parts of the world his country and its intentions are regarded with skepticism and often outright mistrust. Sons of revolutionaries ourselves, we find it strange indeed to be looked at as the inheritors or protectors of an outmoded colonialism. The extent to which the stereotype of the capitalist exploiter has taken hold confuses and angers us. Striving in our own country to achieve equal dignity and equal opportunity for all men, regardless of their race, we are shocked by the depth of bitterness against the white man—any white man—among many people of another color.

The injustice of such attitudes may rankle but the fact is they exist. And we have to reckon with them if we hope to influence

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

the new nations toward the ways of peace and freedom.

Throughout Asia, in Africa, and in the Middle East, the old societies are breaking up. Everywhere there is change and, above all, a new and driving determination to achieve a better life, one way or another. We cannot stop the drive—even if we wanted to—but we can hope to help it go forward in ways that will at least be not unfriendly.

In concrete terms, that seems to me to require first of all a clear showing of our genuine interest and desire to help these nations in their efforts to advance economically. It must be a sustained interest for the element of continuity is vital to successful development. Nothing could be more calculated to breed resentment and bitterness than to raise hopes, only to disappoint them later. Unless we, the public and the Congress, are prepared to carry through, whatever the scale of the program we adopt, we would be better off, in my judgment, not to start it in the first place.

Let us acknowledge frankly that economic development is a long-term undertaking and that if we really want to do an effective job we cannot confine our commitments entirely to the fiscal year. A multipurpose dam, for example, designed to provide irrigation, power and flood control cannot be accomplished overnight. Many months of planning and engineering are required. The construction itself may take years. If several countries are involved, lengthy negotiations may be necessary before even the first stage is reached. Without assurance that financing will be available, few countries can afford the effort and expense involved merely in preparing a well-planned proposal.

At the last session the Congress, somewhat reluctantly, did approve the establishment of a development loan fund and authorized appropriations for 2 years as contrasted with the administration's request for a 3-year authorization. But even this modest step was marred by actual appropriation of only $300 million as against $500 million requested for the first year and authorization of $625 million for the second year. The President had asked for $750 million for the second and third years. Already the fund has received applications totaling well over $1 billion, which is some indication of the hopes placed in it.

There are, of course, important, but surely not insuperable, questions of constitutional and legislative prerogative involved in any departure from the annual appropriations basis. The significant thing to me is the fact that much of the objection to a longer period of appropriation is based less on the constitutional grounds than on opposition to the longer term commitment itself. This view of economic assistance as a kind of emergency or temporary program to be determined almost anew each year seems to me, as I indicated earlier, a self-defeating approach.

There are other ways, too, in which the sincerity of our concern can be demonstrated. But none is likely to be more important or more far reaching than the influence and potential contribution of our businessmen.

Whether he chooses or not, the American businessman has a large role, for good or for ill, in the economic-assistance program.

I am thinking not only or even primarily in terms of capital. Capital contributed by private investment is important and it is encouraging to note that it has been flowing in increased amounts in some sectors. But the old pattern of private investment is no longer possible in many areas. Most of the new countries are determined to keep control of the development of their resources firmly in their own hands.

This is a basic premise which wise and prudent investment will accept or it will venture at its peril, as well as at the risk of discrediting further the free economic policies which in too many places invoke bitter images, however exaggerated, of colonial lords and hated foreign exploiters.

Far more than capital, however, the crying need of many of the underdeveloped nations is for know-how—technical, managerial, and administrative. Report after report on particular countries have pointed to the lack of trained and qualified personnel as the single most limiting factor on development efforts. It is noteworthy, for example, among the Arab States, Lebanon has probably the highest standard of living. Lebanon does not have the rich oil deposits of the other Arab States, indeed her natural resources are meager. But her people are relatively advanced and have the ability to organize themselves and make good use of such resources as are available.

Here is an area in which American enterprise is, I think, indisputably supreme. The American genius for effective organization is a hallmark of our country. We pride ourselves on our practicality, our pleasure in trying new approaches, our zest to get things done. What field offers a greater challenge in these respects than that of economic development? Provided, of course, they are accompanied by a willingness to adapt to the very different conditions that prevail among the underdeveloped nations and to take a long rather than a short view of their opportunities.

Such a positive constructive approach on our part can help immeasurably. Only such an approach can make clear that totalitarian methods are not required to achieve economic advance; rather, there is a real choice of roads to follow. Further, it can provide encouragement to choose the road compatible with the ways of democracy and the preservation of human values.

The task confronting the newly developing nations is enormous. Small wonder that so many of their leaders seem often to waver and shrink from the hard and often unpopular decisions that sound progress may require. We cannot and should not attempt to do the job for them. But we can help to strengthen their willingness to tackle the job and to enhance the chances of its successful accomplishment. The fate of millions turns on the choices that will be made over the next few years. Indeed, the existence of the free world itself—our own ultimate security—may be at stake.

Jefferson-Jackson Day Dinner, St. Louis

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD L. NEUBERGER

OF OREGON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, March 3, 1958

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, a most eloquent and informative speech was delivered to the St. Louis County Jefferson-Jackson Day Dinner in St. Louis on March 1, 1958, by the distinguished junior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE].

In his able address, our colleague from Tennessee has emphasized the distinct responsibility which historically falls upon the legislative branch of Government when there is abandonment from the Executive in the White House. I believe that Senator GORE's address should be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, and I ask unanimous consent for that purpose.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS BY SENATOR GORE

The pleasure and joviality evidenced here tonight is characteristic of a Democratic rally. A Democratic get-together is synonymous with a good time. Even so, we have enough of the rebel and stubborn elements among us to make our party affairs not only interesting but uncertain.

There is no uncertainty about my pleasure and pride in being with you tonight. It would be an honor and a pleasure to speak to such a significant and loyal gathering as this under ordinary circumstances, but my pleasure in coming to Missouri is doubled by the fact that it has been my pleasure and profit to serve on committees and work in the closest harmony and friendship with your Senators. The privilege of their association in the Senate, the leadership which each has provided for our party and for our country prompts me to say that I am grateful to Missouri for Senators TOM HENNINGS and STUART SYMINGTON.

Senator HENNINGS, one of the outstanding constitutional authorities, not only in the Senate but in the entire country, has become a recognized champion of the rights of individual citizenship and has given the kind of leadership for election-law revision and reform in corrupt practices that makes us all proud to be Americans.

The one clear clarion voice for justice and fairness to beleaguered farmers, for adequate national defense, for educational and technological progress, and for permanent public improvements to strengthen our country's economy and productive capacity has come from Missouri's junior Senator STUART SYMINGTON.

The United States Senate is now performing a unique and unusual role in American history. It is a role of leadership with which the Congress can successfully cope only with the greatest difficulty, if at all.

By reason of constitutional limitations, the legislative branch of our Government cannot perform executive functions. By its very nature, its very division and diversity, it is hard for a legislative body to speak with that clear and certain voice which is the characteristic and function of executive leadership.

Yet the worldwide challenge to the greatness of our country and to the survival of our system and ideals, when we are plagued with weak executive leadership, constantly prods the United States Congress and, more particularly, the Senate into action, into qualified leadership of our country, and of the cause of freedom.

Once before, in the period immediately following the War Between the States, the legislative branch of the Government, especially the United States House of Representatives, provided leadership for the country. This was an attempt to usurp powers properly exercised by the President. The record of that performance is revolting to all decent sensibilities, the results tragic. The notorious Thaddeus Stevens led the Government and the country into shameful acts of prejudice, vengeance, and hatred. The deep scars from the Civil War were not allowed to heal, as they would have healed with time and the noble impulses of our people, but instead were kept open as a taunt and a prod to bigotry and demagogery of reprisal. These scars can still be seen today.

I hope and believe that the present ascendancy of the legislative branch of our Government will bring better results. At all events, we may be sure that the intent is not malevolent. The motivation springs from neither prejudice nor desire to usurp. Instead, the Senate is undertaking to encourage and spur the use of Presidential powers by the President himself, on the one hand, and to fill the vacuum of ideas and action

through legislation, committee studies and reports, and varied articulation, on the other.

To put it bluntly, we are trying to persuade and to help the President do a job that he ought to be doing himself.

The motivations that unify and propel the Senate, let me emphasize, are essentially good and, in important respects, nonpartisan. They arise from patriotic concern for our country and a compassion for the well-being of its people, from a deep faith in the Nation's greatness and out of a dedication to its future glory.

Even so, the kind of leadership which the needs of the country require and deserve, both at home and in affairs abroad, can come only from one who is clothed with the power, prestige, the honor and glory of the Presidency of the United States. The Constitution provides for it, our country expects it, conditions at home and in the world demand it.

Yet we do not have adequate executive leadership. I do not say this in a partisan sense, nor with pleasure. It is with sadness and concern that I say it. Nevertheless, I have never been one to believe that we will find the solution for any national problem by refusing to recognize and acknowledge it, thus hoping that it will go away if we just deny its existence.

Please forgive me if I refrain from undertaking to evaluate the reasons for the inadequacy of President Eisenhower's leadership. This is not essential to my thought tonight. It is the fact of its inadequacy rather than the reasons for it that impels the Congress into its present role of leadership.

Under the circumstances, the legislative branch has no choice but to do the very best it can, inadequately constituted and equipped as it is for the task.

Both the facts of today and foreseeable events are grim.

The grand alliance of free nations is threatened with gradual disintegration. The confidence of even our closest friends is shaken. Both friendly and uncommitted nations are tempted to follow a course of neutrality or outright hostility toward us.

Current Soviet superiority in ballistic missiles, rocket propulsion, satellites, large-scale atomic powerplants, number of submarines, and conventional military forces in being deeply disturbs the confidence of our friends and threatens the security of not only the United States, but the entire free world.

At home, partly for want of sound programs and partly because of rampant influences of selfish interests, an estimated 5 million Americans, with many dependents, are totally unemployed. Uncounted additional millions are working only a few hours per week. Farmers suffer depressed conditions. Bankruptcies are at the highest rate in our history, business failures at a rate equal to the early 1930's. Steel production is at only fifty-some-odd percent of capacity.

Meanwhile, the cost of living reaches an alltime high.

It is because of these circumstances that Senators and Congressmen with vision and concern, despite constitutional and organizational limitations and handicaps, are resolutely undertaking to fill the vacuum in national leadership.

It has been from the floor of the United States Senate, for instance, that the country has been alerted to the dangers from Russian military supremacy; from the floor of the United States Senate that the voice of the people has cried out against the social injustice and economic needlessness of widespread unemployment and suffering, the inequity of tax favoritism, tight money, high interest rates.

It is in the United States Senate that bold programs for conquering space are being molded; in which adequate programs to maintain American leadership in the fields of technology, nuclear power, and missile research have been presented.

But there are things that Congress can do and things that Congress cannot do. Congress can appropriate money for national defense but it cannot spend it. Congress can pass bills authorizing contracts for valuable public improvements but Congress cannot sign the contracts. Congress can provide the necessary laws for public welfare but Congress cannot administer the laws.

These are executive functions which only the executive branch of the Government can perform.

Congress has acted—acted in many fields. But congressional enactment of legislation, or passage of appropriations, as I have said, is not enough. Unless there is genuine acceptance of programs enacted by the Congress, and unless there is will to sincerely put them into effect, then congressional labors come to naught.

President Eisenhower and other administration leaders are now talking about a public-works program—if things get bad enough. Well, things are already bad enough. How much worse must they become to justify a public-works program to stimulate our economy, to provide employment by building needed public improvements. The administration still waits. Well, Congress is not only ready to act now, but has already acted. With foresight and concern, the Congress passed an omnibus rivers and harbors bill in 1956 which authorized a public-works program that would have brought, and would now bring, not only employment opportunities, but vast economic benefits to all segments of our country. The President vetoed this bill.

In 1956, Congress enacted a far-reaching highway construction program, the largest highway program in the history of the world. It was designed to interconnect all of our principal cities within 13 years, with magnificent multilane interstate and defense highways adequate to the traffic needs of 1975. Only 2 years later it stands in grave danger of being slowed down and stretched out from the planned 13 years to 24 years. Instead of proposing an acceleration of this vital program of highway improvement which could now be used to stimulate our sagging economy, the administration proposes to slow it down even further by diverting $68 million per year from the highway trust fund to other purposes.

President Eisenhower's atoms for peace speech, which was delivered to the United Nations in 1953, is, I believe, generally considered to be his greatest. I surely so regard it. Congress has sought to translate this commendable program into action by maintaining our leadership in the peaceful uses of atomic energy. The Eisenhower administration has fought these proposals consistently and, unfortunately, thus far it has fought them successfully. The result is that the United States which led in harnessing the strength of the atom is now losing its of large-scale nuclear power production.

The Joint Committee on Atomic Energy has been urging for several years projects to develop nuclear-powered rockets. Our pleas have fallen on deaf ears and the lack of effort has been shrouded in a cloak of secrecy ostensibly for security considerations. The money Congress appropriated for this project has not been spent. Is it any wonder we are behind?

The same fate has befallen our efforts to bring about an atomic airplane. Funds have been cut back, programs have been rolled back and stretched out.

Rollback. Cutback. Stretchout. Just wait until November and the American people will add another word to administration jargon—strikeout.

During the summer of 1957, the all-powerful Bureau of the Budget dispatched a letter to each Department of the Government which stated in part as follows:

"The President has requested that all agencies in the executive branch keep the rates of commitments, obligations and expenditures for fiscal 1958 at or below the level for the fiscal year 1957."

This meant that there was an arbitrary dollar ceiling imposed on defense expenditures no matter what action the Congress might have taken.

More recently a subcommmittee of the Senate, after full hearings, outlined 17 areas in which decisive action is needed if we are to hope to regain lost time in the field of missiles and rockets. But we have not had the decisive action we need. The Congress can recommend missile production but it lacks the power to make a contract to implement the recommendation.

In this distraught world, free nations look to the United States of America for leadership and inspiration, for initiative and imagination, for boldness and action. Instead they find vaccilation, timidity, indecision.

Through all of this the most eloquent voices, the most penetrating vision, the most logical analyses, the newness, the imagination, the boldness and the hope have principally come from the Senate of the United States. I would have to name but a few of many examples to illustrate my point.

Even so, ours is a forbidding outlook. But what would it be without the Congress to stir the country and the Government away from complacency toward concern, from fiction to reality, from nothing to something?

Our efforts have not been without fruit. The American people have now been awakened to their danger, and the voice of the people from North to South, East to West, demands action. Action. Action. This they will have, if not immediately, ultimately.

After the election next November there will not be, in my opinion, enough seats on the Democratic side to accommodate the new Democratic Congressmen.

And I think it overwhelmingly likely that the Democratic Party will be called back to power and responsibility in 1960. For this we must prepare. And to prepare for so great a privilege is to act responsibly today, tomorrow, and always—opposing on principle and supporting on principle, standing firm and alert, ready to oppose that which is wrong, willing to support that which is right.

Benson Is Right

SPEECH
OF
HON. PERKINS BASS
OF NEW HAMPSHIRE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 27, 1958

Mr. BASS of New Hampshire. I thank the gentleman from Utah for his contribution.

Mr. WAINWRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BASS of New Hampshire. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. WAINWRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, I think the gentleman from Utah [Mr. DIXON] gave a specific answer. I would add that the Secretary of Agriculture does one more thing in the field of leadership. He, almost alone, stands for some form of cutback on what has generally been referred to—to use slang—as a handout. It takes a lot of courage

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

to do that. I think fundamentally the gentleman from Florida would, and should, agree with that.

PTA of Great Value in Solving Education Problems

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS H. KUCHEL
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, March 3, 1958

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, the National Congress of Parents and Teachers held its 61st Annual Founders Day at San Francisco on February 17, 1958. On that occasion, Mr. Randolph A. Hearst, president of the Hearst Publishing Co. and a distinguished member of a great American family, addressed the conference. The son of the late William Randolph Hearst, he is the grandson of the late Phoebe Opperson Hearst, a cofounder, in 1897, of the National Congress of Mothers which thereafter became the present Congress of Parents and Teachers.

In his address, Mr. Hearst made some excellent, practical, and constructive suggestions for improving education in America. I ask consent that the text of it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

May I congratulate the Parent-Teachers' Association on this occasion of your 61st Founders Day. It is a distinct pleasure for me to accept this tribute to my grandmother as a representative of the Hearst family.

Sixty-one years ago, Mrs. Alice Birney approached my grandmother with an idea that was entirely new at that time, to form an organization of mothers dedicated to the idea of promoting the welfare of children through a closer relationship between the home and the schools, and also by cooperation between parents and teachers.

These two ladies were mutually attracted to each other. Both were intelligent, idealistic, and vitally interested in the welfare of children. On February 17, 1897, they launched the National Congress of Mothers which, a few years later, became known as the now famous Parent-Teachers' Association.

Today the PTA has grown to 11 million members. Four million of these are men, and 700,000 are educators.

The PTA has become a tremendously influential organization. It is nonpolitical in nature, and although its members and officers work with groups like the NEA and, on occasion, with some political groups, the PTA is completely independent.

Today the PTA faces the greatest challenge in its history. Since October 4, 1957—the day the Russians dramatically launched the first earth satellite and proved thereby to the world the extent of their scientific achievements—the educational systems of the free world and of totalitarianism—whether we like it or not—are at war.

This conflict cannot be settled by guns or diplomacy. It must be fought in our homes, and in the classrooms of our grammar schools, our high schools, our colleges, and our universities. There is no other area of decision.

The danger is a very real and present one.

By charting the scientific and technological progress of the two countries over the past 30 years, it is shown that the United States started on a high level and continued to rise steadily.

But it is also shown that the Russians started much lower, continued at an inferior level for 10 years or more, then began to rise rapidly, until today, although they are still behind, should the rate of improvement continue, they will soon overtake us. When, or rather, if this happens, the United States will then be a second-rate power.

Since the launching of the first sputnik, it was natural that our educational system would, and will continue to be, subject to criticism and public scrutiny.

A great many people, myself included, believe our present educational system is soft. We cannot blame the educators alone, for many of us who are most critical did nothing to prevent the swing toward so-called progressive education and its resultant mass mediocrity.

I believe in universal education. We have a duty to prepare our children for citizenship. We are a Republic, and only through proper mass education can we remain one.

We also have a duty to educate to the fullest the talented and ambitious children, and not allow them to be held back by the less capable or the indolent.

I favor establishing two types of high-school diplomas. One might be called academic and the other commercial or technical. The latter being one which prepares the student for a useful and respectable craft.

Parents, of course, should be informed which of these diplomas their children is working towards, and which one he has the ability to attain.

I recommend that greater disciplinary authority be granted to teachers. Sometimes the best cure for a short-attention span is a good rap on the knuckles.

Unquestionably, more emphasis should be placed on fundamentals. No child should be allowed to pursue an elective until these basic fundamentals are thoroughly mastered.

I believe that the competence of the teacher—not the cost of the school building or size of the gymnasium—is of paramount importance.

I believe there should be more emphasis on science, but not to the exclusion of other branches of learning.

In the world of today, and still more the world of tomorrow, the scientist must know something of politics and the social studies. Likewise, the politician must know the problems of the scientist.

We cannot afford to specialize to such a point that we exclude all other knowledge from our understanding. Our society is too complex and interdependent to permit the luxury of limited and arbitrary views.

These are criticisms which the last few months have shown to be general among the public. Whether they are valid or not remains to be seen.

There is no doubt, however, that we are facing an educational crisis. To meet it we look to the PTA to accept a responsibility it alone is in a position to exercise.

Whatever changes are made will be brought about by the people of this country, for school boards—rightfully so—are controlled in their policies by the desires of their local communities.

And we must not overlook the fact that the PTA is in a position to influence strongly the desires of the local communities.

This is a great responsibility. It is also a great opportunity. It takes a long time for governments to act. You can act immediately, and your actions will be felt immediately.

It might be desirable that at the next meeting of your national congress, the PTA should formulate an educational policy, in conjunction with competent educators, and then fight for it in every community in the land.

Should this be done, I am convinced that it would be one of the most effective ways in which Americans can meet a clear and immediate threat to our national existence.

By uniting in the support of a program like this, the 11 million active and devoted members of the PTA can be the most potent force in the United States to improve our high standards of educational and scientific achievement.

I hope that in your progress toward this goal you will continue to avail yourselves of our readiness to be of help.

Thank you.

Space Technology and the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HARRY FLOOD BYRD
OF VIRGINIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, March 3, 1958

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a very able speech delivered by Dr. Hugh L. Dryden, Director, National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics, entitled "Space Technology and the NACA"; also a resolution adopted by the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics. The NACA conducts an aeronautical laboratory near Hampton, Va.

There being no objection, the address and resolution were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SPACE TECHNOLOGY AND THE NACA

(Address delivered by Hugh L. Dryden, Director, National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics, at luncheon meeting of the Institute of the Aeronautical Sciences, New York, N. Y., January 27, 1958)

The topic of our day is the new frontier, space, and the new challenge, the conquest of space. The escape of objects and man himself from the earth into space has long been the subject of science fiction writers and the comic-strip artists. More recently, it has been a matter of interest to a growing number of serious-minded scientists. Now, it has acquired a new sense of imminence and reality. Space travel has stirred the imagination of man to an extraordinary degree. It is, however, one thing to desire to travel in space, and quite another to satisfy that desire. Early accomplishment of this goal will require major advances in science and technology.

This effort will stimulate industrial and economic development. Space vehicles will open the way to acquisition of much new knowledge about the earth and the universe. They will enable development of new military weapons. They will bring great national prestige.

The launching of the first manmade satellite on October 4 of last year produced an extreme swing of the pendulum from general lack of interest in space travel and even ridicule of its proponents, to expectation of early interplanetary flight. This essentially emotional reaction may make it very difficult to proceed with a sound program. En-

gineers have a special responsibility to be bold and imaginative, and yet they must be thoroughly realistic and practical. We must do our share in acquainting the public with the characteristic difference between engineering and technology, and other professions and fields of endeavor.

In many professions, for example, law, education, diplomacy, the spoken or written word plays a dominant role in accomplishment. The lawyer prepares a brief with great care, but often the key factor is the skill with which he pleads his case, and thus persuades others to accept his conclusions. Lawmakers debate the issues and resolve them by compromise and majority vote. Similarly in other fields, in sales and even in banking. A characteristic feature is that when the discussion ends in decision, the result is immediately at hand. There is no timelag or only a very small time lag between decision and accomplishment.

In engineering there is also much discussion, debate, and compromise. But when decision is reached to build a bridge, an airplane, or a space craft, there remains the "hardware" construction. The materials of our physical world cannot be talked or argued into the desired shape. There is a long timelag between the decision and the completion of the bridge, or airplane, or space craft. Like the time span between conception and birth of a child, no amount of discussion or investment of money can reduce this time interval to zero. Thus travel to the moon by manned or unmanned vehicles will require more than discussion and decision and allocation of funds. It will require much effort and time and will be soonest achieved by a systematic and orderly program of research and development. The public must be understanding and patient with the scientists and engineers in addition to providing the necessary funds.

I wish to discuss with you briefly my own views as to what the national program should be, the role of research, and specifically the role of the NACA. In speaking of the program as a national program I do not wish to exclude the possibility of the program being an international one; its technical character would be the same.

In my opinion the goal of the program should be the development of manned satellites and the travel of man to the moon and nearby planets. I omit for the present travel outside the solar system since the probable travel times seem well beyond the adult life of an individual even with optimistic extrapolations of known science and technology. The immediate goals should be more limited, and these I will discuss a little later.

There is rather good agreement that there are at least three general aspects of an adequate space program. These are: (1) Research in space technology to provide data for the design of useful and efficient vehicles, the provision of a safe environment for man and otherwise to insure the success of manned space flight operations; (2) design and development of scientific and military space vehicles and their launching, flight, and recovery; and (3) research on the phenomena of the high upper atmosphere and nearby space, such as the character and distribution of matter, cosmic rays, solar radiation, electric, magnetic, and gravitational fields, etc., and scientific studies of the universe made possible by the use of satellites and space platforms as observation sites.

You know as well as I, how eagerly those in astronomy, geophysics, and meteorology—to name only three of the interested scientific groups—anticipate the tremendous advantages that will result from such observation sites in space.

The development and operation of military missiles, military satellites, and military space vehicles are clearly a military function and it is well understood that a vigorous program is necessary. It is not so well understood by the general public that additional vehicles and operations will be required for scientific research on space phenomena and scientific exploration of the universe, in addition to those employed for research in space technology. The national program must include both nonmilitary and military aspects. It is perhaps the nonmilitary aspects of space flight that will have the greatest impact on the thinking and the future of all mankind.

The organization of the national effort is receiving much study. As you know the President and Secretary of Defense have announced the formation of an Advanced Research Projects Agency within the Department of Defense to which responsibility for military space projects is to be assigned. Responsibility for nonmilitary aspects has not yet been fully determined. Some groups have recommended the creation of a completely new independent civilian agency of government to conduct research and development in its own laboratories or by contract, to contract for and sponsor development of components and vehicles, and to engage in space flight operations. Some of these proposals restrict the activities of the proposed new agency to nonmilitary projects; others include at least the research aspects of military projects.

The basic reason underlying these proposals for a new civilian agency is plain. The scientific community, understandably, is worried about the possibility that the extremely important nonmilitary aspects of space technology would be submerged or perhaps even lost if included as a mere adjunct to a military program.

There is another solution to the problem of how best to administer the national space-technology program, one which clearly recognizes the essential duality of our goals—the prompt and full exploitation of the potentials of flight into space for both scientific and military purposes. Actually, this solution is old and well-tested. It is explicitly stated in the 1955 legislation that established the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics with responsibility to supervise and direct the scientific study of the problems of flight, with a view to their practical solution. The committee structure of the NACA embraces both the nonmilitary and the military elements of aeronautics. The researches of the NACA are designed to be useful to both the nonmiliary and the military segments of aeronautics. The entire operation of the NACA is based upon the premise that coordinated teamwork effort by all parties concerned provides the surest guaranty of progress in aeronautics.

At its meeting on January 16, 1958 the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics expressed its view that the national space program can be most rapidly, effectively, and efficiently implemented by the cooperative effort of the Department of Defense, the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics, the National Academy of Sciences and the National Science Foundation together with universities, research institutions, and industrial companies of the Nation. Under this plan the National Science Foundation in collaboration with the National Academy of Sciences would plan scientific experiments and assign priorities for research on space phenomena for basic scientific purposes as previously described. The National Science Foundation would assume responsibility for financial support of scientists in the detailed planning, design and construction of special apparatus, related research and analysis of data for approved projects. The National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics would conduct flights for scientific purposes when within its capabilities or jointly, with appropriate agencies of the Department of Defense, in the successful pattern of the research airplane programs. The NACA would also coordinate and conduct research in space technology in its own laboratories and by contract in support of both military and nonmilitary projects.

Since the end of World War II the NACA has been engaged increasingly in research applicable to the problems of space flight and has designed and constructed the special aerodynamic, structural, and propulsion facilities required for this work. For example, studies were formally initiated in 1952 leading to the X–15 research airplane project, a cooperative project between the NACA, Air Force, and the Navy. North American Aviation is now building the X–15 and its is scheduled to make its first flight in about 1 year. The X–15 will be used to explore problems of manned flight into nearby space particularly the control of the attitude of the vehicle in space in the absence of aerodynamic forces, the safe return from space to the atmosphere without destructive heating, and the effect of weightlessness on the pilot.

The NACA is also engaged in studies of satellite configurations suitable for safe reentry at still higher speeds, both for manned and unmanned flight. The present program is far from adequate. Our rate of progress in solving the problems of space flight must be very greatly increased. The problem is essentially one of extension and expansion of effort. For this purpose new research facilities will be needed at existing laboratories and at new laboratories, including a launching site for space flights for research purposes. A larger staff will, of course, be needed. A greatly expanded contract research program is similarly essential to obtain assistance from groups with special competence in specific areas. Thus special talents, experienced staffs, and facilities of existing organizations can be pooled for the accelerated effort that is required. I would emphasize that these organizations already have demonstrated that they can work together successfully, and, perhaps equally important, that they have established the necessary close relationships with the scientific community and with industry.

To provide material assistance in its program the NACA recently appointed a special committee on space technology under the chairmanship of Dr. H. G. Stever, associate dean of engineering of the Massachusetts Institute of Technology. A partial list of the members of the new committee includes:

Mr. H. Julian Allen, Ames Aeronautical Laboratory.

Dr. Hendrik W. Bode, director of mathematical research, Bell Telephone Laboratories.

Dr. Milton U. Clauser, director of aeronautical laboratory, the Ramo-Wooldridge Corp.

Prof. Dale R. Corson, Cornell University.

Mr. James R. Dempsey, manager, astronautics division, Convair.

Mr. Robert R. Gilruth, Langley Aeronautical Laboratory.

Mr. S. K. Hoffman, general manager, Rocketdyne division, North American Aviation, Inc.

Dr. W. Randolph Lovelace II, Lovelace Clinic.

Dr. William H. Pickering, director, jet propulsion laboratory, California Institute of Technology.

Dr. Louis N. Ridenour, Jr., missile systems division, Lockheed Aircraft Corp.

Mr. Abe Silverstein, Lewis Flight Propulsion Laboratory.

Dr. James A. Van Allen, department of physics, State University of Iowa.

Dr. Wernher von Braun, Director, Development Operations Division, Army Ballistic Missile Agency.

The committee will also include representatives of the Air Force and Navy not yet designated.

This committee will take a fresh look at the research and development problems of

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

space technology and make recommendations as to the needed programs. The first meeting of the committee has been scheduled for February 13. The major research fields which must find a place in the overall national program include space mechanics; space environment; energy sources; propulsion systems; vehicle configuration and structure; materials; launch, rendezvous, reentry, and recovery; communication, navigation, and guidance; space biology; flight simulation; measurement and observation techniques.

The design and development of vehicles should proceed simultaneously with research on space technology. While the goal is manned flight to planets within the solar system, the vehicle program must proceed in stepwise fashion. We have something to learn from the U. S. S. R. experience. So far as we know, they began as did we, with a supply of German V–2 rockets and the aid of German scientists and engineers. In contrast to our own development, their program proceeded in logical steps with consistent support from top government officials and at high priority. Larger and larger rockets were developed by the U. S. S. R. scientists, leading to ballistic missiles of steadily increasing range, with many missiles built and fired. A group was organized for scientific work on phenomena in the high atmosphere, using rockets. In addition to physical apparatus, animals were sent aloft, including dogs. As experience was gained and reliability increased, the first satellite was launched, followed soon by the second carrying the dog, Laika. It is said that Laika had already been aloft on a rocket and been safely returned. Probably the Sputnik II was the same type of rocket used in that work, now boosted into satellite orbit by large rockets from the ballistic-missile program.

We need a similar step-by-step program, each step fully tested. I think there will be needed two parallel lines of vehicle development, one unmanned, which should be able to proceed rapidly, and the other man-carrying, whose development will probably be somewhat slower. I personally am unwilling to be a party to trying to put a brave young pioneer into orbit until his demonstrated chance of successful return is much better than 50 percent. The earliest vehicles will be progressively larger unmanned satellites, carrying more and more complex equipment to perform more and more difficult scientific and engineering tasks. We may expect these to be followed by unmanned vehicles which travel around the moon, and later those which land on it. This line of development has already attained its first objective.

Concurrently, there should be a systematic program on manned vehicles. The X–15 is a research tool to get some experience in flight into nearby space. Other projects should be initiated promptly toward the goal of manned satellite flight. As the chief milestones are passed, other, more advanced goals should be set.

We have the talents and the resources to assure that we in America can lead the way. It is imperative, for the peace and welfare of the world, that we shall lead the way.

As I think about what lies ahead, I am reminded of the comment of Wilbur Wright, voiced many years ago: "It is not necessary to look too far into the future; we see enough already to be certain that it will be magnificent."

NATIONAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE FOR AERONAUTICS RESOLUTION ON THE SUBJECT OF SPACE FLIGHT, ADOPTED JANUARY 16, 1958

Whereas the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics is authorized by act of Congress (U. S. Code, title 50, sec. 151) to "supervise and direct the scientific study of the problems of flight, with a view to their practical solution * * * and to direct and conduct research and experiment in aeronautics"; and

Whereas the advancing flight performance of unmanned vehicles has reached outside the atmosphere into nearby space and the exploration of space by manned vehicles will soon begin; and

Whereas in the opinion of the Committee, the broad authority in its organic act includes the investigation of problems relating to flight in all its aspects, outside of, or within the earth's atmosphere, of aircraft, missiles, satellites, and outer-space projectiles and vehicles; and

Whereas the problems of space technology include energy sources, propulsion, materials, structures, control, guidance, communication, environment, launching, recovery, and human limitations and requirements with respect to the flight of such vehicles; and

Whereas since the end of World War II the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics has been increasingly engaged in research applicable to the problems of space flight and has designed and constructed the special aerodynamic, propulsion, and structures facilities required for this work; and

Whereas the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics in 1952 formally initiated studies of the problems associated with unmanned and manned flight at altitudes from 50 miles up and at speeds from mach number 10 to the velocity of escape from the earth's gravity which resulted in the cooperative NACA-USAF-USN project, the X–15 research airplane designed and now under construction for studying some of the problems of manned flight in nearby space; and

Whereas the urgency of an adequate national program of research and development leading to manned satellites, lunar, and interplanetary flight is now apparent:

Be it resolved, That the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics express its view that an adequate national program must enlist the scientific and engineering resources of the Nation and must include:

1. Research in space technology to provide data for the design of useful and efficient vehicles and to insure the success of manned space flight operations.

2. Design and development of scientific and military space vehicles and their launching, flight and recovery.

3. Research on the phenomena of the high upper atmosphere and nearby space, such as the character and distribution of matter, cosmic rays, solar radiation, electric, magnetic, and gravitational fields, etc., and scientific studies of the universe made possible by the use of satellites and space platforms as observation sites.

Be it further resolved, That the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics express its view that the national program can be most rapidly, effectively, and efficiently implemented by the cooperative effort of the Department of Defense, the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics, the National Academy of Sciences, and the National Science Foundation, together with universities, research institutions, and industrial companies of the Nation.

Be it further resolved, That the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics express its views that the development and operation of military missiles, military satellites, and military space vehicles is clearly the function of the Department of Defense; that additional vehicles and operations will be required for scientific research on space phenomena as well as for research in space technology; that these scientific flights should be conducted by the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics when within its capabilities or jointly by the appropriate agencies of the Department of Defense and the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics in the successful pattern of the research airplane programs with the cooperation of the National Science Foundation; that planning of scientific experiments and the assignment of priorities for research on space phenomena for basic scientific purposes be conducted by the National Science Foundation and the National Academy of Sciences and that the National Science Foundation assume responsibility for financial support; that the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics has an important responsibility for coordinating and for conducting research in space technology either in its own laboratories or by contract, and therefore should expand its existing program and add supplementary facilities to those now available as necessary.

Be it further resolved, That the NACA Special Committee on Space Technology be requested to review the needed research and development in the light of the guidelines given above with a view to the early formulation of an adequate and sound program for the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics.

Unsightly Billboards on Federal Interstate Highways

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. NORRIS COTTON
OF NEW HAMPSHIRE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, March 3, 1958

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, one of the ablest members of the Committee on Public Works is the distinguished Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL]. During my years of service on this committee, I have been impressed with his marked capacity for approaching problems in a constructive and objective manner.

We who are deeply interested in enacting legislation to limit and control billboard advertising on the Interstate System of Highways are impressed by the new formula which has been introduced by the junior Senator from California, and which is based on an incentive to the States to bring about this necessary and praiseworthy objective.

I notice in the Sacramento Bee of February 12, 1957, an article written by Gladstone Williams, explaining the proposal of the junior Senator from California. I think the article is worthy of note throughout the country. Therefore, I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Sacramento (Calif.) Bee of February 12, 1958]

NEWS BEHIND THE NEWS

(By Gladstone Williams)

Billboards: It has remained for California's Senator THOMAS H. KUCHEL to draw up a legislative formula which promises to break the impasse in the Senate Public Works Committee on proposals for curbing the erection of unsightly billboards on the new 41,000 mile system of Federal interstate highways approved by Congress.

He has offered a bill which is believed to have excellent chances of passage. Unless Congress acts at this session there is grave danger of billboard control legislation being lost. The vast highway program, which will

represent an investment of the people's money of upward of $37 billion, soon will get underway and this may be the last opportunity for Congress to do something about it.

At the last session the Senate Committee voted to kill a similar measure. The vote was by the narrow margin of 7 to 6. Senator KUCHEL was one of those voting to deny the bill committee approval.

Support: KUCHEL has never been opposed to protecting against unsightly signs and posters, but felt the legislation was unrealistic and unconstitutional. He preferred to delay action until a better bill could be worked out—one which would be given more chance of congressional approval.

The present Kuchel bill is the result. Already it appears to have enough support among members of the Senate committee to send it to the floor for action. Senator RICHARD NEUBERGER, of Oregon, one of the sponsors of last year's measure, has welcomed it. And the American Automobile Association has given it a clearcut endorsement—the first time the AAA has approved any specific bill, though long in favor of billboard controls.

Alined against those who want to keep the new turnpike free of roadside distractions has been the outdoor advertising industry, which appears to be well financed. It has been aided by certain segments of organized labor.

If a vote could be taken on the question there is little doubt about where the vast majority of the public would stand. But the public opposition is largely unorganized.

Senator KUCHEL's bill differs from others in two main respects. First, it would give the States greater leeway in permitting official directional signs and those advertising activities actually conducted upon the property on which they are located.

Also it would make no atempt to impose restrictions on communities through which the highways will pass.

Incentive: Senator KUCHEL describes his bill as incentive legislation. By that, he explains, "it would establish a policy of incentive payments to the States which would participate in a national policy of preserving the scenic beauty of nature through which the Interstate and Defense Highway System would run.

There would be no compulsion about a State accepting the national policy, but those which did would be allotted an additional 1 percent of the Federal highway fund. This is a little better than the three quarters of 1 percent proposed in last year's legislation. The Federal share would be 91 percent in States regulating billboards.

The bill offers new hope for bringing the road poster business under control. It remains only for the public to express itself on whether it prefers roadsides lined with natural scenery or those walled in by billboards.

Power on the Farms—REA Interest Rates

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH W. YARBOROUGH

OF TEXAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, March 3, 1958

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, many of us are concerned about repeated moves of this administration to try to raise the interest rates on REA loans. Those of us who were fortunate enough to have grown up on the farm know that the great REA program has proven one of the Nation's most beneficial, worthwhile, and progressive projects in all history. This, despite the fact that there always have been, and continue to be, selfish interests which have fought to ruin this remarkable flow of new energy and life to the farm.

Recently the Giddings, Tex., News, one of Texas' fine weekly newspapers, published an excellent editorial against the move to raise REA interest rates.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have the editorial, Rural Electrification, from the February 13, 1958, Giddings News, printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Giddings (Tex.) News of February 13, 1958]

RURAL ELECTRIFICATION

Rural electrification is one of the greatest blessings that has ever come to the farmer's aid in his continuous fight to make a living from the soil. With this blessing of modern science, he is able to have running water, heat, electricity, television, radios and all of the other many things that use electricity as their source of energy. This has put him on a par with the people who dwell in the city, according to Senator JOHN SPARKMAN, who was in Dallas Tuesday for the rural electrification meeting. President Eisenhower's mad infatuation for the Wall Street moneylenders and his mishandling of rural cooperatives is just another example of inept leadership.

It was only a short while ago when the Eisenhower moneylenders in the temple had the Federal Reserve bank raise the interest rate to their member bands and create the tight-money policy which he claimed would starve off inflation. After the Wall Street bankers had made billions out of the Government, and the people, he had them reverse themselves and drop the interest rate because of fear that the present recession would go into a major depression that would "curl your hair."

His every action has been in favor of the private power companies at the expense of the rural electrification cooperatives and other public power agencies. This was so obvious in his insistence that the Dixon-Yates contract be approved.

The cooperatives are aware of what this big business administration is trying to do to them and should it succeed, and the private power companies take over the rural cooperatives, then the only ones that will receive power will be those in densely populated areas and many of the boys and girls on the farm will again be forced to study their reading, writing and arithmetic by the light of a coal oil lamp.

We believe that the rural electrification movement is just as much the business of the Government as maintaining an adequate system of roads and a first-class postal service and that it should not be destroyed in order to enrich the bank accounts of a favorite few.

One Hundredth Anniversary of Oregon Statehood

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK CHURCH

OF IDAHO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, March 3, 1958

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, the State of Oregon soon will celebrate its 100th anniversary, and the President of the United States has signed an official proclamation heralding that event.

The junior Senator from Oregon [Mr. NEUBERGER], who was the author of Senate Joint Resolution 131, authorizing this Presidential proclamation, has written a most vivid and illuminating article for the New York Times of Sunday, March 2, 1958, entitled "Oregon Lays Groundwork for Its Centennial."

We of Idaho feel a particular affinity with Oregon because both our States were explored by the great frontiersmen, Meriwether Lewis and William Clark, and both were once part of what was known as the Oregon country. We of Idaho share with Oregon the great mile-deep Snake River Canyon, bordered by the Seven Devils Range of Idaho on the east and the Wallowa Mountains of Oregon on the west.

I believe the fine article written by the junior Senator from Oregon about his State, which includes descriptions of the scenic realm which Oregon shares with Idaho, should appear in the Appendix of the RECORD and I ask unanimous consent that it be so printed.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OREGON LAYS GROUNDWORK FOR ITS CENTENNIAL

(By RICHARD L. NEUBERGER, United States Senator from Oregon)

Valentine's Day, 1959, is a long way off but the State of Oregon is already busy planning a celebration that will start next February 14 to commemorate the 100th anniversary of Oregon's admission to statehood. Appropriatey on the Valentine's Day just past President Eisenhower signed the official proclamation "calling upon the people of the United States to commemorate with appropriate ceremonies the 100th anniversary of the admission of Oregon into the Union."

Oregon became a State on February 14, 1859. James Buchanan was the President who signed that act. Thus the year 1959 will bring Oregon's centennial, but President Eisenhower was empowered to herald the occasion 12 months in advance because many events associated with the historic anniversary will occur this year. Most of these occasions are certain to be of prime significance to tourists and wayfarers, if only because few States contain the variety of scenery and recreational pleasures which long has characterized Oregon.

This pioneer State of the rugged Northwest stretches from a picturesque and wooded seacoast to alpine ridges cloaked with eternal snowbanks. It includes peaks more than 2 miles high and chasms a full mile in depth. It can offer ski tournaments in summer and golf tournaments in winter. It has wildlife refuges measured by horizons rather than acres, and it has national forests the size of New England States. Roses bloom in Portland most of the year, although Mount Hood's frosty glaciers are never out of sight from Portland on a clear day.

ROSES AND CONIFERS

Trees of fir and pine are more intimately identified with Oregon in the popular mind than is a delicate flower like the rose, for it is true that Oregon produces far greater quantities of lumber than any other State. Oregon is host to long, cool spring seasons and to summers without searing heat. This climate offers ideal hospitality to the rose, and so it is that Portland this June will mark the 50th anniversary of its famous Rose Festival. The occurrence will serve to inaugurate the precentennial events of 1958.

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

Portland's floral parade, principal feature of the Rose Festival, is rivaled only by that of Pasadena. Yet one great difference separates the two spectacles—the prize-winning roses of Portland are grown some 1,200 miles closer to the North Pole. To emphasize the contrasting diversions available in Oregon, a Golden Rose ski tournament is always held in connection with the Rose Festival. This take place at Timberline Lodge, in the solitudes of the Mount Hood National Forest, approximately 50 miles east of the city on a good State highway. In June of 1958, because the Rose Festival will be at half-century, a more elaborate occasion is planned.

INCREASING TOURISM

Anthony Brandenthaler, a lumberman from the upland community of Baker, is chairman of the Oregon Centennial Commission. He has predicted a substantial increase in the State's tourist trade this year, as a prelude to the 8 million visitors anticipated for the centennial year of 1959.

The dominant event of the centennial will be an exposition and international trade fair, to be held on the shores of the Columbia River, near Portland. It will continue from June 10 through September 20, 1959. Sponsors of the exposition hope to dramatize Oregon's strategic location on the Pacific frontier, with its deep harbors and sheltered bays. In addition to being a tourist attraction, it is designed to expand trade in Oregon fruits, lumber, fish, and grain with the countries of Asia.

Oregon's vivid past will play a strategic role in many of the plans for the centennial, and the active State Historical Society has had a major role in preparations. One such event is expected to take place this year. In 1956 Congress passed legislation authorizing the National Park Service to study the possibility of establishing a memorial park under Federal custodianship at Fort Clatsop, near Astoria, where the intrepid Lewis and Clark expedition spent the bleak winter of 1805–6. This report has been favorable, and the Interior Department has followed with a recommendation of a $280,000 governmental expenditure to launch the undertaking. If Congress approves these plans, the first national memorial park on the long 4,000-mile Lewis and Clark train could be dedicated this year.

Practically all such occasions in Oregon will involve, collaterally, innumerable sightseeing opportunities. Astoria, for example, is at the mouth of the Columbia River, mightiest of all the West's waterways. Some concept of the impressive proportions of the Columbia may be gained from the fact that it carries to tidewater nearly 10 times the flow of the Colorado River, author of the unsurpassed Grand Canyon. In fact, even the Snake River, chief tributary of the Columbia, contains more than twice the volume of the Colorado, and the Snake itself has trenched a 6,000-foot abyss along Oregon's eastern boundary known as Hells Canyon.

CONTRASTS

These two realms, some 400 miles apart, symbolize the wide range of contrasts which Oregon, near its first century as a State, offers to the traveler.

Some of the world's finest salmon fishing exists in the broad mouth of the Columbia, off the piers of Astoria. Boats owned by expert commercial fishermen are available for hire. The lordly Chinooks, weighing up to 70 or 80 pounds, cross the bar in thrashing schools as they return from salt water to fresh, on their mysterious migration to spawning grounds in the distant mountains.

The long Clatsop beaches, cloaked with glistening white sand, stretch southward from Astoria. Such resorts as Seaside and Gearhart are amply stocked with hotels, motels and good restaurants. U. S. 101 hugs the gnarled coastline like a lariat, extending to such other oceanshore resorts as Tillamook, Cannon Beach, Ocean Lake, Taft, Newport and many more. Golf courses are available at most such places, in addition to invigorating surf bathing in the chilly North Pacific for those who are young in heart and robust in health. The Centennial Commission has been encouraging the development of extra facilities for eating and lodging wherever feasible.

WILDERNESS

The Hells Canyon area of Oregon, by comparison, caters to the nomad who is willing to leave pavement behind and who does not object to terrain which has virtually been stood on end. This is a last great wilderness. In the Wallowa Mountains, which form the Oregon wall of the prodigious chasm, my wife and I have camped with the family of a cougar hunter, who made his living by delivering the pelts of the great cats at the county seat for $50 bounty apiece. This family never saw civilization through the long alpine winters. The mother educated their 8-year-old son with correspondence courses bought from a school on the faroff Atlantic coast. In these solitudes of Oregon there still is hunting for mule deer, stately elk and even cougar, if you can corner one on the dizzy rimrock. Out-of-State hunting licenses are somewhat more expensive than those for local residents.

The State has the most valuable national forests in the Nation. Ponderosa pine are as lofty as 20-floor office buildings, and a good deal more majestic. Creeks trill liltingly off rock ledges on their course to the Columbia. Trillium, Indian paintbrush, and the white puffs of bear grass turn meadows into a carpet of vivid colors. I doubt if any boy brought up in America has really savored what life can be in the spacious outdoors, until he has tented in the mountains of the Northwest.

Under the new $40 billion interstate highway program recently sanctioned by Congress, Oregon has two major roads which will qualify for such aid. One is U. S. 99, which bisects the State from Portland to Ashland in a north-and-south direction. The second is the principal artery of highway travel crossing Oregon from west to east—U. S. 30. This road is known all over the world as the Columbia River Highway, where it threads along the gorge which the great river has sliced through the Cascade Mountains and past such snowcapped sentinels as Mount Hood and Mount Adams. Sections of both U. S. 99 and U. S. 30 already have been built to 4-lane specifications. The entire routes are scheduled for such construction before the interstate program is completed.

CRATER LAKE

U. S. 99 goes through Medford, 1 of 2 main portals to Oregon's only unit of the national park system, the other entrance being the pine-lumber town of Klamath Falls. The park is Crater Lake, one of the extraordinary spectacles of nature's marvelous realm. Many epochs ago, an active volcano of the Cascade Range, Mount Mazama, blew off its summit in a mighty eruption. Crater Lake occupies the vast bowl thus created. Two-thousand-foot cliffs help to fashion a tureenlike effect, with Wizard Island a floating crouton in this massive receptacle. Crater Lake in color is an incredible blue—even bluer than the Mediterranean, claim experienced pilgrims.

Should your journey to Oregon include Crater Lake, be sure to vary this glimpse of a wonder of the outdoors by taking in a sample of mankind's talent, at the nearby community of Ashland. In August of each year, Ashland stages a Shakespearean festival which draws devotees of the theater in general and the Bard in particular from all 48 States.

NEW GLOBE THEATER

Southern Oregon College, which is in Ashland, actively sponsors this project. Thousands of visitors sit in their shirtsleeves and bare-armed dresses at a replica of the Globe Theater of Shakespeare's time. The balmy climate of southern Oregon makes this the natural thing to do.

Oregon, on the eve of its first 100 years as a State of the Union, contains nearly all of civilization's blessings, and yet is close to the frontier, too. While Oregon was a State, the last bitter war was fought with the encircled Nez Perce under the martyred chieftain, Joseph. Lieutenant Teller and H Company were wiped out to the last man, when a State government actually sat at Salem and passed laws.

Sixth Gold Medal Award of Honor of New York Southern Society

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HARRY FLOOD BYRD
OF VIRGINIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, March 3, 1958

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address delivered by Mr. Hugh Gordon Miller in presenting to Dr. Francis Pendleton Gaines the sixth gold medal award of honor of the New York Southern Society.

Dr. Gaines is president of Washington and Lee University, and is one of Virginia's most distinguished citizens.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS BY HUGH GORDEN MILLER, HISTORIAN, NEW YORK SOUTHERN SOCIETY, IN PRESENTING TO DR. FRANCIS PENDLETON GAINES, THE SOCIETY'S SIXTH GOLD MEDAL AWARD OF HONOR AND ITS INFORMAL CITATION FOR THE RECORD, AT THE ANNUAL DINNER OF THE SOCIETY IN THE GRAND BALLROOM, HOTEL PLAZA, NEW YORK CITY, ON JANUARY 17, 1958

Mr. president, honored guests, ladies and gentlemen, not merely the South, but this whole country has just finished celebrating with practically unanimous acclaim, the sesquicentennial anniversary of the birth of a great southern hero—the hero closest to the southern heart and the southern tradition—a hero second only in our southland to one other hero, also a Virginian, the immortal Father of his Counntry, first always in war and in peace.

George Washington, at Mount Vernon, typified the eternal principal that the victories of peace are more important than the victories of war. That is the great truth we seek to emphasize this evening, in presenting our gold medal award.

George Washington thus became, as the sons of the Revolution the honored custodian of old Fraunces Tavern, and represented here this evening, will testify, he thus became the American Cincinnatus, even outshining in some respects the great Roman consul who always returned to his farm and his plow after his victories for the Roman Republic and just as General Lee, an ex-superintendent of the Military Academy at West Point, went so heroically to work for a few paltry dollars to build up Washington College in Old Virginia.

Two days from now will be the 151st anniversary of the birthday of Robert E. Lee. This society always, in some way, observes

that birthday. We are going to anticipate by 2 days, and observe that birthday, by delivering our highest token of distinction—a citation for the record, and our gold medal of honor—to Dr. Francis P. Gaines, who for the past 28 years has carried on and expanded and developed the great work of both Washington, the founder, and Lee, the builder, of Washington and Lee University, at Lexington, Va.

Tonight we will observe these two birthday anniversaries; in doing this, we are emphasizing General Lee's achievement in his final days in the vital realm of education, teaching the youth of this country, and the South especially, by precept and example, the very best way to be good American citizens, even in the most trying times, following the great War Between the States. We are going to do this by honoring in the most emphatic way we know how, the splendid American who for these past 28 years, has been ever building upon the original foundation laid by Washington, and reshaped and reorganized by Robert E. Lee, by originating a number of new and vitally important new and original departments of learning; which were soon followed for the first time, with great success, by most of the principal colleges and universities of the country.

What I am now commissioned to do, as the official historian of this society, and to do in the presence of the distinguished presidents of four important southern universities is to emphasize, and to climax by quoting from a book of Dr. Gaines the words of a fifth great (and New England) New England university president, a remarkable tribute made 50 years ago, as splendid a tribute as was ever paid by such a witness to any human being. I like to feel that this witness is with us in spirit this evening. I will quote that contemporary testimony a little later on.

I am commissioned now, in the name of this society, to present our medal of distinction emphasizing the first and primary importance of education, high, and low, as to grades, as the best weapon with which to advance the cause of peace and justice, at home, and contribute most to the defense of our country, and all the free world, in their greatest hour of peril.

I shall not detain you with a recital of the many scholastic and educational achievements of Dr. Gaines. You can get them from any Who's Who in America. His contributions to State and Nation in civil life, in both World Wars, and the Korean conflict, and in the periods of peace which followed—achieved without for one moment losing control of the destinies and advancement of his ever-growing university—would fill a book.

I well remember that when the lawyers of New York City celebrated the anniversary of the birth of James Madison, the Father of the American Constitution, at town hall, Dr. Gaines was the unanimous selection for orator of the day, and as usual he accomplished that assignment as a master of American history, literature and patriotism, and our great heritage of liberty and justice.

The lawyers of this melting pot of new citizens selected Dr. Gaines as an eminent American scholar who could properly present and interpret the work of the Father of the American Constitution in an instructive and effective way.

However, Dr. Gaines, with all his great literary achievements, will best be remembered and appreciated by this particular society in connection with a little book of which he was the author, and which this society sponsored and distributed as a patriotic contribution to the cause of good citizenship, entitled "Lee, the Final Achievement." In that little book, Dr. Gaines resurrected and emphasized the beautiful tribute by the great New England president of Brown University, which tribute I am sure that the New England Society, so long our opposite number, and so often represented on this dais as it is tonight, will fully approve.

I now quote from Dr. Gaines' book the beautiful tribute of that member of the Grand Army of the Republic. It is a requote from the words uttered 50 years ago by Dr. E. Benjamin Andrews, then president of Brown University, who said: "The question of greatness is a relative thing, and we in America will probably always differ as to the rank of our prominent men. But, if an American father were asked which of our great men he would want his own son to resemble, that father if he were wise would be compelled to answer 'Robert E. Lee.'" That testimony speaks for itself and places Robert E. Lee in his proper place in American history for all time to come.

We hope that Dr. Gaines will—perhaps under the auspices of this society, as before without any commercial purposes—someday edit a new and enlarged edition of his book, as a final and mutual contribution to the Lee Sesquicentennial concluded a few days ago. It could do more for humanity, by inspiring the youth of today, than a thousand sputniks whirling through outer space, whether any of them reach the moon or not.

In 1959, this country will celebrate the 150th anniversary of the birth of Abraham Lincoln, with an acclaim that will be heard around the world. The South will join wholeheartedly in that acclaim, just as it did in 1909 on the 100th anniversary of Lincoln's birth, and just as the North has recently joined in acclaiming Robert E. Lee, on the 150th anniversary of his birth. The whole country has long since come to know and understand the purposes of both of these great men. The country has come to more and more know and to understand what both those great American heroes fought for primarily when they began that tremendous struggle—one for the reserved rights of the sovereign States, which he declined command of an army to invade, and accepted command of an army to defend; and the other fighting for an indivisible and indissoluable Union of these still-sovereign States of the United States. And no American would have it otherwise today.

It is a remarkable fact that the only time, so far as this historian knows, at any rate, that any face has ever appeared on a United States postage stamp opposite the face of Washington was the face of Robert E. Lee, and that was in connection with the creation of Washington and Lee University.

Dr. Gaines, I now have the very great honor and pleasure to present to you this very informal citation, and our gold medal, our highest token of honor and distinction, along with our undying affection and esteem; and the fervent hope that we will often be together in the future, as we have in the past, either in person or in spirit, in support of the great work being done by you at that splendid institution, Washington and Lee University, at Lexington, Va.

Briefly, this medal is awarded, and I quote: "To a man or woman born in the Southern States, who renders the most unusual achievement in perpetuation of the history and traditions of the South."

I quote further from an interpretation of this directive in regard to that medal, as follows: "We award our gold medal of distinction for cultural and literary achievement, primarily, as distinguished from mere political or even military achievements. Mere political or military accomplishments and the mere holding of high office, for instance, often have to do with controversial and temporary matters of little permanent moment in the life of a nation."

This gold medal of honor and distinction has been awarded only 5 times during the 72 years of the active existence of this society. The last such award having been made to Miss Margaret Mitchell, in 1938, author of the superb historical novel concerning the War Between the States, entitled "Gone With the Wind."

Regional Power Corporation for Columbia River Basin

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD L. NEUBERGER
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 3, 1958

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, with a view toward opening discussion for means of advancing development of the resources of the Columbia River, I recently introduced a bill designated as the Columbia River regional corporation bill. The proposal for establishing a corporate structure by which new multiple-purpose projects could be built with power revenues has evoked considerable comment—favorable, lukewarm, and critical.

Mr. Malcolm Bauer, special correspondent for the Christian Science Monitor, recently wrote on the subject of the power corporation proposal. His article was published in that newspaper's issue of January 13, 1958. I ask consent that the article be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Christian Science Monitor of January 13, 1958]

NEUBERGER TO PUSH POWER AUTHORITY FOR NORTHWEST

EXPANSION SPEEDED

(By Malcolm Bauer)

PORTLAND, OREG.—The new year promises to be a significant one in the development of the hydroelectric resources of the Columbia River system.

It will be a year of great expansion in the Pacific Northwest power empire, as dams and powerplants begun years ago come to completion. And it will surely be a year of major decisions in the continuing struggle between private and public interests for a dominant role in harnessing the great river and its tributaries.

Installation of new generators in both public and private hydroelectric projects in the next 12 months is scheduled to add 1,378,150 kilowatts to the capacity of the Columbia power system—the equal of 2 dams the size of Bonneville, which was the first big Federal project on the Columbia 20 years ago.

The flood of new kilowatts should relieve the power shortage which has been chronic for more than a decade in this region of low-priced energy. Officials of the Bonneville Power Administration, the marketing agency for power produced by Federal generators on the Columbia, estimate that the shortage will not return before 1965.

Bill proposed

Given the time it takes to build a major dam, however, 1958 is none too soon to plan to meet the crisis anticipated in 1965. The Federal contribution to the 1958 additions to the power pool will come from two projects: Chief Joseph Dam and the Dalles Dam, first authorized by Congress early in the decade.

For this reason, there is much Pacific Northwest interest in a bill to set up a

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

Columbia basin regional power corporation, to be introduced in the new session of Congress by Senator RICHARD L. NEUBERGER, Democrat, of Oregon.

Bond issue

Senator NEUBERGER's proposal is that the Federal Government set up for the Pacific Northwest an independent regional agency to plan, construct, and operate the power facilities of the Columbia system. Such an agency would absorb the Bonneville Power Administration, which is merely a marketing and distributing agency. It would be governed by a board composed of Northwest residents, operating as an agency of the Federal Government.

Of overriding importance would be the board's authority to finance the construction of hydroelectric projects by issuing bonds to be retired out of power revenues. The uncertainty of congressional appropriations has been a major hindrance to growth in the Federal program in the Pacific Northwest.

The proposed agency would be similar to the Tennessee Valley Authority with respect to the power production and distribution activities of the latter; but it would not, as does TVA, have responsibility in other resource fields.

Clause preferred

The Neuberger bill is similar to a measure prepared by the Pacific Northwest Public Power Association, representing local public bodies engaged in the production and distribution of power.

The principal difference is in a suggested amendment to the preference clause, a provision of Federal law which for a half century has required that electricity produced by the Federal Government should go first to meet the requirements of publicly owned distributors and thereafter to private power distributors.

The Pacific Northwest Public Power Association naturally prefers to retain this clause as it is. Senator NEUBERGER's bill would modify the preference clause to give preferred classification also to private industrial organizations buying directly from the regional power authority.

FEDERAL-PRIVATE RACE

This provision of Senator NEUBERGER's bill is of particular importance to his native State, because Oregon electric utility systems are largely privately owned, whereas public ownership of power facilities dominates in the State of Washington.

Oregon utility executives foresee a time when public power distributors will demand all power produced in the Federal system in the Northwest, and private firms will be forced to rely on their own resources. Generally, they are opposed to the Neuberger bill and its treatment of the preference clause, which they would much rather see eliminated.

It is this fear of eventual exclusion from the product of the Federal system that has given an air of urgency and determination to the private power industry's drive to stake out private claims among the dam sites on the Columbia and its tributaries. With the executive support of the Eisenhower administration, they have more than held their own. More than half of 1958's new kilowatts will come from projects financed by private capital.

New effort pledged

The biggest of these are Brownlee Dam on the Snake River, Swift Dam on the Lewis River in Washington, and Pelton Dam on the Deschutes River in Oregon. The three have been built by the Idaho Power Co., Pacific Power & Light Co., and Portland General Electric Co., respectively.

The Brownlee project is the first of the three undertaken by Idaho Power in that section of the middle Snake in which public-power advocates wanted to build a high Hells Canyon dam. Oregon's Democratic congressional delegation is pledged to a renewed effort in this session of Congress to win congressional authorization and appropriation for the Hells Canyon Dam.

The Idaho Power Co. has rushed the Brownlee project, not unmindful that the further it proceeds, the less the possibility that Congress will pass a Hells Canyon bill, already rejected four times. The Brownlee project is scheduled to begin pumping 270,300 kilowatts into the Northwest power pool by next fall. Its entire works would be flooded out by a high dam at the Hells Canyon site.

Idaho Power Co. won the battle of Hells Canyon before the Federal Power Commission. A similar struggle has been raging in the same arena for the right to develop the Snake River downstream from Hells Canyon, to be discussed in the next article.

Traffic Safety—Blueprint for Achievement

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS H. KUCHEL
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, March 3, 1958

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, all Americans have been greatly encouraged by the recent progress in the fight against traffic accidents. Total fatalities in 1957 were slightly lower than in 1956, despite an increase in the mileage of vehicle travel. But the toll of more than 38,000 deaths last year, and 1.3 million persons injured, is still a tragic and challenging record. It will not permit a single moment's letup in the campaign for safer streets and highways.

Recently, in Salt Lake City, Utah, at the annual meeting of the Utah Safety Council, an excellent address on this subject was made by Mr. T. S. Petersen, president of the Standard Oil Company of California, and a distinguished civic leader of the State of California. Mr. Petersen is chairman of the Business Advisory Council to the President's Committee for Traffic Safety, and in his Utah address he demonstrates how a business and industrial leader can fulfill the responsibilities which the safety challenge imposes on all of us.

Mr. Peterson's remarks also outline some of the constructive steps which will be taken this year to assist States and local communities in their quest for a solution of this problem, under sponsorship of the President's Committee. I ask unanimous consent, to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, the text of his address.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UTAH AND TRAFFIC SAFETY—A BLUEPRINT FOR ACHIEVEMENT

Thank you very much, Governor Clyde, Mayor Stewart, Mr. Black, and members of the Utah Safety Council. The pleasure I've experienced at being briefly home again in Utah has certainly been supplemented at this meeting today. May I congratulate all of you on the enthusiasm you are displaying for a cause which is shared by, I am sure, everyone in the Nation—the common cause of traffic safety.

This enthusiasm on your part is, quite frankly, easy to understand. There is no one who is not continually reminded, day by day in many ways, how frightful the carnage on our roads and highways has become. One need only sit in an office and listen to the sirens on the city streets, or pick up a newspaper on the way home at night, to be reminded again and again how thoughtless drivers can be and how helpless, it seems, we have been up to now in finding a solutiton to our national traffic safety problems.

In using the word thoughtless, I am reminded of a newspaper article which appeared several weeks ago in my local newspaper. On Friday evening, January 17, the area where I live was covered by the worst fog in more than a decade. It came in from the sea at the height of the commuting hours and then lifted suddenly at about midnight.

The next afternoon, my newspaper headlined the remarkable fact that five persons had been critically injured in traffic accidents since the previous evening, all of them in accidents which happened after the fog lifted, none while the fog was on the ground.

One would surely think, reading this, that drivers today actually wait for good visibility so they can aim their vehicles at one another like a scientists aims a guided missile.

I'm sure you agree that we must put an end to this target practice. And we must do it as soon as we possibly can.

I said a moment ago that we seemed to be helpless in finding a solution to our traffic safety problems. Perhaps this language was a little too pessimistic for there is much being done today, in every State, and in almost every community. Most certainly in Utah you have hard-working organizations which are looking ahead to the job which remains to be done, not backward at what has already been accomplished.

I'd like, if I may, to join you in looking ahead for a few moments. Perhaps today we can put some dimension to this challenge we, as a nation, face and map out a few of the paths which must be followed if the job to which we have all given so much time is to be done.

Many of you will recall that the President's Committee for Traffic Safety held its first Western Regional Conference in 1956. Like many similar meetings, this one, being the first of its kind, spent much time simply getting off the ground. But this does not mean that nothing was accomplished. The opposite is true.

This first regional traffic safety conference was attended by delegates from 10 Western States and provided a common meeting ground for people who had expressed a real and active interest in traffic safety. It gave them the chance to get together and discuss their common problems. It gave them the chance to sit down and exchange ideas and plans, to give and receive basic philosophies which could be taken home and used in months to come.

And, most importantly, it aroused throughout the West, a much higher degree of citizen support for traffic safety work, the support without which any such program would collapse.

Your State is a good example of how effective this citizen support can be. In talking with many of you before this meeting, it has been clearly pointed out to me that the Utah traffic safety effort has, since you met with the other 10 Western States in 1956, received a great deal more citizen support and citizen participation. With this

added support, your council has been able to work more precisely and effectively these past 2 years.

It was most gratifying to witness the manner in which the Utah delegates returned from this 1956 meeting and set promptly to work doing what they could to supplement the efforts of the existing traffic safety program. Individual citizens, industrial firms and State organizations all took a renewed interest in the work that had to be done. In the last 2 years, your State, and particularly your safety council, has clearly demonstrated its support of traffic safety on both the local and the national level.

It is no idle compliment when I say that your statewide traffic safety organization now stands as an example of what can be done. This is not to say that your way is best, for what applies in one State may not apply in another. But it does seem that you have tailored the suit which best fits your particular frame. Others should look to Utah for guidance and I'm sure they do.

In an effort to provide you with a closer look at the national traffic safety picture, let me digress here for a moment and present some statistics which you might find of interest.

In December of last year, representatives of the President's Committee reported on the number of States which are presently organized in some way to promote traffic safety. Generally, the picture appears quite satisfactory. Of the 48 States, 39 have some kind of traffic safety organization. In the 11 Western States, 8 groups are at work to some degree.

These figures, however, are deceptive. Some of these State committees are primarily on paper while others are insufficiently staffed and financed to do the job required.

It is the responsibility of every citizen to encourage that something be done in those States where no group is functioning. Also, where an organization already exists, but citizens of a State feel a more effective group is desired, these citizens must make their desires known.

In States such as Utah, where an effective organization is already at work, various national groups stand ready to assist in whatever way they can. In these areas some very real progress can be made with the professional help so willingly offered and provided by the Automotive Safety Foundation, the National Safety Council, and the President's Committee, among others.

As an example, the increased field staff of the National Safety Council has been of tremendous help all across the Nation. It is now possible to furnish prompt, skilled assistance to any group interested in organizing a statewide citizen's traffic safety committee. The mere fact that this help is available greatly strengthens the national program.

Utah, incidentally, can be proud of the way in which it has made use of the aid offered by these people.

It's a good thing that you have this sound and workable organization, for the challenge which faces you here in this State is big beyond definition. Your patience and your dedication will be sorely tried in the months and years to come.

Perhaps the scope of the challenge may best be summarized by a quick look at a few key figures.

In 1956, 39,628 American men, women, and children met death in motor vehicle accidents. The latest available estimate for 1957 shows that this figure has dropped to about 38,500. Some improvement, yet, but still a tragedy of the first magnitude.

The highway death situation reached its climax, as you all know, during the Christmas holiday several weeks ago. In the course of that festive 30-hour period 224 died in highway accidents alone and countless others were injured. Imagine all that destruction in only a day and a quarter.

It is a double tragedy that most Americans, reading those holiday headlines, gave monentary expression to their shock and sadness and then went their way with not another thought to what must be done to stop this senseless trend toward more and more death and injury.

While it would be visionary to say that all traffic deaths are preventable, common observation and common sense tell us that undoubtedly most of them are preventable. We know that the rate of fatal traffic accidents can be reduced because it has been reduced.

In 1934, the nationwide rate was more than 16 deaths for every 100 million miles traveled by motor vehicles. By 1956, the national rate was down to 6.4. The rate for 1957 has not yet been published but it should be down a little, not much, but a little.

Yet the total of motor vehicle deaths in 1934 was 36,000, compared to the 38,500 for 1957. While the death rate has gone down sharply, the highway slaughter increases because each year more cars travel more miles, at higher speeds, in greater traffic congestion.

Street and highway traffic in America is the sum of 55 million automobiles, 12 million trucks, and a quarter of a million buses in motion on 3½ million miles of roads.

The daily movement of people and goods by this enormous, ever-increasing fleet of vehicles, public and private, makes motor transportation the largest single common activity in the American economy. In all its phases motor transportation is, and for many years has been, the Nation's biggest business.

We all know that the motor vehicle has made the American economy the most highly developed in the world. We have seen it change the face of our land, remold our way of life, and enrich our culture. It has enabled us to do more work and pursue pleasure more widely than any other people in history.

But the motor vehicle as a mass mechanism is accident prone. In the hands of 75 million Americans licensed to drive, the Nation's automobiles, trucks, buses, and taxis have become instruments of death and injury.

The risks of accident exposure and potential tragedy increase each day. Unchecked, such a toll would mean that scarcely any individual in the United States could escape during his lifetime the tragedy of having one or more of his friends, relatives or associates killed or injured in a traffic accident.

So far we have talked only of statistics. The human aspects of the accident problem are, of course, of even more concern. All of us have had friends, relatives, or fellow-workers killed or seriously injured in traffic. How few are the cases in which we did not shake our heads in the realization that the tragedy need not have happened, that a bit more caution and forethought, a trifle less speed, a gesture of courtesy, an extra measure of alertness on someone's part, would have spared a life.

No citizen can escape responsibility for taking part in the effort to cut down the needless human waste and economic cost of accidents. And I think everyone today can contribute a great deal to this effort. Indeed, you people have already done so.

Knowing the residents of Utah, I can easily forecast your next question, "What, specifically, can we do beyond what we have already done?"

The answer to that question lies in two places. The first is the creation of a proper traffic safety climate in the State itself; the second is the continued quest for a well organized and broadly applicable national program.

In any individual State, several things must be done before citizen representatives can go to a regional conference and either offer anything constructive or make maximum use of what they learn from others. What I am about to say holds true for every State in the Union.

Any workable traffic safety program needs, as I mentioned before, a high degree of citizen support. State officials, organizations such as the Utaah Safety Council, and interested individuals must have the direct and active support of their friends and neighbors. They cannot do their job otherwise.

The support is particularly vital in the realm of legislation, much of which, in spite of its motives and purpose, will be distasteful to some voters. Traffic safety takes money. Traffic safety takes reorganization: the renovation of outdated administrative functions. Traffic safety takes autonomy: the freedom to do what must be done and do it at once. All this must be accomplished by legislation supported by an aroused citizenry.

Traditionally, the American citizen, unless he is alerted to a specific need, is reluctant to agree to change and the expenditure of large sums years after year. Unless this man, this voter, is firmly aware of the havoc which our traffic is creating, you will not be able to get your money, your adequate personnel, your new roads, your organizational changes which are the basic needs for your future success.

And so, the course you must follow is clear. Use your present organization as the basis for rallying about you all the citizens of your State. Tell them again and again what must be done and then set out to do it. Therein lies your first great challenge.

Let me make it very clear that on both the State and national levels you will have the unqualified support of business and industry. A good example of this support lies in the degree to which business is represented at this luncheon today.

Speaking nationally, an outstanding illustration of what industry is doing to support the traffic safety movement is the recently announced Aim To Live program sponsored by General Motors Corp. and spearheaded by its president, Harlow Curtice, who is also chairman of the President's Committee for Traffic Safety.

General Motors has focused its attention on the critical realm of better vision at night in an effort to reduce the excessive night driving toll which last year took nearly 20,000 lives. The company has inaugurated a broad campaign designed to encourage motorists to properly aim their headlights and have them inspected at least twice a year. It urges them to observe the dimming rule and to limit their speed at night.

To make it easy for the driver to follow such a program, the company has enlisted the aid of its 19,000 truck and car dealers plus thousands of independent garages and service stations. By doing this, General Motors is offering concrete assistance to a program which it proposes.

Last week's issue of Life magazine and the latest issue of the Saturday Evening Post both carry 3-page ads which explain the program. Look at these ads and see what one company has done to help us all. Accept this one commendable project as evidence that business is doing something to help you meet the first challenge you face.

Now, what of the second challenge I mentioned earlier?

You in Utah will not be alone as you try to do a traffic safety job, as you try once again to acquaint your friends and neighbors with what must be done. Many others throughout the land are as enthusiastic as you and are working today toward the same end—greater highway safety. Many organizations, some national and some local, are also laboring with renewed and growing vigor. One of these is the group of which Larry Black is a member, the Business Ad-

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

visory Panel of the President's Committee for Traffic Safety.

The entire President's committee has plans at work today which will help you tomorrow. If I may, I'd like to take a few moments to go over these plans with you.

As many of you know, President Eisenhower appointed this committee in 1954, charging it with promoting the national action program and developing active traffic safety organizations in every State. The committee held its first regional conferences in 1956.

As a direct result of these conferences, many State organizations are now functioning smoothly and have a firm footing on which to base their next step.

But many have asked since that time what direction this next step should take. In the hope that we can come up with an answer, 4 more regional conferences have been planned for 1958, 1 each in Atlantic City, Miami, Chicago, and San Francisco.

The background for these forthcoming conferences is interesting. Last December, the President's Committee sponsored a Public Officials Conference in Washington, D. C., attended by about 500 key State, county, and municipal officials from all across the country. Purpose of this meeting was to outline specific traffic safety needs nationally, State by State and city by city. In large measure, this work is now complete. A firm foundation has now been laid for the coming regional traffic safety conferences. It remains now to see what these meetings bring forth.

As far as Utah is concerned, you all know of the work which has been done here since this official's conference, and indeed, long before it met. Governor Clyde, following a suggestion of your own safety council, and in accordance with a fundamental recommendation of the officials' conference, took definite action. He created a Coordinating Committee of State Officials.

This coordinating committee is now developing a balanced program for traffic safety. Once this has been done your safety council can provide organized public support of that program.

Utah is already a leader among those States which have followed the action program formulated at President Eisenhower's 1954 White House conference. And you obviously intend to remain a leader.

Today, both your council and the governor's committee are gathering data and information on which will be based Utah's 1958 traffic safety program. In the near future, these two groups will meet to formulate statewide plans. Your package is almost all wrapped up and ready to take to the western regional conference April 8 and 9 for presentation to other western citizens.

The contents of this package are a good indication of the fine work which has been done in Utah to date.

In your State alone, recent additions to the National System of Interstate and Defense Highways total about 250 miles. Best available estimates indicate that these recent additions have meant, or will eventually mean, the expenditure of $100 million, with more to come later on. Such a vast increase is bound to have a tremendous effect on the State's economy.

Most of these new highways will be of the freeway type, four lanes divided by a median strip. Experience has already shown us that this type of construction minimizes the danger of head-on collisions. Recent testimony before Congress indicates that the death rate on divided roads is just about half what it is on the conventional type.

In addition to planning ahead for the new, safer roads and highways you need, Utah is to be congratulated for its work in highlighting the economic cost of traffic accidents. The research and planning division of your State highway department started more than a year ago to investigate the detailed cost of traffic accidents in which Utah passenger cars were involved over a 12-month period. It is my understanding that this study is in its final phases and the results will be known possibly within the next 2 or 3 months.

Still another commendable item in the package you will carry with you to your next Western Regional Conference is the high school driver training program which the Utah Legislature provided in 1956 by a $1 supplement to the State license fee.

Such legislative action, once it is outlined to those in other States, will serve as an example of what can be done. Talk about this in April when you meet with the citizens of other Western States. Let the West know that proper training can prevent accidents before they happen. Let the West know what your experience has been in this essential category of our traffic safety effort.

I am very happy to announce, incidentally, that Larry Black has agreed to serve as head of the Utah delegation to this forthcoming regional meeting. I know now that you will be prepared to do something specific while you are there.

The phrase "something specific" is the keynote of the April conference. Many of you have undoubtedly been to conventions and meetings where a good deal of work and effort has been put forth, while the delegates, once the affair was over, have been unable to answer the vital question, "What did we really accomplish?"

Too many times, conventions and conferences highlight a problem but propose no solution, leaving the delegates to say "This is all well and good, but where do we go from here?"

The President's Committee intends that the four 1958 regional conferences shall not fall into a trap of this sort. We intend that these meetings shall, with your help, do something specific rather than waste the time of the important people who will attend.

It is our sincere hope that all delegations attending these four conferences will bring home with them a positive plan of action, detailed down to the simples procedures and encompassing all the knowledge of the various traffic safety groups who will attend. The President's Committee believes, and has so planned its conference programs, that State delegations will find what they need to support them in the jobs they are doing at home.

Pinpointing your particular role in this April meeting, let me say simply that the Utah Safety Council will, and I speak from experience, be one of the groups which takes the lead in seeing that the conference accomplishes its purpose.

Beyond this, I am confident that your organization will, once the conference is over, continue to take the lead here in Utah and help push it to a high place on the roll of those States which place sufficient value on human life to be willing to do something about preserving it wherever possible.

There lies your second challenge—to share your knowledge and your ambition with others on common ground and from this conference and others to come, to gain the increased knowledge and ambition which will lead you to success in your efforts.

One more point: Let me ask that in the months and years to come you continue to speak up as you have done in the past rather than soft-pedal your plans. Ask through every public relations media at your disposal for added citizen support and, once you have it, you will find the money, the administration, the increased personnel, and the time to push your work to its conclusion. Speak loudly and you'll be heard.

All of us throughout the Nation who share your desire to make our streets and highways safe rather than sinister are watching what you can do.

We've seen the fine start you have made and how time and again you have renewed your dedication to the cause of saving lives.

Personally, this opportunity to meet with you today has been a tonic. I have the feeling that if you can accomplish as much as you have, others can do the same. Perhaps things aren't as bad as the figures indicate. Perhaps by the time our new roads are finished, and there are another 20 million cars and trucks on the highways, we'll have been able to infect all the people of Utah, and the entire country, for that matter, with a little of the enthusiasm which has carried us this far.

Perhaps then they will join us in helping to prevent this wholesale destruction. Perhaps they will sense that something concrete and effective can be done and, in the end, help us do it.

Thank you again for letting me talk with you today. May I wish you all the best of luck for the coming year—one which I pray will be both a safe and productive one, here in my native State and throughout the land.

Appropriations for Improved Library Services

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THRUSTON B. MORTON
OF KENTUCKY
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, March 3, 1958

Mr. MORTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a very excellent letter concerning the appropriations for improved library services, which I have received from Dr. Robert R. Martin, Superintendent of Public Instruction of the Department of Education for the Commonwealth of Kentucky.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

COMMONWEALTH OF KENTUCKY
DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION,
Frankfort, February 26, 1958.

The Honorable THRUSTON B. MORTON,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR MORTON: Kentucky's aspirations and accelerated efforts for greatly improved library services for our people seem to be facing serious appropriation obstacles in President Eisenhower's proposal of only a $3 million appropriation for the Library Services Act for 1958–59.

It is my understanding an appropriation of the above amount would reduce Kentucky's share to only $50,000. The present appropriation of $5 million gives our State program $137,000. A full appropriation of $7,500,000 would give Kentucky $221,000.

The impact of our efforts of the past few years to implement greatly improved library services is just now beginning to benefit our people. We now have 96 bookmobiles in operation which are closely geared to the development of regional library centers. We have 4 new regional libraries in operation and the establishment of 4 more is scheduled for 1958–59. Ultimately, plans call for about 15 regional libraries serving all sections of Kentucky. As you well know, this program of expanded library services, coupled with improvements in public education, would give great impetus to our efforts to raise the educational level of our people.

It is my understanding an appropriation of only $3 million would result in the clos-

ing of at least 2 of our newly established regional libraries and abandonment of the plans for the establishment of 4 regional libraries scheduled for next year.

Since an appropriation of $5 million will make it possible for Kentucky's program to only stand still at its present level, I want to urge you to exert your efforts and influence for the full appropriation of $7,500,000 for the year 1958–59. I am sure your help in this matter will be sincerely appreciated by not only the professional persons involved in our library program, but also by the many good citizens who have given so freely of their time and material support to our library program.

Cordially yours,

ROBERT R. MARTIN,
Superintendent of Public Instruction.

Results of McGregor 1958 Poll on National Issues

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. J. HARRY McGREGOR

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 3, 1958

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I would like to place in the RECORD the results of the questionnaire which I annually send to the people of the 17th Ohio District, the district which it is my proud honor to represent in the Congress of the United States.

It has always been my belief that it is the duty and responsibility of every elected representative to do everything possible to obtain the views of those he represents on the vital national and international problems which confront us all. For this reason, I instituted the annual courthouse meetings, and for this reason I also circulate this questionnaire among the people of the district.

In connection with the distribution of the questionnaire, I want to mention particularly that the newspapers of my district have again provided wonderful cooperation. This year every daily paper in the district, and most of the weekly papers, published the questionnaire in a prominent place in their papers, so that a great many people who could not be reached by direct mail were given an opportunity to express themselves on these important matters. I am deeply grateful to these public-spirited editors and publishers for their assistance.

I am, of course, sorry that I could not reach every one of my constituents with this questionnaire, but it is my conviction that the replies received, coming as they do from representatives of almost every walk of life, provide me with a very helpful indication of the trend of thinking among a good cross-section of my people. As a part of the questionnaire, I ask them to mention their occupation or profession, and this gives me an opportunity to tabulate the results not only by overall percentages but also by somewhat more stratified separate groupings. I feel that this procedure gives me a more accurate and complete analysis of their opinions.

The population of my district is about half rural and half urban, and nearly all of the labor and farm organizations are represented, as well as both large and small business. In addition, there are two universities and two colleges. I am happy to report that answers were received from representatives of every one of these groups, and especially gratifying to me were the large number of completed forms which contained additional comments on the various questions. It is reassuring to me to know that so many constituents in my district are interested in the important issues now before this legislative body and are eager to express their views on them.

The questionnaire and the results are as follows:

A QUESTIONNAIRE

In an endeavor to learn the views of the folks back home relative to several subjects of national importance that will be before the Congress, may we have your considered opinion?

NATIONAL DEFENSE

After 18 months of continuous study, the nongovernmental Rockefeller studies group last week reported to the Nation that the United States must boost defense spending by about $3 billion each year for the next several years if it wants to halt a rapidly deteriorating position in the military race with Russia.

(NOTE.—The 21-man panel which made the Rockefeller study was a nonpartisan, nongovernmental group headed by Nelson Rockefeller. It consisted of a cross section of American life—scientists, representatives of labor, industrialists, former defense officials and military officers, atomic experts, educators, and publishers. Among the panel members was Gen. Lucius Clay, well known in our district.)

	Percent	
	Yes	No
Do you favor a larger congressional appropriation for defense purposes?	76	24

TAXES

Before the successful launching of the Russian earth satellites, there was hope for the possibility of a tax cut this year. Now it appears that a choice must be made between stronger defense and lower taxes.

	Percent	
	Yes	No
Are you willing to postpone a tax cut in order that the necessary funds are available for defense needs?	81	19

EDUCATION

The Russians have apparently made tremendous strides in scientific education. Various proposals will be forthcoming concerning ways in which the Federal Government might assist in improving the level of education in this country.

	Percent	
	Yes	No
(a) Do you favor a system of Government-sponsored scholarships for the training of students showing exceptional aptitude in the sciences?	68	32
(b) Do you favor the appropriation of funds by Congress for construction of schools?	41	59

THE FARM PROGRAM

Do you believe that the "soil bank program" should be continued?	27	73
Do you believe that all Federal controls on farm products should be removed?	64	36

PERCENTAGE DISTRIBUTION OF REPLIES TO QUESTIONNAIRE BY OCCUPATION OR PROFESSION

	Yes	No
Do you favor a larger Congressional appropriation for defense purposes?		
Total results, all occupations	76	24
Labor	71	29
Ministers	80	20
Newspaper and radio	75	25
Public officeholders and Federal employees	75	25
Professional men, doctors, dentists, engineers, etc	77	23
Teachers	82	18
Attorneys	73	27
Businessmen, industry, and salesmen	77	23
Farmers	48	52
Housewives	76	24
Students	95	5
Retired	70	30
Occupation not given	55	45
Are you willing to postpone a tax cut in order that the necessary funds are available for defense needs?		
Total results, all occupations	81	19
Labor	76	24
Ministers	100	0
Newspaper and radio	75	25
Public officeholders and Federal employees	75	25
Professional men, doctors, dentists, engineers, etc	80	20
Teachers	88	12
Attorneys	87	13
Businessmen, industry and salesmen	78	22
Farmers	62	38
Housewives	83	17
Students	93	7
Retired	78	22
Occupation not given	58	42
Do you favor a system of Government-sponsored scholarships for the training of students showing exceptional aptitude in the sciences?		
Total results, all occupations	68	32
Labor	68	32
Ministers	83	17
Newspaper and radio	50	50
Public officeholders and Federal employees	64	36
Professional men, doctors, dentists, engineers	55	45
Teachers	73	27
Attorneys	71	29
Businessman, industry and salesmen	68	32
Farmers	46	54
Housewives	72	28
Students	91	9
Retired	67	33
Occupation not given	44	56
Do you favor the appropriation of funds by Congress for construction of schools?		
Total results, all occupations	41	59
Labor	48	52
Ministers	66	34
Newspaper and radio	43	57
Public officeholders and Federal employees	44	56
Professional men, doctors, dentists, engineers	32	68
Teachers	66	34
Attorneys	13	87
Businessmen, industry, and salesmen	38	62
Farmers	29	71
Housewives	49	51
Students	62	38
Retired	23	77
Occupation not given	31	69
Do you believe that the soil-bank program should be continued?		
Total results, all occupations	27	73
Labor	18	82
Ministers	17	83
Newspaper and radio	38	62
Public officeholders and Federal employees	17	83
Professional men, doctors, dentists, engineers	19	81
Teachers	29	71
Attorneys	14	86
Businessmen, industry and salesmen	16	84

Approved For Release 1999/09/08 : CIA-RDP60-00321R000100010001-4

PERCENTAGE DISTRIBUTION OF REPLIES TO QUESTIONNAIRE BY OCCUPATION OR PROFESSION—continued

	Yes	No
Do you believe that the soil-bank program should be continued?—Con.		
Farmers	21	79
Housewives	35	65
Students	59	41
Retired	11	89
Occupation not given	14	86
Do you believe that all Federal controls on farm products should be removed?		
Total results, all occupations	64	36
Labor	73	27
Ministers	83	17
Newspaper and radio	57	43
Public officeholders and Federal employees	78	22
Professional men, doctors, dentists, engineers	74	26
Teachers	41	59
Attorneys	74	26
Businessmen, industry, and salesmen	84	16
Farmers	74	26
Housewives	66	34
Students	21	79
Retired	86	14
Occupation not given	72	28

Economic Conditions in Washington County, Maine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FREDERICK G. PAYNE
OF MAINE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, March 3, 1958

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a very interesting and thought-provoking letter to the editor in the February 19 issue of the Portland (Maine) Press Herald from the Honorable Roscoe C. Emery, of Eastport, Maine, in regard to economic conditions in Washington County, Maine, may be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NO ROOM FOR GLOOM DOWN EAST

To the EDITOR OF THE PRESS HERALD:

During the past year there has been a good deal of propaganda—that is probably the correct description of it—representing the economic condition of Washington County, particularly the Eastport area, as being depressed to the point of demoralization. In this connection I should like to present some facts that show a somewhat different picture.

There are certain indices that any economic study of this county worth a moment's consideration should take into account. Among these is commercial banking activity, which was greater in 1957 than in 1956 in the county as a whole. Savings accounts, except in banks paying minimum rates of interest, were generally larger in 1957 than in 1956, one institution reporting a savings department gain of no less than 13.7 percent. The Department of Banks and Banking states that consolidated reports of the savings banks (as such) in this county show an increase in deposits during 1957 of $362,863 to which must be added an increase of $304,000 in a savings institution of another type, a total of $666,863, which isn't bad for an area said to be in an economic plight. Tax payments have, in the main, been good. Every municipality—town, city, or plantation—in the county paid its county tax in full by January 1, 1958—perhaps not too many counties in Maine can equal that record. The county treasurer's report for 1957 shows that $30,000 was paid on the bonded indebtedness of the county, and that its net debt was reduced by about $25,000, indicating that it is continuing to walk out from under the bonded debt of $500,000 it assumed some 50 years ago in connection with the construction of the Washington County Railroad, now a part of the Maine Central system.

TONS OF BERRIES

The blueberry crop in 1957 was the largest in years, figures by one authority at 11 million pounds of processed berries worth $1,830,000 as compared with something less than 7 million pounds worth $800,000 in 1956. The sardine season in 1957 in this county was not as poor as has been reported—the county's total pack was only 50,000 cases under that of 1956. The State department of agriculture, in a release dated January 2, said Washington County had last season its best run of fish in 5 years. It is true that lobster fishermen were paid lower prices than in 1956, and that the clam fishery isn't, and probably won't ever again be the resource it has been in earlier years. It is also true that, as elsewhere in Maine, purchases of pulpwood fell off by as much as 30 percent, which is serious, but resulted mainly from a policy of reducing inventories so that it probably won't recur this year.

On the other hand, the tourist business, aided by improved conditions on Route 1, was materially better than in 1956, and farming, never previously a very impressive factor in the county's economy, has taken a turn for the better. According to County Agent L. G. Rozelle, "a million dollar industry has been built up in hatching eggs" and "Washington County is taking its place in modern agriculture with higher quality and efficiency in the lines of agriculture adaptable to the area."

Other, perhaps negative indices, include the fact, that Washington County had only five bankruptcies in 1957, compared with 10 in Piscataquis, with only about half of our population; 14 in Waldo, with only three-fifths our population; and 47 in Somerset, with only 5,000 more people than we have. Also, we have comparatively few foreclosures—never a mass foreclosure such as occurred in Aroostook last May when the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation took over 20 pieces of real estate in the Fort Fairfield area alone. While figures on total gifts to such charitable funds as the March of Dimes, Red Cross, and Salvation Army are not available, it is believed they were not less in 1957 than in 1956 and previous years. There seem to be as many cars and trucks per capita here as in other rural areas of Maine; about as many TV sets, and wherever I have been in this county the people seemed to be both well fed and well clothed. Most of our residents own their own homes, and such mortgages as there are have been incurred mainly in the process of purchase. As stated, not many are under foreclosure.

MILLIONS IN CONSTRUCTION

On the more positive side, it should be pointed out that the St. Croix Paper Co. has spent $15 million in improving and enlarging its facilities at Woodland; a million-dollar bridge is nearing completion at Jonesport-Beale's Island; and a $30 million naval radar instalation is already underway in Cutler. Perhaps this depression talk and calamity howling has been slightly overdone, especially as the Quoddy tidal power project is now in the offing with all the enormous industrial activity it would involve.

It is true, of course, that unemployment, as listed in the Calais office, reached its highest point in 5 years during December but increase in unemployment is not peculiar to Washington County. There is increasing unemployment everywhere. It is also true that during December it is likely to reach its peak for the year in this county. Last summer blueberry processors had to import labor from Nova Scotia to harvest the crop, and pulpwood operators have for years complained about the lack of laborers in their line.

As to Eastport, which always seems to be singled out for special mention by the crepe-hangers, it so happens that Eastport doesn't owe a dollar of bonded debt and has a surplus of $75,000 on hand. Its city manager reported early in January that no less than 85 percent of the 1957 tax had then been collected, with 3 months remaining before the tax-lien deadline—as satisfactory a record as in any of the past 5 years. He further reports that its relief load is easy, its burden is light—amounting last year to only $1,800—and that excise-tax collections for 1957 were well above those for 1956. Deposits in the Eastport Savings Bank were larger on January 1, 1958, than on January 1, 1957, being now at an all-time high. There are plenty of new cars on the streets, and the dwellings here bristle with TV antennas. Eastport may not be as prosperous as some towns in Maine, but it is very, very far from being as badly off as it has been represented to be.

A SHOPWORN PHRASE

The disaster propaganda referred to, in which the phrase economic plight is a stock, if somewhat shopworn phrase, is not in any way helpful either to the welfare or the morale of Eastport or Washington County as a whole, and the time has come to put a stop to it by applying to vague derogatory statements the test of facts and figures, as was done under somewhat similar circumstances 4 years ago, when it was squelched by a single presentation of dependable information.

There is no place in this county for a negative or defeatist attitude. What we need and should cultivate is the same aggressive, self-reliant and resourceful booster spirit that has put many another area, some of them right here in Maine, well on the way to solid prosperity.

R. C. EMERY.

Industrial Development Conference Planned by Chicago & North Western Railway

REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, March 3, 1958

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, on March 20 a precedent-making conference will occur in my State.

For the first time, I think, a major American railroad will convene a conference dealing with the importance of industrial development of the area it serves.

The conference, arranged by the Chicago & North Western Railway Co., and to be held in Milwaukee, will be attended by some 350 leaders of industrial development in Wisconsin cities, towns, and villages served by the railroad.

I may say, incidentally, that the Chicago & North Western is Wisconsin's largest railroad. It serves 85 percent of the State's counties, with 94 percent of its population.

The railroad's freight lines also serve more than 5,000 industries in the State.

Mr. President, we have all heard much of the increasingly difficult problems faced by America's railroads. We have heard, as well, of economic stagnation in many cities and States of our country. Here is an answer to such conditions, an answer worthy of being followed throughout the land. I am more than pleased to note that the Chicago & North Western is preparing to meet its problems head on by a forward-moving conference of this nature.

I may say, Mr. President, that I, for one, have long been interested in the issue of industrial development of my State, and, for that matter, all other States of the Union. Since my interest is naturally primarily in my own State, I have been in close contact with the State industrial development division, which had been created by the 1955 Wisconsin State Legislature. I have been in contact as well with many of Wisconsin's more than 170 development corporations, and with the bureau of community development, a vital part of the extension division of the University of Wisconsin.

I send to the desk two items. The first is a newspaper article, describing this March 20 conference.

The second, by way of background, is on the issue of industrial development, itself. It consists of excerpts from a splendid statement which had been made on November 19, 1956, by the very able director of the bureau of community development, Prof. R. J. Colbert.

Professor Colbert spelled out, step by step, the tasks of a local industrial development program—a procedure which has been tried and found to be effective in the course of more than a decade of worthwhile work by the bureau.

I ask unanimous consent that both items be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT PARLEY CALLED BY CHICAGO & NORTH WESTERN

As part of its program of industrial development, the Chicago & North Western Railway Co., today disclosed it will hold a statewide conference on industrial development for Wisconsin in Milwaukee on March 20.

More than 350 leaders in industrial development in cities, town, and villages served by the railroad in the State are expected to attend the 1-day meeting to be held at the Hotel Schroeder. The conference will be centered around addresses by national authorities on various aspects of industrial development and is believed to be the first of statewide scope to be sponsored by a railroad. Speakers will include representatives of several major industries.

"Industrial development and the selection of new plant sites by America's expanding industries have reached almost the status of a science," said Clyde J. Fitzpatrick, president of the North Western. "Industry today carefully studies many factors before it finally determines where it will make its home.

"Because the benefits of industrial development are shared by the railroad and the communities it serves for years to come, it is our hope that this conference will lead to a greater understanding by leaders in industrial development in Wisconsin of the needs of industry in seeking new plant sites."

Fitzpatrick also pointed out that the opening of the St. Lawrence Seaway in 1959 is an important factor to Wisconsin in attracting new industries seeking areas in which to settle.

The morning session of the conference will be devoted to specific aspects of industrial development. It will be addressed by John T. McCarty, consultant on public and employee relations services of General Electric Co., who will speak on What You as an Individual Can Do for Industrial Development in Your Community; H. McKinley Conway, editor and publisher of Industrial Development magazine, who will speak on What Specific Characteristics Industry Looks for in a Community; and Otto W. Pongrace, manager, engineering, and construction service department, Ford Motor Co., who will discuss Plant Location Factors Considered by Industry After a Community Is Selected.

The afternoon session will be opened by an address by Ben W. Heineman, chairman of the North Western, on the Railroad's Role in Industrial Development. Dr. Harold M. Mayer, of the department of geography of the University of Chicago, will speak on What the St. Lawrence Seaway Means to Industrial Development in Wisconsin and the Middlewest. James C. Downs, Jr., chairman of the board of Real Estate Research Corp., Chicago, will address the conference on What Price Industrial Land?

The North Western is Wisconsin's largest railroad, serving 85 percent of the State's counties containing 94 percent of Wisconsin's population. The railroad's freight lines also serve more than 5,000 industries in the State.

EXCERPTS FROM ROY J. COLBERT'S STATEMENT ON TESTED PROCEDURE FOR INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT

* * * * *

For more than a decade, the Bureau of Community Development has been working with communities in all parts of Wisconsin. Careful community case records are kept as a basis for avoiding duplication of effort, for assembling needed information, and for evaluating the results of our efforts. Thus, we have learned that certain procedures have proven more effective than others. I will briefly outline what we find most useful and effective.

1. In the first place, we insist that the community appoint or select a group of trusted and respected citizens as a committee for industrial development.

This committee must have the authority and approval for creating and executing programs of action. What is everybody's business is nobody's business, and nothing gets done. This, more than anything else, explains why so many promising communities have made so little progress. While local business and professional man stand ready to help, no one is willing to stick out his neck for fear he will be criticized by others in the community. Consequently, it is necessary that he be appointed to serve on a committee that has instructions to go and get what this community needs in order to make it prosper. Such a committee may be appointed by local government or by local organizations. With this accomplished, the community is ready to invite the cooperation of the university and the many other agencies that can help. It can study local needs and resources and do something about them. In some instances it may be necessary for this group to form a development corporation to raise necessary capital to buy factory sites or to finance construction of suitable buildings for lease, sale, or rent to manufacturing concerns. (We shun subsidies of all sorts, including tax exemptions. We regard such practices as unsound.) We now have in Wisconsin some 170 such local industrial development corporations, most of them in small communities. Most of these are organized as profit corporations; a few are nonprofit; a few others are set up as departments of local governments, as municipal corporations, similar to water departments, or city-owned powerplants. They have proven to be a most effective means of developing or attracting industries and in getting communities to better understand their resources. They have done much to unite rural and urban people.

2. The next necessary step in an effective program for economic development is getting the facts about what the community has in the way of industrial potential. No investor is likely to buy a pig in a poke—he is sure to ask many pertinent questions about the community. He wants to make sure that his investment will not only pay dividends, but that it will be a congenial and satisfying service. We have listed some 15 standard questions that appear in almost every prospect's check list of requirements for plant locations (see Wisconsin's Economic Outlook, p. 32). Consequently, the local committee or corporation must be ready with accurate information when contacting a manufacturer or investor who is interested in plant location. The bureau aids many communities in collecting and preparing such folders or brochures for careful and personal use in their visits or interviews with investors or prospects (a brief outline or guide is provided the committees and they are urged to have the high school social science classes help in collecting and organizing the information and maps).

3. The next step of such a local program is to carefully survey what manufacturing is already established or available in the community. Too often we take for granted the small or even the larger local employers. It is not fair to attempt to recruit outside companies until we have become acquainted with what we have in our own backyards. Perhaps, through thoughtful and considered cooperation it is possible to improve, expand, or stabilize the employment opportunity already established. This should be the very first responsibility of the local committee or corporation. (Again, the bureau provides check sheets for local committees to help them make sure that they get the information that is necessary for intelligent service.) The importance of this step is, I believe, so evident that we need not detail or illustrate it further at this time.

4. The next step for the committee or corporation is to carefully consider what kind of industry or business is most appropriate and suitable for the community—taking into account any manufacturers already in the community. For example, if there is already in the community a plant that employs a large number of women, it would not be economically wise to invite into the community another manufacturer who employs largely women. The newcomer would no doubt have to pirate some workers from the established plant. The committee should attempt to build a diversification of job opportunity. This is but one of many factors that must be considered when attempting to determine what is best for a given community or areas. Nevertheless, this is an important matter that should help the committee to determine what industries to seek or encourage.

5. The next fundamental step for the local committee or corporation is the preparation of a definite prospect list, and a carefully planned campaign to get acquainted with industries that are expanding or considering new locations. It is indeed astonishing to find how few people are acquainted with American industries. We use and take for granted the products of hundreds of industries without considering them as job-making establishments. Then, too, hundreds of new processes and inventions are almost

daily creating the basis for new industries—plastics, electronics, chemicals, atomic energy, not to mention others in a long list. There are a number of sources of help for the committee when it starts on its campaign to get acquainted—the lists and directories of the United States Department of Commerce, the classified directories of State manufacturers, trade associations, and magazines. In undertaking this campaign to get acquainted with industry, we have advised against broadside advertising. We believe that personal and direct relations get quickest and most satisfactory results.

6. Be careful. This is good standard advice to the community that is seeking to expand its economic opportunities. There is no question but what there is keen competition among States and communities for good industrial prospects. This has attracted some rather fast-talking promoters who see a chance to shake down the overanxious. Consequently, when considering an independent concern for location in the community, the committee should apply a few fundamental tests. The honest and dependable companies will help rather than take offense. First, examine the company's financial status, its credit base, its rating. If it insists on selling stock in the community as a condition of accepting the location, beware. That is not generally done by reputable concerns. The company should be able to pay its way and get the capital it needs (though it may need financial counseling). It may need to rent or lease its building, but it should have the means to meet its payroll and other obligations, including taxes. Second, what is the managerial history of the company? Faulty management explains more business failures than any other cause. Consequently, it is important to carefully consider this fact. If the firm has started with little and made much; had good labor and community relations; met all obligations promptly; diversified its products and kept pace with improvements—that is good management. Third, what about the company's market, sales organization, and practices? Is it able to sell what it produces? Does it have only one customer, or has it a wide diversified market? Who are its customers? Answers to these questions may give the committee valuable help in deciding whether to go slow or fast in locating the concern in the community. By carefully considering these simple tests, the committee may be able to avoid costly mistakes.

7. The final step in the bureau's procedure relates mainly to manufacturing concerns that have been in the community for some time—some before the program got started and others were brought in by the committee. Often these small industries are doing well and could do better if they were able to enlarge their plants, modernize equipment, diversify their products, widen their market, or otherwise improve. In other words, they need more capital to grow and employ more people. Local banks are often hampered in making adequate loans to these industries. Furthermore, those who head these industries are often not experienced or acquainted with procedures in business or corporation finance. Careful and thoughtful counseling not only helps them improve and grow, but it helps expand and stabilize local employment opportunity. This service often involves encouraging sole proprietors to incorporate, and thus insure continuation of their enterprise no matter what happens to them. Incorporation also improves their credit prospects. It is this growing need for appropriate credit and credit counseling that led to the bureau becoming interested in creating the State Industrial Development Credit Corp. which, in fact, is an association of banks, insurance companies, and other lending agencies of the State. The bureau also cooperates with the Federal Small Business Administration in these matters.

* * * * *

WHAT IS THE EFFECT OF INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT ON THE LOCAL COMMUNITY?

Often we hear thoughtful local leaders ask, "What will be the effect of bringing an industry into our community?" Some of them hesitate because they think of manufacturing plants in terms of belching smoke, noise, dust, and the attraction of outsiders to run the town. Needless to say, such imagined conditions do not develop. Perhaps the most outstanding result that one sees after a few years of industrial growth of a small community is the fact that there has been an increase in the population and an increase in the number of new homes that have been built. By looking closer one sees that this increase of population is not from outsiders but rather from the young people born and raised on the nearby farms and in the community. They have remained in the community because of job opportunities. Otherwise, they would have joined their older cousins and sought employment in the faraway places. Looking again, one sees improvements and expansions in the services, a larger volume of business, and an improvement in educational, recreational, and health facilities. Many surveys have been made to learn the actual impact of growing industry on the community. Such surveys have revealed that the community has not only improved the economic status of rural and community people by furnishing regular and adequate employment, but it has vastly improved that part of the standard of living which is furnished by the tax dollar. It has provided a broader and more stable tax base. It has done much to cement a closer relationship between town and country. The expression that one gets from many of those who have had a hand in the development program is "I do not understand why we haven't made this start earlier."

Americans Need Jobs Now—Eisenhower Report Lacks Realism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MELVIN PRICE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 3, 1958

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, the statistical evidence of the economic recession that grips us has been given wide attention. There are now 45 labor-market areas that have more than 6 percent of their work force unemployed. Our industry has been operating 25 percent below productive capacity. The Nation's output of goods and services has been falling—from a yearly rate of $439 billion in the third quarter of 1957 to $433 billion in the fourth quarter.

This economic sickness that has stricken us comes at a time when we should be growing stronger, not weaker. Our population is expanding rapidly, bringing with it new demands for goods and services; many nations around the globe are developing economically and are in need of the products of our factories, and we have no doubts that we are in a productive race with the Soviet Union and the Communist world.

There are 4,500,000 Americans officially out of work, and millions more who are earning less because of shortened production rates. These men and women, indeed, every man and woman in the country, looks to their leaders for creative plans for ending this condition. And what does the President tell them? In his economic report in January, he said "the decline in business activity need not be prolonged." Essentially, this is the keep-your-chins-up line that does not encourage business expansion or pay the piled-up bills of the unemployed.

The President, under provisions of the Employment Act of 1946, is required to submit to Congress a suggested program to promote maximum employment, production, and purchasing power.

The President failed to do this in his report. In the following article Stanley H. Ruttenberg, director of the AFL–CIO department of research, suggests that political reasons prevailed in the President's economic report. Mr. Ruttenberg also presents indicators for doubting that there will be some magical moment when soon unemployment will vanish and idle assembly lines will begin rolling at a rapid pace.

Mr. Ruttenberg's article, which appears in the March issue of the American Federationist, official publication of the AFL–CIO, follows:

AMERICANS NEED JOBS NOW—EISENHOWER REPORT LACKS REALISM

(By Stanley H. Ruttenberg, director, AFL–CIO department of research)

Economic statistics are more than just numbers. At this time they tell an unpleasant story about the present state of the economy.

About 4,500,000 Americans were out of work in January. More people were unemployed than at any time since 1950. Even during the 1954 recession, unemployment did not reach this height.

But this number—4,500,000—applies only to the full-time unemployed. It does not measure the loss in working time or in take-home pay caused by lower production. In December, the Nation's manufacturing workers were employed the lowest average number of hours since before World War II—39.3 hours per week.

Unemployment insurance claims in January were much higher than the normal seasonal rise could explain. In mid-January total claims exceeded mid-December claims by approximately 825,000. The year before a comparable increase was only about half as great. Even in the recession of 1953–54, it was only 550,000.

Recent Labor Department statistics have added 21 communities to the list of labor market areas with substantial labor surplus (meaning that more than 6 percent of the labor force is out of work). That makes the total 45.

These figures are not mere statistics. They point to millions of individual workers who have been laid off and cannot find new jobs. They point to communities and industrial cities like Pittsburgh and Bridgeport where the level of unemployment is large enough to cause problems for all parts of the population.

In short, they point to the fact that Americans need work now.

Other economic statistics also warn of dangers. The Nation's total output of goods and services has been going down at a time when economic growth is imperative. Between the third and fourth quarter of last year, the figure dropped from a yearly rate of $439 billion to $433 billion, and output was continuing to fall at the beginning of this year.

Consumer buying power declined 1 percent between the third and fourth quarters of 1957 and is continuing to drop as a result of rising unemployment and shorter workweeks. Industrial production fell over 2 per-

cent in December, a drop of almost 8 percent below December 1956. With the index still falling, it was estimated that the drop from January 1957 to January 1958 was almost 10 percent.

Freight loadings have been dropping since last summer. The decline from September to December was 26 percent—causing layoffs for workers in the railroad industry.

American industry has been operating at about 25 percent below productive capacity, and a decline in capital goods investment is expected in the first quarter of 1958—from a yearly rate of $36.8 billion in the first quarter last year to a $35.5 billion yearly rate.

Despite mounting unemployment, falling output and these other economic warning signals, the President's Economic Report in January hopefully told Congress that "the decline in business activity need not be prolonged." These reassuring words have not fooled business, labor or academic economists who attacked the lack of realism in the report.

Even worse, it is clear that the report has failed to propose a program to meet today's threefold challenge:

1. Reversing the current economic downturn is a responsibility of the Government right now. The report's hope that this condition won't be prolonged does nothing to cure real and current problems. We now have 4,500,000 Americans out of work. We are losing the production of important goods because of falling output. We are losing needed revenue because of declining business activity. These problems won't just blow away.

2. America faces the problem of meeting the Soviet challenge. Time is a most important factor. We cannot afford to wait to see whether the economy might turn upward in the second half of this year. We must make the money, minds, and goods of our country available to make sure the Russians do not surpass us in technological, scientific, or military fields. A declining economy hampers our chances. A growing economy would make our basis for meeting the challenge secure.

3. America has a growing population—a population requiring expansion of economic and social programs necessary to our way of life. Programs must be started now to meet these needs. Programs previously started must be expanded, not curtailed, if we want to promote the health and welfare of our citizens.

By failing to recognize and suggest ways to meet the current challenge, the President's economic report has failed to carry out the requirements of the Employment Act of 1946.

This law says that the President must submit a report to Congress each year on current and projected economic conditions and must suggest a program to promote maximum employment, production, and purchasing power.

Evidently prospects of next November's returns have made it seem politically impractical to report the facts realistically and propose programs that would carry out the duty imposed by this law.

Though prosperity, security, and a balanced budget are political goals for proper returns next November, needed action for the economy and for security might produce an unbalanced budget temporarily. The solution to this dilemma seems to have been to place almost mystical emphasis on the balanced budget—and hope that security and prosperity will be produced just by the power of thinking everything will be all right.

But it is dangerous and deceptive to make such a report to Congress. Even if the administration is correct in thinking that the second half of this year will show a slight improvement, we will have lost millions of dollars' worth of production, millions of productive man-hours and millions in revenue.

Even if there is some upturn—and there is no absolute assurance that there will be—unemployment will not just blow away. A serious unemployment problem will exist for some time. Joblessness will continue long after an upturn starts, and the administration admits that not much change in direction can be expected before June.

The reasons that a change would not affect unemployment immediately are quite clear.

First of all, if new orders increase or production picks up, unemployed workers will not be hired right away. The first step will be to lengthen hours of work for the people now employed.

Secondly, the report itself contains indications that productivity will increase. This means that even greater output would be possible without hiring a single additional worker.

Furthermore, the labor force increases every year. In the past 5 years 800,000 persons, on the average, have joined the ranks of those looking for jobs.

Despite these realities, the President's Economic Report pays very little attention to the critical question of unemployment. In the section called Appraisal of the Current Economic Situation, neither employment nor unemployment is mentioned. It is in this section that the report cheerfully says that the decline need not be prolonged. This is a curious fact in a report whose purpose is supposed to be the promotion of maximum employment as well as maximum production and purchasing power.

The report, however, does give some economic reasons for its optimistic view. Three factors are emphasized as positive signs for economic improvement: increased military contract placements, higher State and local government spending, and an upturn in construction.

It is true that the Defense Department will put about $4 billion to $4.5 billion more into contracts during the first half of 1958 than at the low point last year, but the present budget shows that the rise will not continue in the last half of this year. While $4 billion to $4.5 billion would have some positive effects on the economy, it isn't enough to insure the results the administration has predicted.

Nor do proposed expenditures by State and local governments look promising. These governments have been taking in less and less money because the whole economy has been heading downward. They may decide that since they have less money to spend, they will cut back some of the projects formerly planned.

Even though the tight-money policy has been eased slightly and State and local bonds may be offered at lower interest rates, there is no strong basis for forecasting a larger upturn in State and local spending.

Construction does not seem to improve the picture either. In 1957 the physical volume of construction was behind the level of 1956. Though Government agencies predict that construction spending will go up about 5 percent, part of this upturn in volume will be counteracted by higher costs. As a result, the construction rise in volume will not reach the 5-percent figure. Nor will enough more homes be built in 1958 to give much hope of a large upturn in that area.

Surely these weak bases for predicting an upturn cannot satisfy the American people. It is not responsible for the administration to grasp at them to make possible a psychological basis for a balanced budget proposal that may jeopardize needed defense requirements and probably will threaten the fulfillment of the economic and social needs of the American people.

The President's economic report should have recognized the psychological and economic facts of life. A downturn with rising unemployment and declining production calls for programs that will build economic strength now. Economic prosperity will give the United States a strong base for all defense needs and social and economic progress requirements.

We cannot afford to wait for a program to meet these problems. These actions must be taken now:

1. Defense spending should be stepped up to meet whatever is necessary to restore strength to our military establishment—regardless of the budget.

2. Consumer spending must be encouraged rather than discouraged by the administration. Increases in wages and salaries are essential now.

3. Tax cuts in the form of raising individual exemptions by $100 would reduce the tax burden on low- and middle-income families.

4. Coverage of the wage-and-hour law should be extended to millions of low-wage workers, and the minimum wage should be upped to $1.25 per hour.

5. Comprehensive Federal housing and urban redevelopment programs are essential.

6. The social-security system should be improved.

7. Federal legislation for additional uniform minimum standards for State unemployment insurance systems is necessary now.

8. Federal aid to the States for school construction cannot wait for tomorrow's children.

9. A Federal program of assistance to distressed areas is vital.

The time for action on these items is the present. Joblessness and military security cannot be ignored while we hope for better times.

This Nation was not built on a cost accountant's ledger but by democratic efforts to promote the general welfare of the Nation and its citizens. This is not the time to look for a bookkeeper's paradise. We must move without delay to strengthen the Nation and the economy for the benefit of the American people.

A Lion in the House

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES W. VURSELL

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 15, 1958

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I include in the Appendix of the RECORD an article about our distinguished minority leader, the Honorable JOSEPH W. MARTIN, JR., of Massachusetts. This article was written by Larston D. Farrar, a business writer who is known to many of us here, and published in the January 1958 issue of the Lion, which is circulated internationally to members of the Lion's Clubs of the world. It is appropriately entitled "A Lion In the House."

The article follows:

A LION IN THE HOUSE

(By Larston D. Farrar)

JOSEPH WILLIAM MARTIN, JR., at 72, is the official minority leader of the Republicans in the United States House of Representatives. For more than 30 years, since shortly

after he was elected to the House of Representatives in 1924, JOE MARTIN has been an honorary member of the Attleboro, Mass., Lions Club and he has taken an active and continuing interest in the activities of that club, as well as in the doings of Lions everywhere. Some years ago, North Attleboro, Mass., JOE'S home town, started a Lions club and the Attleboro club has been sharing their famous member with his home-town Lions.

Mr. MARTIN'S interest in the Lions Club was underscored several years ago, at the Lions International Convention in Madison Square Garden, New York City, where he said:

"I am proud to come and speak at this great convention of one of the great forces for building a more peaceful and understanding world. I am also proud of my membership in the Attleboro club of your organization. Through that membership, I am cognizant of the fine part this organization performs in building better communities, and supporting and sustaining the more unfortunate * * *."

Michael J. Lane, Washington attorney and a Lion's ambassador of good will, declared recently: "I have always found JOE MARTIN to be a real Lions booster. Besides taking an active interest in the organization, he has performed yeoman service for us whenever possible for him to be of help. He is a real Lion."

JOE MARTIN himself is quite reticent about speaking of his help to the Lions. He indicates that his record can speak for itself. This also is true of his official record, which is an impressive story of accomplishment in the Republican Party.

Known as "Mr. Congress" to most Republicans, he has been either minority leader of the House of Representatives or Republican Speaker of the House of Representatives ever since 1939.

There are many Republicans on Capitol Hill who look to JOE MARTIN for leadership and value his counsel. Almost every morning he has breakfast with various of his colleagues and it is apparent that they like JOE, even those who disagree with him most violently about party strategy.

JOE MARTIN is distinctive in appearance. He has a face that reflects anger or joy very quickly. His blue eyes glow, or smolder, as the case may be, behind bushy black eyebrows. He usually has a ruffled look, and his shock of dark hair frequently is windblown, giving him an unkempt look at times that, according to society writers, makes women want to take him in tow and mother him. None has so far.

As he walks down the ancient and hallowed marble corridors of Congress, his blue eyes usually twinkle and there is a bounce to his step that belies his years as he greets friends and political enemies with a smile. Sometimes he pauses to exchange stories with a colleague, or a particularly close friend, and, always, he is accessible to those who want to see him.

JOE MARTIN does not play golf or other sports. As a young man, he was a fairly good shortstop and had a chance to play semipro baseball, but passed it up. His only hobby these days is walking, and, due to his hurried schedule, he doesn't get much chance even for that.

After arising early in his suite in the Hay-Adams House, situated across Lafayette Park from the White House, he goes by taxicab to Capitol Hill, where he eats breakfast in the Congressional Dining Room. He goes to his office, on the second floor, to greet his secretary, and a raft of assistants, and busily goes through his personal mail.

He generally spends an hour or so dictating replies and taking calls, and then he meets with his party associates in the House to plan strategy for floor battles to come. The House ordinarily meets around noon, and he is present for the start of the session. After a while, with the session under way, and fully aware of the schedule of speeches to follow, he goes downstairs for lunch. Sometimes, at this hour, he and other congressional leaders go to the White House for lunch with the President.

In the afternoon, if the House remains in session for debates, the minority leader must stay in the House of Representatives virtually all of the time. While debates are going on, he confers with his secretary who brings him messages and letters to be signed, as well as filling him in on other matters that need attention.

After the session—whether it ends early or late—he goes back to the office to clean up the loose ends of a hectic day. He gets a little while to read more letters, to work on a speech or to meet a delegation of businessmen from his district.

By the time he leaves the office, it is dark, except perhaps in the summer months. He may go to a reception or a cocktail party, before having dinner with friends, or at his own hotel. In the evenings, since JOE is a bachelor, he is much-sought-after guest.

JOE MARTIN, as Speaker of the House for the 80th Congress (1947–48) and the 83rd Congress (1953–54), won a reputation for being a fair and proficient presiding officer. But as is the case with many speakers, he frequently was trying to juggle several ideas in his head at the same time, and naturally pulled more than one boo-boo. In the spring of 1955, while the House was debating foreign aid, Mr. MARTIN arose to defend the administration's request. He said he based his views on the judgment of the President and General Motors. There was, according to the newspapers, general laughter, among his colleagues over this fluff. Mr. MARTIN hastily corrected himself to say that he meant general staff—a term he uses interchangeably for the Joint Chiefs of Staff.

JOE MARTIN was born November 3, 1884, (appropriately enough, since this is general election week) in North Attleboro, the eldest son of eight children. His father, now deceased, was a blacksmith, of Scotch-English descent. His mother, nee Catherine Katon, was an Irish Catholic, and she is still living at 93. He has 3 brothers and 1 sister still living.

The Martin family was of slender means in JOE'S childhood. He started throwing newspapers at the age of 5 or 6, and later worked in jewelry shops and as night telephone operator, to help rear the family. He declined a college scholarship in order to go to work as a newspaper reporter on the North Attleboro Evening Leader at the age of 18. After 6 months, he went over to the Attleboro Sun at a salary of $10 a week. He sent two younger brothers through Dartmouth College. After 5 years as a newspaper reporter, he saved $1,000. He has never been in debt and still has the first savings account he opened in the Attleboro Savings Bank in 1902. At this time, he persuaded several local citizens to join him in pooling a fund, into which he put his own $1,000, and purchased the North Attleboro Evening Chronicle. Under his management, circulation rose from 800 to 4,000 daily. He was, in fact, the youngest publisher of a daily newspaper in the United States when he was 24. He still owns the Chronicle, which his brother operates for him, and in 1941, he purchased the Franklin (Mass.) Sentinel, a weekly newspaper which also has prospered under his ownership.

When he was 21, he asked his father whether he should pursue baseball (he was then getting some local fame for his batting and fielding) as a career—follow the newspaper business—or go into politics.

"You'll be better off JOE, if you stick to newspapering," his father replied. "Politics is a dirty business."

"That's why I'm getting into it, dad," JOE replied. "It needs to be cleaned up, and you can't do that by holding your nose and standing on the sidelines."

Actually, he stayed in the newspaper business and pursued politics. His first experience was in managing a friend's campaign for the State legislature. When he was 27, he became a candidate himself, winning his race for the Massachusetts house of representatives by a substantial majority. He next was elected to the Massachusetts State senate, serving there until 1917, when he temporarily retired from politics.

While in the Massachusetts legislature, he made friends with Calvin Coolidge, then chairman of the Senate Committee on Rules. Coolidge made MARTIN secretary of his committee and the two became lifelong friends. In 1924, when Coolidge ran for President, MARTIN climbed on the bandwagon and was elected handily to Congress. He has returned to the same seat ever since.

When Roosevelt was riding the crest of the New Deal, JOE rode the waves, too. Once, when he was joshed about voting for many New Deal measures, MARTIN replied, with a twinkle in his eyes: "The world moves, and I move with it."

In short, he rolls with the political tides. He is not militant, in temperament, but he hates to see either public suffering or crookedness in public life. He has always championed labor's right to organize, has supported social security, voted for the Fair Employment Practices Commission and many other Roosevelt measures. Although he supported most of the preparedness policies in the pre-Pearl Harbor days, President Roosevelt referred to him contemptuously as the leader of a famous triumvirate: "Martin, Barton & Fish." (Joe Martin, Bruce Barton and Hamilton Fish.)

JOE MARTIN has retained his leadership of the Republicans by cultivating the newcomers to Congress, in a personal way, and leading the Representatives by suggestion rather than by dictation. He has never "laid down the law" in an autocratic manner although he usually has had his way in the end.

"Mr. Congress" has played important roles in every presidential campaign since 1936. He helped to nominate Alfred Landon, then Governor of Kansas, in 1936 and served as eastern campaign manager, but could not get him elected. The same was true in 1940, when he backed Wendell L. Willkie and was chairman of the Republican National Committee. In 1944 he supported Tom Dewey, and also in 1948, although in the latter year he, himself, was a dark horse who harbored hopes that the nomination lightning might strike him. Otherwise, he has told wealthy backers who wanted to see him run for President: "I have no ambitions to be in the White House, I am perfectly satisfied to remain in the House of Representatives. My one ambition is to be Speaker of the House." He has achieved that ambition on two separate occasions, and may again.

The Gifted Child—A Vital American Resource

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, March 3, 1958

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, on several occasions I have spoken in the Sen-

ate about the need for specialized educational facilities for American youngsters who rank in the highest group on intellectual-quotient tests and other examinations of intellectual attainment. Among these most superior youngsters are the future scientific geniuses of the land—the Edisons, the Farradays, the Einsteins. Among them, as well, are the future leaders in the liberal arts and the humanities. I am pleased to point out that the task of identifying talented youngsters and giving special training to them is moving full speed ahead in the State of Wisconsin.

I had earlier pointed out the fine role of the University of Wisconsin and cooperating high schools in this process.

I now wish to point up the activities of the Milwaukee public schools, under Superintendent Harold S. Vincent.

The Milwaukee program was described in the Miwaukee Journal of February 16, 1957. It is a symbol of what can be done, what is being done, and what should be done in every school, if the Nation is to obtain the fullest benefit from its best-qualified youngsters.

I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EIGHTEEN THOUSAND TO TAKE TESTS SEEKING GIFTED PUPILS

(By Robert L. Dishon)

More than 18,000 elementary and junior high school pupils will take tests next month as part of a plan to enrich studies for gifted children in the Milwaukee public schools.

The examinations will be the first in a continuing testing program. Eventually, the results will provide teachers, principals, and administrators with information on the direction and rate of learning of each child.

The testing service also will supply data which school officials will use to formulate stronger courses of study for average and slower learners.

The testing program is part of a more extensive study being made by Superintendent Harold S. Vincent and his staff to find out how best to identify talented pupils and teach them.

SUGGESTIONS STUDIED

Now being studied are these suggestions:

Establishment of special classes and perhaps special schools for gifted pupils.

A pilot project of fourth- fifth- and sixth-graders in a special class as an experiment to obtain information for future planning for gifted pupils.

Changes to strengthen curriculums in the junior and senior high schools.

School officials also are studying what might be done in in-service training programs to prepare teachers better to handle gifted children.

Each high school now decides what, if any, programs will be offered to gifted pupils. Special classes for gifted children are organized in several high schools. Other schools have none. In junior high and elementary schools, the brighter pupils are taught in special groups in regular classes.

WANTS ENRICHED WORK

"I am hopeful," said Vincent, "that out of the studies will come enriched work, possibly starting the teaching of some of the things a little earlier also more advanced work.

"In back of it all has to got to be a recognition by everybody that we all have to work harder in the schools—pupils, teachers, and parents. We must create a better respect for the schools and that is something the schools can't do alone. We need the full consent, knowledge, and understanding of parents."

The first test in the new citywide program will be given to eighth graders March 11, according to G. Dwight Rowe, coordinator of testing services.

AID FOR COUNSELORS

Intelligence and achievement tests will be given to all fourth, sixth, and eighth graders. Also, eighth graders will be given a special science test, the results of which will be used next fall when the pupils enter high school or the last year of junior high school.

The test results will be used to determine how effective present programs are and how they might be strengthened. They also will be used by teachers under whom the pupils will study next fall and by guidance counselors.

A special staff will be employed this summer, with a $3,000 grant from the Edward A. Uhrig Foundation, to develop thorough case studies on about 100 of the most gifted children identified by the tests.

"This," said Dwight Teel, assistant superintendent in charge of curriculum and instruction, "will give us a great deal of evidence on giftedness. This is a field where we need some experimentation.

"We are aiming at making sure that all these (gifted) pupils are identified and that adequate programs are provided for them. We also want to determine in what area the pupil is gifted."

PILOT PROJECT EYED

School officials also are studying the possibility of a pilot project in which a group of pupils from the fourth, fifth, and sixth grades would be placed in a special class as an experiment to obtain information for future planning for gifted children.

Teel said he hoped to meet soon with officials of Marquette University, University of Wisconsin in Madison, and the University of Wisconsin—Milwaukee to work out a program to give talented high-school graduates credit or advanced standing for certain high-school work.

Talented pupils are taught differently in some city high school. Some schools have no special programs. At least 2 schools have had classes for the brighter pupils more than 20 years.

Bay View high school; for example, has special classes for gifted children and seminar classes for some 45 of the brightest children, according to Principal Bernard C. Korn. At Bay View and other schools, talented pupils are identified through testing, teacher observation, and guidance conferences.

FIFTEEN PUPILS IN SEMINARS

Seminar classes in chemistry, social science, and English have about 15 pupils each. These are the brightest pupils and are invited into the classes, Korn said. They meet at the beginning of the semester and about a month before the end of the semester.

At the initial meeting, each pupil selects a project to work on. During what would be the normal class period, he works on his project. The teacher is available for conferences. Several pupils may work together on a project.

Another 350 talented pupils at Bay View are in special classes in music, art, and the regular academic subjects. These classes were started 20 years ago, Korn said.

Rufus King high school has special classes in science and mathematics. About 150 pupils are in the mathematics classes and about 110 in special biology, chemistry, and physics classes, according to Principal Walter L. Brauer. The program has been operating about 4 years.

MOVE AHEAD FASTER

In the science classes, the emphasis is on more extensive work by pupils. Talented mathematics pupils not only get more extensive work but are encouraged to move ahead faster. Some are studying analytical geometry and calculus.

A different approach has been used at Riverside high school for more than 30 years. Rapid, medium, and slow learners are grouped according to their ability in English, history, science, and mathematics classes.

Selection of the brighter pupils, said Principal Merton S. Lean, is made when a pupil enters the ninth grade at Riverside. Test records and previous achievement are studied to select the pupils, according to Lean. Riverside teachers also discuss the pupils and their performances with principals of the elementary schools the pupils attended.

A program for rapid learners was started at Custer High School 2 years ago. It will be expanded next fall, said Raymond F. Michalak, principal. Sixteen special classes offer enriched programs, in English, mathematics, history, and science for sophomores and juniors.

Next fall, other classes in contemporary problems will be started for seniors, according to Michalak. They will function as seminars similar to those at Bay View. A special class also will be started next fall for pupils in all grades who are talented in art.

Federal Regulatory Agencies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM E. PROXMIRE

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, March 3, 1958

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, on Thursday, February 20, the Waukesha, Wis., Freeman, printed an excellent article favoring providing a guide for proper conduct for the Federal regulatory agencies.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that this article be printed in the Appendix to the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SENATE BILL WOULD REGULATE REGULATORS

Quite unwilling to agree that $22,000-a-year men on 6 Federal commissions are entitled to gifts from the industries they regulate, Senator WILLIAM PROXMIRE has introduced a bill in the Senate to make such honoraria illegal. Yesterday he was joined by seven Senate colleagues in sponsoring the measure which this newspaper, for one, hopes gets speedy and unanimous approval in both Houses of Congress. Having proved to be a master publicist in his own behalf, Wisconsin's junior Senator is quickly establishing a reputation in Washington for doing the logical thing at the proper time. He accompanied his bill with a statement to the effect that present law governing Federal agencies is inadequate and the country needs "a clear and positive guide for proper conduct." He added:

"The people have a right to unquestioned confidence that the decisions of agencies, such as the Federal Communications Commission, will reflect disinterested judgment in the public interest."

Until Dr. Bernard Schwartz began telling a Senate committee and the Nation about some of the worst cases of double dealing

among commissioners, the American people seem to have had unquestioned confidence that the decisions of its Federal agencies reflected disinterested judgment. We believe this to be true since the veracity of the six Federal agencies involved has seldom been questioned. Since the first of these, the ICC (Interstate Commerce Commission) was created by Congress in 1887, an auro of infallibility has surrounded them. Their decisions, while somewhat harsh and inexplicable at times. were usually regarded as in the best interests of the Commonwealth. Members of Congress must have had faith in the unimpeachable character of these Commission members, since they set their salaries high, much higher, in fact, than Congressmen themselves enjoyed until the last few years. Even members of the President's Cabinet receive only $3,000 more per year.

Perhaps it was this high regard for the judgment of appointees to the ICC, FCC, FTC, SEC, FPC, and CAB which seemed to make it unnecessary to draw up detailed rules of conduct like those Senator PROXMIRE is now proposing. A parent often feels dutybound to tell Mary and Johnny to be on their best behavior the day they enter kindergarten, like not bringing home the blackboard chalk, the classroom blocks, or other honoraria laying around loose. By the time college graduation rolls around, such instructions appear wholly unnecessary.

But we seem to have entered a new era in public as well as private conduct. These alphabetical Government agencies which make decisions involving billions of dollars, have been pictured as less concerned with good behavior than is desired. Dr. Schwartz, the law school professor, dared to claim than an unholy alliance existed between them and big business. For this he was promptly sacked but on second thought was called back to explain what he meant. If the American people have become somewhat cynical about their Government in Washington, we can hardly blame them at times. We now find ourselves agreeing with attempts to regulate the regulators and applauding a Senator's efforts to make the Ten Commandments part of a commissioner's oath of office.

A Texan Learns About Washington

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 3, 1958

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Robert E. Baskin, a staff writer for the Dallas Morning News, was recently assigned to Washington. He was given as his first assignment the job of writing a series of articles on Washington, D. C., its history, its political status as the Nation's Capital, and the problems which face it.

Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include in 6 parts the 6 articles written by Mr. Baskin:

[From the Dallas Morning News of December 8, 1957]

I. TEXAN IN CAPITAL—WASHINGTON CAUGHT UP IN DILEMMA

(By Robert E. Baskin)

WASHINGTON, December 7.—To an outlander the city of Washington in this fall of 1957 is a city both strange and wonderful.

It is a world to itself; it is unlike any other center of population in the United States.

Physically, it is a beautiful city, with its orderly development, started in the time of the first President. There is the Mall, the Capitol, the White House, and the great gleaming Government buildings, and there are the parks dotting the city in just the spots where they ought to be.

And, too, there are the slums, the ugly back alleys, and the ill-smelling upper reaches of the Potomac River. And there is the traffic in the late afternoon, far worse than Dallas', as the office workers hurry to their segregated homes in Virginia and Maryland.

There are the Negro areas, where block after block of row houses have been taken over by an ever-increasing influx of colored people.

And along Massachusetts Avenue there are the embassies representing a host of nations who in the last 10 years have found that their very existence can depend on the decisions, and whims, of the Capital of the United States.

Whose Capital is this?

Although it is identified as the Capital of the United States of America, it has become the Capital of the democratic world. Here is where the money comes from; here is where the great decisions must be finally approved in the unremitting struggle with the Communist world.

There is a self-consciousness about Washington in its relations with the rest of the world.

Its ears are attuned to the whispers, the thinking and the reaction of the world's peoples.

What will Ghana, or Afghanistan, or Belgium, or Britain, think of what we are doing? Can the Soviet Union reap a propaganda harvest out of this?

These may be subconscious questions, but they exist nonetheless. They extend to domestic issues, particularly in the civil rights field.

There is obviously not so much concern about what Kansas will think of this or that, or, more particularly, Alabama.

Just after the decision was made in 1954 to integrate the schools of the District of Columbia, 2,000 students struck briefly.

Washington learned then how closely it is watched abroad. There were anguished telephone calls from Western Europe and elsewhere, wanting to know what had happened, what the outcome would be.

On Capitol Hill the Congress finds itself caught up in the current of the new internationalism.

It is sometimes hard to remember that an individual Congressman comes from a mountain district in West Virginia, a wheatfield district in Nebraska, or city district in Chicago.

Here in Washington he must learn to wrestle with the great issues of the day—foreign aid, the military budget, scientific development—complex issues that he little dreamed of when he mounted the hustings.

Is this the Capital of his constituents? Most of them probably are aware that they have a representative in Washington, a strange faraway city where they devise the forms you have to fill out and where your income tax finally goes.

But if they came here, they would find it difficult to recognize as a Capital that somehow is representative of the Nation. But things vitally affecting their lives are done in Washington almost every hour.

In that sense, it is their Capital.

This fall Washington is a troubled city.

Russian scientific advances have aroused much greater alarm here than in the inland areas, providing another instance of the Capital's sensitivity to world opinion.

The illness of the President, the failure of the Vanguard missile and other recent events have contributed to the general uneasiness.

At the White House, the State Department and the Pentagon, the scientists, diplomats and military experts come and go in a never-ending stream.

On the Hill congressional committees are inquiring into the Nation's missiles program. A new budget is being formulated for the next session of Congress that is expected to be substantially higher than the last one.

There is every indication that the big government that was born of the New Deal will become bigger than ever.

But Washington is a troubled city on its own home front, the 70-square-mile area that constitutes the District of Columbia.

A great racial and sociological change is taking place in the Capital. Whatever the merits of integration, this change is one that has caused grave concern among the District's residents.

Members of the Negro race are pouring into Washington. They now make up 46 percent of the population. Great areas of the city have been relinquished by white residents, who have moved to Virginia and Maryland.

The school population, since integration, is nearly 72 percent Negro, and the decline in white pupils is continuing.

Demands for home rule and the vote are mounting again, and there are predictions that eventually these things will be realized, making the District of Columbia, in effect, another State.

Washington's crime rate is high, and the police department has been under fire from the National Association for Advancement of Colored People for alleged discriminatory policies.

The growth of Metropolitan Washington has created enormous problems in municipal affairs, traffic, water, and other fields. The population of the city in the metropolitan area has just reached 2 million.

All of these problems are extremely complex.

Efforts to solve them are of concern to every citizen of the Nation, whether they realize it or not. For this is the Federal City, the city originally laid out for the whole Nation.

A Texan Learns About Washington

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 3, 1958

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, the following is Mr. Baskin's second article entitled "The Growth of Washington and the Problems Arising From It":

[From the Dallas Morning News of December 9, 1957]

II. TEXAN IN CAPITOL—THE GROWTH OF WASHINGTON AND THE PROBLEMS ARISING FROM IT—WASHINGTON COPES WITH VAST GROWTH

(By Robert E. Baskin)

WASHINGTON, December 8.—The population of metropolitan Washington this fall reached the 2-million mark, making it the ninth largest city in the Nation.

That appears to be just the beginning of a vast expansion, that is at once governmental, residential and mercantile.

By 1980, it is estimated that the area will have 3,400,000 residents. By 2000, a population of 8 million, with Baltimore and Washington becoming one huge metropolis, is foreseen.

In 1940 the area had less than a million people.

This huge increase in population is changing the face, the ways and, in some instances, the thinking of the Nation's Capital.

How did it happen?

"Washington used to be a slow moving southern-type city," says William Press, executive director of the Washington Board of Trade who is a native of the District of

Columbia. "But in recent years the city has taken on vastly more importance.

"When F. D. R. moved in with the New Deal and the Government began going into new fields, the big change started. Since that time economic controls, international finance and Government spending operations have been concentrated in Washington, with many representatives of industry, both foreign and domestic, and all types of economic groups moving their bases here.

"The Federal Government in Washington is now dealing with every phase of modern life.

"World War II gave further impetus to this trend.

"The old Washington wasn't too darned important. New York was much more important. But now somebody in Washington is fooling with somebody's affairs in Dallas and everywhere else in the world every minute.

"The whole outlook has been broadened, and the tempo of the city's life has stepped up tremendously."

Older residents of Washington can look back nostalgically on their graceful capital of earlier times—a pleasant place to live, with broad avenues, attractive Federal and Georgian architecture, good schools and gracious living.

Not all of this is gone with the wind, of course.

The Georgetown section of the city, in particular, remains a place of residential beauty. Society continues to function, but it is increasingly a heavily publicized type of society, with the cocktail party and social-climbing rivalries predominating.

The District of Columbia itself, the federally administered heart of the metropolis, has run out of space. It is only 70 square miles of real estate with great areas devoted to governmental buildings and parks. This area contains 860,000 of the metropolitan area's 2 million residents. The others live in Montgomery and Prince Georges Counties, Md., in Fairfax and Arlington Counties, Va., and in the cities of Alexandria and Falls Church, Va.

The overflow from the District of Columbia has created grave problems for the neighboring Virginia and Maryland areas. For example, Fairfax County, Va., needs 7 new high schools in the next 3 years.

Residential building goes on endlessly throughout the area.

Decisions on such areawide problems as water, sewage systems, and highways become complex. Frequently they require acts of Congress, acts by State legislatures and approval by county and city governments.

A joint congressional committee headed by Senator ALAN BIBLE, Democrat, Nevada, is begininng hearings this winter on Washington's metropolitan problems. No one sees any possibility of a Federal authority being set up to administer the metropolitan area.

But there is a possibility that an overall agency, authorized by Congress and the legislatures of Virginia and Maryland, will be proposed to deal specifically with highway, water, and sewage problems affecting the area.

As an older city, Washington has the slum developments that have plagued other cities. But it has been worsened here by the influx of many impoverished families, nearly all Negroes, in the last few years.

It is no exaggeration to say that Washington is rapidly becoming a predominately Negro city. In 1950 Negroes accounted for 35 percent of the district's population. Today 46 percent are Negroes, and 71.9 percent of the school population of the District of Columbia is Negro.

This has changed the tone of the city. The exodus of whites to Virginia and Maryland has been accelerated following integration of the school system in 1954.

In addition to the school situation, the spread of Negroes to formerly all-white neighborhoods has been stepped up. The principal extensions have been in the northeastern part of the city. The northern and southern areas remain predominantly white but Negroes are moving there, too.

In the metropolitan area 77 percent of the population is white, no change in the overall ratio having occurred in recent years, because most white persons fleeing the District of Columbia traveled only as far as the segregated Maryland and Virginia areas.

Businessmen are deeply concerned over the change that is taking place. Real estate men have found themselves in a particularly trying situation.

"The pattern always runs like this," says a representative of a large real estate firm. "You have a good white rental area. Then Negroes begin to infringe on it. You soon get vacancies and they can't be filled with whites. So you integrate, open up the vacancies to Negroes. They move in, and all the white tenants move out. Then it happens on the next block. In addition, white families with children have moved out in large numbers since the schools were integrated.

"Negro tenants mean continual additional supervision for real estate agents. You have to go to court much more often to collect rents from them than you do for whites."

What has caused this influx of Negroes to the District of Columbia?

There are two major factors, most Washingtonians agree:

1. There is more job opportunity and less discrimination in the district. (Nearly one-fourth of the district's 231,000 Federal employees are now Negroes.)

2. Washington is the southernmost northern metropolis and Negroes moving out of the South reach it first in their journey northward.

It is also significant that there are no Negro ghettoes in Washington, such as New York's Harlem, although they are concentrated more heavily in some places than others.

The District of Columbia government is moving ahead vigorously to wipe out slum areas.

In Foggy Bottom, along the Potomac, once one of the worst slum eyesores, a new "city within a city" public housing project is being erected. It will be complete with a stadium, auditorium, shopping village and other features. This will be an integrated development, costing between $25 and $30 million, but many whites are reported moving in or preparing to move into the excellent apartment houses.

A large-scale slum clearance project is being undertaken in the northwest part of the city.

In Georgetown erection of better-type apartments and homes has tended to stabilize the white population there.

New apartments near the core of the city have found plenty of white tenants to move in.

But the overall trend continues to be toward a predominantly Negro city. No one can foresee an end to this trend.

A Texan Learns About Washington

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 3, 1958

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, the third of Mr. Baskin's articles, entitled "The Washington School Situation—A Violent Change," follows:

[From the Dallas Morning News of December 10, 1957]

III. TEXAN IN CAPITAL—THE WASHINGTON SCHOOL SITUATION—A VIOLENT CHANGE—NATION EYES VAST SHIFTS IN SCHOOLS

(By Robert E. Baskin)

WASHINGTON, December 9.—The public schools of the District of Columbia in the last 4 years have undergone the most sweeping change of any school system in the country.

It has been a change that has caused dismay and alarm among parents, some educators and virtually all southern Congressmen.

But it has been viewed with equanimity—and even enthusiasm—by those who share President Eisenhower's sentiment that the District of Columbia should be a model of nondiscrimination.

The change came on a September morning in 1954 when the public schools were integrated, following the Supreme Court's ruling that separate schools were inherently unequal.

This fall the school population adds up like this: Total students, 110,761, of which 71.9 percent or just about 80,000 are Negro.

White parents are fleeing the District to the segregated towns of Maryland and Virginia, or sending their children to private schools.

In the last year white enrollment in the District schools has decreased 2,755 pupils while 5,388 more Negro students have been enrolled.

Dr. Hobart Corning, the District School Superintendent, calls this an alarming change of balance.

The increase in Negro students has been going on for 10 years but it has accelerated in the last 5 years. In 1950 Negro students exceeded whites for the first time.

There are some schools, but not many, that are either all white or all Negro, because of their residential areas, but the influx of Negroes to Washington, coupled with the loss of white population, is expected to eliminate the all-white schools.

To an outsider, particularly one from the South, the events of integration here can only be viewed with shock. The change is one that cannot be told with cold statistics.

The violence of the change has not been in terms of physical conflict. It is a violence of abrupt change, of a new way of life for Washingtonians accustomed to certain southern viewpoints.

The only demonstration was in the spring of 1954, when 2,000 students went on strike, apparently opposing integration. Many of them gathered in Franklin Park, across from the school administration building. Dr. Corning declined to treat with them, and they dispersed.

Other than that, the change has been accomplished with no major incident. But there have been little incidents, about which teachers have testified, that contribute to unease—incidents involving switch-blade knives, unwed mothers, lack of personal hygiene and interracial contacts.

And most distressing of all has been the decline in educational accomplishment, a fact ruefully conceded even by the most integration-minded educators.

In the midst of all this teachers of both races have been caught in a difficult situation. The burden is on them to educate whomever the school authorities send them. There is every indication that most of Washington's teachers are carrying on in the face of difficulties with a professional spirit.

An example of what has happened at one school may be found at McKinley High School at Second and T Streets Northeast. In 1953 this school had an all-white student body of about 700. Today it has 1,055 Negro students and 199 whites.

Dr. Charles Bish, the energetic white principal, admits that the first year of integra-

tion was a tense one. Since then, he says, things have progressed in a more orderly fashion.

"We moved too rapidly," he says. "Policies were still being formulated, and there was an element of fear present.

"We had a few incidents. One Negro boy was caught with obscene cards. He was expelled. On another occasion a Negro boy pulled out a long knife to sharpen a pencil and the place almost caught fire.

"All these stories about Negro boys saying things to white girls—I haven't been told about any here, not in the last 2 years."

Integration has meant death to high school social life. There are no more school dances, dinners or other similar events.

"I have found," says Dr. Bish, "that the community takes over these functions—the churches, civic organizations and others—and it's just as well, because we may have had too many frills."

The school has its own swimming pools, but "we've gone out of the swimming business since integration," the principal says.

Dr. Bish is acutely concerned over educational standards.

"Educators ought to have the say on scholastic standards for admission, promotion and graduation," he says. "Keep education in the picture. Many people have forgotten this. This is no device to avoid integration, but the standards must be kept up. It isn't justifiable to have a 7th grade student in the 10th grade just to avoid hurting someone's feelings."

To support educational standards Washington schools have adopted what is known as the "4-track system," in which all courses are divided into four groups—basic, general, college preparatory and honors. Students are assigned to groups after extensive tests.

The last two categories are for bright students. The basic and general groups have decidedly lower standards. Percentagewise, more Negroes gravitate to basic and general and more whites to the two upper groups, Dr. Bish says.

"You are dealing with the merging of different cultures and because of this you have a greater range of individual differences," the principal believes. "Therefore you must seek homogeneous groupings—bright students with bright students, average students with average students, and so forth."

The 4-track system is not without opposition. All graduates, no matter what group they are in, receive the same diploma. This, opponents contend, diminishes the value of a high-school diploma and it also allows students with below-par abilities to be graduated.

Before integration the Washington schools were divided administratively into a white division I and a Negro division II. In division II many Negro teachers had reached administrative positions of importance. They have not lost their tenure or standing because of integration. The assistant superintendents in charge of elementary schools and vocational schools are Negro.

Throughout the system, which includes 127 elementary schools, 23 junior highs, 11 senior highs, 5 vocational highs, 1 school for pages at the Capitol and a 4-year teachers college, Negro teachers hold jobs. There is every indication there will be more of them.

"We have always had more Negro applicants for teaching positions than white applicants," says Miss Margaret Pepper, executive assistant to the superintendent. "We do have a problem in getting white teachers, since there are more opportunities for whites elsewhere. We have had no problems with Negro teachers conducting mixed classes."

The last published figures showed 2,256 Negro educational employees to 1,824 white.

Miss Pepper, who has been a teacher and administrator in the schools here since 1921, says that integration proved that the Negro schools weren't equal.

"While we did our best to make our separate schools equal, we have found since integration that they weren't equal," she says. "Our educational standards are now just what they have always been, but the level of achievement has been lowered."

The school system also is more aware of disciplinary problems, Miss Pepper reports.

"Before integration the white schools followed a policy of encouraging self-discipline for students; in the Negro school there was more authority imposed by the teachers. There has had to be an adjustment in this field," she says.

Much concern has been given to the fact that while Negroes constitute nearly 72 percent of the school population they make up only 46 percent of the total population of the District of Columbia.

While private schools cause some of the disparity, there are other reasons. Negro families are generally larger. The white population is composed of many older people and many single women who work for the Government.

The change that has taken place has had its shock effect upon many individuals, both black and white.

One of these is Miss Margaret Tripp, a white elementary school principal, who perhaps has her counterparts all over the District.

This is what she told a congressional committee in 1956:

"I have a large percentage of Negro children to be instructed * * * I think I have more Negroes than white teachers, and I am a member of a minority group. I have no feelings of inferiority about it, but I am in a minority for the first time in my life, and that is an adjustment."

A Texan Learns About Washington

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 3, 1958

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, the following are Mr. Baskin's views and comments on the controversial Davis committee report:

[From the Dallas Morning News of December 11, 1957]

IV. TEXAN IN CAPITAL—THAT REPORT ON SCHOOLS KEPT ALIVE

(By Robert E. Baskin)

WASHINGTON, December 10.—The most serious charges against Washington's integrated school system have been made by a congressional subcommittee, which was embroiled in controversy from the moment it began its work.

Today in Washington there is still controversy, sometimes bitter, over the report issued by the committee this year.

A majority of the committee urged a return to the segregated system, contending that "the evidence * * * points to a definite impairment of educational opportunities for members of both white and Negro races as a result of integration, with little prospect of remedy in the future."

Two members of the subcommittee assailed the majority report, although they conceded that much factual information has been developed by the investigation.

"The statistics speak for themselves," said the dissenters, "and it is not a record of which anyone can be proud."

The subcommittee was headed by Representative JAMES C. DAVIS, Democrat, of Georgia. Southerners were in a majority on the panel, and this made the whole proceedings suspect in the minds of many persons.

In addition to this, the hearings were conducted just before the general election in 1956, and there were allegations that Democrats were trying to damage the Eisenhower administration.

Testimony produced by the hearings was of a type calculated to make headlines.

Witnesses related incidents involving unwed mothers, sexual activities, vandalism, school-age venereal disease and a wide range of juvenile delinquencies. But they also testified about less sensational matters, such as overcrowding in classrooms, teaching techniques and school costs.

The committee majority, composed of Representatives DAVIS, JOHN BELL WILLIAMS, of Mississippi, WOODROW W. JONES, of North Carolina, and JOEL T. BROYHILL, of Virginia, made specific findings after the hearings.

1. Integration was too hasty and without sufficient preparation.

2. School integration had greatly accelerated an exodus of white residents to Virginia and Maryland. "If the exodus continues at its present rate, the district will become a predominantly Negro community in the not too distant future."

3. Differences have been shown in the ability to learn and educational achievement between the average white and Negro students.

4. These differences have created a most difficult teaching situation in the integrated schools.

5. Morale and health of some teachers have been damaged, and there has been a loss of some teachers, which creates a difficult replacement problem.

6. Discipline problems and delinquency resulting from integration were described as appalling and retarding to educational progress.

7. Sex problems have become a matter of vital concern to parents. The number of cases of venereal disease among Negroes has been found to be astounding and tragic.

8. The operation and maintenance of the district schools have been more adequately financed than the average school system. The teachers' salary scale is among the highest.

Many of these findings were bolstered by direct testimony from teachers and vital statistics.

But minority members of the committee, Representatives A. L. MILLER of Nebraska and DEWITT S. HYDE, of Maryland, protested the report as dwelling on sordid items almost entirely.

"We have a feeling that a more objective approach would uncover some good things in the educational and social life of the District schools," MILLER and HYDE said.

They also complained that leading questions were asked at the hearings. In this field, political considerations were to be noted.

Witnesses repeatedly were asked if they considered integration in the District schools a model to follow for other communities faced with integration. This seemed to be a slap at the President, who had expressed the hope that the District of Columbia would be a model of nondiscrimination.

The minority report also said that the majority's recommendation for a return to segregation obviously cannot be done without a constitutional amendment.

MILLER and HYDE, while differing, have this to say:

"The facts brought to light by this investigation seem to indicate that Negro leaders, and those actively interested in the advancement of the Negro people, have much work to do among Negro people and that all of the difficulties attended with integration are not caused by the seemingly uncompromising attitude of the white people."

During the course of the investigation by the subcommittee, a part of the House District of Columbia Committee, there were re-

ports of attempts to intimate anti-integration witnesses. Supt. Hobart Corning had to give assurances to all teacher witnesses that they were free to testify as they wished.

There have also been accusations that the subcommittee called only those witnesses at the public hearings that would produce pro-segregation testimony.

"Many persons were called to the private hearings that weren't called to the public hearings," says Miss Margaret Pepper, executive assistant to the superintendent.

Miss Pepper, and the school authorities, also believe that too much attention was given to such things as a number of teenage unwed mothers, virtually all of whom have been Negro.

"There has been no increase in unwed mothers because of integration," she says. "There is no evidence of relations between the races.

"There will always be incidents, but they are not necessarily due to racial conflicts."

The committee also explored the field of juvenile crime. It found that in 1955 Negroes under 17 were charged in 1,438 felony complaints, while whites accounted for only 376—a percentage of 79 percent by Negroes.

Vandalism at public schools has shown a marked increase since integration, the subcommittee said.

The group showed its greatest alarm over sexual incidents and venereal disease rates. A number of teachers testified about these conditions in detail, including incidents of attempted rape, assaults, soliciting by Negro girls and other sexual affronts.

A Department of Health report showed that of 854 venereal disease cases reported in 1955, 97.8 percent was among Negroes.

The subcommittee also expressed concern over classroom overcrowding, citing figures to show that the average class size has increased since integration over both segregated branches of the schools in earlier years.

The Davis Committee's work will remain a topic of conversation here for a long time to come. There are few neutral views about the matter.

Liberals and members of the National Society for Advancement of Colored People contend that it is tuned to the ears of southern constituents, that it is one-sided and inflammatory.

Some Congressmen think that the report may not have gone far enough, that conditions are getting increasingly worse as Washington's Negro school population mounts to near the 75 percent mark.

Congressman BROYHILL, a Republican, who represents the northern Virginia area adjacent to the District of Columbia—and who was a member of the subcommittee, professes to see little hope for the future.

"It looks like we're heading for chaos," he says. "That may sound emotional and dramatic, but it is nonetheless true.

"The only solution is a return to segregation in the District, and that does not appear to be at all practical."

A Texan Learns About Washington

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 3, 1958

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, in his fifth article Mr. Baskin reviews the perennial question "Should District residents have home rule and vote":

[From the Dallas Morning News of December 12, 1957]

V. TEXAN IN CAPITAL—FEDERAL CITY STILL ARGUES HOME RULE

(By Robert E. Baskin)

WASHINGTON, December 11.—Residents of the District of Columbia have a unique status in our national democracy, and it is a highly controversial status.

They have no vote, either for President of the United States or the men who administer their city government.

They are taxed by their city government and the Federal Government, and this taxation includes two levies on income, one by the United States and one by the municipal administration, which is an agency of the United States.

To an outsider, who is confronted with this situation for the first time, this seems manifestly unfair. The old battle cry of the revolution against taxation without representation immediately comes to mind.

But the issues involved in home rule for the District of Columbia are not nearly so simple.

The subject of the vote and home rule is hotly disputed here. So far all efforts to pass legislation to achieve home rule have been blocked by the House of Representatives' District of Columbia Committee.

Representative OLIN (TIGER) TEAGUE of College Station, has been a member of this committee for 11 years.

"There has been a big drive for home rule every year since I have been here," TEAGUE says. "It is led by people who are looking for power for themselves or by idealistic dreamers.

"As soon as I came up here, I made it a point to read up on the history of the District. It was obvious, even when the Capital was in Philadelphia, that the Nation needed a capital city that belonged to the whole country, not just to the residents of the city itself.

"The District of Columbia—a Federal city—was the result.

"The Capital City should never be controlled by any one group. It must represent the whole Nation."

Authority for the District is found in article I of the Constitution. It limited the area to 10 miles square (100 square miles) and specified that Congress "shall exercise exclusive jurisdiction" over the District.

In 1788 Maryland and Virginia ceded to the Federal Government a 100-square-mile area, straddling the Potomac River. But the young Capital City, meticulously laid out by Major L'Enfant, grew very slowly. Wits referred to it as "the city of magnificent distances." In 1846 it was decided that the entire area would never be needed and Virginia's portion of the District was ceded back to that State. This was a colossal though understandable lack of foresight, and it left the District with 70 square miles of land, which today is bulging with overpopulation.

In the early years there was experimentation with various forms of home rule. In 1802 the mayor was named by the President and the city council elected by the people. In 1812 the council was allowed to elect the mayor, and from 1820 to 1871 the people elected the mayor directly. A territorial form of government, with a Governor, Legislative Assembly, and a nonvoting Delegate to Congress, was set up in 1871. All of these officials were appointed by the President, except for the Delegate, who was popularly elected.

Apparently none of these systems worked well. In 1874 the present form of government began to emerge and was spelled out exactly by Congress in 1878.

Administration of the city government since that time has been by three Commissioners, two appointed by the President and the third a ranking member of the Army Corps of Engineers, who is in charge of public services and works. Other facets of the municipal government are divided between the other two Commissioners.

Congress acts as sort of an extraordinary city council for the District. Home-rule proponents say District matters take up too much of Congress' time, but in this way the national will, and not just the regional will, is expressed.

Federal property in the District, which is almost half of the area, is not taxed, but Congress, since 1954, has annually appropriated $20 million to help defray costs of the municipal government. The result is a debtless city, and all expenses are paid out of current revenues.

There are those who think the Federal Government is getting quite a bargain. William Press of the Washington Board of Trade estimates that the Government would be paying $40 million annually if it paid the equivalent of taxable values.

Taxation of the people here, like all taxation, continues to mount. Washington not only levies an income tax, but it has a 2-percent sales tax as well. Both taxes long have been considered unthinkable in Texas.

But it is generally conceded that the District Government is a highly efficient one and virtually free of corruption.

Opponents of home rule say that the vote for the District's residents is overemphasized. Residents can always maintain their voting rights in their home States if they choose. However, Congressman TEAGUE of Texas says he favors allowing a vote for President and Vice President.

What is the source of the major opposition to home rule?

Opponents frankly are concerned over the character of the city government that would emerge. They note that 46 percent of the District's employees are now Negroes and this percentage is rising. They believe that the government would be dominated by Negroes, creating an unrepresentative situation for the Nation's Capital.

"While 10 to 12 percent of the national population is Negro, 46 percent of the District's population is Negro," says Representative JOEL T. BROYHILL, Republican, Virginia, a member of the House District Committee. "We cannot afford to have a national capital that is altogether unrepresentative of the whole Nation."

Tight Federal control, too, is believed necessary because of the constant growth of the Federal Establishment.

There are 231,000 Government employees in Washington, and the bureaus, the departments, the Congress, and virtually all agencies never seem to have enough room. This is the consequence of big government.

For example, the President's executive staff formerly occupied an annex of the White House. When the State Department moved out of its old building across the street, the executive staff spread into that large structure. It is now overflowing and there is talk of erecting a new building.

Once upon a time one House Office Building was sufficient. Now there are two, and a third is under construction.

A second Senate Office Building is nearing completion.

Temporary buildings erected in World War I along the Mall are still standing, and they are full.

Foreign governments are erecting enormous establishments to keep abreast of the free world's affairs.

In 1952 extensive hearings were held by the House District Committe on a partial home-rule proposal. This plan would have set up a 15-member council, to be elected from the city's wards, and a mayor appointed by the President, who would carry the administra-

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

tive burden. Congress would have had veto powers over the council. A District delegate to Congress would have been elected, but would have no vote. There was no provision for voting in national elections. Zoning—a vital item in the Capital—would have to be approved by the National Park and Planning Commission.

This bill, moderate as it was, never left the House committee, although it had been passed by the Senate. The committee felt this was only the first step to full home rule.

Some Congressman expressed a preference to ceding the District back to Maryland rather than adopt such a measure.

The bill was supported by a number of civic groups, labor unions, and various religious bodies. But it had powerful opposition from the business community.

An opposition witness, Rufus S. Lusk, of the Washington Taxpayers Association, said: "The caliber of members of this committee and the other committees of Congress is very far above what we would have on a city council. * * * Occasionally politics get into it, but not very often. They do the best they can. You cannot expect to get that with a city council."

One thing is certain at this time: No home-rule legislation can be expected as long as the House District Committee, with a number of southerners on it, is constituted as it is.

"But," said a Congressman, "if home rule ever gets on the floor of both Houses, it will be passed. There are too many northern Congressmen concerned about the Negro votes in their districts. To vote against home rule, in a sense, would be considered an anti-Negro vote, the Capital's population being what it is."

A Texan Learns About Washington

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 3, 1958

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, in his sixth and final article Mr. Baskin reviews the recent NAACP charges against the Metropolitan Police Force:

[From the Dallas Morning News of December 13, 1957]

VI. TEXAN IN CAPITAL—NAACP WAR WON EXCEPT WITH POLICE

(By Robert E. Baskin)

WASHINGTON, December 12.—The National Association for Advancement of Colored People has just about won its war in the Nation's Capital, but it has lost one significant battle.

In the last 10 years elimination of discrimination and bars to Negroes has proceeded at a breathtaking pace.

Public transportation has been desegregated.

Hotels, restaurants, and other public places have been opened to Negroes, although few of them seem inclined to frequent the better class establishments.

Public schools are fully integrated.

Negroes have taken over vast residential areas.

Tremendous job opportunities have been opened up, particularly Federal jobs.

"A generation ago Negro workers accounted for 3 percent of the civil-service jobs in Washington," Secretary of Labor James P. Mitchell reported recently. "Today they make up 24 percent. In 1940 less than 1 percent were doing supervisory work; today 16.6 percent hold supervisory jobs, and more than 300 Negroes of distinguished ability have been appointed to positions of responsibility in the Eisenhower administration."

The NAACP has kept up pressure through the years for these things. But it has not been content, despite the fact that the District of Columbia's life has been severely jolted by the rapidity of the social change.

This fall the NAACP aimed its fire at the District's Police Department.

It claimed that Police Chief Robert V. Murray, a widely respected, veteran officer, and his Department were practicing brutality and race discrimination. The NAACP said it had 14 cases of brutality to present. It demanded that Murray be ousted.

On top of this, the organization asserted that the Police Department had a gag rule which prevented brutality cases from being aired. The three District Commissioners then took an unusual step.

They directed that officers who knew of brutality or race discrimination could report them to the NAACP, without approval of their superiors.

The FBI was called into the case. After an investigation, it found nothing to warrant Federal action because of brutality or discrimination.

But the NAACP kept up a drumfire of criticism of Chief Murray, and finally hearings were ordered to clear the situation.

Eugene Davidson of the NAACP complained that only 281 of the authorized force of 2,300 men in the Police Department were Negroes. This, he said, was unfair in a city where 46 percent of the population is Negro.

The hearings were conducted before the District's three Commissioners in an atmosphere of tension.

Congress manifested its interest from the start. Chairman JOHN L. MCMILLAN, Democrat, South Carolina, of the House District of Columbia Committee proposed a full investigation of the NAACP's activities in the district.

"We have a private organization (the NAACP) completely killing the morale of the police department," MCMILLAN said.

Senator HARRY F. BYRD, Democrat, Virginia, charged that the NAACP had grown so powerful "under sponsorship of the Federal Government" that it had been granted the privilege of questioning individual policemen as to how they obtained evidence.

"This," said BYRD, "gives the NAACP a privilege that a United States Senator does not have. It is the equivalent of permitting the private questioning of FBI agents without the authority of J. Edgar Hoover."

The hearings went extensively into promotions, assignments, and other treatment of Negro policemen. Murray and his senior officers testified that promotions and assignments were based on merit, regardless of race.

The hearings lasted 9 days. The findings of the three commissioners were a complete repudiation of the NAACP charges.

No brutality or race discrimination was proven, the commisisoners said. They expressed complete confidence in Chief Murray.

Thus came the first real setback for the NAACP in at least 10 years here.

Commissioner David B. Karrick said he was convinced that the community standing of the NAACP in the district was hurt by the charges against the police department. Washington newspapers and other observers accused the NAACP of recklessness.

There remains a likelihood that Congress may go ahead next year with a full inquiry on the NAACP's activities here.

Meanwhile, the efficiency of Murray's police department is indicated by a declining crime rate. However, the District's crime rate still may be considered a high one, with Negro offenders far in the majority.

In fiscal 1956, Negroes committed 7,794 major crimes compared to 2,324 committed by whites. These crimes ranged from murder to auto theft.

Officers have testified that arrest of Negroes have been much more difficult since the NAACP began its campaign against Chief Murray.

The NAACP apparently intends to maintain its pressure.

"Public officials here jump through hoops every time the NAACP shouts," says Congressman JOEL T. BROYHILL (Republican, of Virginia) of the House District of Columbia Committee.

"Since the influx of Negroes into Federal jobs in the District, there has arisen a kind of discrimination in reverse, a leaning over backward. A white supervisor, for instance, will be afraid not to promote a Negro employee over a white worker because he fears the NAACP will complain. We have had a number of complaints along those lines."

There is a heavy representation of Negroes in the guards of the various Federal buildings and in the national park police, which are the police force for the areas owned by the Federal Government.

What more can the NAACP ask in the Nation's capital?

No one here is quite sure. There aren't many more fields to conquer. There is no question that the District of Columbia has led the way in changing from a segregated city to an integrated one. The abruptness of this change has left visible and painful wounds.

So far the segregated communities in Virginia and Maryland have been viewed by white residents as havens. And they have moved there by the thousands.

But these havens may not last long.

Maryland is undertaking gradual integration of its schools in compliance with the 1953 Supreme Court decree.

And the NAACP is attacking segregation in Arlington, Va. There the State of Virginia has posed a massive resistance policy that would close down public schools to avoid forced integration.

So the war—the cold war of domestic America—goes on. It provides a disturbing picture to a visitor from the provinces.

The eternal question—what is the solution?—is in nearly everyone's mind in the Capital City.

Looking at the confusion in the public schools, the interracial antagonisms, the gargantuan Federal Government and the political tensions in Washington, the visitor may well conclude:

"This isn't the solution."

Mortality Rate of Top Soviet Rulers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HENRY S. REUSS
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 6, 1958

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following list of some of the leading figures in the U. S. S. R. who have been purged, as compiled by Commonwealth Survey, official organ of the United Kingdom overseas information services in its November 12, 1957 issue, pages 998–1006, which may be of interest to scholars in the field of Soviet studies:

Name	Office	Date
EXECUTED		
Abakumov [1]	Minister of State Security	
Alksnis	Air Force Chief	1937.
Beria	Minister of Internal Affairs	December 1953.
Bubnov	Commissar of Education	1937.
Bukharin	Member of Politburo, 1919	March 1938.
Bulanov	Yagoda's Secretary	Do.
Chernov	Commissar of Agriculture	Do.
Drobnis	Former member of Central Committee, Communist Party.	January 1937.
Dekanozov	Georgian Minister of Internal Affairs	December 1953.
Eideman	Corps Commander	June 1937.
Eskaraev	Deputy Chairman, Kazakh Council of Ministers.	March 1938.
Feldman	Corps Commander, Chief of Personnel of General Staff.	June 1937.
Goglidze	Uzbekistan Minister of State Security	December 1953.
Grinko	Commissar of Finance	March 1938.
Ibragimov	Crimean Prime Minister	1928.
Ikramov	President of Turkmenistan	March 1938.
Ivanov	Member, Central Committee, C. P	Do.
Kamenev	Member, Politburo, 1917	August 1936.
Karakhan	Deputy Commissar, Foreign Affairs	December 1937.
Kazakov	Kremlin Doctor	March 1938.
Khazani	Police Interrogator, Georgia	September 1955.
Khodzhaev	Prime Minister, Uzbekistan	March 1938.
Kobulov	Deputy Minister, Internal Affairs	December 1953.
Komarov	Deputy Chief, Investigation Department, Ministry of State Security.	December 1954.
Kork	Army Commander, Head of Frunze Military Academy.	June 1937.
Krestinsky	Deputy Commissar, Foreign Affiars	March 1938.
Krinyan	Police Interrogator, Georgia	September 1955.
Kulumbetov	President of Kazakhstan	March 1938.
Lerin	Secretary, Azov-Black Sea Executive Committee.	December 1937.
Levin	Kremlin Doctor	March 1938.
Leonov	Chief of Investigation Department, Ministry of State Security.	December 1954.
Lordkipanidze	Chairman, Adzhar Central Executive Committee.	October 1937.
Likhachev	Deputy Chief Investigation Department, Ministry of State Security.	December 1954.
Mdivani	Deputy Chairman, Georgian Council of People's Commissars.	July 1937.
Merkulov	Minister of State Control	December 1953.
Meshik	Ukrainian Minister of Internal Affairs	Do.
Mgaloblishvili	Prime Minister, Georgia	Autumn 1937.
Muralov	Former Commandant, Moscow Military District.	January 1937.
Orakhelashvili	Chairman, Transcaucasian Council of People's Commissars.	December 1937.
Putna	Corps Commander, Military Attaché (London, Berlin, Tokyo).	June 1937.
Primakov	Commander of Kharkov Military District	June 1937.
Pyatakov	Member, Central Committee	January 1937.
Rakhimbayev	Candidate Member, Central Committee	1928.
Rosengolts	Commissar, Foreign Trade	March 1938.
Rukhadze	Minister of State Security, Georgia	September 1955.
Rykov	Member, Politburo, 1924	March 1938.
Rapava	Minister of State Control, Georgia	September 1955.
Ryumin	Deputy Minister of State Security	July 1954.
Sadvokasov	Alma Ata Party Secretary	March 1938.
Serebryakov	Member, Politburo, 1920	January 1937.
Sharangovich	Second Secretary Byelo-Russian Central Committee	March 1938.
Sheboldayev	Party Secretary, N. Caucasus	December 1937.
Smirnov	Member, Central Committee, C. P	August 1936.
Stavitsky	Police Prosecutor, Georgia	September 1955.
Steiger	Soviet Diplomat	December 1937.
Toroshelidze	Member, Central Executive Committee of Soviets	July 1937.
Tseretell	Deputy Minister of Internal Affairs, Georgia.	September 1955.
Tukhachevsky	Marshal of Soviet Union, Deputy Commissar for Defence.	June 1937.
Uborevich	Army Commander	June 1937.
Vlodzimirsky	Head of an M. V. D. Investigation Department.	December 1953.
Yagoda	Commissar, Internal Affairs (NKVD)	March 1938.
Yakir	Army Commander, Commander Leningrad Military District.	June 1937.
Yenokidze	Member, Central Committee, C.P.	December 1937.
Yevdokimov	Member, Central Committee, C.P	August 1936.
Zelensky	Member, Central Committee, C.P	March 1938.
Zinoviev	Member, Politburo, 1917	August 1936.
Zubarev	Deputy Commissar, Agriculture	March 1938.
Zuckerman	Head of Department of Foreign Affairs Commissariat.	December 1937.
UNNATURAL OR SUSPICIOUS DEATHS		
Chervyakov (suicide to avoid arrest).	Chairman, Byelo-Russian Council of People's Commissars.	1937.
Dzerzhinsky (heart failure).	Candidate Member, Politburo, 1925; Head of Cheka (Secret Police).	1926.
Frunze (reported died from operation).	Commissar for Defence	1925.
UNNATURAL OR SUSPICIOUS DEATHS		
Garmarnik (suicide to avoid arrest).	First Deputy Commissar of Defence, Head of Political Administration of Red Army.	1937.
Lyubchenko (suicide).	Candidate Member, Central Committee, C. P.	1937.
Ordzhonikidze (died suddenly after conflict with Stalin).	Commissar, Heavy Industry	1937.
Raskolnikov (poisoned).	Ambassador. Fled to France, 1938	1939.
Tomsky (suicide to avoid arrest).	Member, Politburo, 1922	1936.
Skrypnik (suicide)	Education Commissar, Ukraine	1933.
Trotsky (murdered in Mexico).	Member, Politburo, 1917	1937.
Zhdanov, paralysis of the heart.	Member, Politburo, 1939	1948.
ASSASSINATED		
Kirov	Member of Politburo, 1930	1934.
IMPRISONED AND DISAPPEARED		
Radek	Member of Central Committee, C. P	January 1937.
Sokolnikov	Deputy Commissar, Foreign Affairs	Do.
Rakovsky	Chairman, Ukrainian Council of People's Commissars.	March 1938.
Bessonov	Counsellor, Soviet Embassy, Berlin	Do.
Pletnev	Kremlin Doctor	Do.
DISAPPEARED		
Preobrazhensky	Member of Politburo, 1920	Not heard of since 1936.
Syrtsov	Candidate Member, Politburo, 1930	Expelled 1930, vanished same year.
	1936	
Arkus, Fatyanov	High officials of the State Bank	
Maryassin	Chairman of the State Bank	
	1937	
Aitakov	President of Turkmenistan	
Akhun-Babaev	President of Uzbekistan	
Atabaev	President, Turkmen Republic	
Goloded	Chairman of Byelo-Russian Council of People's Commissars.	
Gorshenin	Secretary of the Komsomol	
Isaev	President, Kazakhstan	
Isakeev	Chairman of the Kirgiz Council of People's Commissars.	
Kaminsky	Commissar of Health	
Khalepsy	General	
Khripin	Corps Commander, Red Army	
Kruglikov	State Bank Chairman, appointed 1936	
Musabekov	Chairman of the Azerbaidzhan Council of People's Commissars.	
Orlov	Admiral, Deputy Commissar of Defence, Chief of Naval Forces.	
Postyshev	Secretary of the Ukrainian Central Committee, C. P.	
Prokofiev	Deputy Commissar of Internal Affairs (NKVD).	
Rudzutak	Deputy Chairman of the Council of People's Commissars.	
Shotemor	President of Tadzhikistan	
Sivkov	Commander of the Baltic Fleet	
Sulimov	President, RSFSR	
Svanidze	State Bank Vice-Chairman, appointed 1936.	
Unshlikht	Candidate Member, Central Committee, C. P.	
Urazbekov	Chairman, Kirgiz Council of People's Commissars.	
	1938	
Belov	Commander, Byelo-Russian Military District.	
Blukher	Marshal of the Soviet Union, Commander of Far East Army.	
Boldyrev	Commissar of Health	
Chubar	Commissar of Finance	
Dybenko	Commander, Leningrad Military District	
Eikhe	Commissar of Agriculture	
Gorbachev	Army General	
Gribov	Commander, N. Caucasian Military District.	
Kalmanovich	Commissar of State Farms	
Kashirin	Army General	
Kireev	Commander of the Pacific Fleet	
Kozhanov	Commander of the Black Sea Fleet	

[1] Execution reported December 1954, but believed to have occurred much earlier. Abakumov was last mentioned in the press in January 1950, and was not present at the 1952 Party Congress. (See p. 1004.)

Name	Office	Date
DISAPPEARED—con.	1958	
Kosior	Deputy Chairman of the Council of People's Commissars.	
Krylenko	Commissar of Justice	
Ludri	Admiral, Head of the Naval Academy	
Lyubimov	Commissar of Light Industry	
Makharadze	President, Transcaucasia and Georgia	
Mezhlauk	Deputy Chairman of Council of People's Commissars.	
Smirnov	Commissar of the Navy	
Velikanov	Commander, Trans-Baikal Military District.	
Viktorov	Admiral, Deputy Commissar of Defense, Chief of Soviet Naval Forces.	
Yegorov	Marshal of the Soviet Union, Deputy Commissar of Defense.	
Yezhov	Commissar of Internal Affairs (NKVD)	

Name	Office	Date
DISAPPEARED—con.	Later Years	
Charkviani	Candidate Member, Central Committee, C. P.	1952.
Kapustin	Secretary, Leningrad City C. P. Committee.	1949.
Khrapchenko	Chairman, Arts Committee, Council of People's Commissars.	1948.
Kolesnikov	President, Soviet Red Cross	1948.
Kuznetsov [1]	Lieut.-General, Secretary Leningrade Party Committee.	1949.
Nikitin	Member, Party Central Committee	1948.
Popkov [1]	Candidate Member, Central Committee	1952.
Rodionov [1]	Chairman, Council of Ministers, RSFSR	1952.
Shakhurin	Commissar for Aviation	1946.
Shikin	Col.-General, Chief of Political Administration, Red Army.	1949.
Tyulenev	Army General, Commander Kharkov Military District.	1949.
Vosnesensky [1]	Member of Politburo, 1941	1949.

The following members or candidate members of the Communist Party central committee disappeared between 1936 and 1939:

Akulov, I. A.; Antipov, N. K.; Bauman, K. Ya.; Beloborodov, A. G.; Blukher, V. K.; Chudov, M. S.; Gikalo, N. F.; Eliava, Sh. Z.; Kabakov, I. D.; Khataevich, M. M.; Knorin, V. G.; Kosarev, A. V.; Lominadze, V. V.; Lomov, G.; Miliutin, V. P.; Osinsky, V. V.; Preobrazhevsky, E. A.; Pyatnitsky, I. A.; Rukhimovich, M. L.; Serebrovsky, A. P.; Schmidt, V. V.; Smilga, I. T.; Stetsky, A. I.; Sulimov, D. E.; Uglanov, N. A.; Yakovlev, Y. A.; Zatonsky, V. P.

THE POLITBURO [1] 1917–57

Below is a list of members of the Politburo of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union from its inception in 1917 to 1957 showing the length of their service and their fate. Present members are marked thus *. Most of them served as candidate members before being promoted, but many candidates failed to secure election.

[1] The Politburo was replaced by the Praesidium of the Central Committee of the party in 1952.

Members

Name	Date of election	Date of removal	Fate
Lenin, V. I.	1917	1923	Died 1924.
Stalin, J. V.	1917	1953	Died 1953.
Trotsky, L. D.	1917	1926	Murdered 1940.
Sverdlov, Y. M.	1917	1919	Died 1919.
Zinoviev, G. E.	1917	1926	Executed 1936.
Kamenev, L. B.	1917	1927	Do.
Bukharin, N. I.	1918	1929	Executed 1938.
Sokolnikov, G. Ya.	1917	1918	Imprisoned, disappeared 1937.
Bubnov, A. S.	1917	1918	Executed 1937.
Krestinsky, N. N.	1919	1920	Executed 1938.
Serebryakov, L. P.	1920	1921	Executed 1937.
Preobrazhensky, E. A.	1920	1921	Disappeared 1936.
Tomsky, M. P.	1922	1929	Suicide 1936.
Rykov, A. I.	1924	1930	Executed 1938.
Molotov, V. M.	1925	1957	(See above.)
*Voroshilov, K. E.	1925		
Kalinin, M. I.	1926	1946	Died 1946.
Rudzutak, Y. E.	1926	1937	Disappeared 1937.
Kuibyshev, V. V.	1927	1935	Suspicious death 1935.
Kaganovich, L. M.	1930	1957	(See above.)
Kirov, S. M.	1930	1934	Murdered 1934.
Kosior, S. V.	1930	1938	Disappeared 1938.
Ordjonikidze, G. K.	1930	1937	Suspicious death 1937.
Andreev, A. A.	1932	1952	Out of Office.
*Mikoyan, A. I.	1935		
Zhdanov, A. A.	1939	1948	Suspicious death 1948.
*Khrushchev, N. S.	1939		
Beria, L. P.	1946	1953	Executed 1953.
Malenkov, G. M.	1946	1957	(See above.)
Voznesensky, N. A.	1947	1949	(See footnote 1.)
*Bulganin, N. A.	1948		
Kosygin, A. N.	1948	1952	Not reelected.
Saburov, M. A.	1952	1957	Dismissed, July 1957.
Pervukhin, M. G.	1952	1957	Do.
*Kirichenko, A. I.	1955		
*Suslov, M. A.	1955		
*Aristov, A. B.			
*Byelayev, N. I.			
*Brezhnev, L. I.			
*Furtseva, E. A.			
*Ignatov, N. G.	New members added July 1957.		
*Kozlov, F. R.			
*Kuusinen, O. V.			
*Shvernik, N. M.			
Zhukov, G. K.	1957	1957	(See page above.)

[1] In his secret speech at the 20th Congress of the CPSU in February 1956 (see Vol. 2, p. 1023) Khrushchev revealed that "those who innocently lost their lives," as a result of the Leningrad Case, "included Comrades Voznesensky, Kuznetsov, Rodionov, Popkov and others." The Leningrad case occurred in 1940 when a large number of Zhdanov's followers in that city were removed from their posts. Complicity in it was one of the charges against Abakumov, whose execution was announced in December 1954, and was also alleged against Malenkov in a speech by Khrushchev in July 1957. Some Zhdanovites who disappeared in 1949 were "rehabilitated" in 1956.

Some candidate members

Name	Date of election	Date of removal	Fate
Dzerzhinsky, F. E.	1925	1926	Died of heart failure 1926.
Petrovsky, G. I.	1925	1929	Relegated.
Uglanov, N. A.	1925	1929	Disappeared 1937.
Chubar, V. Y.	1926	1939	Disappeared 1939.
Syrtsov, G. I.	1930	----------	Dismissed in December the same year and not heard of again.
Postyshev, P. P.	1934	1937	Disappeared 1937.
Shcherbakov, A. S.	1941	1945	Suspicious death 1945.
Bauman, K. Ya.	1929	1930	Disappeared 1936.
Melnikov, L. G.	1953	1953	Dismissed, June 1953.
Bagirov, M. D.	1953	1953	Dismissed, July 1953.
Shepilov, D. T.	1956	1957	(See above.)

Tragedy of the Arab Refugees

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 24, 1958

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, the following article very clearly sets forth the facts about the tragic situation of the Arab refugees. It is very clear from this presentation that the Arab leaders are practicing thought control over the refugees and using them for political purposes. This explains the Arab leaders' refusal to cooperate in any solution.

The following article is from the publication Prevent World War III, winter-spring 1958 issue:

THE TRAGEDY OF THE ARAB REFUGEES

A major impediment in the struggle for peace in the Middle East is the Arab refugee problem. The society has stressed the importance of this question which cannot be solved by resort to power politics (see Prevent World War III, No. 50, Will the U. N. Solve This Problem?). The humanitarian aspect of this burning issue must also be the concern of all men of good will. History will not forgive nor forget those who continue to indulge in self-seeking stratagems while the lives and happiness of thousands of men, women, and children are at stake.

The annual report of the director of the United Nations Relief and Works Agency for the refugees (UNRWA) (July 1956 to June 1957) makes reference to these considera-

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

tions when it discusses the major factors hampering the work of the agency. The report notes that these difficulties have, in a large measure, arisen because the humanitarian problem with which the agency is dealing represents for the Arab governments a burning political issue, both of internal and of foreign policy. The implications of this observation touch the very root of the refugee problem.

For years the world has been led to believe that the Arab governments were solely concerned with the human welfare of the refugee masses who live in makeshift camps and depend upon United Nations relief. There is no doubt that this impression has helped to disguise the antiwestern policies of certain unscrupulous Arab leaders. Not a day passes without the propaganda mills of these politicians grinding out bitter denunciations against the West as though the plight of the Arab refugees was deliberately engineered by western policymakers.

But this is only part of the story. These Arab leaders strive in every possible way to maintain a state-of-war psychosis among the refugees. All sorts of demonstrations are organized to keep the emotions of the refugees at white heat. There are many examples of how these Arab leaders keep repeating to the refugees that some day they will return and destroy Israel by fire and sword. Recently, a Syrian leader, Akram al-Hawrani, addressed a huge rally in which he promised the refugees that the day was near when they would destroy the usurpers of their rights in Palestine: "The 1948 plot, the great imperialist plot which has caused you to be driven from your country shall never be repeated. This plot will not be reenacted. The hand which stretches out to conclude peace with Israel will be amputated; its owner shall be killed. There is to be no peace with Israel, no peace with Israel. The Arabs will return to their homes and properties in the near future, triumphant and victorious with God's help." A few days after this fire-eating speech prominent Egyptian leaders addressed a rally in the Gaza strip at the unveiling of a monument dedicated to the Arab refugees. The monument portrayed a refugee soldier pointing his left hand to the lands of Palestine and carrying a machinegun in his right hand. The Egyptian General Al Latif praised the intrepid spirits of the refugees while his listeners chanted "Return to Palestine."

This is the humanitarian solicitude that Arab leaders display to the refugees who live in misery. The need homes. They require adequate nourishment and medical care. Above all, they should enjoy the fruits of productive labor, but Arab leaders who pretend to speak for them, seem to be oblivious to these basic human requirements. Thus, the Arab refugees seem to be suspended as it were, between life and death. There is an old military precept that desperate people make good soldiers. It is this idea which seems to guide the Arab leaders in their approach to the refugee problem.

The results of Arab policy show up clearly in the refugee camps. The noted journalist and author, Hal Lehrman, recently analyzed this aspect of the problem after a careful on-the-spot investigation (Commentary, September 1957). He observed that the refugees were in a state of abysmal ignorance. Whatever ideas and information they had, seemed to be derived from common or controlled sources. He further reported that the refugees "were being systematically cut off from knowledge of any fact which might diminish a die-hard determination to go home."

The state of ignorance among the refugees is the trump card of those who are determined to manipulate these people as though they were pawns. They are unaware of the vast transformations which have taken place in Israel. They do not know that many Arab states are in a position to provide them with new homes, and they are ignorant of the fact that the very same Arab leaders who profess to champion their cause, block every realistic attempts to alleviate their condition. Instead, they are fed a diet of stereotyped slogans which paint the West as a bloodless monster and Israel as its heartless offspring. This isolation from the real world is bolstered by the internal makeup of UNRWA. Mr. Lehrman reports that the agents of this United Nations organization are "almost to a man themselves refugees from Palestine." This is like employing a sick man to take care of his fellow patients in a hospital. The fact is, as Mr. Lehrman points out, that these agents numbering close to 10,000 have the most to gain as job holders "from keeping the problem unsolved and the job alive." Moreover, these U. N. agents who seem to be more cultured, relatively speaking, than their fellow refugees, exploit their brethren as weapons in the effort to regain their lost advantages resulting from the exodus from Palestine.

Tied in with this rather strange situation is the fact, as reported by UNRWA, that the majority of the teaching staff among the refugees is recruited from the refugees themselves. A number of weeks ago the director of UNESCO, Dr. Luther Evans, disclosed that UNESCO funds were being used to teach Arab children to hate Israel. Dr. Evans detailed the uses of the $100,000 fund and mentioned that part of it was going to schools for Arab refugees and in every one of those schools the kids are taught that they are going to push the Israelis into the sea, he said.

The vested interest which thousands of Arab U. N. agents have in blocking a solution of the refugee problem so as to secure their jobs, and the indoctrination of refugee children as mentioned by Dr. Evans, is complementary to the outside activities and propaganda of the Arab governments. The net result of the outside and inside work is to fasten upon the refugees a naive and inflexible outlook which is tailor made for those who exploit the problem for ulterior motives.

Nor can we ignore the direct controls of Arab leaders through agents who have infiltrated these camps. Their function is not only to inform, but to punish those who dare to question the wisdom of a Nasser. It is therefore well-nigh impossible to gage the true sentiments of these people who must reckon with the provocateur and the secret agent. This is another way that the Arab refugees are kept in line. They dare not ask the simple question of their great leaders in the Arab world, "If you are so concerned with our plight, why don't you give us some of your lands which you can well spare so that we can produce and contribute to the general development of all Arab countries?"

Needless to say, this question can hardly be answered honestly by the Arab leaders. As Mr. Lehrman shows, this leadership has prevented the execution of many sound programs for the rehabilitation of the refugees—which, incidentally, would have also benefited the nonrefugee Arab masses. It was the Arab leaders who, after lengthy negotiations, turned down the Jordan Valley Authority project which would have brought into cultivation wastelands in Jordan as well as Israel. The excuse for rejecting the project was flimsy. The Arab leaders said that the JVA could not be accepted until the refugee problem had been solved. Yet, as Mr. Lehrman points out, it was precisely the JVA which could have helped to solve the problem.

Numerous other projects have been proposed by the United Nations and other interested parties but invariably the Arab leaders, without consulting the refugees themselves, have turned them down. Indeed, Mr. Lehrman reports that there is a fund of $200 million for large-scale projects to integrate the refugees in the Arab countries, but it stays practically untouched because the Arab leaders have other ideas. To put it simply: They would rather see the refugees vegetate on relief handouts than lose them as a valuable weapon in their anti-Western campaign.

Even UNRWA is looked upon with a sort of contempt any cynicism by Arab leaders. In this connection the Director of UNRWA reported numerous cases of obstruction by the Arab Governments, notably in his attempt to remove ineligible persons from the Agency's relief rolls. He also cited obstacles put in the way of UNRWA's work by the four Arab host Governments. This, of course, has made it most difficult for UNRWA to calculate the exact number of genuine refugees and has increased the inefficiency of administration. In addition to these impediments, Mr. Lehrman reveals that the Arab Governments obstruct "UNRWA's efforts by harassing its officials, by charging excessively for warehouse and other local services and even by profiting from tariffs on imports for refugee use."

As a matter of fact, the Arab leadership discriminates against the refugees by limiting their political rights and by refusing to grant them working conditions comparable to those of non-Arab refugees. Mr. Lehrman quotes one UNRWA official: "Arab leaders do not give a damn whether the refugees live or die."

The citation of the above-mentioned facts must be taken into consideration if a realistic, just, and humane solution of the refugee problem is to be attained. Many sincere people start from the premise that these refugees were forcibly expelled en masse by the Israelis and therefore the Israelis must make amends. The premise is without foundation. In actual fact, the mass exodus of the Arabs from Israel stemmed out of the invasion of Israel by the Arab States in 1948. This aggression took place in direct violation of U. N. resolutions calling for the establishment of the State of Israel. As part of the military operation against Israel, Arab leaders organized and encouraged the mass exodus of the Arab peoples living in Palestine. This is confirmed by Arab sources no less than by other authoritative reports on that situation. For example, the London Economist carried the eyewitness report concerning the Arab flight from the city of Haifa: "* * * There is but little doubt that by far the most potent factors were the announcements made over the air by the Arab Higher Committee urging all Arabs in Haifa to quit. The reason given was that upon the final withdrawal of the British the combined armies of the Arab States would invade Palestine and drive the Jews into the sea. It was clearly intimated that those Arabs who remained in Haifa and accepted Jewish protection would be regarded as renegades."

On April 3, 1948, the Near East Arabic Radio said: "It must not be forgotten that the Arab Higher Committee encourages the refugees to flee from their homes in Jaffa, Haifa, and Jerusalem, and that certain leaders have tried to make political capital out of their miserable situation. The Arab States must not allow the future of the refugees to be sacrificed to make political capital out of their fate."

Emile Ghori, the secretary of the Arab Higher Committee and one of its representatives before the United Nations, admitted to the Beirut Telegraph on September 6, 1948: "The fact that there are these refugees is the direct consequences of the Arab States in opposing partition and the Jewish State. The Arab States agreed upon this policy unanimously and they must share in the solution of the problem."

On September 27, 1948, the Near East Arabic Radio attacked the Arab Higher Committee's record in these words: "It is be-

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

smirched by the flight of its leaders and their encouragement of the Arabs to leave their homes even though no previous arrangement had been made for their housing and resettlement."

Space does not permit additional citations but anyone conversant with the tactics of the Arabs in 1948 and 1949 knows that it was precisely the Arab States that looked upon the refugees as pawns in their conspiracy to destroy Israel.

Contrary to Arab propaganda the State of Israel has always shown sympathy and solicitude for the Arab refugees. Indeed, when the war broke out the Israeli Government made a number of attempts to halt the flight of the Arabs and appealed to them "to play their part in the development of the state (Israel) with full and equal citizenship and due responsibility in all its bodies and institutions, provisional or permanent" (May 14, 1948). In 1948, it was estimated that there were more than 40,000 Arab refugees living in Israel. Between May 15, 1948, and 1950, Israel spent a total of $11 million in the care of these Arab refugees. Indeed, during that period it is estimated that Israel spent at least $1 million more on its Arab refugees than all the Arab States together on the remainder of the Arab refugee population.

The many thousands of Arab refugees who remained outside of Israel were not forgotten by the Israeli Government. On August 8, 1949, Israel notified the Palestine Conciliation Commission that it would accept the return of 100,000 Arab refugees. The Arab States rejected this compromise and demanded the unconditional repatriation of the entire Arab refugee population. On December 1, 1950, the Israeli representative at the United Nations informed the U. N. that "without waiting for peace negotiations the Government of Israel is ready to detach the compensation problem from the general framework of peace negotiations and to make payment into a U. N. reintegration fund" for the Arab refugees. In initial installment of £1 million into such a fund was offered by Israel. One year later the Israeli Foreign Minister reaffirmed Israel's willingness to deal with the problem of resettling the refugees as a special problem before the final settlement of the Arab-Israeli conflict. The Arab States rejected all of these offers and sought Israel's unconditional surrender to their terms.

In this connection it is important to note that during the first 3 years of its existence Israel was obliged to absorb close to 700,000 Jewish refugees. Approximately half of these unfortunate people had fled from persecution and oppression in the Moslem lands of the Middle East and north Africa. It is significant that the number of Jewish refugees coming into Israel during this 3-year period was approximately equal to the number of Arab refugees.

There are many United Nations reports, surveys, and documents attesting to the fact that the Arab States could, if they wished, alleviate the plight of the Arab refugees and absorb them in their respective economies. However, it is also a fact that the Arab countries studiously avoid this responsibility. While in their propaganda the Arab countries bemoan the state of these refugees, they show no inclination to cooperate with the United Nations with a view toward helping these unfortunate victims. There is no doubt that, if the Arab States showed a genuine determination to better the living conditions of the Arab refugees, the State of Israel on the basis of its past pronouncements, would generously contribute to this effort.

From the foregoing it should be obvious that the Arab refugee problem is capable of solution provided that there is a sincere desire on the part of all concerned to reach agreement. But what shall we say when some who claim to speak for the refugees, refuse to sit at the conference table and prefer to dedicate statues of soldiers pointing machineguns toward Israel? Only the combined efforts and goodwill of Arabs and Jews can put an end to this tragedy. The Israelis have always expressed a willingness to help in untangling this complex problem. It is clearly up to the Arab governments to show a similar attitude by word and by deed and to renounce the policy of exploiting these unfortunate people as pawns in their efforts to prevent peace in the Middle East.

Federal Regulatory Agencies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM E. PROXMIRE
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, March 3, 1958

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, an analysis of the impact of the recent collapse of fair-trade leadership by top manufacturers appeared in the March 2 issue of the New York Times in an article by Hebert Koshetz. In the course of this article it is pointed out that without the benefit of some protection as to minimum prices, the small dealer will be unable to continue selling branded merchandise that enjoys national acceptance, and without such merchandise, he truly will be hard pressed to stay in business.

Mr. President, the small retailer whose back is already to the wall in thousands of cases throughout America because of the current economic slump, faces a grim and perhaps impossible future unless the Congress acts to provide protection against cut-throat, predatory price competition.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the part of the article dealing with the problems of the small retailer be printed in the Appendix to the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Last week, small retailers were dealt something of a blow by the news that General Electric Co. had abandoned so-called fair trade or the fixing of minimum prices for its small appliances. Other manufacturers of appliances and hardware items followed suit and many discount houses and department stores were soon in the throes of a miniature price war on these goods.

The move by the producers of small appliances will have wide repercussions in retailing circles and one of the things it probably will bring about is a hue and cry for stronger fair trade legislation at the national level. Without the benefit of some protection as to minimum prices, the small dealers will be unable to continue selling branded merchandise that enjoys national acceptance, and without such merchandise, he truly will be hard pressed to stay in business.

SUPPORT FOR FAIR TRADE

It is inconceivable that large manufacturers such as General Electric, Sunbeam, and others will not back national legislation for minimum price selling. Flaws in the present fair trade laws which have been passed by the States have made it difficult for these manufacturers to control retail prices. From one standpoint it seemed that their insistence was aimed at the consumer and that in effect they didn't want him to get a bargain.

But the problem goes deeper than that. Physical distribution of any product on a national scale cannot be accomplished without the small, independent retailer. The convenience that he provides the customer by stocking the goods and providing a point of sale when the product is sought cannot be overestimated.

Despite the growth of large supermarkets, chainstores, and department stores, the small retailer still distributes close to 50 percent of all consumer goods. Eliminating him means the removal of the propinquity of thousands of products and a deep cut in overall unit and dollar volume, not to mention the employment and rentals involved in the great American distributive machine.

Address of Donald A. Williams, Administrator of the Soil Conservation Service, Before the 12th Annual Convention of Soil Conservation Districts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRED MARSHALL
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 3, 1958

Mr. MARSHALL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to call attention to the address of Mr. Donald A. Williams, Administrator of the Soil Conservation Service, given before the 12th annual convention of the National Association of Soil Conservation Districts at Minneapolis, Minn., on February 17, 1958:

ADDRESS OF DONALD A. WILLIAMS, ADMINISTRATOR OF THE SOIL CONSERVATION SERVICE

I am delighted to be here with you today at the start of your convention. I have looked forward to this occasion for a long time. In fact, for a year—ever since your last convention in St. Louis. You see, your annual meeting is one of the highlights for me each winter.

It's a great inspiration to be with you. You are dedicated men * * * dedicated to the welfare of your home community. You are dedicated to the protection and improvement of the soil and water resources in your soil conservation district because these resources supply the lifeblood to your community, to your State, and to your Nation—today, and in the future.

You are public officials of your State. You have the public interest at heart. You give freely of your personal time and energy without pay. If you didn't, you wouldn't be attending this convention on your own time. I am most proud to be associated with you. And, of course, it is always good to be among old friends. During the past year I have visited with literally thousands of district officials at your State association meetings, at area meetings, and on other occasions.

Let's pay tribute to the ladies' auxiliary and to their president, Mrs. Mungle. She has a full program lined up for the ladies this week. At some of the State association meetings I have been impressed with the lively interest of the ladies in the soil-conservation cause. I want to encourage you ladies to keep up this good work.

I view my participation in your convention as an annual opportunity for a two-way look at the road we are traveling together. Nolen

has asked me to concentrate my remarks this afternoon under the title "Service Through Districts."

That is a most appropriate subject. Because the primary purpose for the existence of the Soil Conservation Service is to serve America through soil-conservation districts.

Of course, we in SCS don't have any exclusive rights on that opportunity. Many of you are, and all of you should be bringing all other available conservation services to your communities through your district.

Our goal is a mutual goal. Your goal and our goal is to help farmers and ranchers get useful conservation plans working on all their land. We'll find the pot of gold at the end of our rainbow when all needed soil and water conservation measures are in full operation on all farms and ranches in the Nation.

Therefore, I want to devote my remarks at this session to three questions.

Where are we in conservation progress?

How did we get where we are?

How can we get on with the job faster?

TWENTY YEARS OF PROGRESS

Let's look at the first question. What progress has been made in soil and water conservation? We could start by comparing today with 20 years ago.

Where were you 20 years ago? Were you as concerned then as you are now about soil conservation? I suggest that each of you turn your thoughts back to 1938.

The Soil Conservation Service was just 3 years old then. I was an SCS engineer working on demonstration projects in the State of Washington. The soil conservation district movement was in its infancy. Many of you were working vigorously to get a soil conservation district law enacted for your State and to get district organization started.

The first State enabling acts were passed in 1937. Twenty-one States enacted district laws that year. By 1938 only 13 districts had been organized.

It was another 10 years before all State legislatures had passed district enabling acts providing for local initiative and responsibility in developing district soil and water conservation programs aimed at solving local soil and water problems. Between 1938 and 1948 there were 1,936 districts organized and 530,000 farmers and ranchers had become cooperators.

Today there are more than 2,775 districts in operation. They cover more than 1¼ billion acres of land. About 93 percent of all farms and ranches are within these districts. More than 1¾ million farmers and ranchers are district cooperators.

Eighteen States are totally covered by districts. Most of the other States have only one or two holdout counties. In only a handful of States is there any significant area of farmland not in districts. And in all but one of these States, district organization is proceeding rapidly. There were 62 new districts organized last year.

The evidence is clear. You have moved ahead rapidly and effectively over the past 20 years. Obviously, you are over the hump as far as district organization is concerned.

CONSERVATION CONCEPT BROADENED

During this same period there evolved a changing concept of soil conservation and the conservation objective. While the original objective was to overcome the menace of erosion to American land, gradually that concept was broadened. Today the objective is to use each acre of agricultural land within its capability and to treat it in accordance with its needs for protection and improvement.

The modern concept involves increasing soil productivity and increasing standards of rural living for today, tomorrow, and for posterity. It combines the objective of national welfare with better living for the people who work the land.

Modern soil and water conservation is putting to work on the land needed combinations of effective practices—combinations planned for and fitted to the soil and water resources of the land, acre by acre.

As one travels almost anywhere across our Nation, conservation progress is self-evident. You see field after field of crops being grown in contour rows that go around the hills. Waterways reach back into fields like fingers waiting to carry the excess flow of water from heavy rains. Mile on mile of terraces slow down the water and guide it to waterways. Moisture soaks down twice as deep in fields protected with proper conservation treatment.

Many sloping fields are farmed in contour strips where gullies once were eating their way up the hillside. Livestock graze on lush pastures of newly adapted grasses, or on range restored to high productivity by good management. Larger populations of wild birds and animals reap the benefits of improved habitat which conservation farming provides.

More than one-third of all farms and ranches are in some stage of having a basic conservation plan applied through a Soil Conservation District. About 1,160,000 district cooperators already have basic conservation plans fully developed with some effective conservation measures in operation. Soil surveys have been completed on more than a half billion acres.

District cooperators have constructed more than one million miles of terraces. Almost 850,000 farm and ranch ponds have been built, covering more than 1½ million surface acres.

They have planted nearly 4½ million acres of trees. They are using conservation crop rotations on 60 million acres—contour farming on 35 million acres—strip cropping on 15 million acres—and conservation use of grassland on more than 100 million acres.

District cooperators have leveled 5 million acres of land for irrigation. They have improved water application on 8 million acres—obtained better soil drainage on 19 million acres—improved wildlife habitat on nearly 4 million acres.

These and other measures are being used in a wide variety of combinations as needed on individual farms and ranches.

The progress is impressive, indeed.

WATERSHED PROTECTION

Another development in the broadening concept of conservation came about in 1954 when Congress enacted the Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act. You all know it as Public Law 566. The purpose of this Act was to help meet the needs of local people who are faced with problems on small watersheds. It, too, is founded on the soil conservation district principle of local responsibility and leadership.

It provides a means for bringing the water element into balance with the soil element in our total soil and water conservation effort. It offers a means to work on difficult problems that can be solved only through group action.

Since 1954 application for watershed assistance have been received from more than 800 local sponsoring organizations. Of this number, 310 have been approved for planning. On most of these, planning assistance is either under way or completed. Operations have been started on 69 of these projects.

Progress in this area is at least beginning.

In order to get watershed protection help a local community must qualify as a local organization with authority under State law to carry out, maintain, and operate the proposed works of improvement. When the legislation was encased many interested communities could not qualify as a local organization. Since then, 38 States have enacted 80 different pieces of legislation bearing upon problems of implementing the new watershed protection authority.

To me, this, too, represents significant progress, although changes in State law are still needed in many States in order for the watershed program to be fully effective.

Now, let's look at the second question. How has all this been accomplished? Of course, there has been a multitude of contributing factors. The Federal Government has, throughout this period, carried on conservation services through research, education, technical assistance, cost-sharing, and credit. State governments have provided conservation services in varying degrees. Some county governments have furnished help. A wide variety of private interests have put their shoulder to the wheel.

But farmers themselves have made by far the greatest contribution. And that is as it should be because the final responsibility for soil conservation rests with the people who own and operate the land. The services of Government agencies and private groups can be effective only to the extent that the farmer himself wants to move ahead.

TEAMWORK AND COOPERATION

The largest single other factor behind this notable progress has been teamwork and cooperation. Over the years there has been a steady strengthening of relationships among the various organizations offering conservation service. The Soil Conservation Service has always stressed the need for good relationships with our sister agencies of government and with soil conservation districts—our partners in the soil and water conservation effort. Since I have been Administrator, I have emphasized teamwork and cooperation more than any other single item.

Those of you who were in St. Louis last year will recall that I reported to you then on a plan of action on how to work toward outstanding relationships between districts and the SCS. The plan was developed by a committee of State conservationists and officers of NASCD.

We have followed through in SCS to put into effect the recommendations in the plan insofar as our personnel are concerned. Your national association and State associations have taken similar action as far as district officials are concerned. I won't take you time to review these suggestions today, because many of you are already following them.

Last September, Nolen Fuqua and Bob McClelland met with our State conservationists at our annual meeting to again review ways and means of further strengthening district-SCS relationships. We shall continue such emphasis.

We have given comparable emphasis to teamwork and cooperation with our sister agencies of Government. Our relationships have improved markedly over the years. They will continue to improve despite a current rumor campaign by one selfish special interest group.

Let me digress for just a moment to comment on that rumor campaign. Reports on it reach us from various sections of the country as the Washington located special interest rumor factory continues to grind out rumors in one distorted fashion after another.

Probably you have been confronted with some of them yourself. For example, it was charged that SCS was recommending that ACP administration be taken away from the ASC committees as a first step toward abolishing the committee system. That rumor was false in concept and deceitful in origin. SCS has not and does not intend to make any such recommendation to any person, organization, or agency at any time.

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

Another example is a charge that I personally am attempting to wreck the ACP. Again, nothing could be further from the truth. I have always believed, and I continue to believe, that Government cost-sharing in conservation is in the public interest and is vital to adequate conservation progress in our country. In 1953 I served as Administrator of ACP in another rather trying period. The steps taken then toward more cooperation of that Federal activity with local and State units of government and toward more enduring conservation have met with your approval and strengthened public support.

I do emphatically believe in the necessity for sound, enduring conservation work, and I will continue to say so. There is urgent need for more, not less, cooperation and teamwork in the conservation effort. I believe, too, that there is room for more consistent conservation policy among the various elements of the job and a more effective voice of State and local government in their direction.

Now that I have that off my chest, I want to report some tangible evidence of teamwork and cooperation.

LOCAL CONTRIBUTION GROWING

We have made a study of the amount of local, county, and State funds used last year for assistance in the soil-conservation district program. We found that local and State interests—both private and governmental—are contributing at least one-fourth of the annual operating costs of districts. A local contribution of $1 is being made for every $3 made available from the Federal Government.

Costs to individual farmers and ranchers for applying conservation measures on their land were not included in these estimates.

Most State governments are appropriating larger sums at each session of their legislatures to help districts carry on their work. In 1957 these State appropriations approached $5 million.

County and local funds and facilities are made available to districts through local government grants or appropriations and by contributions from business and private sources. These amounted in value to at least $20 million in 1957.

There is another form of private help, too, that is extremely valuable. I am referring to the time, efforts, and expenditures of thousands of citizens who lend personal support to districts because they believe in this approach to an urgent problem.

We can only guess at the tremendous educational value of conservation subject matter in advertising sponsored by local firms in support of district programs. A wide variety of soil and water conservation activities are conducted by farm publications, newspapers, banker groups, and others. The dollar value of such help can only be estimated broadly. Therefore, it was not included in our study. However, the value of such services donated in 1957 is probably equal to, if not greater than, the $25 million value of local, county, and State contributions.

This gives us some measure of the value of this type of teamwork and cooperation. It has many implications.

For one thing, it is an indication of the growing appreciation of the district form of democracy in action in America. Districts have thoroughly proved their effectiveness as tools for getting the soil and water conservation job done in a democratic way. You have won the confidence of community, county, and State leaders in government, business, industry, and other segments of our society.

Twenty years ago the financial support to the district movement was entirely from the Federal Government. The Federal Government has continued to supply districts with scientists and technicians through SCS. While the current cost of financing these technical services is less than $73 million, the local support has grown to about one-third of the support furnished by the Federal Government. This represents a growth of non-Federal support from zero to one-third in a period of only 20 years.

It is interesting to observe that this development has sprung up during a period in American history distinctive by the degree to which people have turned wholly to the Federal Government for help in solving their problems. This means to me that local people have come to view the district program as an effective means of combining local, State, and Federal effort for the accomplishment of soil and water conservation.

The study offers proof that your program for greater service launched by NASCD several years ago is unfolding successfully. If tax money had to be used to pay for all of these contributions to the district program, the total effort would cost the American taxpayer appreciably more than it is costing.

In effect, the conservation program is getting tremendously effective help that we had not counted on in the early years of the job. Because of it, Federal funds available for technical assistance are achieving perhaps one-third more than would be possible without such support.

As the conservation movement has moved forward, an increasingly large percentage of the SCS appropriation used for salaries has gone each year into the cost of supplying trained scientists and technicians to districts. In 1957, 93.4 percent of our salaries paid were for field technicians. Only 6.6 percent were paid for overhead and administration.

FASTER PROGRESS NEEDED

Now, let's turn to the third question. How can we get on with the job faster? And we do need to speed up progress.

I noted in your grassroots survey that most of you said that progress is too slow in your district. You reported that 2½ million farmers and ranchers still need to develop their basic conservation plans. Also, some conservation plans that have been developed need revision. And there is still an enormous job to be done in conservation treatment on cropland, grassland, and woodlands—and in watersheds, too.

You reported the need for SCS scientists and technicians to help farmers with conservation jobs on the land as holding back progress in most districts. More than three-fourths of you reported a serious shortage of SCS technicians to assist in district operations.

You reported a lot of other facts, too. I was highly impressed with the broad scope of information assembled in the survey. You must have spent many hours district-by-district assembling this useful information.

There are many things that can be done to speed progress. We certainly can't cover them all here this afternoon. Studying your convention program, I concluded that finding ways to speed up conservation progress might be called the theme of this convention.

We noted earlier that in most parts of the country you are over the hump in district organization. We know how to tackle this conservation job, both technically and administratively. I think one of the big opportunities for the future is in the expansion, development, and perfection of your program—district-by-district.

I have observed over the Nation that progress is substantially greater in some districts than in others. There is also a direct correlation between the rate of progress and the degree of leadership exercised by the district-governing body. Much more good conservation work gets done on the land when the district-governing body is doing things.

You men attending this convention undoubtedly come from districts where the most work is being done. The fact that you are active in the affairs of your national association leads me to the conclusion that you have an active program in your district.

It follows, too, that you develop more aggressive district programs when your State association has a positive program of action. Over the years I have attended a good many State association meetings. I want to tell you right now that the ones I have been to during the past year have been the best ever. One of the outstanding recent developments in the entire district movement is your increasing interest and participation in State association affairs. I want to publicly congratulate you men who are giving State associations this vigorous leadership.

There are always dozens and dozens of things that you can do in your home district to strengthen your district program. These are being pointed up for you through the work of State soil conservation committees, State associations, and your national association. For example, in some States district-training schools are offered. Many States have published excellent district supervisors handbooks which spell out in detail your duties and responsibilities. The Soil Conservation District Foundation has made available to you a Guide Book for Action Programs.

This type of assistance can be extremely helpful to you. It cannot, however, strengthen your district program one iota if you don't make use of it. Take the Guide Book for example. It is full of ideas that have worked in districts somewhere. Those ideas cannot help you strengthen the conservation program in your district if you don't have it and use it. I recommend the Guide Book as a useful tool for every district official.

Of course, an annual plan of action for your district is a must to efficient operations. Most of you make an annual written plan. Some that I have seen are dandies. Can the plan of action for your district be improved to speed up conservation progress? Are you using the program for greater service to carry out that plan?

I like to describe the program for greater service as a program for putting everybody in the community to work for soil and water conservation—the chambers of commerce, bankers, equipment dealers, schoolteachers, the clergy of all denominations, newspapers, radio stations, 4–H Clubs, Boy Scouts * * * everybody. A good program for greater service has a-job-for-everybody and somebody-for-every-job.

You help in speeding conservation progress by keeping local, State, and national leaders informed on soil and water conservation accomplishments and needed resources. You help by continuing active State and national associations.

USDA TOOLS

You help by making the most effective use of all available conservation tools. And there are many of them. You've been getting more all the time. There are 7 different tools available from the Department of Agriculture to help carry out your district program. I want to list them and ask some questions about them.

1. As you might expect, I will mention first the technical assistance from the Soil Conservation Service. Is too much of the time of our local technicians required to do nontechnical jobs? If clerical help would be furnished by the State or county, could more efficient and effective use be made of your technical help?

2. There is educational help furnished through the Extension Service. Are you using all the help you can get, or getting all the help you can use, on the educational

phase of your district program from the county agent?

3. There is help available under certain circumstances for watershed protection work under Public Law 566. Are any State legislative actions needed in your State to make your district eligible for watershed protection help?

4. There is cost-sharing help for farmers in applying conservation practices on the land available through ACP. Could more enduring conservation benefits be attained in your district through ACP cost-sharing geared to planned conservation operations?

5. Credit is available for needed soil and water conservation loans through the Farmers' Home Administration. Do all of your district cooperators know that if they cannot get needed credit for the financing of certain conservation installations through private credit, that credit for this purpose is available through FHA?

6. The conservation reserve phase of the soil bank offers opportunities for receiving rental type payments for taking cropland out of production. Can some district cooperators who have delayed making needed land use adjustments, convert such land from crops to grass or trees under the Conservation Reserve?

7. In the 10 Great Plain States, there is the new Great Plains conservation program. I want to comment briefly about this activity, since it is new.

The purpose of the Great Plains conservation program is to help farmers and ranchers in the 10 Great Plains States to achieve agricultural stability by carrying out a plan of operations which will help to minimize climatic hazards and protect land from erosion and deterioration by natural causes. It is in addition to the other conservation services which have been operating for some time.

By law, this program must be based on the farmers and ranchers conservation plans of operations. The program assures Federal cost-sharing for applying needed soil and water conservation practices for a period of years. It emphasizes land use changes and wind erosion control and moisture conservation and management practices that in combination will provide the most enduring conservation benefits. It offers a new opportunity for the practical application of sound scientific principles for speeding up soil and water conservation in the Great Plains region.

Soil conservation district officials everywhere should take note of the underlying concept in the Great Plains conservation program. The whole approach is founded on a basic conservation plan. A farmer is not eligible for cost-sharing help until he has developed a sound plan of conservation farming for his entire operating unit. The purpose of the cost-sharing is to help in applying the measures in his conservation plan. In other words, to get help he has to plan his farm and farm his plan.

This principle has countrywide application. The various conservation tools that we have—conservation credit, technical assistance, cost-sharing, conservation reserve—these can all be used on individual farms for most effective conservation if the conservation course for the farm is charted by a basic conservation plan.

I am firmly convinced that increased emphasis with farmers on sound conservation plans for their land can be the key to more efficient use of our various conservation tools to help speed up conservation progress.

There are many other things that can be done, too, I am sure. You will be discussing various ideas throughout this week. I hope you can pick up at least some ideas during this convention that will help you strengthen the soil and water conservation program in your district.

In closing I want to leave you with one thought that I picked up from a recent issue of the Reader's Digest. It is a slogan attributed to the American salesman. It is this: "If you have made up your mind that you cannot do something—you are absolutely right."

I know you men have made up your minds that you can and will do more things to quicken the rate of conservation progress.

Business Week Looks at Alaska

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. E. L. BARTLETT

DELEGATE FROM ALASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 3, 1958

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Speaker, increasingly the attention of the Nation is being directed toward Alaska. This is for many reasons. One of them is because the Territory is so important in defense of this country. One of them is because of the drive for Alaska statehood. One is because of the growing awareness that in Alaska is a storehouse of treasures which will enrich for generations to come our supplies of needed raw materials. Business Week, in the February 1, 1958, issue, took an overall look at Alaska in an informative article which I take pleasure in calling to your attention:

OIL RUSH, AIR HUB, AND DEWLINE: THAT'S NEW-STYLE ALASKA FRONTIER—OPENING OF 20 MILLION MORE ACRES OF TUNDRA TO OIL HUNT, PLUS FARM SURGE AND TAX BAIT FOR INDUSTRY, GIVE NEW FILLIP TO ECONOMY, BUT TODAY'S SOBER-MINDED ALASKANS SHUN WORD "BOOM"

Picture a land mass stretching from Maine to Florida, from the Great Lakes to the Gulf of Mexico, embracing our 20 easternmost States. Wrap around it a coastline greater than that of the United States itself, and you have an image of Alaska.

But that's only one image, and an extremely deceptive one. For Alaska, twice the size of Texas, one-fifth as large as all the 48 States together, is a single entity only by virtue of the fact that it was delivered to us in one package. In its variety of climates and economic resources, it could be half a dozen States.

Dream of a star

In the months just ahead, both Houses of Congress will be asked to vote on statehood for Alaska. The bill has cleared the hurdle of committee hearings. That's as close as Seward's folly has come in 90 years to realizing its dream of self-determination.

By no means is that dream shared by all the 215,000 Americans—whites, Indians, and Eskimos—who populate Alaska. Among the champions of statehood, however, the conviction is strong that the United States is ready to add a 49th star to the flag. And this heady prospect has imparted a buoyancy to life in that little-known frontier that sits astride the Arctic Circle.

Boom in the making?

A Business Week reporter emerged from a hard look at the Territory last week muttering that Alaska is on the threshold of a boom. Alaskans don't like the ugly cylical connotations of the word "boom," and they abhor the living-cost gyrations that a genuine, hell-roaring boom could evoke. Away out at the end of the supply line, where freight costs are double because there's no backhaul to speak of, they've already got all the high cost of living they can stomach.

That's why people like Bill Snedden, publisher of the Fairbanks Daily News-Miner, and Bob Atwood, editor of the Anchorage Daily Times, soft-pedal the boom talk. They point out that the Alaska economy no longer rests on salmon and gold. The accident of geography and some purposeful planning have given Alaska other economic props.

Far northern livelihood

The military forces, accounting for possibly one-fourth of the population, contribute importantly to Alaska's dollar wealth. White civilians outnumber by 3 to 1 the Eskimos, Indians, and Aleuts.

Federal employment, numbering some 15,000, is responsible for the largest block of civilian income, in excess of $60 million. Mainly because of large defense works, construction payrolls have been running a close second, although they are down now.

Economists pierce the air with anguished cries when they try to analyze Alaska. Whatever statistical bases are available crumble under the quirk of seasonality—the carpenter who shifts to taxi driving in winter, the fisherman who takes his bundle back to Seattle after the fishing season. The Territorial Employment Security Commission can't build up its unemployment insurance fund because of seasonal drains.

I. JET AGE FRONTIER

Jack London and his contemporaries created vivid fiction about the Arctic after the Klondike gold rush of 1897. It was both vivid and authentic, and it created a lasting image of Alaska as a frozen waste in which man's struggle against the elements ends in disaster. No comparable literary figure has come forward to record that the dogsled in Alaska is as outmoded as the horsecar in New York.

The Boswells of the Yukon, mushing up to a Dewline station on the Arctic coast today, would be shocked to find Sector Superintendent Randall Joyner working in his shirtsleeves in a steam-heated office, at his elbow a phone that connects him to his home office in New York within moments.

If they hit Anchorage at the right time, of course, they would see dogsleds racing a measured course on Fourth Avenue—although the snow might have to be imported, and the dogs and their Eskimo owners would have been flown in from remote corners of the Arctic.

Busy skies

In Anchorage, the Civil Aeronautics Administration operates the fifth busiest airport in the world, ranking behind Chicago, Los Angeles, New York, and Miami (London, busiest foreign port, ranks far down the list). This is due in large part to the fact that private planes are almost as popular as autos. But the 8,400-ft. runway is also an important domestic and international traffic center. Anchorage is a refueling point for Scandinavian Airlines System flights between Copenhagen and Tokyo. Air France is planning to make it a way station.

Frontier with 1958 trimmings

The frontier flavor is unmistakable—the low, flat buildings, the hustle, the feverish scrawling on cocktail napkins at the bar of the Westward Hotel, the walk-up office buildings. But it's a 1958 kind of frontier. The skyline is broken by two 14-story apartment buildings of steel and glass that tower nakedly over their neighbors. Jet planes streak across the sky in the midday dusk. The landscape is dotted with new schools, and more are on the boards.

Anchorage, with a population of 100,000, is Alaska's largest city. That population figure is deceptive, for it includes not only some residential suburbs of lovely homes but

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

also the families of servicemen temporarily at nearby Elmendorf Air Force Base and Fort Richardson. Its true value as an economic statistic is limited because more than half the working population is employed by the Federal Government—a tax-exempt employer, as City Manager George C. Shannon is quick to point out.

II. UNCLE SAM'S HAND

Evidence of Federal domination in Alaska is never very far below the surface. The Government owns something more than 98 percent of all the land. In distributing largesse, the absentee owner has been about as benevolent as you could expect a bumbling bureaucracy to be, but in its lack of understanding of local needs and conditions it perpetrates what feel to Alaskans like some towering injustices.

City's burden

Take the Alaska Railroad, a modern, efficient, 440-mile system that links Anchorage with Fairbanks in the interior and Sewurd on the Kenai Peninsula. It's owned by the United States and does a profitable business. Its central offices and yards are in Anchorage.

The railroad, being Government owned, is exempt from city taxes. Until recently the railroad maintained its own fire-protection system at a cost of $90,000 a year. As the city improved its fire rating, the railroad proposed that its properties be taken under the municipal wing for a fee. The city agreed to do it for $30,000 a year.

The shift was made, but then the ponderous machinery of Federal Government began to turn. We'll pay no fee, said Washington, fire protection is the city's responsibility. So the railroad saved a clear $90,000 and the city was saddled with the fire-protection job, receiving for it no payment.

Redtape paradise

It isn't that Washington sets out with malicious intent to be a freeloader, but rather that an economic complex the size of Alaska is a paradise for the redtape-happy bureaucrat. In some matters the Great White Father in Washington is the soul of generosity; he picked up half the tab for 11 schools that Anchorage has built since 1950.

Welcome change

Alaskans have been carrying on an abortive vendetta with Washington for a good many years. Recently they've been less caustic. The reason for the change is Fred Seaton, Secretary of the Interior.

"Fred Seaton has done more for Alaska in the last 16 months," says Bill Snedden, the Fairbanks publisher "than anybody else in the last 50 years."

To appreciate the tenderness of that sentiment, you must understand that past Secretaries of the Interior have been about as popular in Alaska as a fuel-oil salesman at an anthracite convention.

Seaton celebrated his 48th birthday in December. The Fairbanks Chamber of Commerce had one of its members bake a 220-pound birthday cake, and flew it to Washington for presentation by Delegate E. L. BARTLETT.

III. TODAY IT'S THE OIL RUSH

The latest Seaton gesture to win Alaska's approval was his revocation of Public Land Order 82, by which the Government in 1943 blocked off the whole Arctic coastal slope against oil leasing and exploration. Some 20 million acres of tundra are thus restored to the public domain, and the scramble for leases is on.

In the long term, Alaskans view this gesture as one step in many that will permit their economy to find its own level. There is also a short-term advantage. Lease applications must be accompanied by a filing fee of 25 cents an acre.

Peanuts? Talk to Gov. Michael A. Stepovich, the dark-eyed young lawyer from Fairbanks who is the first native son to hold that appointive office. Mike Stepovich makes it clear that the filing fees are more than peanuts.

Buried treasure

For more than half a century, oil geologists have been poking into the Alaska soil. Drilling has been desultory and largely unrewarding. It persists because oil men generally affirm the belief of a distinguished geologist at Standard Oil Co. (New Jersey) who said in 1941 that, geologically, Alaska is one of the four great oil provinces in the world. (Events proved him right about the other three: the Middle East, southeast Asia, the Gulf of Mexico.)

On United States Naval Petroleum Reserve No. 4, created in 1923, oil and gas have been found, but both wells were capped some years ago. Last July, Richfield Oil Corp. brought in a discovery well on the Kenai National Moose Range south of Anchorage. Because of restrictions to protect the dwindling moose herd, Richfield hasn't yet been able to test the productive capacity of the well, variously estimated at from 400 to 900 barrels per day. Standard Oil Company of California, a partner in the Richfield exploration, is drilling a second well nearby.

Cash in the treasury

"In 1957," says Governor Stepovich, "16-million acres were leased for oil exploration, the vast bulk of that since the Richfield strike on July 23. At 25 cents an acre, that comes to $4 million. Under a 1957 act of Congress, Alaska's general fund gets 90 percent of that, or $3.6 million. Not many people realize that $3.6 million is equal to almost 10 percent of our annual budget—40 percent of our 1956 Territorial income tax collections."

Should oil production follow, the Territory would also receive 90 percent of the 12½ percent royalties.

With 20 million acres of Arctic slope opening up this fall under Seaton's order, the general fund apparently is in for another windfall.

Widening hunt

If the oil companies have any real optimism about Alaska oil, they're keeping it to themselves. Richfield and Standard of California have committed themselves to spend up to $30 million on their joint venture. Humble Oil & Refining Co. and Shell Oil Co. are probing into the Jute Bay area of the Alaska Peninsula. Phillips Petroleum Co. has spent $8 million in the Icy Bay region on the gulf. All the majors are at work. In a special study of the widening search for oil, the Anchorage Chamber of Commerce sees it as a $100-million investment—plus another $200 million for facilities if the search is successful.

Moose first

Restrictions on oil activity on the Kenai moose range illustrate the frustrations of territorial impotence. Even organized sportsmen have urged relaxation of regulations to permit orderly examination and development of the oil potential. But the welfare of 4,000 moose—10 percent of Alaska's total—prevails.

President Elmer E. Rasmuson of the National Bank of Alaska at Anchorage notes that almost 25 percent of the Territory's land mass is in reservation of some sort. In this respect, he says, "Alaska became the victim of an outdated conservation philosophy that was a sort of vicarious atonement for the waste of the motherland."

Bracing for it

Anchorage businessmen have given a good deal of thought to how they can brace for the rush of drilling that's expected to start this summer and what will happen to their town if a real oil boom gets rolling.

A couple of months ago they passed the hat along Fourth Avenue and collected $5,000 for an impact study. They engaged James Dalton, prominent Alaska mining engineer, to study the impact of the Williston Basin and other oilfields on neighboring communities. Nobody is spending the money before the oil starts to flow; it's just that the business community doesn't aim to be caught without orderly plans.

IV. READY FOR THE FUTURE

The passion for methodical preparation is the stamp of the new breed of Alaska frontiersman. Two years ago, in preparation for statehood, delegates assembled on the campus of the University of Alaska at Fairbanks and framed a constitution. Subsequently the voters elected 2 United States Senators and 1 United States Representative. If the statehood lightning strikes, Alaska won't waste a precious moment getting into Congress.

Lure for industry

Last spring, the Territorial legislature passed and Governor Stepovich approved a tax-incentive law to lure new industry. A business that qualifies may be exempted from all local and Territorial taxes up to 10 years—an exemption that extends in the same degree to the dividends it pays.

The measure was aimed primarily at processing industries that can exploit Alaska's vast potential of timber, hydroelectric, and other natural resources. It holds a lure also to build Alaska's $27-million-a-year tourist industry.

Pacific Northern Lumber Co., Portland, was first to qualify for tax exemption. It will build this year a $1-million sawmill and lumber kiln at Wrangell.

Also seeking to qualify is Alaska Lumber & Pulp Co., which is building at Sitka a $55.5-million pulp mill to be in production by 1960. The project is financed largely by Japanese capital, and its entire output is to go to Japan.

Cradle

The cradle of the new Alaska—the bridge between the fictional Alaska of yesterday and the bumptious Alaska of today, as well as the center of its preparations for the future—is the University of Alaska. Its president, Dr. Ernest N. Patty, is proud of its role. A distinguished mining engineer, Patty left the faculty for a successful business career, then rturned to his first love.

Abundance underground

Patty is a hard-headed realist. He acknowledges Alaska's abundance of mineral resources, but admits "we'd have a hard time if we fell back on our metals." Goldbearing gravels that once yielded $24 million a year now produce $7 million for lack of any price or tax incentive. At Goodnews Bay, Alaska produces 95 percent of the domestic supply of platinum. On the Seward Peninsula is the only known deposit of tin in the United States.

Alaska has excellent coal deposits along the rail belt. Tests are being run on some uranium ores. Chromite, mercury, iron, limestone, volcanic ash—you name it, Alaska has it.

On Patty's staff are two scientists who represent extremes in the Alaska economy, Dr. Allan H. Mick, director of the university's agricultural experiment stations and extension services, and Dr. Max Brewer, a permafrost expert who heads the school's Arctic Research Laboratory at Point Barrow.

Sunlit crops

In the warmth of the faculty lounge, with the outdoor temperature skidding toward minus 25° F. and an ice fog closing in, Mick's optimistic assessment of Alaskan agriculture isn't easy to accept. Yet there are, in the Matanuska Valley south of here, some 1,400 farm families whose prosperity attests to his words.

The Alaska farmer exploits the subarctic quirk of long summer daylight to stretch

his 4- or 5-month growing season to the equatorial equivalent of 8 months.

For a long time, Alaskan agriculture labored under the criticism that its produce was watery, flavorless. The reason was that farmers, with so much assistance from the sun, paid little heed to the need for soil nutrients. That day is past. Now the Alaska farmer is marketing quality crops.

In the past 10 years, says Mick, the farm value of Alaska's produce has almost quadrupled to 53.5 million.

Lonely research

Max Brewer and a handful of helpers man the lonely outpost of the university at Point Barrow. There, in cooperation with the Office of Naval Research and the Arctic Institute of North America, his Arctic Research Laboratory is poking into a variety of esoteric phenomena.

At the Barrow laboratory, and in eight satellite camps occupied at various seasons of the year, the Brewer group is concerned with physiological, botanical, zoological, oceanographic, geological, geophysical, bacteriological, glaciological, even archaeological research.

In summer they maintain a camp at McCall Glacier, 400 miles east of Barrow. In February, the oceanographic and biological groups land a light plane on the polar icecap 100 miles north of Barrow to measure depth of the ice and to measure the salinity and temperature of the underlying water.

V. DEFENDING UNITED STATES DOORSTEP

This is sensitive work, demanding scientists who are both rugged and dedicated. Brewer sounds an ominous note. "We're 20 years behind the Russians in Arctic research," he says, "and at the rate we're going we'll never catch up. As long ago as 1937 they demonstrated that they could land a four-engine plane on the icecap. Who is to say when they might find the ice a stable launching platform for missiles?"

That's a question for Americans to ponder. In the polar projection concept of world geography, the Arctic Ocean is the doorstep of the North American Continent.

In depth

Almost nowhere in Alaska are you apt to forget that. The armed services are there in depth under a unified command—the Alaskan Command—that antedates the consolidation of the services.

Besides their normal defensive role, the services are training men in the realities of combat under extreme weather conditions.

DEW line

Two of the components—the Alaskan Sea Frontier and the Alaskan Air Command—had vital roles in one of the great engineering achievements of all time, completed only last year. That was construction of the DEW line—the $500 million chain of distant-early-warning radar stations across the rim of the continent. The radar fence and the supporting "White Alice" communications system are operated by Federal Electric Corp., subsidiary of International Telephone & Telegraph Corp., under supervision of the Air Command.

While Western Electric Co., prime contractor on the electronic marvels, battled the technical problems involved, the Navy tackled the staggering problem of transporting hundreds of thousands of tons of materials to a forbidding seacoast that is relatively ice free only a couple of weeks a year.

Scant evidence of that labor is now visible. The mountains of material have been assembled into compact little electronic sentry posts, miles apart. Under winter's mantle of snow, they're scarcely visible.

Grapes in the snow

But you know they're there. Every day except Sunday Federal Electric sends a supply plane from Fairbanks to the Arctic coast. It carries mail, perishables, electronic gear, and other supplies to the technicians standing guard.

The supply mission is carried out by Interior Airways, a contract carrier. Interior's *Dewliner* deposits its cargo at two main stations along the coast, then lighter planes handle the redistribution to the substations.

You fly along the DEW line for a couple of hours in the half light of an Arctic winter afternoon.

Out of the gloom the pilot eases the *Dewliner* onto the frozen runway at one of the supply stations. You're invited inside to keep warm while the plane is unloaded. On the mess table, for between-meal snacks, are a bowl of fresh grapes and a tray of bananas.

Address of the Majority Leader, Hon. John W. McCormack, to the Fourth Degree Knights of Columbus

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. O'BRIEN

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 3, 1958

Mr. O'BRIEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and to include with pleasure the ringing American address made by our distinguished colleague and majority leader, Hon. JOHN W. MCCORMACK, at the banquet of the Fourth Degree Knights of Columbus, held at the Conrad Hilton Hotel, Chicago, Ill., on the evening of February 23, 1958.

Worthy Master McGillen; his excellency, Most Rev. Raymond P. Millinger, auxiliary bishop of the archdiocese of Chicago; right reverend and very reverend monsignori; reverend fathers; and one whom I deeply admire and the knowledge of whose honorable and trustworthy service is not confined to the limits of Chicago, but have spread throughout the United States, and I refer to Mayor Daley of Chicago; national commander of the American Legion, John S. Gleason; distinguished guests, and officers and members of the Marquette Province of the Fourth Degree of the Knights of Columbus:

If I read the mind of Bishop Hillinger correctly I know that he will always treasure the fact that this class of 800 new members inducted this afternoon was named in his honor, and that this splendid banquet is a special tribute to him.

I am so happy to be with you this evening. I appreciate very much the invitation extended to me by Worthy Master McGillen, through my dear and valued friend and colleague, Congressman THOMAS J. O'BRIEN, who is held in high esteem by all of his colleagues.

Like yourself, I listened to the excellent address of Americanism delivered by our brother knight, National Commander Gleason. I thoroughly agree with him when he said that, "It is too bad, without regard to religion, that every American could not witness the exemplification of the fourth degree of the Knights of Columbus with its ringing ritual and message of patriotism and Americanism."

Mr. Toastmaster, as I walk through the halls of the Capitol, or along the streets of a city, and see young men and young ladies, or parents walking with their children, I often ask myself the question, "What kind of a world will they live in? Will it be a world of peace? Will their enjoy the form of government we have? Just what kind of world faces them?"

And the answer immediately comes to me that the world they will live in will depend on what we do today; the manner in which those in the position of leadership perform their trust and their duty to the American people. For a sound leadership is necessary—a leadership of vision and courage.

As public opinion in a democracy is a powerful factor in forming governmental policy and action, it is imperative that our people be informed as fully as our national interest will permit.

If public opinion is formed as a result of emotional reactions, it could contribute to harmful results. If the people are informed and public opinion is sound, it will contribute constructively to the best interest of our country.

In the world today there are a number of basic considerations that confront us, and which we must face with courage. Some of them appear to me to be (1) the world is undergoing one of the most, if not the most, trying and challenging periods in the history of man; (2) there is no such thing now, or in the future, as military isolation; (3) that vicious and inhuman forces are determined upon world revolution and conquest; (4) that their ultimate goal is the United States of America; (5) that, from a military angle, the only thing the Communist leaders in the Kremlin respect is what they fear, and that is military power and strength greater than they themselves possess; (6) in this period of emergency, when neither war nor peace exists, it is vitally important that our leadership do those things that we can do and should do in the national interest of our country; (7) that while it is vitally necessary that we be strong from a military angle, it is also imperative that we be strong from a spiritual angle; (8) that if we are to err in our judgment, it is better that we err on the side of strength than on the side of weakness; (9) that we must recognize that military strength is relative in nature, and that the military strength and power of our country must be considered in relation to the military strength and power of the Soviet Union, that the Soviet Union is the present source of our danger.

For today, confronting us, are the forces of dictatorship in most vicious form, dedicated to world conquest, determined to dominate not only the body but the will and the spirit of man, by force and through fear to compel that spirit to forget its belief and faith in God and His law, or to be remodeled in the likeness of atheistic communism.

To some this is a period of frustration, of confusion, of fear, and of defeat. To others it is a period of faith and confidence in ultimate victory.

It is to millions of persons through the world, possessing deep and active faith, actuated by God's word, willing to make all necessary sacrifices, who will give the necessary strength and leadership that will bring about ultimate victory. The conflict in the world today might well be termed the war of love versus hate.

But, no matter how dark the situation might become, deep faith by individuals and nations may well be the sustaining influence between victory and defeat.

There is no place where what I have just said could be more effectively expressed than to the members of the fourth degree of the Knights of Columbus, the patriotic chapter of our great order.

For faith is affirmative, not negative. Possessing faith we fight for the spiritual truths and ideals we believe in, and in the world of today when we do that, we are most effectively combating atheistic communism.

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

When we fight affirmatively, with God and His law as the origin of our thoughts and actions, dangerously sinister as it is, communism becomes "the lesser involved in the greater."

We are more effectively combating communism when we fight to put into active operation the spiritual truths and ideals in which we believe. For when we confine ourselves to fighting against something, we are on the defensive, and no war has ever been won strictly through defensive thinking or tactics. It, therefore, follows that, while it is necessary and imperative that our country be militarily strong, it is also necessary and imperative that our people be spiritually strong.

We hear and live again the clarion call of men and women who want freedom, "where law ceases, tyranny starts" or, as Patrick Henry said, "give me liberty or give me death." We are living again the days of the martyrs. We need again the spirit of the crusaders. For there are many martyrs in the world of today, and there are many Patrick Henrys as well. What has happened in Hungary, a little over a year ago, is powerful evidence of this fact.

The desire for liberty is not man-made, but comes to mankind from God himself through his natural law.

The spirit of those who fought and died for liberty in Hungary is not dead today. Who knows when in Poland, East Germany or elsewhere, in the future, there will be others who will be martyrs on the altars of religion and liberty.

The history of man shows that dictators come across the horizon of time, and suppress temporarily the God-given desire for liberty, but history also shows that they can never destroy that desire, and in the world of today that is and will be a powerful factor in our favor.

When the Hungary uprising took place, we had no policy to capitalize it. From our angle it is important in the event of an uprising in Poland, East Germany, or elsewhere that, unlike Hungry, we have a policy of an affirmative nature in their hopes and efforts for independence and freedom.

In viewing the world situation as it now exists, we must assess our weaknesses as well as our strengths. We must also assess the strength as well as the weaknesses of the Soviet Union. To do otherwise would mean that we are living in a dream world. It is quite clear through our Strategic Air Command and, if necessary, its ability to reach its targets with its weapons of destruction, that we are offensively powerful from a military angle, and that such offensive power might also act as a deterrent to attack, surprise or otherwise, as long as our intercontinental bombers can reach their targets in the Soviet Union.

While we have other powerful weapons and means of attack and defense, it is our Strategic Air Command that is our primary power.

On January 21, 1958, the Committee on Appropriations (in a report to the Congress) in discussing the overall superiority we still have said, "This superiority is explained largely by our great power in the Strategic Air Command. Our chief difficulty arises out of the fact that in the critical areas of space satellites and ballistic missiles, we are generally behind the U. S. S. R."

In the field of ballistic missiles it is the overwhelming opinion of competent officials and military men that we are behind the Soviet Union and, in this connection, I again quote from the same committee report, "We live in an age of every-increasing danger. In military strength the Soviet Union has been progressing more rapidly than the United States, which immediately after World War II was vastly superior, militarily, to the Soviet Union."

At the present time, the Soviet Union has perfected, with accuracy, and production, the intermediary ballistic missile, with a range of from 700 to 1,000 miles. We have not, as yet, perfected this missile, though we are on the road to doing so, but it will still take some time. In this field, we are behind the Soviet Union.

But, the real danger is in the field of intercontinental ballistic missiles, and while the Soviets have not as yet perfected this terrible means of destruction so that they can hit targets with sufficient accuracy, they are far ahead of us.

In addition, it is known, like ourselves, that they are exploring means of intercepting intercontinental bombers, so that if perfected on their part, very few, if any of our bombers could reach targets in the Soviet Union.

There are many other important activities that I could discuss—very important—such as biological, chemical and psychological warfare—the strength and power of our Army and Navy compared with the strength of the Soviets, but at this particular time and on this occasion, I confine my remarks to what appears to me to be the immediate danger that confronts us, effective ballistic missiles, capable of being fired from one continent to another—coupled with the Soviet defense against our intercontinental bombers.

In our case, due to the fact that the President has, and I consider it unfortunately so, on several occasions, notified the world, which includes the Kremlin, that we would not be the aggressor, which means that we would not engage in a surprise attack, that we must be prepared on all aspects of modern warfare. Personally, I feel it was unwise to let the world, particularly the potential enemy, know of our full thoughts and intentions. Let them do some guessing! The time could arrive when, for our own safety, we might have to move quickly and unexpectedly.

The main point I want to convey to you is that if the Soviet Union perfects the intercontinental ballistic missile before we do, and perfects a defense against our bombers—for a period of time, unless we at least catch up quickly—they will have a decided advantage over us.

In other words, unless we move quickly, there is likely to develop in the reasonably near future, a situation where the Soviets could hit American targets, and very few, if any, of our powerful bombers could get through to targets in the Soviet Union.

If that time should arrive, and many competent persons and military men I have talked with feel it can, then the question is "Will the Soviet leaders permit us to catch up with them?" As far as I am concerned, I do not believe that they will.

It is vitally important that we always be in position where we can reach targets in the Soviet Union—that is as long as the Kremlin adheres to dictator communism, carrying with it the avowed determination to dominate the world.

The question naturally addresses itself to you as well as to me, "Why are we behind the Soviets in these fields of science and technology?" There are a number of factors. In 1954, a subcommittee with which I served investigated the whole field of military research and development. If our recommendations had been followed, we would not be in the position we are today.

It is pretty clear that the main reason for our present predicament is due to management, which means leadership, on the governmental level. In support of this statement I quote from a letter, now public, written by Dr. Frederick L. Hobde, chairman of the Army scientific advisory panel, and president of Purdue University, to the Honorable Wilber M. Brucker, Secretary of the Army, dated October 30, 1957, a unanimous report of the panel, consisting of over 50 outstanding Americans, in which they said, in part: "The problem before the Nation is not simply one of money, or even men—these we have in substantial amounts and that which we do not have can be provided. Whatever failures there may be, they are primarily those of management—in which we have a share—which resulted in delays in decisionmaking and confusion in the direction of our technological forces. Despite rapidly developing pressures for immediate reorganization, a thorough diagnosis of our management ills must be made before remedies are prescribed."

In further support of what I have said, I again quote from the Appropirations Committee report of a few weeks ago: "One of the most heard of complaints is the frustration of scientists and research people, generally arising from inability to get decisions on work to be done. Almost endless layers of review are encountered."

In the same report the committee said: "We live in the days of ever-increasing danger. In military strength the Soviet Union has been progressing more rapidly than the United States, which immediately after World War II was vastly superior, militarily, to the Soviet Union." And the committee further pointedly said: "We should press forward toward an operational capability in these fields, and in any other fields in which we are behind."

The further question addresses itself to you and to me and to other Americans is what should and what can be done. It seems clear to me that:

1. Our Government should determine the nature of the danger from the Soviet Union.

2. With that knowledge, what we must do to meet that danger.

3. Then for those in leadership in our Government, both executive and legislative, to organize our powers to meet the same.

As Dr. Hobde well said in his letter to Secretary Brucker, "We have the brains—we have the facilities," and as I say, the American people will make all necessary sacrifices.

It is a question of leadship on the top level in our Government, with the appointment of the best qualified men to key positions of decisionmaking, and authority to carry out of these decisions, in coordinating brains and facilities and, in particular, the giving of direct leadership, if necessary, and strong action by the President himself. One thing is certain, we cannot afford any further delays in decisionmaking, and in seeing that those decisions are carried out.

We cannot afford to live in a dream world, in the world of today with atheistic communism bent on world domination, with slavery, persecution, imprisonment, death, and even martyrdom desulting therefrom. We cannot afford to let the cooing of the Soviet leaders deceive us.

Based upon my own knowledge, the next 1½ to 2 years will be important years, of a far-reaching nature in the history of our country and of the future world. What we do within that period might well be the turning point in our favor. What we fail to do in that period might well be the turning point in favor of communism.

Coming back to what I said at the outset of my remarks, What kind of a world do you think the young American of today faces? What we do in the next 1½ or 2 years may well determine how your children's children are going to live.

Under no conditions can we afford to have the Soviet Union have a distinct and decided advantage over us in any field of modern warfare where they can attack us without fear of retaliation, even for a brief period of time. There is no need for this situation to exist if strong leadership exists and coordinates the brains and facilities of our country. We have great men and women in the field of science and technology and in other important fields, who, if put to work as a team, with decisions made on

the high level and carried out effectively, can meet the situation. However, we cannot afford to delay because delay plays into the hands of the enemy. There already has been too much delay.

If these things take place, and with American public opinion aroused and insisting upon deeds and not mere words, I have every confidence of success, not only for ourselves, but particularly for our children and our children's children.

A Pilgrimage to Puerto Rico

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. A. FERNÓS-ISERN
RESIDENT COMMISSIONER FROM PUERTO RICO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 3, 1958

Mr. FERNÓS-ISERN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Apendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I include an article from the May 6, 1957, edition of Newsweek magazine which has recently come to my attention and which describes how the underdeveloped countries of the world have come to look to Puerto Rico for hope and inspiration as to what is possible for them to accomplish toward modernization of their industries and higher level of living for their people. I feel that this article is descriptive of Puerto Rico's role in this respect, and I recommend it as an article which will help to accent one of the ways in which Puerto Rico is helping the United States in its championship of freedom and progress within a free world:

A PILGRIMAGE TO PUERTO RICO—UNDERDEVELOPED WORLD FINDS OUT HOW IT'S DONE

An Indian woman in her sari and a young Arab in his galabia were among the visitors watching the water cascade over the spillway of the big dam near Trujillo Alto. "This is wonderful," said the Arab, and the Indian woman nodded agreement. It was not the size of the dam that impressed them. It was the fact that it had been built through local initiative in a country that only 20 years ago was one of the most backward in the world.

These two were typical of the thousands of visitors from almost a hundred different countries who have been swarming over Puerto Rico as observers, official and unofficial, for their own governments. Some have been students on grants from the Puerto Rican Department of State and the United States International Cooperation Administration. Others have represented the United Nations or the Organization of American States. Still others have represented private business in many lands, interested in Puerto Rico's surging development.

Among them has been an Algerian nationalist leader, wanted by the French, who came to seek answers for his own tormented and economically backward country; he went away convinced that a solution other than armed rebellion could be found. Another was an Indonesian newspaper editor who soon found that Communist stories of American imperial oppression were something less than the truth; he left swearing that he would set the record straight back home.

All of these people had come to Puerto Rico to see how a colony, acquired in war and speaking a language different from that of the conquerors, could be peacefully transformed into a flourishing commonwealth, one of the most prosperous States in Latin America.

Vice President RICHARD M. NIXON has called the island a "showcase of American cooperation." President José Figueres of Costa Rica called it "a link between North and South America."

It is Puerto Rico's Governor Luis Muñoz-Marín who has been the one man most responsible for making the island a showcase. In 1949, when President Truman announced "the bold new program" that would become known as point 4, Muñoz-Marín told him: "In the last 10 years we have begun to do the things you call for in your point 4. We have worked out techniques and have pretty much solved the basic problems. We have something to show the underdeveloped countries of the world. Send us their representatives and your technicians, and we'll teach them what we have learned."

Soon students and government officials were coming from countries with similar problems, from Egypt, Formosa, Iraq, Burma, Pakistan, India, Israel, Thailand, and Nigeria, and from the Latin American republics. When Tunisia became independent, it sent a delegation to study the island's commonwealth ties with the United States.

COLONIALISM'S ANSWER

The recent independence of Ghana also opened the way for study of the Puerto Rican experiment. One Ghana official said: "We can't blame our failures on British colonialism any more. You in Puerto Rico seem to have found the answer to our problems."

The most eagerly studied Puerto Rican innovation—and perhaps the most dramatic—has been the development of low-cost housing. A mutual-aid plan provides building materials and an experienced foreman, all for $300. The man who is going to live in the house must provide most of the labor.

Less tangible but of more far-reaching importance has been the economic formula worked out through the Puerto Rican Industrial Development Co., or "Fomento," as the islanders call it. Fomento has built or sponsored some 400 factories which it has subsequently turned over to private enterprise—a case of state socialism employed to serve capitalistic ends.

One thing that helps Puerto Rico's relations with underdeveloped countries is the fact that there are no racial bars or prejudices. Another is the very smallness of the island. As Under Secretary of State Arturo Morales Carrión says: "The United States is too vast for the people of newly independent states. They see great hydroelectric projects and multibillion-dollar campaigns and feel that this is impossible for them. Puerto Rico is in a scale of reference they can match. We achieved what the Communists promised but without resorting to Soviet methods or to the destruction of individual rights and initiative."

Our National Guard

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. FLOYD BREEDING
OF KANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 3, 1958

Mr. BREEDING. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I should like to point up two letters received by me relative to our National Guard strength and its importance to our national defense structure.

In so doing, I add my strongest expression of support for the most serious consideration before any decision is reached which would have the effect of reducing the overall strength of the national guard, thereby eliminating a great many guard units.

I agree wholeheartedly with the Honorable George Docking, Governor of the State of Kansas, in his belief that we must maintain a balanced Defense Establishment, in spite of the progress in the missile program, and that the proposed reduction in the size of the Regular Army can best be offset by maintaining a strong National Guard.

An explanatory statement by Maj. Gen. Joe Nickell, Kansas National Guard, setting forth our comparative National Guard position, is certainly of great interest.

THE STATE OF KANSAS,
Topeka, February 10, 1958.

Hon. J. FLOYD BREEDING,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR FLOYD: You have previously received a communication from my chief of staff, Maj. Gen. Joe Nickell, adjutant general, concerning the 10-percent slash in Army National Guard strength proposed by the President in the Federal budget for fiscal year 1959, and a proposed reduction in the number of National Guard units. This would reduce the nationwide strength of the Army National Guard by 40,000 men to a strength of 360,000.

The Kansas Army National Guard suffered a cut of more than 400 men under last year's national strength reduction from 437,000 to 400,000. The proposed new reduction would force this State to discharge an additional 650 trained men, and may cause 20 cities to lose units of which they are proud and in which the entire communities are actively interested. At the same time, the press reports the Russians continue to maintain 175 Army divisions, while we have only 15 divisions in active service.

At the governors' conference in Williamsburg last year we adopted a resolution favoring the Cordiner report which, it was reported, would save the Armed Forces several billion dollars a year in the cost of training technicians who are leaving the Armed Forces for more attractive pay outside the service. It appeared to us then, and it seems to me now, that favorable action on the Armed Forces pay bill as recommended by the Cordiner report would effect sufficient savings to maintain our National Guard and Reserve forces at present strengths. I believe that we must maintain a balanced Defense Establishment, in spite of the progress in the missile program, and that the proposed reduction in the size of the Regular Army can best be offset by maintaining a strong National Guard.

I urge you to do everything possible to maintain the fighting power of America's 27 National Guard divisions, and particularly the splendid Army National Guard of the State of Kansas.

Sincerely,

GEORGE DOCKING,
Governor.

STATE OF KANSAS, MILITARY DEPARTMENT,
Topeka, January 20, 1958.

Hon. J. FLOYD BREEDING,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN BREEDING: The President's budget has been submitted to the Congress and in the line item entitled "Army National Guard" in the Department of the Army section of the budget, the strength which the Army National Guard must be

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

reduced to by the end of fiscal year 1959, June 30, is 360,000. This is a cut of 40,000 in fiscal year 1959 under the 400,000 floor which the President said would be retained under the guard in his public statement during the controversy of 6-month trainees last spring. The Army National Guard is presently being reduced from the 437,000 it had last spring to a maximum of 400,000, which must be reached by June 30, 1958, the end of the current fiscal year. All personnel in the 6-month training program must be included in these reduced strength allowances. The military press has reported this and also the fact that there will be a reduction averaging 20 percent in the number of National Guard units in the United States and in some types of units this reduction will aggregate 40 percent.

The present budget also provides that only $10 million of the $30 million appropriated and carried over last summer for armory construction and $3 million for nonarmory construction shall be released in fiscal year 1958. No construction funds are budgeted for fiscal year 1959 or fiscal year 1960, the explanation being that another $10 million of the current funds previously appropriated, will be made available in fiscal year 1959 and another $10 million in fiscal year 1960. There is no reference to the utilization of the $3 million for nonarmory construction.

To reach a strength of 360,000 by June 30, 1959, will seriously impair the efficiency of the Army National Guard of the United States, and to reduce the number of units will cause a tremendous problem for those communities in Kansas which have voted over $4 million in general obligation bonds in the past 3 years to provide the State matching funds for armory construction. Besides affording a continuing school and military training for the young men of these communities (Kansas has 64 cities which have guard units), the money return in Federal and State drill payments, minor local expenses and federally paid local caretakers make a sizable industry in many of our county seat towns.

The United States Army Reserve, which is budgeted for an overall strength ceiling of 300,000 by the end of fiscal year 1958, is reduced 10 percent, also, and budgeted for a strength of 270,000 at the end of fiscal year 1959; but since the current paid drill strength of the Army Reserve is only 205,000, it will mean a gain of 65,000 for the United States Army Reserve program during the year, according to the military press. The Army, it is said, will show the Armed Services Committees that the Guard has not made sufficient progress in signing up prior servicemen as volunteers and these men will be assigned to Army Reserve units. At the present time there is great resentment, on the part of young men who have completed 2 years of service under the Selective Service System, against being forced to discharge their entire reserve commitment. The 37,000 men now being released from the Guard program, together with the 40,000 to be released in fiscal year 1959 are all volunteers and if the gain of 65,000 in the Army Reserve is achieved through the enforcement of penalties against the prior servicemen assigned to the Reserve units, it is anticipated that you will receive many individual complaints in the coming year. For your closer consideration with relation to the affect this program is going to have in your Congressional District, I am attaching hereto a list of National Guard units and the towns in your district in which they are located and urge you to give some thought to which of the 3 or 4 cities, which are bound to lose units in your Congressional District, you would give priority in disbanding.

All of the official training reports and mobilization ready schedules indicate that the National Guard is in a high state of training, as a whole, in the United States and that is particularly true of the State of Kansas. National Guard units have been converted as to type many times in the past to meet the changes in weapons and tactics indicated as necessary by our military planners and conversion plans have been filed by Kansas, and I believe by all States, to convert the units to the new Pentomic concept. Many of our officers are now taking courses at the Missile School of the Army at Fort Bliss and some of the National Guard units are being converted to On-Site Niki installations. The National Guard is fully capable of meeting the challenge of conversion to any new structure of organization required in modern warfare.

I urge you to give the most serious consideration when this matter of reducing the overall strength of the Guard and eliminating a great many units reaches final consideration in the current session of the Congress.

Sincerely,

JOE NICKELL,
Major General, the Adjutant General.

Cardinal Samuel Stritch, of Chicago, Named Pro-Prefect of the Congregation for the Propagation of the Faith

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ROLAND V. LIBONATI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 3, 1958

Mr. LIBONATI. Mr. Speaker, I wish to commend to the attention of my colleagues the naming by Pope Pius of Cardinal Samuel Stritch, archbishop of Chicago, as pro-prefect of the Congregation for the Propagation of the Faith. He becomes a member of the curia of the church in Rome, the first American ever to be so named.

The congregation is the seventh, in order, of the 12 congregations which govern the affairs of the Roman Catholic Church. The Pope is prefect of the first three, the congregations for the holy office, the consistory, and the oriental church.

The Congregation for the Propagation of the Faith originated in a commission of cardinals set up by Pope Gregory XIII to seek a reconciliation of the divergent eastern branches of the church.

SPREADS THE FAITH

The commission was expanded in its functions by Pope Clement VIII, and was created as a permanent consistory by Pope Gregory XV in 1622.

It was charged with the task of spreading the Roman Catholic faith throughout the world, and its jurisdiction today is one of the broadest in the church.

It has wide authority in the field of the church's missionary work, and in mission territories exercises the functions of other congregations of the church, as well.

The appointment brings the number of cardinals in the curia to 15. Previously these have always been Italian, French, British, Spanish, or Dutch. Only other non-Italian member at present is Cardinal Eugene Tisserant of France.

When the cardinals eventually are called on to pick a successor to Pope Pius, who celebrates his 82d birthday tomorrow, the cardinals are unlikey to choose anyone who has not had experience in the central government of the Catholic Church. Today's appointment will give Cardinal Stritch that experience.

CONGRATULATED BY CHICAGOANS OF ALL CREEDS

Chicagoans of all faiths reacted with expressions of pleasure and pride to the announcement yesterday that Cardinal Stritch, Roman Catholic archbishop of Chicago, has been made pro-prefect of the Catholic Church's Sacred Congregation of the Propagation of the Faith.

Cardinal Stritch said he received the news with surprise. Noting that never before has an American prelate held such an important office, the Cardinal declared modestly, "It is clear that Pope Pius XII in honoring me principally had in mind honoring the Church in the United States.

DALEY GIVES CONGRATULATIONS

Mayor Daley, joining other Chicagoans in saying he was delighted to see Cardinal Stritch honored, said, "I shall be sorry to see him go. The Cardinal has enjoyed the respect and admiration of everyone, and we are losing one of the Nations' great churchmen.

In Springfield, Governor Shatton said:

This is indeed a most fitting honor and distinction bestowed on Cardinal Stritch. The United States in general and the State of Illinois in particular is highly honored.

Among the thousands who sent their congratulations to Cardinal Stritch were the Reverend Dr. Paul M. Robinson, president of the Church Federation of Greater Chicago, and Rabbi Richard G. Hirsch, congregational director of the Union of American Hebrew Congregations.

PERSONAL LOSS TO FRIENDS

A leading layman in the Chicago archdiocese, Charles C. Kerwin, of Lake Forest, former president of Catholic Charities of Chicago and vice president and treasurer of the Catholic Church Extension Society, said the departure of Cardinal Stritch will mean a great personal loss to everyone who has known him.

At the same time, he said, he was overjoyed that Cardinal Stritch has received the great honor. Kerwin is a knight commander of the Order of Pius IX, one of the highest orders in the church.

Cardinal Francis Spellman, of New York City, sent this telegram to Cardinal Stritch:

My heartfelt congratulations go to your eminence on the great distinction of being the first American cardinal in history to be designated a cardinal in the Roman curia.

[From the Chicago Tribune of March 2, 1958]

TEXT OF STATEMENT

Cardinal Stritch issued the following statement after the announcement he had been elevated to the office of Roman Curia:

"When this news came to me, I was surprised and amazed. It never entered my mind that the holy father would think of me for such an important office in the Roman Curia, which assists his holiness in the government of the universal church.

"It is clear that his holiness in honoring me, principally had in mind honoring the church in the United States. Never before in history has an American prelate been called to such an important office. The

Sacred Congregation of the Propagation of the Faith, under the immediate authority of the holy father, is entrusted with the care of the foreign missions of the church.

CITES GROWING INTEREST

"The Catholics of the United States have shown a growing interest in these missions. Quite evidently, the holy father, in calling me to this office, wished to give another expression of his fatherly appreciation for this interest.

"At the call of his holiness I shall go to Rome and with God's help try to prove myself worthy of his confidence and of the great Catholic body of whom I shall be a symbol.

"To my clergy and people on this occasion I express my deep affection. They have been my support and edification through these 18 years. I know that I shall have their prayers in the discharge of the heavy responsibilities of the office to which I am called.

AWAITS OFFICIAL NOTICE

"I may say to them that I have not received the official document calling me to this important office. When I receive it I shall inform them in detail or what is involved in this call of the holy father.

"For the present, all that I know is that the holy father has called me to be the prefect of the Sacred Congregation of the Propagation of the Faith.

"The prefect is the esteemed Cardinal Fumasoni-Biondi, whom we remember as being apostolic delegate in the United States. It will be a great comfort for me to have at my side this great Cardinal, who, with the exception of his years as apostolic delegate in the United States, has been an outstanding official from minor to prefect of the Sacred Congregation of the Propagation of Faith."

TELLS LOVE FOR CITY

"His knowledge of the foreign missions, his great abilities and his understanding promises me some usefulness in helping the Holy Father in his great apostolate for the missions of holy church in these difficult times.

"May I add that after 18 years here in Chicago, despite my being from other parts, I am a Chicagoan and I love Chicago, its people and its warmth. It is my prayer that through the years which God will give me I shall be able to contribute my little part to making Chicago the world's greatest city, in which spiritual values will take precedence over material and humanistic considerations."

We, all the Members of Congress from the State of Illinois honor this gentle, quiet, firm, religious man of God; his interest in the aged and the poor by fostering, stimulating and providing arranged financing for the building of homes for their betterment as one of his outstanding accomplishments.

He venerated and served the so-called older parishes of the disappearing home neighborhoods, near the heart of the downtown commercial areas of cities. He helped modernize their structures and developed programs for the return of parishioners. His attainments have benefited God and country in every emergency, either in times of war or peace. He was always an American and a patriot. We ask God's blessing and bid him Godspeed in his new work to care for the needy, the sick, and the forgotton humans, in the missions of the world, that a new peace may enter their lives.

Analysis of H. R. 8002

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN H. RAY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 17, 1958

Mr. RAY. Mr. Speaker, in accordance with leave heretofore granted, I wish to include in the Appendix of the RECORD the following memorandum, I have prepared with respect to H. R. 8002 which is scheduled to come to the floor on Wednesday, March 5. I hope the analysis and comments will prove helpful.

H. R. 8002 would amend section 201 of the Budget and Accounting Act of 1921—now section 11 of title 31 of the United States Code—that being the section which defines the President's function and obligation with respect to preparing and submitting his annual budget.

That bill presents two problems: First, Is the end result at which the bill is aimed a good one? and, second, Does the bill in its plan and phraseology provide a sound and practical procedure for attaining that end? The announced purpose of the bill is good—it is like saying one is against sin to say that one would like to strengthen the control which can be exercised by Congress over departmental expenditures and especially the unobligated funds carried over from previous years. Neither among proponents nor among opponents of the bill have I found any criticism of or opposition to that broad objective.

I have found, however, that many colleagues have not considered the second question. Since that is the field of controversy, a short analysis of the bill may be helpful.

The bill declares that it is "the policy of the Congress that estimates for proposed appropriations will be determined on an annual accrued expenditure basis"; that the amount of proposed appropriations shall, "to the maximum extent deemed desirable and practicable by the President, be determined on an annual accrued expenditure basis"; that the conversion to the use of the annual accrued expenditure methods "shall be accomplished in such manner and at such time as may be determined by the President"; and finally that the bill shall cease to be in effect July 1, 1961.

Under the circumstances which exist, it seems to me that this is a queer and illogical plan for the changes proposed.

For one thing, would it not be ridiculous for Congress, after considering seriously and approving a change in policy such as that proposed in the bill, to wind up by saying that the change should cease to be effective after 2 years? Surely a bill of this kind should not be proposed as a 2-year experiment. If the scheme of the bill is sound and advantageous, it should be proposed on a long-term basis. If it is not demonstrably sound the bill should not be enacted.

Even more important, the 84th Congress, by Public Law 863, gave the President authority to require the several departments to adopt accrual accounting procedures. H. R. 8002 would be effective only with respect to departments which have so changed their accounting system. To date the President has been amle to direct that change in only a few of the smaller departments. It is not expected that the Department of Defense, for example, can make such a change for another 3 or 4 years. Therefore, it would seem that if H. R. 8002 were to be enacted, there would not now beany substantial area of Government operations in which the bill could apply.

H. R. 8002 contains three sections. Section 1 would add 4 new subsections to section 201 of the Budget and Accounting Act. These four subsections are the provisions for the so-called annual accrued expenditure basis for appropriations. Section 2 is in effect a limitation of the scope of section 1. It provides some leeway for making contracts outside the limits set forth in section 1, and it states the rulemaking character of the bill. Section 3 contains the provision already referred to that the bill shall cease to be effective July 1, 1961.

Now for the details of the proposed basis for appropriations and some comments thereon:

The first subparagraph of section 1 attempts to define the reasons for the bill. It declares that revisions in the presentation of budget estimates and estimates for deficiency and supplemental appropriations are essential in order "to provide a more informative basis for the enactment of appropriations by Congress," but the bill does not provide for any information which the executive and legislative branches of Congress cannot get under present laws; "to reduce or eliminate the large carryover balances of appropriations from 1 fiscal year to another," but again these results are already within the existing power of Congress and the executive, and depend upon action by those branches of Government; "to bring about economy in Government expenditures," but the bill adds nothing to present law on the subject. The result described would come only by actions of the Congress outside of this bill.

The bill declares that, for the foregoing reasons, it is the policy of the Congress that estimates for proposed appropriations will be determined on an annual accrued expenditure basis. Since the three reasons quoted above are contrary to fact, the bill cannot be regarded as good legislation.

Section 2 of the bill attempts to define certain situations in which contracts may be made in addition to the amount of an appropriation authorized on the annual accrued expenditure basis. This is new law and provides authority for making contracts beyond the year covered by the annual accrued expenditure estimate. The section relates to technical matters which I am not qualified

to discuss, but I am informed by those familiar with the technical side of appropriations and contracting that there is serious controversy on whether or not such contract authority should be granted.

The bill has been widely publicized as a measure which would enable the Government to make savings which it cannot make under the present law. I find no basis for that assertion. In fact an Assistant Director of the Bureau of the Budget and one of the directors of the Citizens Committee for the Hoover reports have stated to me that the enactment of H. R. 8002 will not enable the Government to make any savings which could not be made under present law if the House committees and the Director of the Budget utilized their existing powers. The executive officers and the House committee have all the authority they need under the laws now in force. I have asked the Citizens Committee many times to give me a single case to which the foregoing statement would not apply, but on analysis, none of the cases submitted sustains the assertion of those who support the bill.

I submit, Mr. Speaker, that H. R. 8002 should not be enacted.

Cut in the National Guard

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT W. HEMPHILL
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 3, 1958

Mr. HEMPHILL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I enclose herewith a letter from Hon. W. M. Brice, Jr., the progressive mayor of the town of York, S. C., with reference to the cut in the National Guard:

TOWN OF YORK, S. C.,
February 28, 1958.

Re National Guard units,
Hon. ROBERT W. HEMPHILL,
Congressman, Fifth Congressional District of South Carolina,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR BOB: I understand that there is a move underway to cut the defense budget by canceling several of the National Guard units. I further understand that the two units located in the armory here in York will possibly be involved in the cut, if the cut takes place.

I fully realize that there is a great need in Washington for economizing. I also fully realize that the two units here in York mean a great deal to this community, as well as the Clover community. This past year the payroll of the 2 units located here in York amounted to between $65,000 and $70,000. As you can see, this was a tremendous benefit to the citizens and businessmen of York. We are certainly most interested in seeing the payroll continued, if at all possible. The armory that we have here in York is an extremely fine building, and would certainly be a bad thing if there was no one here to use it. The National Guard unit has also been used in York before to assist in cases of emergency. I am speaking here of the severe hail storm in 1955. If it had not been for the National Guard unit, the protection of property, especially in the business section of York, would have been extremely hard for our police to handle. The National Guard was called upon to help and they responded quickly. As you can see, it is a protection to York, as well as creating a payroll for York.

As you know, business conditions have been off considerably recently, and it does not appear that the situation will change tremendously in the very near future. I, therefore, can assure you that our businessmen would certainly feel the pinch if this payroll from our two National Guard units was cut off.

I fully realize that I have written you on numerous occasions with regard to legislation, but I feel that that is the only way you will know how the people of this community feel about certain pieces of legislation. We would appreciate your seriously considering this matter, and if you feel that you can do anything to help prevent the funds for our local National Guard unit or units from being cut off, we would certainly appreciate it.

With kindest personal regards, I am,
Very truly yours,
W. M. BRICE, Jr., *Mayor.*

The President Needs To Fight for a Better Trade Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HALE BOGGS
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 24, 1958

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article:

[From the Courier-Journal of February 16, 1958]

THE PRESIDENT NEEDS TO FIGHT FOR A BETTER TRADE BILL

While defense and science have been capturing the headlines, the administration's failure to sell its trade program either to Congress or the people may have more fateful immediate consequences.

Unfortunately, even the bill Mr. Eisenhower has asked his supporters to fight for is far from perfect. It does ask for a 5-year renewal instead of the previous 1- to 3-year limits, because the European Common Market came into existence in January of this year. Within this framework, from 6 to 11 nations will adjust their own tariffs and trade programs, excluding nonmembers. The President must have sufficient authority to deal with the group on a more permanent basis than he has had heretofore.

But he has permitted tariff sympathizers to write into the bill some dangerously weakening amendments. The escape clause to which foreign trading nations have long objected are stronger than ever in the new bill. And there are some tricky provisions by which, in case of claimed damage to domestic industries, tariffs can be raised to prohibitive heights.

Senator DOUGLAS pointed out, in his first major speech on the bill, the importance of maintaining a United States influence on the European Common Market, and the great impetus the St. Lawrence seaway will give to import-export trade in the Middle West. But these voices of reason are small beside the massed trumpets of the china makers, the bicycle makers, the wool growers and processors, and similar industries which prefer to operate behind protection.

The importance that even friendly nations attach to our restrictive trade policies is obvious in the current Canadian election campaign. The Conservatives are campaigning on their determination to cut some trading and financial ties with the United States and their seeking out of alternative Commonwealth markets and investments. They blame their rivals, the challenging Liberals, for "putting all of Canada's eggs in one (United States) basket" and thereby causing the present rising unemployment.

These are hardly the times in which we can see our best and closest friends angrily seeking other partners and not be concerned. But the concern will have to be translated into bolder action than the administration has seen fit to invoke up to now.

Letter in Cleveland (Ohio) Plain Dealer Points Out TVA Achievements

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOE L. EVINS
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 3, 1958

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Speaker, recently a senior at Western Reserve University, of Ohio, wrote the editor of the Cleveland Plain Dealer a letter so cogently and pointedly refuting arguments against the Tennessee Valley Authority, one of our greatest national assets, that I feel impelled to call it to the attention of my colleagues of the Congress and others. Accordingly, I am inserting in the Appendix of the RECORD this concise and trenchant statement of facts on TVA's accomplishments. I commend the spirit of intellectual independence and the determination to seek for truth and make up one's own mind expressed and exercised by Miss Susan Sifritt in this letter.

The letter follows:

HUZZAH FOR TVA

To the EDITOR, PLAIN DEALER:

SIR: I am a senior at Western Reserve and for the past semester I have been studying in Washington on the Washington semester program at American University.

As part of the Washington semester, we are required to write a project which involves interviews as well as bookwork. My project was on the TVA, which someone on your editorial staff lashed into last Saturday.

I talked to the TVA in Washington, several representatives from the area, and several administrative assistants to Senators supporting TVA, as well as some who do not, and the United States Chamber of Commerce, an enemy of TVA's, and the National Association of Electric Companies, a lobby for privately owned electric companies. I have come to a conclusion supporting TVA.

Your arguments, the same as those used by TVA opponents, are so old they are hackneyed. They are also simply answered.

TVA's low power rates, either by competition or example, have caused low electric rates in the area surrounding it, but dividends paid by these privately owned companies have increased 6½ times, while the national increase was only 3 times. Both the stockholders and consumers have benefited economically outside TVA area.

TVA flood control (would there have been any if privately owned electric companies instead of TVA had built the dams on the rivers?) on the Tennessee River and its tributaries helps reduce crests on the Ohio and Mississippi Rivers, saving money on flood damage.

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

And TVA farm test-demonstrations in 13 out-of-valley States are showing farmers more effective methods of farming and conservation. Does this not contribute to the economy outside the Tennessee Valley?

It is quite possible that TVA bought so much coal from Kentucky and Tennessee because, as is stated in the TVA Act, TVA is to help the valley economy. It would not be helping it if TVA bought most of its coal elsewhere. And what it does buy out of the valley area certainly contributes to the economy of those States.

The TVA, outside of its power system, uses Federal funds to pay for its flood control, navigation, agriculture and fertilizer and forestry research, etc. These Federal funds come from tax money. But if this money was denied TVA because it benefited only a region instead of the whole country, should not money for the West's reclamation projects, or for the Great Lakes' St. Lawrence seaway be denied for the same reason?

Of course not. Each region received Federal aid for projects which will help it, and each region's needs vary—what good would the St. Lawrence seaway do in Montana?

TVA needs to expand its power facilities to meet growing power demands from its consumers. The power system is self-supporting, as required by the TVA act, and with the exception of what it reinvests, pays all of its profits to the Treasury.

Had the existing electric companies in the Tennessee Valley made electricity available to the valley in 1933, which it did not even under REA, they might still be in business. But the successors to the Insull combine were more interested in milking its customers and lining its pockets.

The income of the valley is still below the national level, but so is that of the South. However, valley income has risen from $836 million in 1933 to $5.5 billion in 1950. In 1933 the valley people paid $3 million in Federal income taxes, in 1950 they paid almost $300 million.

TVA does not entice industry to the valley from the North with its low electric rates; not one example of this can be found. But the valley gets industry because it goes after it and because of the abundance of natural resources, including actual and potential hydroelectric power, and a large labor market.

Monopolies use 48 percent of TVA's electric power—this includes Aluminum Company of America, Du Pont, Monsanto, and Eastman. Perhaps the success of these private enterprises may be more dependent on public ownership than anyone has guessed—an idea not likely to appeal to the NAM.

Is your editorial policy toward TVA based on fact and reasoning or the electric companies' propaganda?

SUSAN SIFRITT.

A New Tax Cut Idea

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WAYNE L. HAYS
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 3, 1958

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter I received from a constituent in Salem, Ohio, with a simple solution for putting more money into circulation:

FEBRUARY 19, 1958.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN HAYS: A simple solution to put more money in circulation and to cut down on time spent figuring out who gets a tax cut and how much:

Each day that Ike takes a holiday would be a tax-free day on income. There would be a great deal of money put in circulation as a result and perhaps some of the recession would be alleviated.

We all can't take the number of vacations he does, but we could sure have a lot of fun spending that money that we'd save on taxes in that time. It might be interesting to figure out what it would add up to for the average wage earner for a period of 1 year on a tax-free holiday basis.

Very truly yours,

ROSINA SCHELL.

The Unfairness of Labor's So-Called Scorecards

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALBERT P. MORANO
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 3, 1958

Mr. MORANO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the major portion of a column entitled "Labor Front" which appeared in the Bridgeport, Conn., Sunday Herald on March 2.

This column admittedly presents this Congressman in a favorable light. Of course, that is pleasing and gratifying. But, more important, it serves as an impartial voice protesting the insidious machinations of the political cosmeticians of the large labor unions who are charged with "making up" the type of faces they want to see worn by the Senators and Congressmen they purport to judge.

I have long protested against these so-called boxscores of voting records. They are totally incomplete. They are dishonest by design. They are as rigged as an election in Moscow. A Republican has as much chance of looking good in this distorted mirror as Quasimodo would have of getting on the list of the 10 best-dressed Frenchmen.

The bit of reporting and comment by Ed Murray is brightly written and to the point. Mr. Murray has not in the past been one to tear into the labor movement. He is able, honest, and writes with fairness and integrity.

If he is to be judged, he certainly would be high on the list of those who are labor's staunch supporters.

That the announced results of the United Auto Workers new scorecard should elicit this criticism from a labor editor, surely confirms the opinion that many of us have had for a good, long time regarding these and similar scorecards.

The only boxscore that counts is the unabridged voting record of each Congressman which shows all amendments, recommitals, and so forth, and which gives the full picture of the Congressman's stand on an issue. Taking just 1 vote out of some 5 or 6 on the issue can make a legislator look anyway the scorecard editor wants him to look.

The UAW scorecard flatly records me as voting for a move to cut $50 million from grants to States and cities for sewage plant construction.

The record will show that in the debate I favored the authorization. In 1956 I voted for an authorization of $50 million a year for 10 years for the program. In 1956 I voted for the first $50 million appropriation for fiscal 1957. When it was apparent that appropriations already granted were not being used since works progress was delayed, I voted to delay further expenditures until applications already made could be processed and the projects started.

When the House and Senate conferees approved a $45 million appropriation, I accepted it.

This explanation does not appear on the UAW scorecard. They merely state I was against sewage-plant construction by taking one vote of a series of actions—the one vote which would give the impression they seek to create.

On the matter of pay raises to Federal employees, I might say that I was assured this bill would be overwhelmingly approved. My presence was required in my district on the date of the vote. Prior to the vote I worked actively in behalf of the postal and Federal employees' deserved pay raise. Opposition had been diminished to a token. The raise was passed by a lopsided vote as I was sure it would. Does my absence on the day of the vote justify the UAW rating me as opposed to a Federal pay increase when I devoted months to assure passage of the bill? Why was I not scorecarded by the UAW on the postal pay-raise bills for which I voted. The Herald scorecard fairly recorded this vote. The UAW did not.

Mr. Speaker, I commend the newspaper column to the attention of my colleagues. Because parts of the column refer to Members of the Senate and to several of my colleagues in the House, I include the entire column with the exception of those paragraphs.

The article follows:

LABOR FRONT

(By Ed Murray)

CRITICISM ON SCORECARDS

In 1956 when Representative ALBERT P. MORANO won Connecticut Federation of Labor endorsement after a bitter fight he was denied financial support by the national AFL–CIO. MORANO's voting record, as compiled by the AFL–CIO committee on political education, was against him.

The Connecticut Industrial Union Council, which is now merged with CFL, supported MORANO's Democratic opponent, former State Senator Jack Stock.

MORANO was the only Congressman in the Nation to win local labor support and yet be denied financial aid. He raised vigorous objections, which the Herald at the time ran in full.

MORANO's major objection was that the COPE voting scorecards were rigged along partisan lines to make Republicans look bad and Democrats look good. He also complained that the votes considered were largely on issues of little interest to Connecticut voters.

It now appears that the Greenwich Republican may soon be raising a similar howl—and this time he may have at least a little more justification for his complaint than he did in 1956.

COPE hasn't yet published its scorecards, but this week the United Auto Workers published their own scorecard.

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

MORANO fares only fairly well on the UAW scorecard. He shows 11 right votes and 7 wrong ones. This would not generally be considered enough of a score to merit labor endorsement.

But here's the rub: The Herald on October 27 published a story on the voting records of Connecticut's 8-man congressional delegation in which their votes were contrasted to the records of acknowledged liberals in both houses.

MORANO's record showed he voted with the liberal block on 9 key issues and against them only once. His 1 vote against the liberal block was strictly on a partisan issue—a resolution to investigate the administration's tight money policies.

The Herald's list paralleled on most issues the voting record compiled by Americans for Democratic action. But like all voting records, it was highly selective. An attempt was made to select issues which clearly separated liberals from conservatives on important issues and to duplicate as few issues as possible.

* * * * *

The Herald's original report on voting records was heavily weighted in the Senate by the civil-rights battle. The House votes were dominated by foreign-aid issues. In both the House and the Senate the Herald noted a lack of clear-cut issues, chiefly because many important measures never came up for final action.

The UAW researchers did a fairly good job on digging up additional issues, though MORANO and other disgruntled GOP's can reasonably argue that several issues reflect only the narrowest of partisan clashes.

There is at least one MORANO vote record by the UAW, however, which will probably count heavily against him in his chances of winning labor support.

MORANO was the only Connecticut Congressman to vote in favor of a move to cut $50 million from grants to States and cities for sewage-plant construction. Several Fairfield County towns are currently confronted with acute sewage problems.

MORANO will have a good complaint about his record on pay boosts for Federal employees. He voted in favor of hikes for postal employees. This vote was recorded by the Herald, but not by the UAW. MORANO, however, failed to vote on increases for other Federal employees, and this issue was recorded by the UAW.

The UAW scorecard is also open to general criticism on the grounds that it fails to show whether a vote in favor or against a particular measure is right or wrong. This makes it difficult for the reader to judge whether he agrees with the UAW's idea of right or wrong on the individual issues.

The sharp differences between the Herald and the UAW reports on voting records point up the weaknesses in selective voting records, particularly for a session of Congress during which there was little significant legislation. It's expected that COPE will publish its scorecards soon after the end of the second session of the 85th Congress.

In reporting on the full record of the Congress, COPE will have more issues to choose from and should be able to do a better job than either the Herald or the UAW did in showing the tenor of voting by Republican and Democratic Congressmen. But there will still be a need for voting records that are more cued to the interests of Connecticut union members than to the national interests of the Democratic Party.

Despite the limitation of voting scorecards, organized labor performs a tremendous public service in publishing them.

They give the average voter a vital aid in evaluating his Congressmen.

But the scorecards could be even more effective if the men who compile them could guard against the reasonable criticisms that have been made.

Manpower for the Armed Forces

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ELIZABETH KEE
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 3, 1958

Mrs. KEE. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include a copy of my newsletter Keenotes which was released today:

KEENOTES

(By Representative ELIZABETH KEE)

What to do about manpower for the armed services is a problem which Congress and the country must face up to soon. Everyone agrees that the United States must maintain armed forces adequate to meet any emergency so long as the present stalemate between this country and the Russians continues. At the core of the manpower problem is the question of how the men are to be obtained for the armed services and how they are to be paid.

At the present time, we depend upon the draft and voluntary enlistments to fill the needs of the services. Turnover of personnel is high. The loss of trained personnel each year is not only a serious drag on the efficiency of the services but it is also extremely expensive.

It costs about $25,000 to recruit and train a man for duty with one of the services. If he serves only his draft period, or his short enlistment, this tremendous investment will be largely wasted.

The draft is a highly costly operation. Congress appropriates about $34 million each year to support the Selective Service System. The draft calls run about 10,000 men a month. Some experts contend the draft is a highly inefficient way of recruiting manpower in times of peace. It interrupts the lives of young men and, in many instances, delays if not prevents their college education.

An imposing array of experts in the field of defense manpower, both civilian and military, contend the problem can best be met by a more realistic method of paying men in the services. The pay scale should be based upon skill and ability and not upon length of service, these experts believe.

They offer convincing evidence to support their views. For instance, if highly skilled technicians, who are increasingly important to a defense system that relies more and more on missile and other intricate electronic devices, can be induced to choose one of the services as a career, the need for replacements will be greatly reduced.

The Cordiner report, named after the General Electric president who headed a Presidential commission, recommended pay scales for these experts based upon ability. The report recommends making the services attractive enough to keep the men from taking their skills, acquired at Government expense, to private industry at the end of enlistments.

Some men believe a revision of the pay scale, in line with the Cordiner report, would save $5 billion a year in the costs of recruitment and training. Perhaps this is high. But many experts agree that this proposed system would produce better-qualified men and do away with the need for expensive and inefficient recruitment and drafting.

At the present time a House Armed Services Subcommittee is engaged in a study of defense manpower. This highly important hearing is not attracting the headlines of the investigation into ECC or studies of missiles and other outer-space developments.

But the result of this hearing could, in the long run, be of utmost importance to the future security of the country. Out of the hearings may possibly come a manpower system that will not only produce the necessary trained technicians but can do so at substantially less cost to the taxpayer.

This manpower problem is one that deserves the close attention and careful study not only of Congress but of all our people.

Our Educational Needs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROY W. WIER
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 3, 1958

Mr. WIER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I desire to insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a letter from Mr. G. E. Kelley, executive vice president, Bay State Milling Co., Winona, Minn., in which he discusses our educational needs.

Mr. Kelley's letter follows:

BAY STATE MILLING CO.,
Winona, Minn., February 7, 1958.

The Honorable ROY W. WIER,
Member of Congress, House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE WIER: Since the Russian sputniks were launched, the press has carried many stories and editorials regarding Federal aid to education, especially in the field of science and higher mathematics, and I presume by now any number of bills in various forms have been introduced and undoubtedly many more will follow.

There has been a good deal of talk about large sums to be appropriated for scholarships since the President's statement on Federal aid to education. But let's face the facts. The 14 liberal arts colleges in Minnesota, as well as the University of Minnesota, are already crowded. In fact, most of the private colleges are bulging at the seams and even as early as last summer were forced to turn down many college applicants because of their crowded facilities.

I appreciate that some money is available for the construction of dormitories, but I also know that many colleges throughout the country and several in Minnesota need some financial aid in the construction of new science facilities. Many of these colleges are operating their science departments in outmoded, small, and dingy quarters. How can they possibly increase to any extent the number of their science students?

With just a few possible exceptions, most of our private colleges are already operating at a loss because they have been unable to increase tuition, board and room, and so forth, to meet the increased costs of operation. Therefore, it seems to me, that if Federal aid is granted to universities and colleges some provision should be made to not only take care of scholarships, but also to help in the construction of science buildings.

Here in Winona we have 2 of the 14 liberal-arts colleges of Minnesota—St. Mary's College and the College of St. Teresa. Up to about a year ago St. Mary's College science department was in the basement of one of their buildings and, because of these crowded quarters, they had to raise a certain amount of money among the local business firms and go into debt for the balance to put up a new science building. Even today, they do not have an adequate supply of the right kind of laboratory equipment.

Just a few weeks ago the lay advisory board of the College of St. Teresa (of which I happen to be a member) toured the present

science building which is now about 75 years old. The third floor of this building has already been condemned and the other two floors are in such condition that one wonders how they can conduct science courses with any degree of efficiency.

I am sure there are many other colleges in a similar situation. Shall appreciate it very much if you will keep some of these facts in mind when the various educational bills come up for discussion in committee and on the floor.

With very kind personal regards,

Sincerely,

G. E. KELLEY.

Reciprocal Trade and Foreign Aid

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. NOAH M. MASON
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 3, 1958

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, after more than 20 years' experience with foreign aid and the reciprocal-trade program, and after $60 billion of American taxpayers' money spent in foreign aid, is the world better off today than it was when Uncle Sam embarked upon these programs? Is the world more peaceful today than it was when Uncle Sam embarked upon these programs? Has Uncle Sam more real friends today than he had 20 years ago? Is world trade less restricted today than in 1934 when Congress passed the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act?

Eric Johnston and Secretary Dulles say the world is more peaceful, that trade barriers are lower today, that the world is much better off. However, well-known authorities in the field of world trade and in the field of foreign affairs say just the opposite.

For instance, Dr. Clair Wilcox, formerly Director of International Trade for the State Department; Dr. Claudius Murchison, economic adviser to the American Cotton Manufacturers Institute; and Dr. Lee Coulter, a nationally known consulting economist, one of the best-informed men in America today on foreign-trade problems, all agree that the trade of the world today is more tightly regimented than it ever has been before in history in time of peace.

Eugene Castle, a very successful American businessman, author, and world traveler, took a tour around the world to see how America and Americans rated in world opinion after giving away over $50 billion in foreign aid. In his book, The Great Giveaway, he gives his impression and—to say the least—his impressions and his judgment of world conditions and the world attitude toward America and Americans is the exact opposite of the opinions of Eric Johnston and Secretary of State Dulles. Mr. Castle claims that a very large part of our foreign aid—American tax dollars—has been wasted and has accomplished very little toward establishing peaceful relations in the world.

Mr. Speaker, as a part of my remarks I include the following two editorials from the Chicago Tribune pertaining to our foreign-aid program, and the high-powered sales campaign that Eric Johnston has been drafted to conduct:

[From the Chicago Daily Tribune of February 27, 1958]

THE HUCKSTERS

The degradation of popular government has rarely been carried to such an extreme as we have witnessed in the Washington sales conference rigged by Eric Johnston at the behest of Mr. Eisenhower to "sell" foreign aid to a reluctant Congress and people. That the President himself lent his presence and voice to this vulgar attempt to substitute merchandising for the processes of legislation only evidences the depths to which we are being dragged.

Mr. Eisenhower himself exposed the nature of this attempted deception when he was moved to complain that, after 10 years of handouts on a colossal scale, the giveaway had so conspicuously failed to persuade the people of its merit that each year a "life-and-death struggle for its very existence" must be waged.

But, instead of acknowledging that the existence of doubts on such a widespread scale called into question the legitimacy of the program and its utility in achieving its professed aims, the President and the assorted windbags recruited from both parties to talk up foreign spending acted as if their only mission was to engage in a medieval ritual for exorcising an intruding devil.

The trick was simply to say that those who opposed the dissipation of the taxpayers' money were wrongheaded and immoral, meanwhile wrapping the vestments of righteousness about all who spoke in favor of foreign aid. Dollars were equated with peace, and spending with the well-being of unfortunates in the world's slums and stews.

In addition to browbeating to overcome logical objection, all the standard techniques of the huckster were called into play, as they have been from the start of foreign aid.

It has cost the American taxpayer $65 billion since the end of World War II.

Yet neither Mr. Eisenhower nor any of the orators on call ever came to grips with the salient point, which is that after this enormous drain upon the country nothing stays put. After $65 billion, we are no nearer peace. Our security, as we daily hear, is uncertain. The countries we have sought to buy as friends and allies are wavering and undependable, and it is doubtful whether they will stay hitched no matter how many times $65 billion may be spent in the effort to stabilize their attachment.

All of the obvious questions about the practical effects of foreign spending only served as launching pads for the same tired old arguments in defense of mutual security, which more accurately could be designated mutual insecurity.

First, there was the argument of dire consequences. If the spending were stopped, said Mr. Eisenhower, we should find ourselves encircled and isolated as more and more countries fell to communism, so that the burden of armaments and conscription would fall ever more heavily upon us and our prospects for survival would diminish.

This attempt to scare objectors into submission was coupled with the allied argument of great expectations. Our cash doles were buying peace, fortifying other countries to withstand Soviet expoitation, bringing hope to nations which otherwise might embrace suicide thru communism.

And, finally, there was the accustomed concluding plea to protect our investment, for everything so far done would fall apart unless the American people were reconciled to the endless continuation of the process of throwing good money after bad.

We have heard all this before. The war and post-war loans of 1917 and after were justified on the same terms. So was lend-lease, the Marshall plan, and everything that succeeded. Yet more than 40 years after the start of the process we stand on a platform so insecure that the only argument that can be made is to shore up the creaky thing with more billions beyond count lest we sink in the surrounding quagmire.

[From the Chicago Daily Tribune of February 28, 1958]

THOSE OPPOSED ALSO CAN SEND TELEGRAMS

Eric Johnston's 15 millionaires have exhorted 5,000 businessmen to wire money to Eric Johnston's foreign aid promotion effort.

There is a risk in this for Mr. Johnston's cause. Taxpayers who do not approve the $3.9 billion giveaway can also send telegrams, and we hope they do.

How about telegrams to the 15 millionaire cup rattlers? The telegrams could tell what the senders think of the current money raising effort for Mr. Johnston's Nonpartisan Committee for International Economic Growth.

Those 15 moneyed money raisers' names are: Ernest R. Breech of Ford Motor Co.; George R. Brown of Brown & Root; Abraham Feinberg of Julius Kayser Co.; Lamar Fleming, cotton merchant; William C. Foster of Olin Mathieson Chemical Corp.; Henry John Heinz II of J. J. Heinz Co.; Theodore V. Houser of Sears Roebuck; Eric Johnston, motion picture industry executive; George L. Killion of American President Lines; Frank Pace, Jr. of General Dynamics Corp.; William E. Robinson of Coca Cola; Nelson A. Rockefeller, heir to oil millions; Dr. Ethan A. H. Shepley, chancellor of Washington University, St. Louis, and corporation director; Joseph P. Spang, Jr., of the Gillette Co.; and Roger L. Stevens, New York real estate man.

Anyone who has any acquaintance or dealings with any of the men just enumerated might save a lot of money over the long run by investing in a few telegrams, lobbying against the lobbyists. Others can send their messages to chief spokesman, Eric Johnston, now working out of the office building of the International Association of Machinists at Washington.

Boston Globe Commends TVA as National Asset for Defense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOE L. EVINS
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 3, 1958

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Speaker, the record of the TVA has won it many friends throughout the country and, indeed, the world. Among the latest commendations of the performance of this great national agency was an editorial in the pages of the Boston Daily Globe, one of New England's great newspapers, which briefly but pointedly commented on the annual report of the TVA for the past year. The editorial, which appeared in the January 2 issue, follows:

PROGRESS OF A DREAM

The vision of the late Senator George K. Norris of Nebraska, whose statesmanship led to the creation of the Tennessee Valley Authority during the great depression, is being vindicated, as that highly significant undertaking renders its annual accountings to

the Federal Government. This is especially true of its stewardship for fiscal 1956–57.

TVA, during that period, effectively controlled the worst flood in the river valley in 90 years—with enormous savings in property damage and personal suffering in the 7-State area affected. Though it continues to grow, with seven steam-generating plants under construction being paid for out of revenues received from power, demands for ever more power are growing also.

Simultaneously, the Authority is far ahead of schedule in repayments to the Federal Government on the investment—some $68 million ahead in fact. During 1956–57 fiscal year its power sales jumped by 12 percent. The trend of its rates has been steadily downward.

This excellent report, unfortunately, is not likely to end the struggle between the administration and Congress over TVA. The fact that two of President Eisenhower's nominees to the Authority come up for confirmation in the forthcoming session already finds storm signals flying. It is administration policy to curb further growth of TVA, curtail its functions, force the project to finance itself through revenue bonds and increase annual requirements for repayment on its debt. The unforgotten Dixon-Yates episode of 2 years ago, when an attempt was made unsuccessfully to interpose a private power combine in TVA operations, illustrates the policy.

TVA, as its latest report makes clear, is a national asset for defense and for the economic growth of a huge section of the South.

London: Facade and Reality

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 24, 1958

Mr. MULTER, Mr. Speaker, a very discouraging picture of the future of Britain has been presented by the columnist Joseph Alsop. He points out that the lack of vigorous imaginative American leadership during the last 5 years is in part responsible for the plight of our ally. Mr. Alsop's column from the New York Herald Tribune of February 24, 1958, follows:

LONDON: FACADE AND REALITY

(By Joseph Alsop)

LONDON.—In the pale sunshine, 13 years after the great victory, London hardly seems the same wounded hero of a city that it used to be for so long after the war.

The outward surface is more prosperous than ever. The magical London combination of green open space and crowded avenue, of intimacy and public splendor, of double polished glossiness and carefully preserved patina of age is also more magical than ever, because it is so unchanging in a fast changing world. And London is more than ever the most agreeable of all the great world cities for a foreign visitor.

These reflections on London's surface may seem more appropriate for a postcard for the homefolks, showing some such familiar tourist sight as the changing of the guard. Yet they are necessary, in order to put into proportion the fairly brutal thing that also needs to be said. In sum, this London with its rich and charming surface, whose shining courage so recently set an example to the world, is now a city that all but stinks of defeat.

The fact, if it is a fact, is of infinite importance to all the nations of the West. But judgments of atmospheres are unavoidably personal; and so I shall speak more personally in the present report than is customary in this space.

In the postwar years, I have made at least one visit of inquiry to London each year. In all that period, whether under labor governments or conservative governments, the essential London drama has been the same. It has been the drama of the British people grimly struggling to maintain Britain's historic role as one of the great world powers, after the fearful human and material and strategic losses of the Second World War.

It has been a pretty moving drama to watch, but now it seems to be coming to an end. There are just too many signs of the disarray that always, in every army, foretells the acceptance of defeat.

For example, the feature of British political life that has always most amazed me was the fact that any given moment, almost every one from the Prime Minister downward, at every level and in every sphere, somehow struck the same note. It might be a belligerent note or a friendly note, or any other kind of note. But it was always the same.

It used to make me feel like a geologist climbing about over an enormous rock, tapping with his hammer everywhere and always getting exactly the same "ping" or "pong" wherever he tapped. But all this is over now. The most extraordinary and discordant variety of ntoes is now to be heard, from the different leaders of the two major parties, from the civil servants and the ministers they are charged with advising, even among the higher permanent staffs of single ministries.

The cause of this wholly novel discord of ideas and attitudes is really simple enough. Britain today is squarely confronted with at least half a dozen major problems which Britain alone does not have the means to solve.

There is Britain's economic problem, which keeps Britain on a permanent brink of disaster. For example, approximately 22 percent of Britain's lifeblood, the hard currency revenue of the Sterling area, comes from two highly unstable ex-colonial countries, Ghana and Malaya.

Again, the loss of the Middle Eastern oil sources, which are now in ever-greater danger, will add a cruel billion dollars a year to the debit side of Britain's national balance sheet. A single individual, the Sheikh of Kuweit, contributes very nearly 10 percent of the new capital annually available in the Sterling area, which is desperately short of capital. And so the story goes.

There is Britain's strategic problem, which is insoluble because of the economic problem. For example, the so-called support costs which the Germans have been paying for the British divisions in NATO amount to less than $130 million. But because the Germans are refusing to pay these costs, the British government is thinking of cutting its NATO contribution beyond the point of acute danger, in a way that will prejudice all Britain's relations with the new Europe, and for a sum really hardly larger than the British pig subsidy.

There is the Middle Eastern problem, which looks like it is growing desperate. For example, the old Iraqi strong man, Nuri Pasha, was recently in London to repeat his anguished warnings that the Kremlin would soon play the anti-Israeli ace, which will in turn take every trick in the Arab pack. The leading British experts are now reluctantly convinced that Nuri's warnings are probably well founded. But in all the British Government I could not discover any man with any positive idea about parrying this prospective Soviet maneuver, which will be like a dagger thrust at Britain's very jugular.

One could continue the recital almost indefinitely, covering all the foreign policy problems involved in the approach to the summit conference, all the domestic political problems revealed by the Conservative Party's swinging defeat in the Rochdale by-election, and so on. But I have said enough to illustrate the tragic point I have been trying to make.

If it is a true point, it is tragic for America as well as for Britain; for Britain's defeat will almost surely mean the West's defeat. Worse still, we in America will have our own share of the blame for the tragedy. For vigorous, imaginative and courageous American leadership is now the most essential ingredient in the solution of almost all our allies' problems, and Britain's above all. And this essential American ingredient has been utterly lacking for the last 5 years.

Wearing of the Leek

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HENRY ALDOUS DIXON
OF UTAH
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 24, 1958

Mr. DIXON. Mr. Speaker, there is an old Welsh saying, "Hateful is the man who does not love the land in which he was reared." So, with more than a few drops of Welsh blood, I must pay tribute in the Congress of the United States to the national symbol of my ancestral home, St. David.

As the arrival of March 17 has meant the wearing of the green for the Irish, for the Welsh March 1 has meant the wearing of the leek. This national flower of Wales was first worn in a battle against the Saxons on the advice of St. David to distinguish them from their enemies.

Much folklore is associated with our patron saint. Tradition has it that his birth was foretold 30 years earlier by an angel to St. Patrick. Some say that he lived to the ripe old age of 147 and a 10th century manuscript gives his death date as A. D. 601. But one thing is certain—during his life he towered among his fellows by his holiness, his wisdom and his eloquence to become the spirit of a vigorous nation.

Those who are Welsh may recall the tale of the bees that St. David blessed and sent to Ireland with their keeper, the monk Modomnoc. They kept so quiet during the trip that the sailors did not know they were there, but when they landed, they began at once to buzz around, build honeycombs, and make honey.

I like the comparison that has been made between these bees and the contributions that St. David's countrymen have made to America. Someone said: "When the Welsh settle in a place, they buzz loudly and contribute to their new home a certain tart and spicy sweetness—plus a sting when the occasion demands it."

As a sample of the honey the Welsh have contributed to America, there was Captain Jones who commanded the *Mayflower*, Roger Williams and William Penn who founded two colonies built on

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

religious liberty, and Thomas Jefferson who voiced our Nation's fight for freedom from Great Britain in the Declaration of Independence.

The Trouble With Harry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALBERT W. CRETELLA
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 26, 1958

Mr. CRETELLA. Mr. Speaker, I include an editorial from the New Haven (Conn.) Register on the subject of a recent speech made by a former President. This speech, as all his others, was made not as an effort to rally nonpartisan action but in the interests of pure political expediency. Mr. Truman's effectiveness is on the wane, for his utterances have taken on a complexion of such frantic contempt, libelous accusations, and sheer demagoguery that fewer and fewer people, except himself, can believe what he has to say.

I think the editorial which follows reflects the national indignation which has resulted from distortion of fact by an ex-President of the United States:

THE TROUBLE WITH HARRY

The trouble with ex-President Truman is that he has begun to take his "give-'em-hell" capacity too seriously. It is one thing to be frank and forthright as a politician—which is the most that Mr. Truman achieves. It is another thing to rise to the exceptional opportunities for national leadership which are open to every ex-President.

Mr. Truman has demonstrated strikingly for the Nation—and for Connecticut with its impending special session of the legislature—all of the weaknesses of a purely partisan approach to unemployment.

In his exultant attack upon the Eisenhower administration he has made it quite clear that the whole problem of national prosperity—and beyond it, the larger problems of expanding American strength and productivity in a dangerous world—is to be measured only in political terms by his standards.

It is clear that the prospect of 5 million unemployed Americans is hardly uncomfortable to Harry S. Truman—so long as he can blame their plight on the Republicans. It is clear that every other setback to American hopes and disappointment for American ideals has a certain cheerfully accepted value for Mr. Truman—so long as it can be attributed to the failures of Republican policy.

This may seem to be good politics. It is certainly full of the oportunism upon which Mr. Truman has built his career. But we seriously doubt that even the most worried, or the most embittered of today's presently unemployed people, will find in such an attitude the answer to their personal problems or the answer to national need.

Mr. Truman might have been expected to differ sharply with the Republican approach to Federal action in a period of recession. But it is disappointing to note that, once again, he has gone far beyond constructive fact and responsible alternative to indulge in inaccurate and reckless exaggerations.

If the Truman view prevails, it will be impossible to find a common course for a Democratic Congress and a Republican administration to follow in girding the country against its troubles.

But such a view cannot prevail. There are still too many men who—like ex-President Herbert Hoover—recognize that partisanship can never solve really serious problems, and who seek, accordingly, to find a basis for constructive and confident action by men of all parties when a national crisis must be faced.

Note on Trinity Partnership by Oroville Mercury

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUBERT B. SCUDDER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 24, 1958

Mr. SCUDDER. Mr. Speaker, in its October 18 issue of last year, the Oroville Mercury had an interesting editorial entitled "Congress Getting Wise to the Socialists." As the Trinity partnership bills await action in the House Interior and Insular Affairs Committee, this timely article offers extra food for thought.

The editorial points out the movement during the last session to loosen the reins on TVA interest obligations. In effect, public power supporters were out to limit TVA interest payments to 40 more years, following which it could "freeload" without any effective controls. Fortunately, this cagy attempt was thwarted—and by a considerable majority in the Senate.

Is it not ironic that the public power faction refers to Trinity partnership as a "giveaway to private utilities," when it asks 160 million Americans to pay $101 million a year for electric bills of 5 million in the Tennessee Valley? If there ever was a giveaway this is it. And public power advocates are trying for a different kind of giveaway in opposing the partnership arrangement at Trinity—that is giving away $310 million worth of direct public benefits for the sole benefit of public power's principal pet, the preference agency. Public power is fighting Trinity partnership because the preference agency will not be able to get Trinity power any cheaper than 93 percent of the people in northern California.

It does not seem to make any difference to the preference pushers whether joint development of Trinity nets $310 million or $310 billion—their platform and line would be the same. It is time we did something to shatter both.

I respectfully include the editorial referred to above, from the Oroville Mercury, at this point in the RECORD:

CONGRESS GETTING WISE TO THE SOCIALISTS

Socialists in Congress had it figured out that a bill would pass during the recent session making it possible for the Tennessee Valley Authority to pay interest on the huge public money investment for TVA only for 40 years, then be free of congressional review and control.

The bill, however, was amended in Senate committee to provide that TVA must continue to pay interest indefinitely. When the bill reached the Senate floor a still more stringent anti-Socialist amendment was added providing that TVA must make a payment each year of $10 million to reduce the principal.

The TVA Senators were greatly agitated. But Senator GOLDWATER, of Arizona, pointed out that 5 million persons in the Tennessee Valley were asking the other 160 million Americans to pay $101 million a year toward their electricity bill. When the vote came only six Senators voted against the amendment. * * *

Thus it was seen that the country is getting tired of the constant nibbling by the Socialists whereby they force the rest of us to pay the bills of the lucky few.

That Senate vote, by the way, indicated that the partnership plan for use of Trinity project power may be successful.

Pensions for World War I Veterans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. USHER L. BURDICK
OF NORTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 3, 1958

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I would like to include a letter from Mr. George A. Schick, of Lisbon, N. Dak., on the subject of pensions for World War I veterans. The letter speaks for itself:

LISBON, N. DAK., *January 15, 1958.*

Hon. USHER L. BURDICK,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: This is in regards to pensions for World War I veterans, looking back we find all Civil War veterans were pensioned, also the Spanish-American War veterans were pensioned, and the World War II veterans got everything but a pension, and it wouldn't be too much of a surprise if they got a pension in the near future; but what has been done about World War I veterans? America took these men and sent them where she seen fit to face bullets, et cetra, they went and done their job. (Now they're the forgotten men) now we're even barred from the veterans' hospitals unless we're service connected, as you well know the youngest of these World War I veterans is over 60 years of age, and are passing out of the picture at the rate of over 240 a day. When is America figuring on doing something for these men?

Our President doesn't seem to be for giving these gallant men their right and just pension, but he sure has plenty to throw across the ocean, and for sputniks, raising Federal wages, and so forth, and what have you. I see where 1 farmer got around $200,000 just for not raising the staff of life (wheat), yet there is no money for these men that faced bullets that America might live. Most all of these men now are over 60 years of age. Some are still struggling along on farms; some in other business, etc. It is time they are retired and let younger blood take over.

We want a pension of $100 per month, and not to be barred from any veterans hospitals, and this pension is not to be counted against our social security or vice versa. We want $100 per month with no strings attached, so we can buy the bare necessities the remainder of our days, which isn't long any more.

World War I veterans are organizing all over the United States and our purpose is to get our $100 per month pension. Right in Lisbon now we have a membership of over 200, and that number is slowly growing. We have all agreed that the only way we can get our rightful pension is through the ballot box.

We want to thank you for the fine job you have done for the State of North Dakota, and also what you have done in the past for

World War I veterans, and we are counting on you as our representative to try and do something for these forgotten men, before there is nothing left to do but look over the tombstones that mark their graves.

GEORGE A. SCHICK,
A World War I Veteran.

A Bill To Amend the Social Security Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LESTER HOLTZMAN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 3, 1958

Mr. HOLTZMAN. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing in the House of Representatives a bill which will amend the Social Security Act, and provide a more liberal application of the law.

In the first instance my bill would remove the present limitation of $1,200 per annum on outside income that can be earned by those who are recipients of social-security benefits. In this day and age when the cost of living continues to spiral upward, and savings have been evaporated, it is most difficult for many of our elder citizens to make ends meet, and to provide themselves with even the bare necessities of life. The removal of the income limitation will enable them to live more comfortably and securely in their old age, without the fear of dependency on other members of the family, or on society itself.

The second provision of the bill would make full social-security benefits payable to men at the age of 60, and to women at the age of 55. The current requirements are 65 years of age for men, and 62 years of age for women. The reduction in this age limit would permit many of our working force to retire earlier than anticipated from the labor market, and thus make room for the thousands of younger men and women who must be absorbed into this labor market each year. Today many firms in private industry have a fixed policy against hiring new workers who are over 40, and yet have a firm policy of retiring workers who have reached the age of 65. Labor and management have been giving much thought and consideration to the problem of the older worker and his retirement, but there is need for further research which must be undertaken by industry, labor, and the employees themselves. By 1975 it is estimated that there will be more than 20 million Americans 65 years of age and over. The number of elder citizens in this country is growing larger each year, and it is the responsibility of the Federal Government to reevaluate and revise, if necessary, our programs for the welfare of these senior citizens.

The third section of this package bill provides for the elimination of the requirement that an individual must have attained the age of 50 before he is eligible to receive disability-insurance benefits. Under the present law many people who are disabled through no fault of their own must wait years before they reach the age of 50 and can apply for benefits. In the meantime they are forced to rely on relatives, friends or welfare agencies for their very existence. Removing the age limitation would permit a worker to file immeditaely for benefits after he has become disabled, and would in some small measure contribute to his support and that of his dependents.

The welfare of all our citizens, young or old, able or disabled, should be of primary concern to us, and I believe that this legislation, which brings into 1 package 3 major changes in the Social Security Act, would help us keep pace with the changing scene, and would certainly be a humanitarian act benefiting so many more of our people.

Strains on Our Canadian Ties

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WAYNE L. HAYS
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 3, 1958

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Forrest Davis, which appeared in the Cincinnati Enquirer on Wednesday, February 19, 1958:

EATON, PREMIUM ORES CASE STRAINS OUR CANADIAN TIES

(By Forrest Davis)

WASHINGTON.—One sometimes wonders whether our unwieldy Federal bureaucracy has been sufficiently briefed on the oft-stated desire of President Eisenhower and his Foreign Affairs Adjutant, John Foster Dulles, to cultivate fair, seemly, and neighborly relations with friends and allies. The administration of mutual assistance, for example, is subject in some cases to delays hard to explain on the ground of normal bureaucratic procrastination.

Afghanistan is a critical point of United States-U. S. S. R. rivalry. The Afghan kingdom has waited with decreasing impatience for the International Cooperation Administration to process the joint endeavor to build a modern university at Kabul and an international airport on a strategic route from East to West. The fumble has held things up for a year and a half.

I cite this instance among others because our earlier ventures in Afghanistan have been deplored on the ground that they were not easily visible to Afghans. While Moscow was paving the streets of Kabul for all to see, we build a hydroelectric and irrigation system in a remote valley; an enterprise which is, by and large, a fiasco. There being no ready market for hydroelectric power, the plant's turbines have not yet been installed. Nor is the valley suitable to large-scale agriculture, the soil being saline.

A great university and an international airport could impress even the mountain tribes.

A more vexing problem in this vein confronts our Government and economy not in the far recesses of Asia but with our nearest friend and neighbor. Canada is essential to our security and well-being more than any other nation, yet by some perverse train of events our Government seems bent upon affording the Canadians ever fresh occasion for grievance.

No sooner had the administration yielded to Canadian remonstrances over surplus grain disposal policies that dried up the Dominion's usual wheat market abroad than we seriously curtailed our imports of Canadian petroleum. Pacific Coast markets have furnished the incentive for development of the great new oil fields of Western Canada.

These fields and their convenient outputs are important to us on three counts. First, their southward flow would not be subject to the hazard of a sea voyage in time of war. Secondly, Canada's oil wealth strengthens the economy of our most remunerative customer and oil exports help balance the trade settlements which run too heavily against Canada. Thirdly, United States capital is largely represented in the Canadian fields, capital which must continue to be invested in th Dominion to the benefit of both countries.

The disadvantage which Canadians feel exists against the United States feeds the buy-British campaign called into being by the Tory Prime Minister, John Diefenbaker. That campaign already has reduced United States exports and bids fair to injure our trade to the north even more. The campaign, moreover, is popular and much is being made of it in the current parliamentary campaign.

Into this troubled situation the Department of Justice has seen fit to inject another abrasive issue. The Department's determination to appeal the unanimous Tax Court decision of last April in the Premium Iron Ores and Cyrus Eaton income tax cases far transcends the interest of the Cleveland financier and his associates. It threatens the tax convention between Washington and Ottawa, under which the huge and profitable American investment in Canadian raw resources and industry has gone forward.

The Diefenbaker government has reiterated the protest of the St. Laurent government to our State Department against what the Financial Post of Toronto calls "an outrageous United States tax raid." Other Canadian newspapers have been no less forthright. G. C. Nowlan, the Dominion Minister of National Revenue, has called the attention of the Parliament at Ottawa to the grave consequences which would follow a successful appeal in the United States courts of the Premium and Eaton matters.

As matters stand it appears that the Department of Justice, acting for the Internal Revenue Bureau, having gained a deferral on February 17, intends bringing the case up next October. Meanwhile, the whole question of United States-Canadian tax relationships will be in suspense.

The Revenue Bureau's claim of something like $2 million from Cyrus Eaton and $2.6 million from Premium Iron Ores, Ltd., was disallowed last spring by all 18 judges of the United States Tax Court. The Justice Department had, in effect, demanded that all the judges be polled. Ordinarily, given the added weight of international expediency, the case would have been dropped.

Not so. In the face of the Dominion Government's protest and the full force of Canadian opinion, the Revenue Bureau and the Department of Justice insist upon treating the Eaton-Premium claim as just another attempt to wring money from unwilling taxpayers. It is such failures to coordinate policy on a high level, to restrain bureaucratic zeal in the interest of international comity that contributes to our reputation abroad as a brusque and ungainly friend.

On its international level the issue gets down to this: The Canadian Government holds Premium Ores to be a Canadian corporation subject only to Canadian taxation on its profits. Our tax people hold that because certain company transactions took place in Mr. Eaton's Cleveland offices, the United States Government is entitled to a tax bite. The Tax Court ruled with the Canadian Government's contention.

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

The case against Mr. Eaton and his associate, William R. Daley and his wife, rests on a technical dispute, resolved in favor of the defendants last April.

Considering the present aggravated climate of the United States-Canadian relations and the necessity of negotiating a new tax treaty if the appellate court held with the Revenue Bureau, it would seem the part of wisdom for the State Department to use its good offices with the Department of Justice. There are sufficient causes of dispute more difficult of settlement—St. Lawrence Waterway toll subsidies, the adjustment of petroleum quotas, the prospect of larger import duties on lead, zinc, and other metals so that it would seem the administration should mediate this superficially minor but fundamentally dangerous difference.

Judge John J. Aponick New President Judge of Pennsylvania's 11th Judicial District

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 25, 1958

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Wilkes-Barre Times Leader-Evenings News of February 27, 1958, upon the selection of Judge John J. Aponick to become the 16th president judge of the 11th judicial district of Pennsylvania, the court being located at Wilkes-Barre:

NEW PRESIDENT JUDGE

His commission having arrived and been recorded, Judge John J. Aponick of West Nanticoke will become the 16th president judge of the 11th Judicial District of Pennsylvania on Saturday, succeeding President Judge W. Alfred Valentine who retires tomorrow after a distinguished career as a lawyer and jurist.

The 11th judicial district, which now is limited to Luzerne County, included Wayne, Susquehanna, Bradford and Tioga Counties, as well as Luzerne, when it was created in 1811. It also embraced Lackawanna, which then was part of Luzerne. Subsequently, Pike and Monroe were added. At a later date, the district included Columbia, Montour, and Wyoming Counties.

From time to time, the district was rearranged and for a period Luzerne was part of the 13th judicial district.

The 11th judicial district had only one judge at the time it was established and he automatically became the president judge. Additional law judges were authorized in 1867, 1874, 1901, and 1913. The Orphans Court is separate and has its own president judge.

Judge Aponick follows in the footsteps of some of the community's most illustrious citizens. The list includes, in order of their service, the names of Seth Chapman, John B. Gibson, Thomas Burnside, David Scott, William Jessup, John N. Conyngham, Garrick M. Harding, Charles E. Rice, Stanley Woodward, John Lynch, George S. Ferris, Henry A. Fuller, William S. McLean, Jr., Benjamin R. Jones and W. Alfred Valentine.

Now serving his third term as a member of the bench, Judge Aponick takes on no small responsibility, for that invariably is the price of distinction in any line. The judiciary is no exception to the rule.

Judge Aponick is well prepared for his new role by education, experience and temperament. He has acquitted himself ably in the 2 decades he has been on the bench, carrying out his pledge to administer justice impartially. He has supplemented his legal attainments by service in other fields in peace and in war. His has been a well-rounded career, highlighted by an impressive record and a becoming modesty. That he is a worthy successor to Judge Valentine is perhaps as fine a compliment as might be paid to him.

Friends and neighbors, in offering congratulations, will wish him well in his new capacity.

Sacramento Union Tackles Another Federal Power Blooper

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUBERT B. SCUDDER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 25, 1958

Mr. SCUDDER. Mr. Speaker, in the recent hearings on Trinity partnership legislation, Federal power supporters claimed that the Pacific Gas & Electric Co. was making unfair profits from the Central Valley project. This is untrue, and anyone with economic sense knows it is. Federal power has pulled another blooper in trying to cast a shroud of suspicion on the partnership bills pending before the House Interior and Insular Affairs Committee.

The Sacramento Union in its editorial of February 9, 1958, What Profits? shows why this latest Federal power claim is false. First of all, partnership opponents ignore the basics of State control over private utilities. They would like the public to believe that P. G. & E. and other utilities run rampant on rate charges for bigger profits. They do not specify that P. G. & E. profits are based on 6 percent of its plant investment. Thus, as the Sacramento Union points out, if the company "had a billion dollars invested in a plant, its profits would be calculated on that investment, whether it sold 5 billion or 10 billion kilowatts of electric energy."

It is obvious then that any purchase of power is an operating expense, and is not used in figuring out the 6 percent rate of return. Again, quoting from the Union, if the P. G. & E. "purchased $1 million worth of power from the Bureau of Reclamation and sold it for $2 million the extra million dollars would have to be passed along to consumers in the form of lower rates."

Unfortunately, the supporters of all-Federal development of the Trinity River project have sufficiently confused the CVP power issue in their efforts to prevent P. G. & E. participation at Trinity. We need more clarifications of the Sacramento Union caliber to dispel the haze around utility profits.

I respectfully include the Sacramento Union editorial, referred to above, at this point in the RECORD:

WHAT PROFITS?—BUREAU POWER SOLD TO P. G. & E.

A poorly informed Comptroller General of the United States told a committee of Congress last week that the Pacific Gas & Electric Co. was making too great a profit from the power it purchased from the Central Valley project. The P. G. & E., under California law, makes no profit on any electricity it sells, whether it is produced by a company generator or by some agency from which it is purchased.

Such profit as the P. G. & E. makes is based on 6 percent of its plant investment. If it had a billion dollars invested in a plant, its profit would be calculated on that investment, whether it sold 5 billion or 10 billion kilowatts of electric energy.

If it purchased $1 million worth of power from the Bureau of Reclamation and sold it for $2 million, the extra million dollars would have to be passed along to consumers in the form of lower rates.

Purchase of power is an operating expense only and cannot be used to determine the 6 percent (or less) which the company is allowed to make, under very strict California PUC regulations.

The only way the company can expand its plant investment is to get money directly from the people of this State who want to invest their money. And the only way they can induce people to invest money with them for this purpose is to perform in such a manner as to warrant the confidence of the people with money to invest.

The only place where the P. G. & E. is authorized to make any profit is on the rate of return against its capital investment—its physical properties.

In the Niche of Time

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. S. WALTER STAUFFER
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 3, 1958

Mr. STAUFFER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article which appeared in the County Leader, Newtown Square, Pa., February 27, 1958, on our colleague, BEN JAMES, a member of the Pennsylvania delegation who will retire this year after five terms in the House. Those of us who have known BEN over the years feel the article is a well-deserved tribute to his long service to his district, State, and country:

IN THE NICHE OF TIME

The real effect of the retirement of United States Congressman BENJAMIN F. JAMES will not be felt until next year, when a successor opens quarters in the hoary Old House Office Building in Washington.

We were privileged to meet the big fella more than a year before he first ran for Congress, back around the waning months of 1946. At that time we were impressed with the idea that here was a man who could get things done. In fact, that was part of the first congressional campaign theme for BIG BEN in 1948.

Since his initial election in 1948—91,193 for the then Villanovian, to 56,116 for a guy named Snyder—BEN JAMES gained in local popularity just as he increased in stature and importance with the men in whose midst he toiled.

In 1956, Mr. James had 137,222 faithfuls pull the lever over his name. His Democratic opponent, a dude named Welsh, pooled 84,507. The plurality of the gettings-done gentleman had grown by 46,029 in five elections. His majority had kept pace,

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

the gaudy 52,715 being 17,638 more than the majority over his 1948 opponent.

This continued increase in appeal can be attributed to one great factor: BEN JAMES could get things done.

BEN did not make all the local appearances for which political leaders requested. He was not a baby kisser. He did not make regular visits to the post offices, which were his domain, so to speak. He never permitted the use of his name in a trumped up or empty publicity story.

BEN had a quiet way of accomplishing things. He never promised anything concrete if there was even a remote chance that he could not produce. Many a person left his office inwardly believing his appeal would reap no rewards, only to receive subsequent news that everything had worked out as wanted.

Often times, after an appellant left his office, BEN would reach for the telephone and quietly call a friend in the particular department concerned with the request. He knows important people in every high Government office—and in many cases, knows them on an intimate basis.

Every letter opened in the Congressman's office is answered within 24 hours. If requested information is not readily available, the correspondent is so informed. He has a staff trained to his own standards: To get things done.

When community leaders were protesting the recent cross-country highway, BIG BEN told them how to organize and what to do. He arranged a meeting with the highest potentate in the Federal Bureau of Roads, and practically had a commitment even before the local leaders had their meeting.

Mr. JAMES never permitted the full story of that and similar accomplishments to be reported to his constituents with him in the hero role.

"No," he would say, "this is their story (meaning the local leaders). Let them tell their people all about it."

The same situation was repeated many times. His role in helping keep Westinghouse in Lester, get ship contracts for local yards, have benefits obtained for frustrated veterans, expedite local agencies in obtaining loan sand grants, and speeding up local post-office construction, has been, for the most part, known only to those with whom he actually came in contact. Tha tis the way he always wanted it.

Yet, with his reluctance to blow his own horn, Mr. JAMES could get pretty upset when someone who knew the facts, gave the credit elsewhere or ignored his part altogether. He also fumed when asked to do soemthing for anyone who was dishonest. Strictly honest himself ,he found it difficult to condone any other course. He did not like fakery in any form.

Regardless of whom the Delaware County voters send to Washington in BEN JAMES' place it will be some time before he is forgotten, either by his colleagues who looked to him for advice and counsel, or by his Delaware County constituents who never failed to receive an answer and never received a phony answer.

BEN JAMES, the printer, who rose from boy apprentice to the presidency and board chairmanship of one of the finest printing houses in America;

BEN JAMES, the township commissioner, who sought to help make his home community a better place in which to live;

BEN JAMES, the State legislator, who became a stalwart in ePnnsylvania governmental circles in his quest for better recognition of his home county;

And, BEN JAMES, United States Congressman, is on the threshold of becoming BEN JAMES, retired statesman, contented family man, and, perhaps, world traveler.

In this fifth life of BEN JAMES, he will be accompanied by Frieda, a wife whose lovliness, vivaciousness, and sincerity have had much to do with the success and public acceptance of her husband.

BEN JAMES has eereyd his community well. When this trem of Congress is over, he will have earned the comfort and esteem that will be his in retirement.

Alaska Statehood Editorials

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. E. L. BARTLETT
DELEGATE FROM ALASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 3, 1958

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Speaker, the Fairbanks (Alaska) News-Miner of February 25 has performed a service by setting forth in its editorial of that day comments from 11 newspapers throughout the States advocating immediate Alaska statehood. Under leave to extend my remarks, I place the Alaska editorial in the RECORD:

COMMENT ON STATEHOOD

The Nation's press has taken up the cause of advocating action on Alaska statehood more insistently than ever before, although we have always had strong support from the fourth estate.

Here is a sampling of editorial comment which has appeared in the past few weeks:

Detroit Times: "Advocates of statehood for Alaska are predicting Congress in the new session will grant a place of equality in the American Union to the Territory so intimately related to the security and prosperity of the whole Nation. We hope they are good prophets, and that they will take a page out of their own experience as a guide."

Madisonville (Ky.) Messenger: "It is alien to the spirit of our institutions to keep a large group of Americans—well over 200,000 now and rapidly increasing—in the second-class citizenship of territorial status."

Montgomery (Ala.) Advertiser: "Alaska should be a state because that is the best way to strengthen and to realize the potentialities of a growing region that constitutes the closest approximation of a frontier with the Soviet Union anywhere under American laws."

New York Journal-American: "There is no sound argument against Alaskan statehood. There never has been one. This session of Congress can bring to itself the honor of fulfilling a historic obligation. By doing it, it will win the applause of the American people."

St. Petersburg (Fla.) Times: "This year is a good one for making two new states. Both could name Senators and Representatives in November along with the rest of the country. And the new states would have 2 years' experience as parts of the Federal Government before going to the polls to vote for a President in 1960."

Wilmington (Del.) Journal Every Evening: "Alaska has been ripe for statehood for years, and there have been indications that 1958 may be the year. In the House Speaker RAYBURN has proclaimed his powerful support for the measure, and in the Senate partisan considerations, which hurt Alaska's chances in other sessions, seemed to be giving way to a bipartisan feeling that both parties might gain by admitting Alaska."

San Francisco Examiner: "Prospects are more encouraging at this session of Congress than they ever have been that a bill admitting Alaska to statehood will be passed. It is a matter of simple justice and urgent national security that it should be passed."

Washington Daily News: "It is evident that if statehood for Alaska is brought to a vote in Congress this year its chances of passage are good. It's just as evident that opposition to Hawaiian statehood still is so strong it can kill the Alaskan bill if the two are tied together. Both Territories should be States. The cynical practice of playing one off against the other hurts both and adds nothing to the stature of those responsible."

New York Times: "There has been a shift in the statehood situation since 1953 as Alaska's political strength has grown and as Hawaii's leftwing elements have frightened off some former friends of Hawaiian statehood. There is no quarrel between the Hawaiian statehood advocates and the Alaskans. If Alaska gets through at this session Hawaii's chances at the next session will be improved. But the parliamentary attempt to tie the two together comes—let there be no mistake about that—from those who don't want either Territory to enjoy self-government that prevails in other parts of the Union."

Washington Post and Times Herald: "Both Republicans and Democrats seemed to have concluded not only that Alaska's cause is just, but also that both parties would benefit from early passage of enabling legislation. Interior Secretary Seaton has been a consistent supporter of statehood and last year suggested a sensible plan for protection of the Federal interests in Alaska that has become the basis of the present bill * * * the most promising course is to concentrate on passing the Alaska bill now, in full confidence that when Alaska finally assumes her privileges and responsibilities as a regular member of the Union, Hawaii will not be far behind."

It has been a long time since we've read an antistatehood editorial.

Catholic University Scientific Work Praised by Dr. Killian

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 3, 1958

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, the Catholic University of America is one of the outstanding institutions of higher learning in the United States.

Last week it took another important advance in its mission and objectives in the field of higher education, with the laying of the cornerstone for the new Keane physics research center located on the campus of Catholic University.

Among the prominent persons present at the cornerstone-laying ceremonies was Dr. James R. Killian, Jr., president of Massachusetts Institute of Technology, and special assistant for science and technology to President Eisenhower.

As carried in the Catholic Standard of February 28, 1958, I insert in my extension of remarks an address made by Dr. Killian on that occasion:

CATHOLIC UNIVERSITY SCIENTIFIC WORK PRAISED BY DR. KILLIAN

Two of our top priority objectives are to increase the amount and quality of our basic research and to augment the capacity of our graduate schools of science. This new cen-

ter will contribute to the fulfillment of these urgent national objectives.

It is, therefore, heartening to observe the steady achievement of American universities in maintaining this amalgamation of advanced teaching and research. The history of this great and growing institution is impressive evidence of this achievement. Catholic University pioneered in X-ray work as early as 1895 under Dr. Daniel W. Shea, and in aeronautical engineering in the early part of this century, under Dr. Albert Zahm and Dr. Louis Crook, and in recent years we have witnessed the building of an outstanding physics department under the leadership of Dr. Karl F. Herzfeld.

The building of this laboratory against the background of accomplishment exemplifies the will and the vitality of this university spirit and gives encouragement to all who feel optimistic about the future of American education. The Catholic University of America extends its influence over the Nation and the free world, with students from every State of the Union and from 58 foreign countries.

With these sentiments of congratulations and assurance, I wish for all who will work in this new center, students and staff alike, a full measure of the joyous experience of learning and creating, and I salute Catholic University for its vitality and its growing contribution to the Nation.

Great Plains Are Outlined

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. FLOYD BREEDING
OF KANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 3, 1958

Mr. BREEDING. Mr. Speaker, there appeared in the Hutchinson (Kans.) News of February 26, 1958, an article entitled "Great Plains Are Outlined."

Mr. L. D. Wooster, secretary of the Western Kansas Development Association, describes, in the item, the distinct physical features and conditions which characterize the Great Plains area.

As a former president of the Western Kansas Development Association, I consider the article of considerable interest and have asked that it be reprinted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of this date:

GREAT PLAINS ARE OUTLINED

HAYS.—What are the Great Plains? What are the conditions which cause it to be marked definitely? What are the chief physical features of the Great Plains environment?

L. D. Wooster, secretary of the Western Kansas Development Association, has answered as follows:

1. A comparatively level surface of considerable extent.

2. Predominantly a treeless region in contrast to the forested areas in the eastern half of the United States from which the early settlers came.

3. Subhumid climate. Precipitation below the average deemed necessary for the ordinary raising of crops.

4. Windy. Because of the relatively level, treeless surface of the land the winds have a more nearly unobstructed sweep across the plains. This increases evaporation.

5. The drier the climate the greater the likelihood of extremes of temperature—blizzards in winter and heat in the summer.

6. A sixth characteristic is a predominantly sandy soil.

Other factors effecting the manner of living at least in the case of western Kansas, are: (1) the altitude and the direction of the slope and lay of the land; (2) the rather numerous small streams, especially in the northwest section; (3) thick layers of sand and gravel forming great reservoirs for underground water; (4) native vegetation suitable and adapted to the foregoing factors.

Tribute to the Late John Minadeo, Heroic School Patrol Boy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ELMER J. HOLLAND
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 3, 1958

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. Speaker, Mayor David L. Lawrence, of Pittsburgh, Pa., proclaimed Thursday, February 13, 1958, as John Minadeo Day.

In this proclamation the mayor pointed out that this young boy, a school-patrol leader, sacrificed his own life on October 7, 1954, to protect his classmates from the pathway of a runaway automobile.

This young man, a native of Italy, emigrated to this country just 5 years before his act of heroism.

Johnny Minadeo was just a young boy who dreamed of America, and in the waiting period before he was permitted to enter the country with his parents he learned all he could about our great land. Upon his arrival he immediately enrolled at the Gladstone Junior High School, Pittsburgh, and his teachers stated his one ambition was to become a good American citizen because he was so proud to be here.

He was an outstanding student, and when appointed to the school patrol he accepted his responsibilities most seriously.

On the day of the accident it has been said by those who witnessed it, that he forgot all safety to himself to keep his classmates from being harmed.

It was through his heroic action that many were not hurt or killed. By his brave deed, he received although posthumously the honor of which he spoke so often to his teachers—that of being a citizen of the United States.

No school could bear a more honorable name than that of John Minadeo.

The proclamation follows:

PROCLAMATION

Whereas John Minadeo, a school patrol leader, sacrificed his life on October 7, 1954, to protect his classmates from the pathway of of a runaway automobile; and

Whereas this young man, a native of Italy, had emigrated to this country just 5 years before with his parents; and

Whereas his heroism has been recognized with the posthumous award of citizenship of the United States, the Carnegie Medal of Honor, and medals from the American Automobile Association and the Automobile Club of Milan, Italy; and

Whereas the memory of his devotion to duty and unflinching loyalty to the highest traditions of the school-safety patrols will be perpetuated through the dedication of the new John Minadeo School in his honor: Now, therefore,

I, David L. Lawrence, by virtue of the authority vested in me as mayor of the city of Pittsburgh, do hereby proclaim Thursday, February 13, 1958, to be John Minadeo Day in Pittsburgh, and urge our citizens to give appropriate recognition to the valor of a young man whose life embodied our best traditions of loyalty to his fellow men.

Done this day, February 11, 1958, at the office of the mayor, in witness whereof I have hereunto set my signature and cause the seal of city of Pittsburgh to be affixed.

DAVID L. LAWRENCE,
Mayor, City of Pittsburgh.

REMARKS MADE BY FRANK J. ZAPPALA, REPRESENTING THE ITALO-AMERICANS OF PITTSBURGH, AT THE UNVEILING OF A BRONZE PLAQUE IN MEMORY OF JOHN MINADEO, WHO DIED IN PERFORMANCE OF PATROL DUTY ON OCTOBER 7, 1954—CEREMONY AT JOHN MINADEO SCHOOL, 6502 LILAC STREET AND SHADY AVENUE, PITTSBURGH, THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 13, 1958, 2:30 P. M.

We have assembled here today to pay tribute to the memory of a lad whose courage, bravery, devotion to duty, and total unselfishness, symbolize everything that is sublime and noble. He died that others might live.

We have often heard the old adage, "Actions speak louder than words"—and by his actions, this boy of tender years but of stout heart, paid with his life in order that he might be worthy of the trust reposed in him by the school safety patrol; and in so doing, he not only lived up to the high ideals of this splendid organization, but he joined the ranks of immortal heroes.

At this point, I would like to give you a brief history of the school safety patrol. The school safety patrol came into being by virtue of the necessity of protecting and preserving the lives of children attending school, against the hazards and dangers of our ever-increasing traffic problems.

The patrol idea began in the early 1920's, and was soon adopted by a number of cities; then, encouraged by the American Automobile Association, it spread and developed into one of the most successful traffic safety movements in operation today, attracting worldwide attention, study, and emulation. Since the advent of the school safety patrol, community after community has reported no traffic fatalities in school areas, for periods up to 15, 20, and even 30 years.

It was shortly after World War I, when motor vehicle traffic increased enormously, that school and police officials and representatives of AAA Motor Clubs devised the pattern for school safety patrol activity which has been used by an ever-growing number of communities. It was in 1923 that the first patrols were organized in the West. Police and school departments, State automobile associations, and other civic groups have been sponsoring patrols as they were formed, ever since. Across the Nation, patrols number 662,000 in over 14,000 communities; and they serve us well—the job they do has played a vital role in reducing the traffic fatality rate for those in the 5 to 14 age group by 48 percent over the last 30 years.

The boys and girls who serve on the patrols are selected from upper grades. They are outstanding students. Being chosen for patrol duty is an honor for which pupils strive.

The patrol member must be punctual and pay strict attention to duty. The safety of schoolmates is a big responsibility. School children learn the rules for safe walking in class. The patrol boys and girls see to it that these rules are applied at school crossings every day. By constant repetition, good habits of safe walking are formed and in time become automatic. And usually, the lessons learned by the students at the school

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

crossings, go with them in the event that they move to other areas where there is no patrol to remind them. Courtesy and caution are the keynotes guiding each student in the discharge of his duties. Patrol members are instructed to wait for a break in the flow of traffic before permitting children to cross the street. Where traffic is controlled by a police officer, the patrol member directs his classmates in conformity with the signal of the policemen.

When they are on their own, patrol members post themselves so that they are clearly visible to approaching vehicles, but they stay out of the path of moving traffic. When it is safe, the patrols direct the children across the street; in some cases, a police officer is assigned to train and work with patrol units in each community. This comradeship with the police officer, the sacrifice of time to serve others, are lessons in good citizenship at an early age, a vital part of the educational process.

The rewards of service in the school safety patrols last a lifetime, but the communities served by these boys and girls honor them while they are members of the patrol. Toward the close of the school year, many cities publicly honor the faithful service of their youthful traffic safety specialists—in some cases, by designating a day as School Safety Patrol Day and by holding parades and reviews. In other cities, the youngsters are rewarded with a special day of fun, such as a picnic or a theater party. National School Safety Patrol Day is observed annually in Washington, D. C. In May of last 29,000 patrol boys and girls, representing cities in the East, South, and Midwest, marched down Constitution Avenue before an estimated 125,000 spectators.

We thus see what an important part the safety patrol is playing in our modern educational system, and what splendid ideals and principles it fosters.

It is obvious that young John Minadeo possessed all of the requisites of a patrol leader, when he was chosen for this important post by the Gladstone Junior High School, where he had enrolled as a student; and, more particularly, when we consider the fact that he had been here but a short time, having come to the United States with his parents, from Montagano, Province of Campobasso, Italy, on July 16, 1950—barely 4 years before his tragic death. The fact that he had been singled out for this responsible position thrilled the boy, and he went into it wholeheartedly, determined to do a good job; he assumed the role of being his brothers' keeper with a zeal and fervor comparable to that of the early martyrs in the Roman arenas, or of the gallant soldiers and warriors on the battlefield. His consideration for others knew no bounds—and when on that tragic date of October 7, 1954, his sense of duty was put to a test by a runaway car, he met the challenge gallantly, bravely, heroically, unflinchingly; he set aside all thoughts of personal safety—he laid down his life, to save the lives of the comrades who had been entrusted to his care.

We hear a lot these days about juvenile delinquency, about young hoodlums who are the despair of their parents, of their teachers, and of the law-enforcement agents. We read of monstrous crimes committed by youngsters; gangsterism among the youth of our Nation appears rampant; and just about the time we are beginning to lose hope and see only the prospect of a bleak, criminal future, along comes a boy like John Minadeo to restore our confidence in our youth to clearly show us that boys like him are still in the majority; once again we realize that our future is safe in the hands of the citizens of tomorrow; we have proof positive that youth today is just as fine, just as noble, just as brave as in any other era; and that the criminal element, is, thank God, in the minority. John Minadeo was in this world a comparatively short time, but he did not live in vain; for after we are gone, we are not judged by the number of years that we spent on this earth, but rather by our deeds while we were here, regardless of the span of life allotted us.

While, as a father of children myself, I realize what the loss of this boy—their only son—means to his mother and father, I would like to remind them that their son left this world in a blaze of glory; that his heroism will long remain as a noble example of self-sacrifice and altruism. He has posthumously been honored by receiving the citizenship of the United States; the Carnegie Medal of Honor; a gold medal of the American Automobile Association; a medal of the Automobile Club of Milano, Italy. Moreover, and this is of tremendous importance, in that it shows that other countries are following the example of the United States—the Armando Diaz School, one of the foremost elementary schools in the city of Rome, Italy, has founded a platoon to function as school safety patrol, after the pattern of ours. This platoon is dedicated to John Minadeo and bears his name. Though he is gone, his work goes on.

The board of education of the city of Pittsburgh has displayed its gratitude and appreciation by dedicating a new school to his memory, which bears his name. And in keeping with this same spirit of gratitude and admiration, the Italo-American citizens of Pittsburgh formed the John Minadeo memorial committee, headed by such eminent men as Louis P. Bilotta, general chairman; Fiorentino DiGirolamo, chairman; Louis Carletti, treasurer; and James Settembrino, secretary. This committee in turn appointed me honory chairman and official speaker of this memorable occasion, which I consider a truly flattering and rare privilege. It was due to the untiring efforts of this group that the necessary funds were raised to enable them to commission one of the most celebrated artists in our midst—a sculptor of international renown, Mr. Frank Vittor—to execute a monument worthy of this noble undertaking; a memorial that will pay constant homage to this youthful hero, and which will be placed in the school auditorium in commemoration of his valor. The plaque, superbly sculptured by Mr. Vittor with rare skill and artistry, depicts the scene of the tragedy with admirable accuracy.

And now, I would like to address these last few words to Mr. and Mrs. Minadeo. While it does not bring back your boy, all of these honors, which have created a spiritual unity between the two great Nations he loved so well—the United States and Italy—who today have joined hands in paying public tribute to his memory, should be of great solace and comfort to you, his parents. In conclusion, I can only repeat, with awe and reverence, the words inscribed on the bronze memorial: "Greater love hath no man than this. That a man lay down his life for his friends."

REMARKS MADE BY LOUIS P. BILOTTA, GENERAL CHAIRMAN, JOHN MINADEO DAY, FEBRUARY 13, 1958, PITTSBURGH, PA., AT THE UNVEILING OF THE JOHN MINADEO MEMORIAL PLAQUE

In behalf of the fraternal and civic groups of Americans of Italian descent I have the honor to present to the representatives of the Pittsburgh School Board a replica of the plaque that is anchored to the wall of this magnificent school building. This school is a memorial to John Minadeo, a young Italian immigrant who died that other schoolchildren may live.

The plaque reads:

"JOHN MINADEO

"In grateful tribute, this school is dedicated to the memory of John Minadeo, a safety patrol boy of Gladstone Junior High School (Pittsburgh, Pa.), who on October 7, 1954, sacrificed his life to save the lives of his schoolmates from a runaway automobile. 'Greater love hath no man than this. That a man lay down his life for his friends'."

This boy achieved immortality at a tender age. Generations of future schoolchildren will read of his valor, his courage, and sacrifice. We hope they will draw inspiration from his sacrifice by learning the lesson of tolerance—by learning that America consists of many races, creeds, and nationalities—that all are good Americans if they are good citizens regardless of where their parents came from. America belongs to the descendants of those who came by steerage as well as those who came on the Mayflower.

In recent years we have seen what the combined talents of foreign born have meant to the security of our country. Dr. Enrico Furmi, of Italy, used the mathematical formula of Einstein, of Germany, and the atomic age was born. Dr. Teller, of Hungary, gave us the hydrogen bomb and Dr. von Braun, of Germany, gave America a satellite now circling the earth.

Eliminate the contributions made to America by foreign-born Americans in the arts, science, and inventions and America would be a fourth-rate nation.

Imagine what the opera would be without artists of Italian descent. Think what sports would be like without Negroes and sons of immigrants. A baseball boxscore reads like the League of Nations. The Fighting Irish of Notre Dame sounds more like the assembly of the United Nations. Even children of immigrants forget the contributions made to America by those who came from foreign shores. They enjoyed the freedoms and opportunities of this country but they also brought something that added to the strength and welfare of our country.

We hope there will never arise the need to call Federal troops to this school to protect the equal rights of children of all races and nationalities. We hope the sacrifice of John Minadeo will remind all of the needs for tolerance and brotherhood—that in this school—children learn together and they learn to live together.

Silver Jubilee of Rev. George P. Benaglia, C. S. C., President of King's College, Wilkes-Barre, Pa.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 21, 1958

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Wilkes-Barre Times Leader-Evening News of February 24, 1958, commenting on the observance of the silver jubilee of the ordination of Rev. George P. Benaglia, president of King's College:

KING'S JUBILARIAN

The Reverend George P. Benaglia, C. S. C., president of King's College, who observed the silver jubilee of his ordination today, has had an outstanding career in a religious order where ability is the rule rather than the exception.

To serve as president of two colleges, superior of a seminary, and director of a foundation in the brief span of 25 years is impressive recognition for a clergyman, testi-

fying to his executive capacity, his intellectual attainments, and the respect he commands.

Many clergymen and laymen go through life without a comparable record of achievement or even one of the many honors he already has received. Having made this progress approaching his prime, there is no telling what the next quarter century may bring if he is spared to labor in the field of education.

Wilkes-Barre has had the good fortune to have had him for a resident since 1955. In the 32 months he has been at the head of King's, its progress has continued and the next year should witness another forward step when its new building program is launched under his supervision. His zeal is cloaked in a becoming mantle of modesty.

The community will join with the faculty and student body of King's in extending congratulations and best wishes on this important milestone.

The Quiz-Book Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. HARRY McGREGOR
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 3, 1958

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I would like to include a brief summary of the activities known as the Quiz-Book Program, established by the Temperance League of Ohio, Inc., Mr. Lewis C. Berger, State superintendent. Mr. Speaker, it has been my privilege to attend several meetings of the winners of this program, and it is to be regretted that it is not possible for all Members of the Congress to be in attendance. Regardless of the pro or con on the temperance issue, I am sure everyone who is acquainted with the splendid work of the Temperance League would readily admit that this program makes better citizens for tomorrow. Mr. Speaker, I certainly recommend the reading of the Quiz-Book Program forwarded to me by my very good friend, Mr. Lewis C. Berger:

THE QUIZ BOOK PROGRAM

The Quiz Book Program of the Temperance League of Ohio, Inc., is a unique project for acquainting high school students with the fundamental facts concerning alcoholic beverages. According to Lewis C. Berger, State superintendent of the Ohio League, the plan is now providing instruction for more than 65,000 high school students every 2 years, in 57 of Ohio's 88 counties.

Classroom teaching by the student's regular teacher in a normal classroom situation is the central feature of this program.

The Quiz Book contains the authentic scientific facts about alcoholic beverages. These facts are presented in such a way that the student will realize the dangers in alcoholic beverages both for the individual and for society.

After gaining the approval of the local school administration, Quiz Books are supplied free of charge, in sufficient quantity that each student in the 11th and 12th grades may have one. They are used as text books in regular classes in those grades. The school administration decides the classes in which they will be used and the length of time to be spent on the subject.

Why 11th and 12th grades? Most schools on their own initiative have some temperance teaching scattered through the other grades, and other organizations often provide materials for such teaching. The Quiz Book program provides a summation and a look at the whole problem, individual and social, in one teaching unit.

To whet the interest, a contest feature is provided where it does not violate existing school regulations. By means of local school examinations, and a county examination for local school winners, a boy and a girl winner are chosen in each county where the program is used. The examinations are based on material in the Quiz Book.

The award trip is taken by all the county winners for a given year, traveling together and chaperoned by Temperance League personnel. All expenses are paid by the League to and from the winner's home. Beside providing an interesting and instructive trip just at the close of the school year, the trip provides some additional material of value in the field of temperance. For instance, previous trips have included tea at the Embassy of India, where His Excellency, Ambassador Mehta, has provided information about his country's experience in the gradual introduction of prohibition to that country.

Results: Many students make a decision for personal abstinence, or find a previous decision reinforced, as a result of this comprehensive look at alcoholic beverages and their effect on the individual and society. Probably more than half of the Quiz Book students would otherwise never have a chance at a complete review of the facts.

A second result is just as important. Whatever is done in the future toward controlling the liquor traffic must be done as a result of public opinion, and that public opinion should be rationally formulated on the basis of the known facts. As a result of the Quiz Book program, thousands of young people reach voting age every year having had access to such facts.

Jobs After 40

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEO E. ALLEN
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 3, 1958

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include a resolution adopted by Blackhawk Aerie, No. 952, Fraternal Order of Eagles, of Galena,, Ill., my home city. May it be properly referred to the Committee on Education and Labor, the committee having jurisdiction:

Whereas the Fraternal Order of Eagles is engaged in a nationwide "jobs after 40" campaign to eliminate age discrimination in employment as an unwarranted practice which is depriving many thousands of physically sound, skilled, and experienced workers of the means of a livelihood, and which is resulting in a tragic waste of manpower in the American economy; and

Whereas there is now pending in the United States Senate bill S. 3188, introduced by Senator RICHARD L. NEUBERGER, and cosponsored by nine other Senators, "to prohibit discrimination because of age in the hiring and employment of persons by Government contractors; and

Whereas enactment of such proposed legislation would provide employment for many competent workers now barred by age discrimination, and would set an inspiring example by Government for all industry for the adoption of similar policies: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That Galena Aerie of the Fraternal Order of Eagles hereby goes on record for support of bill S. 3188, and urges enactment of this pending legislation into law.

Adopted by Blackhawk Aerie, Fraternal Order of Eagles, on February 12, 1958.

LURAS E. WIENEN,
Worthy President.

Attest:

JOSEPH D. FEELEY,
Secretary.

Crusade for Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALBERT P. MORANO
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 3, 1958

Mr. MORANO. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this occasion to introduce into the RECORD, a very remarkable statement by His Excellency Manuel A. De Moya, ambassador of the Dominican Republic to the United States, on the 114th anniversary of his country's national independence. Ambassador De Moya's statement is particularly remarkable for its evidence of his country's genuine spirit of friendship for the United States and its concrete expressions of desire to make the free world alliance a working partnership. If all of our allies were as sincerely cooperative and equally dedicated to our common problems, the United States would face the future with but little trepidation. Ambassador De Moya's message is one of great meaning which I hope will be studied by all who are genuinely interested in the problem of international cooperation. The United States has an obligation to translate into concrete action the generous offers of assistance and aid made by the Government of the Dominican Republic:

STATEMENT BY HIS EXCELLENCY MANUEL A. DE MOYA, AMBASSADOR OF THE DOMINICAN REPUBLIC TO THE UNITED STATES, ON THE 114TH ANNIVERSARY OF HIS COUNTRY'S NATIONAL INDEPENDENCE

The close bonds between the Dominican Republic and the United States which make our two countries truly good neighbors; nay, even more, real partners, cause the people of this Nation to rejoice with the people of our fair land on this, the 114th anniversary of the Dominican Republic's independence. Just as the American people share in our commemorating freedom's birth in our land in the year 1844, we too share in the joys of the American people. I wish, therefore, to devote a few words on this day of general rejoicing among Dominicans to two events in the United States within these recent weeks which have filled with joy and hope not only the hearts of the people of this country but also those of the Dominican people, as indeed of all the freedom-loving peoples of the world.

The first of these things, the successful launching of Explorer on its awe-inspiring trek through space, has brought to our lips prayers of thanksgiving to Almighty God for the power He has given the United States, the free world's No. 1 leader and that Nation to which we look not only as a mere good

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

neighbor and partner but, frankly, as a big brother.

The other event upon which I look with rejoicing is President Eisenhower's having outlined in his state of the Union message a few weeks ago, a broad and concrete program for increased allied cooperation toward the goal of world peace. President Eisenhower proposed not only stepped-up military preparedness but called upon the Congress and the people of the United States to share their bounty unselfishly with their neighbors and friends in the free world. The President not only proposed continued financial assistance and military cooperation but he again demonstrated his genuine understanding of the weapons of peace. His overall program for waging total peace contains many dynamic and ingenious new proposals. One recommendation calls for the extension of the atoms-for-peace plan to a more inclusive science-for-peace organization. This holds great promise to the world for uniting the energies and talents of man and directing them toward the solution of the common problems of disease, poverty, and famine.

Both as an individual and as my country's Ambassador to the United States, I want to record my hearty and unstinting endorsement of the President's proposals. Believing that his proposals will be translated into action, I feel that we can all look upon the future with less uncertainty and less fear than before the state of the Union message.

The free world has been given a concrete outline of the United States' plans for waging total peace. In every capital of the world, the President's address has been studied and analyzed for its meaning to each particular country and its implications for the concert of free nations. Once again President Eisenhower has raised high his standard. He has indicated clearly his course, and has sounded a call to united action. Will the partners of the free world alliance respond selflessly and wholeheartedly to this clarion call? It is my fond hope that the allies of the United States will not merely tag along, but will take action to make themselves equal partners in deeds as well as in name.

One may ask, What action is there for us to take? My answer is that within the framework of the President's program there are innumerable opportunities for any nation to step forward and make a meaningful contribution toward the implementation of this program. Free world cooperation can be an actual crusade if each member nation of the alliance exercises its resourcefulness and initiative in spontaneous action. Without waiting for further prodding by the United States, we each can take steps toward the so needed pool of scientific information, knowledge and talent. Each country should look to its own scientific community and make an early determination of the action that is necessary for a greater cooperation between their native talent and its scientific counterparts elsewhere.

Rather than build our military establishment upon United States subsidies—a thing I am proud to be able to say the Dominican Republic has not done, each nation should follow the United States' lead in sensible economic planning in the best interest of military strength and international security. Uppermost in any such planning is the maintenance of an economic balance which will insure national security. In this connection I should like to call attention to the very poignant remarks of the able and distinguished Assistant Secretary of State for Latin American Affairs, the Honorable Roy R. Rubottom, in a January 14, 1958, speech in Miami:

"Now we recognize the need to maintain forces adequate to provide internal security and for the mutual defense of the hemisphere. The problem for any country, of course, is to determine how much is necessary to spend for these purposes. It might be argued that unnecessary expenditures play into the hands of Communist propagandists. Conversely, therefore, spending on productive private industrial capacity or public work would improve standards of living, thereby helping to develop a fundamental and lasting immunity to Communist subversion."

The President has asked for an expanded and more enlightened world-trade program. In so doing, he would be calling upon United States manufacturers to take a realistic look at their protectionist policies in the interests of the well-being of other nations' economy. Each country of our great alliance should impress upon its domestic producers the need for such a reevaluation in the interests of the strength of our concert of nations.

As has been the case in the last 10 years, the American people have been asked to provide extensive mutual aid and I accent the term "mutual." My accenting the term "mutual" relates only to the source of the aid. I do no mean to imply that the United States has not realized cooperation and added security from the contributions made by the recipient countries. However, there is no reason why the United States today need be the only source of assistance.

Fortunately, as a result of the American program, many of the free-world countries are in a state of economic balance and many have surpluses. It behooves each country to follow the United States leadership in assisting our less fortunate brethren. Let each country which is able to do so join the United States in aiding their less privileged friends. Such an idea would foster a more realistic spirit of cooperation and would stimulate individual national enterprise and initiative.

In determining any method for country-to-country assistance, it would be well to examine the changing nature of United States aid. During the last session of the United States Congress there was brought into being the Development Loan Fund which will make available governmental loan guaranties to support and encourage American private investment abroad. Not only is this a more intelligent economic approach to the needs of the free world, but the very theory underlying this program will stimulate the expansion of free enterprise which is the fountainhead and bulwark of the capitalist system. I know that this country's allies were comforted by President Eisenhower's new recommendation for a more extensive use of this fund. In his message, the President dealt with the fund in the following manner, and I quote:

"In proposals for future economic aid, I am stressing a greater use of repayable loans, through the Development Loan Fund, through funds generated by sale of surplus farm products, and through the Export-Import Bank. While some increase in Government funds will probably be required, it remains our objective to encourage shifting to the use of private capital sources as rapidly as possible."

It is my firm belief that the principle of mutual economic assistance, relying to a great extent on private initiative, will be well received by the nations of this hemisphere, and there can be no question of its need in certain areas in the American Republics. I have long felt that the most important single factor underlying national stability is economic strength. I can cite the experience of my own country which achieved political, social and military soundness as a result of economic vitality.

In 1930, when Generalissimo Trujillo was elected to the Presidency of the country, he fell heir to an impoverished land which had been torn by civil war for 80 years. Our national budget was a scant $8 million; today it is $150 million, the highest figure in all our history. Whereas we had before only three highways, today our entire territory is crisscrossed by modern roads, highways, and parkways. Likewise, hospitals and dispensaries which formerly could be counted on the fingers of one hand have multiplied so that adequate medical facilities are available in every nook and cranny of our land. Prior to 1930 illiteracy weighed down the efforts of our citizenry to improve their social and economic lot; today, with schools numbering thousands, we are well on our way toward its complete eradication and a true reign of culture. Our industries are thriving; and whereas formerly our population had to depend upon imports to satisfy its basic needs, today we are an exporting country.

There is no question in the minds of all Dominicans that largely through the efforts of Generalissimo Trujillo we have come in a short period of 27 years from chaos to stability, from war to peace, from poverty to prosperity. Little wonder, then, that all Dominicans continue to look to this man for leadership and guidance.

In short, the standard of living of the Dominican people spirals upward at a steady pace. As night follows day, national stability is the inevitable consequence of a thriving economy.

In this era of necessary interdependence between nations, it is in the interests of all countries to achieve uniform stability throughout the alliance. In my country our solid economic base has made it possible to raise the standard of living of our people, provide for a well-organized military, and assist the less fortunate citizens of other countries who have sought refuge in the Dominican Republic. In this regard we are justly proud of our foreign colonization program. One of the first groups to whom we gave refuge consisted of German and Austrian victims of Nazi persecution. Many of this group were Jews. In addition, there are colonies of Japanese and Spanish, and more recently a group of refugees from the Communist rape of Hungary settled in our land. All of these diverse nationalities are free to pursue their lives unhampered by discrimination or religious intolerance. This is but another example of what a country with a favorable economic balance can do for its neighbors and allies.

President Eisenhower, the architect, builder, and leader of the crusade in Europe has now designed a worldwide crusade for peace. A crusade is defined as a remedial enterprise undertaken with zeal and enthusiasm. A crusade is thus distinguished from other undertakings of man not by the objective of the endeavor, but by the manner of achieving the result. Free-world cooperation will never justly earn the appellation "Crusade for Peace" unless each participant approaches the common tasks with zeal and enthusiasm. The latter qualities are not usually associated with the act of following, but rather are singularly and noticeably associated with leadership. Each of America's allies should thus be persuaded to join her in the ranks of constructive leadership as an equal partner in the crusade. Should this come to pass, it cannot fail to change the national mental attitude of the allies toward the alliance, and breathe new vitality into its soul. The responsibility of leadership is both self-satisfying and productive of creativeness and ingenuity not found among those who follow. The cause of world peace will be immeasurably served by the selfless sharing of all allies in the many responsibilities of free-world leadership. The first test of allied response to this great challenge now confronts us. Will we, America's friends, neighbors, and allies, become her brothers, helpmates, and partners in implementing the President's crusade for peace?

I should also like to touch upon the military aspects of President Eisenhower's call for increased allied cooperation. It is heartening to the United States allies to learn

that this country no longer doubts or questions the value of, or the necessity for, utilizing the military strength of its friends. While we can never hope to match the United States military contribution, we can take pride in our participation and in its recognition by this country. As the President stated in his message, and I quote: "We are not alone. * * * because we are a part of a worldwide community of free and peaceful nations, our own security is immensurably increased."

In practical terms, what have the nations of the Organization of American States to offer America? I say that a secure Western Hemisphere is the basic requirement of American military security. The United States, through treaties and agreements, has established a far-flung and intricate system of military bases. What doth it profit the United States to arm Formosa, Okinawa, Spain, Iceland, if the Communists are successful in securing a base of operations in this hemisphere? Even assuming for the moment that the Communists cannot achieve this objective, the fast-developing Soviet military establishment has other means of bypassing United States overseas bases. We all know that in recent months the huge Russian submarine force has been deploying units throughout the Atlantic and Pacific approaches to this hemisphere. It is imperative for our mutual security that the island nations of the Caribbean and the other countries of the Organization of American States be closely and wholeheartedly alined with the United States.

The Dominican Republic has given of its sovereign territory bases for American missile and radar tracking stations. We have done so without seeking monetary compensation. In practical terms we realize the mutual benefit and need of such cooperation.

The ever-increasing military potential of the Soviet Union is not just a threat to the United States, but menaces our way of life if not indeed our very existence. The godless monolithic Soviet state with its all-pervading singleness of purpose can only be thwarted by a unified, genuinely interlocking alliance.

I am sure that I speak for all the Organization of American States nations when I say that we must and will generously and completely cooperate with the United States and all our neighbors in the interest of the continued freedom and security of this entire hemisphere. I hope that each sovereign member of the Organization of American States will respond eagerly and constructively to President Eisenhower's militant call for unselfish and unequivocal economic military and social cooperation among the nations of the free world. To wage total peace in order to avoid total war requires total cooperation among the enemies of the Red scourge. The crusade for peace awaits the crusaders.

Warning Given on Japan Dishes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WAYNE L. HAYS
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 3, 1958

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following clipping from a San Francisco paper of February 14, 1958, which I think is of interest in view of the reciprocal trade legislation which will be coming up shortly:

WARNING GIVEN ON JAPAN DISHES

The State health department yesterday urged caution in the use of imported Japanese dishes following the disclosure in Berkeley of two cases in which acid foods caused the brightly colored glaze to come off.

Although no illnesses were reported, Dr. Alvin R. Leonard, the Berkeley health director, warned that the accidental consumption of the glaze could possibly lead to lead poisoning. Symptoms include nausea, vomiting colic and diarrhea, he said.

He advised that suspected dishes be tested by immersion in white vinegar for at least 48 hours.

The dishes discovered in Berkeley, he said, came from a shipment from Japan in which the glaze was not properly fired to enable it to withstand usage. Applesauce and jello, he said, caused the glaze to disintegrate.

The State health department, advised that the dishes are available in many stores throughout the State.

One Remedy for the Recession

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 24, 1958

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, how about supplies in reserve—by way of insurance—for civil defense?

There is a very small core of officials and volunteer workers who have organized to bring order out of chaos, and to provide relief services in the event of an enemy attack, but what have they got in the way of tools and supplies to do their job?

Some foreign observers have noted that Americans blow hot and cold. They recall the public's demand for an all-out space program to overcome the Russian's lead when the sputniks first orbited over our heads. But the public seems to have forgotten about this serious challenge, in its worry over unemployment.

Civil defense has long suffered from this lack of sustained public interest in its responsibilities and its needs, even though all of us would look to it for guidance and help, if we should be hit by a devastating enemy attack.

Civil defense must have a backlog of supplies that it can mobilize to take care of such an emergency.

Now is the time to prepare, and have that strength in reserve so that it will be ready, if needed.

The Evening Tribune, of Lawrence, Mass., aware that the Federal Government must take action to halt the decline in economic activity, makes the excellent suggestion that the Government should stockpile materials for Civil Defense, and in doing so, help to stimulate business and employment.

Under unanimous consent, I insert in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the following editorial from the February 18, 1958, issue of the Evening Tribune:

ONE REMEDY FOR THE RECESSION

If the powers that be in Washington are looking for a way out of the current recession, they might take a long, careful look at civil-defense stockpiling. It would help business and it would bolster employment.

The Federal Government is now spending about $40 billion a year on the military forces. It already has accumulated more than $7 billion worth of strategic and critical materials. Why not, then, other vast stockpiles to insure America's survival in the event of nuclear attack?

Survival, relief, and rehabilitation constituted a commonly used term not long ago as our military experts analyzed Russia's potential strength on land and sea and in the air. Then it died down as a summit meeting possibility, instigated by the Soviet top brass, entered the limelight.

The United States has been caught flat-footed many times in history. In the event of an attack upon it, there would be an immediate need for products and services essential for survival and relief. These would include food, water, shelter, and medical and sanitation supplies and equipment. Vast emergency engineering activity would be required for any number of essential projects. And in such an effort, the Nation would be forced initially to rely upon whatever resources survived attack.

Measures to decrease vulnerability to attack, and to increase ability to retaliate promptly, reduce the probability of attack. But only readily usable resources will be of consequence in the period immediately following a nuclear attack. In the recovery and rehabilitation period, stocks of strategic and critical materials would be of great value, especially because they represent stockpiled power, man-hours, transportation, and facilities.

If existing resources are not adequate, especially those which would take a long time to produce, positive steps should be taken to augment them, with Government assistance if necessary.

Sputnik and American Science

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDITH GREEN
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 5, 1958

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, I have spoken before of the need for adequate, immediate support of basic, scientific research. It is a topic which cannot be too greatly emphasized or repeated.

There has recently come to my attention a paper entitled "Sputnik and American Science," prepared by Vernon H. Cheldelin, director, science research institute, Oregon State College. Professor Cheldelin sets forth with great clarity the challenge which faces America today in this field. I commend especially to the attention of my colleagues the graphic analogy drawn by Professor Cheldelin when he states:

Our technology has provided us with bigger and better pipes to draw off the water, and we have gone to the well so often that our reserves are nearly used up. What we need urgently now is a corps of well diggers, to provide us with new basic research information. It will be a long-range, continuing job and these diggers must be permitted to stay in the well to complete their work, without having to climb out every few minutes to deliver a pitcher of water to the

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

corner drugstore or the local chamber of commerce.

Under unanimous consent, I insert the full text of Professor Cheldelin's paper in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

SPUTNIK AND AMERICAN SCIENCE

(By Vernon H. Cheldelin)

The 1957 world series differed from all others. Not only did the Yankees lose, but the series also had to share the headlines with Sputnik I. Its appearance over America came as an unwelcome surprise, although its design had been described last June, and its signals were broadcast on the frequency previously agreed upon among the nations participating in the International Geophysical Year.[1] The initial surprise had barely begun to subside when we were jolted by the appearance of Sputnik II, with over half a ton of pay load hurtling above the earth. Then, if we needed further convincing that the Russians have scored an important technological advance, it was provided by the subsequent frustrations in our own satellite program. Even now, with our Explorer successfully launched, it is clear that we can no longer explain away Russian progress with the thought that they stole the information from us. For the first time since World War II, we are being forced into a complete reappraisal of our technology, our science, and our position in the world.

Americans have been asking themselves what is wrong. Certain immediate answers are obvious. Russia has caught and passed the United States in at least one area of technological achievement. Moreover, anyone who has cared to observe has seen this situation developing. Although exact figures are hard to obtain, it has been evident for several years that the annual production of engineers in Russia has consistently exceeded ours, aproaching double our number by some estimates.[2] The disparity has been made worse by the Russian emphasis on military development, while we have dispersed much of our technological potential into raising our standard of living.

Another fact, of even greater consequence, has emerged during recent years: our position in basic science is also in jeopardy. This distinction is not appreciated by most Americans, for we tend to confuse science and technology, regarding them as a single activity. Actually, basic research in science is the long-range, factfinding process that seeks to formulate general truths and laws, whereas technology involves the application of these truths to specific processes or inventions. Without basic science there can be no sustained technology; science is to technology what the fabled goose was to the golden eggs (no pun intended). Valuable as these eggs are, we are dazzled by them to the point that we forget the welfare of the bird—or even that she exists at all.

A few examples will help to crystallize the differences between basic research and applied research or technology. We may classify research problems into three groups, depending on the degree to which they are basic or applied in nature.

In the first, or applied group, the goals and the uses for the anticipated results are so direct, and the problems so clear-cut as to be immediately appreciated by everyone, with or without scientific training. Examples might be the growth of hybrid corn, the screening of anticancer agents, or the development of heat-resistant metal alloys. Problems in this class range from the most pedestrian ("50 years of continuous research have made our corned beef hash the world's greatest") to some that are very large and costly, such as the development of rocket fuels and missiles.

The second, or intermediate category finds the goals still clearly defined, but the road is generally recognized only by experienced scientists and technologists. In effect, the researcher says, "Yonder is our goal; this is the way we can reach it." Examples in this group would include such studies as the behavior of impurities in germanium crystals (which form the basis of transistor units for radio and telephone communication); or the nutrition of yeast and lactic acid bacteria (which has indirectly provided us with much of our modern information on vitamins and amino acids essential to life); or the structure of the nuclei of living cells (to the aid in the study of cancer).

The third, or truly basic, group includes such research as the formulation of Einstein's theory of relativity or Fleming's discovery of penicillin, where even the most experienced scientists cannot tell at the outset of their searches exactly what they will discover. These represent master explorations, where, as in the days of Lewis and Clark, the principal assignment is to chart the unknown, with the full confidence that whatever is discovered will be of value. Since the scientist is here working in virgin territory, the exact goal in this type of research cannot usually be defined. Who, for example, could have anticipated the connection between the theory of relativity and the atomic bomb? Or the birth of the antibiotics industry prior to penicillin's discovery? In both cases, we see the scientist making an unexpected discovery, realizing its implications, and making the results available for technological development.

It should be evident from the foregoing examples that all three types of research are essential to a nation's development. Yet, when the character of our national research effort is examined, it is apparent that the United States has historically been a leader in the applied, or technological area rather than in basic science. At least 90 percent of the money spent for research in America today goes into the first (applied) group above.

American technology has contributed to our preeminent position in the family of nations by making undreamed of advances in the quick application of basic scientific discoveries. With this emphasis on the applied side of science, we have produced the Edisons, the Fords, and the Firestones but have left the slow, painstaking gathering of basic information about the mysteries of nature to others—chiefly Europeans—so that they have developed the Newtons, the Darwins, and the Einsteins. Although there have been some notable exceptions, America has until very recent times been a "borrower" nation with respect to science, preferring instead to exploit the basic discoveries and build them into our industrial might. Valuable as this was, we nevertheless lagged for many years in the development of a powerful coterie of basic researchers. Compared to Europe, scientifically we have been in somewhat the same position as in the fine arts—the world's greatest consumer, but somewhat short on production.

Why did we not excel in basic science? Mainly because we never needed to. The laboratories of the European universities have for several centuries provided the world with basic discoveries, so that it has been consistently possible for us as a nation to reap the quick benefits of industrial application. Now, however, within a generation Western Europe has suffered two devastating world wars, with corresponding setbacks to her laboratories and her halls of learning. America thus finds herself in the new role of being not only the leading consumer of scientific ideas, but of having to produce new ideas to feed her own technology. In the relatively few years that have seen this transformation, we have not yet learned how to create the atmosphere that is necessary for the best development of pure science.

This transformation is difficult for us as a Nation. For one reason, our technology is too close to our science. The demands for technological advances travel so hard upon the heels of scientific discoveries that it has been frequently remarked that today's laboratory developments are already obsolete. Our agricultural, industrial, and military machines, and our medical arts have so accelerated their ability to transform the wonders of the test tube into mass-produced items for popular consumption that the scientists themselves do not have the opportunity to reflect deeply upon the problems that concern them. Indeed, they are often working with split personalities, one in the test tube, the other in the production plant. While the rapid development of scientific advances is both laudable and necessary, nonetheless the demand upon the research scientists to bring out results ever more quickly, has created a high-pressure type of atmosphere that is not conducive to the development of long-range ideas.

This symptom is manifested in other ways. Modern popular emphasis on the importance of science and technology generally stresses the applications, because these are more easily understood. The public, including the youths in our schools, has become increasingly aware of stereophonic sound, wonder drugs, and better things for better living through chemistry. Yet, useful as these things are, they give a distorted perspective to many young people whose natural curiosity might, under certain circumstances, lead toward studies of long-range problems, but who instead are diverted, usually through richer financial rewards, to the type of research where the dollar is always visible at the bottom of the test tube.

What, then, needs to be done? As a short-range consideration, several logical steps are seemingly being taken. The President has called conferences of scientific leaders throughout the country, and a science "Czar," Dr. James R. Killian, has been appointed. For the intermediate range, there will undoubtedly be Government funds diverted toward scholarships for worthy students, and for summer institutes, conferences, and other special training for college and high-school science teachers. For the longer range, we note widespread consideration of enrichment of school curricula to include more subject matter, particularly in mathematics and science.

All of these measures are important. Yet they are designed mainly to reinforce our technological potential. If science is to be aided over the long range, America must first realize and act on its position with respect to basic research. Scientifically, we are like a community that depends upon a well for its total water supply. Our technology has provided us with bigger and better pipes to draw off the water, and we have gone to the well so often that our reserves are nearly used up. What we need urgently now is a corps of well diggers, to provide us with new, basic research information. It will be a long range, continuing job and these diggers must be permitted to stay in the well to complete their work, without having to climb out every few minutes to deliver a pitcher of water to the corner drug store or the local chamber of commerce. This realization, that basic discoveries cannot be hurried, has long characterized the Europeans, and it is one of the principal reasons that their science has flourished in the past.

The task that confronts America, therefore, is not only to reinforce our technology, but also to expand our basic research effort as rapidly as possible. The extent to which we are capable of doing this is hard to estimate exactly, although comparisons

[1] D. H. Radler, Purdue Research Foundation Publ., 4, No. 2, 3 (1957).

[2] Chemical and Engineering News, 34, 5722 (1956).

with other countries are revealing. Surveys show that during the period 1953–55 the Russian emphasis on basic research was twice our own (14 percent of their total scientific manpower force versus 7 percent of ours).[3] (These figures for basic research probably represent the sum of groups II and III as presented here.) The discrepancy may be even greater now in view of the momentum that the entire Russian program has gained in recent years. England, which has been striving to regain its prewar scientific excellence, is now devoting a full 50 percent of its research effort to basic studies.[4,5] In view of the time required to train scientists (up to 8 years beyond high school) it would seem that a doubling of our basic research effort should be the immediate minimum goal. Based on the cost of the program in force in 1954 ($435 million), the additional bill for such an expansion would probably be about half a billion dollars per year—a small amount considering the size of our total defense effort.

Our eventual capacity to perform as well in basic research as we have done in technology will of course be limited by our ability to find and properly train talented young people. Since over half of our able students (those in the top 30 percent of their class) do not now complete college [6] it should be possible to enhance considerably our supply of college graduates through an expanded system of merit scholarships—even allowing for the fact that many who now drop out are women who may be less inclined to pursue careers in science. Beyond this, quality of product can be best insured by improved quality of instruction—through better training of our teachers and through greater attention in our schools to subject matter in the course offerings in many fields, including mathematics and science. The details of an improved education program for American schools are so numerous that they lie outside the bounds of this article, however, it cannot be emphasized too strongly that students entering European universities are at least 2 years ahead of ours in academic achievement. They have had 4 to 6 years of a foreign language, mathematics through calculus, 3 to 5 years of physical [2,7] and biological sciences, plus a heavy dose of literature and the humanities. They are, in short, already educated people, ready to undertake advanced studies in their specialties. Some real attention is imperative in order to shorten this lag in our training, particularly of those students who are able to handle an enriched course of study.

The excellence of European science has in the past included Russia. Contrary to popular American belief, Russian science has always been strong, in spite of the general ignorance of the population in 1918 and in spite of their absence of an industrial machine. What Soviet Russia has done during the past 40 years is to develop a technology to utilize her science. Recognizing this, it is easy to see that Russia is now as well equipped as we, both to advance scientific knowledge and to utilize that knowledge in the expansion of her technological empire.

To return to our initial considerations, the launching of the sputniks was a technological triumph, and the immediate crisis precipitated by them is a technological one. But, again in the light of our earlier discussion, we can develop our new technology only as we discover new basic information—we can draw the water only as we dig the well. We cannot, therefore, afford to enter a scientific race with Russia except on the soundest possible basis—one grounded in fundamental research. The 13 years of cold war that have already passed since 1945 may easily stretch to thirty, and the nation then possessing the advantage will be the one that has had the foresight to invest now in ideas for tomorrow's technological miracles. If in the meantime we can avert a holocaust—and we devoutly hope that this can be done—the dollars spent on basic research today can be viewed in the same light as the farmer views his investment, in seed corn or the lumber company in tree farming, as a true investment, repaid many times over in the market value of our national product. Our country can then continue to enjoy the magic of better things for better living through science and technology, which has come to be such an intergral part of the American dream.

[3] National Science Foundation Bulletin No. 57–33 (1957). 64 pp.
[4] Nature, 180, 1075 (1957).
[5] J. H. Dunning, Proceedings of the Chemical Society, 168 (1957).
[6] Time, 26, No. 7, 72 (1958).
[7] Chemical and Enginering News, No. 48, 76 (1957).

Mr. President, Beware

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUGH J. ADDONIZIO
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 3, 1958

Mr. ADDONIZIO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Advocate of March 1, 1958. The Advocate is the official publication of the Archdiocese of Newark and the Diocese of Paterson. I know all the Members will be interested in reading the article:

MR. PRESIDENT, BEWARE

Talk about a summit meeting between Mr. Eisenhower and the butcher of the Kremlin waxes and wanes. The more it waxes, the more wary we should become; the more it wanes, the happier and the safer we have reason to be.

It surely must be a demonstration of the earnestness, the sincerity, the depth of our American desire for peace that we should consider even for a moment another meeting between our President and the boss of Communist Russia. One has but to recall the sad, bitter record of such meetings in the past to forecast the complete uselessness—the great danger—of such a conference in the present. Teheran in 1943, Yalta and Potsdam in 1945—the very names bring a blush of shame as we realize how we were taken in, how we betrayed real friends and right principles for pseudogains that quickly vanished from our grasps. The world is still suffering—and will long suffer—from the folly of our participation in those wartime summit conferences.

Later experience indicates all too clearly that we had learned little or nothing about protecting our rightful interests, and about the futility of making—or trying to make—agreements with Communists. In 1953 an armistice was signed at Panmunjon between United Nations and Communist delegates in Korea, to bring to a belated close the war our brave soldiers—for reasons that have never been satisfactorily explained—had not been allowed to win. Almost at once the Reds showed their disdain for their pledged word, their contempt of those who had foolishly accepted it, by steadily increasing their military forces on the northern side of the armistic line, in direct violation of their agreement to the contrary. Only last year did the U. N.—and the United States—show a commonsense reaction to this breach of faith by an equal military buildup in South Korea.

Making still more unmistakably plain the utter uselessness of negotiating with Communists, the Chinese Reds dragged out for more than 2 years (1955–57) the discussions at Geneva relative to the release of Americans taken prisoner in the Korean fighting; at the end exactly nothing had been accomplished. One can but wonder how any patriotic citizen or administration could tolerate such shameful indignity heaped upon us in the guise of diplomatic negotiations; one can but wonder how Thomas Jefferson, Andrew Jackson, or Theodore Roosevelt would have handled a like situation.

Surely, when Mr. Eisenhower contemplates another summit meeting, he cannot be moved to seek one by the memory of any outstanding success he achieved at Geneva in July 1955. For that conference, like every other effort to do business with Communists, was a great mistake which benefited only the enemy cause. A much ballyhooed spirit of Geneva quickly faded in the cold atmosphere of red reality; of practical result, it produced—after 2 long years of discussion—January's agreement on cultural exchanges—an agreement that was made possible largely by our desisting from our rightful demand that the Soviets stop jamming our radio transmission of the very programs we were agreeing should be exchanged. (When, one wonders, will one hear of any concessions made by the Communists in order to reach an agreement?)

The latest (as of this writing) demonstration of the utter unfitness of Communists for decent human society came a week ago from North Korea. There the Reds hijacked a South Korean plane carrying 32 passengers and a crew of 2 Americans, and forced it to land in North Korea. They then used their unwilling guests as hostages in an effort to extort from South Korea recognition of their People's Democratic Republic. This is, indeed, hoodlum diplomacy.

We will do well to remind ourselves who is the prime agitator for a summit meeting. It is, of course, the godless regime of Soviet Russia, whose record of faithlessness in dealing with other peoples is without parallel in human history; whose armed forces in 1956 brutally crushed the aspirations for freedom of the brave Hungarians; whose leaders, without cause or justification, constantly carry on the most outrageous campaign of slander against us; whose agents in this country have enlisted the services of more than 1 million so-called Americans in a nationwide campaign of political subversion.

And why do the Reds want a summit meeting? Surely not for our benefit. Surely not for the sake of any agreement that might result; for the odds are calculated at over 375 to 1 that they will make no agreement, and at 13 to 1 that they will break any agreement they make—and these odds are based on their record of the past 15 years. No, we may take it as certain that they want a summit meeting only for what they will get out of it. In such a conference they see a tremendous propaganda advantage for themselves, especially in the appearance of respectability it will give to their blood-stained and bloodthirsty regime. In it, too, they see a gain for themselves in the relaxation, the optimism which it will induce in the free world, and which may lead us to let down our guard.

That we have at long last reached the end of our patient endurance, and attained a better understanding of the nature of the Communist peril, seemed indicated by Mr. Eisenhower's letter of February 15 to Premier Bulganin. This put-up or shut-up statement of the President is one of the finest American state papers of the last quarter century. It should do much to clarify the thinking of our own people. It should do much, likewise, to begin, at least, to convince the Red leaders that the Alice In Wonderland gullibility of the American people is no more. We pray to God that it may do both.

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

This Eisenhower-Nixon Pact More Secret Government

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. CARLTON LOSER
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 3, 1958

Mr. LOSER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am including an editorial which appeared in the Nashville Tennessean on February 28, 1958, entitled, "This Eisenhower-Nixon Pact More Secret Government." I know that all Members of Congress are interested in a correct and approved procedure for running the Government if the Chief Executive becomes disabled and will be interested in this editorial. It conforms to the remarks made by the Honorable JOHN W. MCCORMACK, the majority leader, in the House some days ago on this subject.

The editorial follows:

THIS EISENHOWER-NIXON PACT MORE SECRET GOVERNMENT

More government by secrecy is revealed in the cozy arrangement between President Eisenhower and Vice President NIXON as to how the Californian would run the Government if his chief should become ill again.

Some others in the official family have been let in on the arrangement, it was explained to a press conference. But the Congress, which has important responsibilities in this connection, and the people are left in the dark. They also should be taken into the President's confidence or know the reason why.

Surprisingly enough, even while making this announcement, Mr. Eisenhower said that the question "is something that Congress should take action on, and I personally think it probably requires a constitutional amendment, if it is going to be clearly corrected."

But because of the buddy relations between himself and the Vice President, he is going ahead on his own. His conscience is clear at the moment, he added, "but I still think it should be handled as something for all future cases."

Despite all this, he has by secret decree said how the question of disability must operate during the rest of his term. And he made it fairly clear that the final decision on when to take over should lie with the Vice President, though he may consult with the Cabinet.

We heartily agree with the President that the Congress has a prime duty in solving this issue, and that body should now see to the taking charge in behalf of the Nation. There is a need to clarify the meaning of the Constitution, which is not a duty imposed upon either the President or Vice President, or both.

Quite obviously, President Eisenhower does not relish a repetition of the situation in September when he was seized with a heart attack. On that occasion Mr. Sherman Adams took over in an unofficial way, with a consequent blow to public confidence. There were signs at the time that Mr. NIXON wanted to be the kingfish, but he was rebuffed both at the White House and the Denver sickbed.

Under the new plan, however, it is planned to make Mr. NIXON a real assistant Vice President with extraordinary powers regardless of what the Supreme Court might later say if this setup were contested.

This would indeed ward off an administrative vacuum, with Mr. Adams happily deprived of his glory. Furthermore, it may be admitted that Mr. NIXON is better equipped for the backstopping role than the present No. 1 aid whose record does not improve under close scrutiny. But the question of legality will not down.

Already the Constitution indicates that if the President is disabled the Vice Preisdent shall take over his duties and powers, but it does not say who shall declare that disability if the Chief Executive is so incapacitated as to be unable to do so. It does not leave such decisions to the Vice President, but able legal opinion supports the view that Congress can end the uncertainties.

Only as a matter of temporary expediency does Mr. Eisenhower defend his new arrangement. What is good enough for him, he concedes, might not be wise for his successors.

"Just place your trust in DICK and me," he seems to say, "and pass a law or amend the Constitution later on. We know our stuff. The secret arrangement is all written down and blueprinted, but it is not the public's business."

If the people are wise—and we believe they are—they will resent this Great White Father attitude and break wide open this strange secret of the Republican high command. They, above all others, have the right to know.

The Struggling Farmer and the Present Farm Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROY W. WIER
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 3, 1958

Mr. WIER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include a reprint of a radio broadcast, prepared by the public relations staff of Farmers' Union Grain Terminal Association, St. Paul, Minn., on the struggling farmer and the present farm program.

The reprint is as follows:

"When the Farmer's Throat Is Cut, So Is Your Own." That's the title of an editorial appearing in the Lewistown (Mont.) Daily News. It's written by a publisher who is fed up with attacks on farm programs. He says, "Thumbing through a magazine the other day, we noticed an advertisement sponsored by the machine-tool firm, Warner & Swasey, of Cleveland, Ohio. It asked: 'Who is this generous uncle who pays all the bills?' The ad then went on to complain that Uncle Sam is 'going to keep farmers prosperous by having them do less work.'"

Now that didn't set very well with the Montana newspaper, and it had some plain talking to do. "Here, out in the open, is an example of the unceasing campaign being waged against America's farmers and ranchers by the national community of business and industry," the editorial said. "The firm of Warner & Swasey, as most other great industrial firms, will quickly defend the questionable practice wherein the Federal Government grants huge subsidies to industry through quick tax writeoffs in defense contracts. And, these industries which reap quick millions from Government contracts seem to be the very ones which squeal loudest over any assistance extended to the struggling farmer."

The Lewistown publisher says he doesn't find this situation amusing at all. And he adds that he doesn't know the solution to the farm problem. But, he says he does know this: "If the farmer is not prosperous, there can be no sustained national prosperity. Much of the current recession finds its impetus in our depressed farm situation, even as the great depression of the 1930's was rooted in the unsolved agricultural crisis."

Pointing to food costs, this publisher says that farmers are subsidizing the consumers, and not the other way around. "In this situation," he continues, "we find in Ezra Taft Benson, a Secretary of Agriculture who is well intentioned, but confused, and who appears to be hostile to the very segment of the Nation which he is supposed to represent and serve." With that, the publisher brings the matter right down close to home. He shows what the 22-cent-a-bushel wheat-support cut will mean in his area. He's checked and found that the cut means Fergus County ranchers will lose $651,868 this year, and that Judith Basin County will lose over $310,000. Central Montana can expect to lose $2 million as a result this year of Benson's wheat-price cut.

Then, the publisher turns to business. He says, "There isn't a businessman on Main Street in any community in central Montana, and most of all in Lewistown, who will not feel this pinch." As he puts the matter, "In Montana and in many another State, the price of wheat is the economic lifeblood."

We wish we had time to read you every word of this important editorial, but we don't. What we've given you are just a few of its highlights in telling the story of the vital stake business has in farm prosperity. It's good to see Main Street measuring up its tight relationship with agriculture, and setting out to do something about improving farm prices.

Address by John S. Gleason, Jr., National Commander of the American Legion

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 3, 1958

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address:

ADDRESS BY JOHN S. GLEASON, JR., NATIONAL COMMANDER OF THE AMERICAN LEGION, AT THE 35TH ANNUAL NATIONAL REHABILITATION CONFERENCE OF THE AMERICAN LEGION, WASHINGTON, D. C., FEBRUARY 27, 1958

Chairman Bob McCurdy, Members of the Congress of the United States, distinguished guests, and my fellow American Legionnaires, tonight climaxes one of the most inspiring and memorable weeks in my entire life. The opportunity to meet with the Members of Congress, Government officials, military leaders, and other outstanding Americans who have honored us with their presence here tonight is always a great privilege. When to this experience is added the rich and heart-warming association with the finest group of veteran rehabilitation and service officers anywhere in the world, the occasion becomes a truly unforgettable moment in my life.

In years past it has been customary for the national commander, in his address to this banquet, to highlight the principal problems confronting the American Legion in the field of veterans rehabilitation. Tonight, however, I would like to deviate a little from tradition, for this reason.

After our appearance on Tuesday morning before the House Veterans' Affairs Committee, there is no member of the American Legion who had the privilege of attending that hearing who now has the slightest doubt as to how the members of that vital congressional committee feel about the veteran-benefit program.

We salute them for their courageous and informed defense of America's war veterans.

If we came here to Washington confused and concerned about expected attacks on veteran benefits, we are returning home confident and certain that the Members of Congress who know the needs of America's veterans and who have the heavy responsibility of fashioning the program to meet these needs fully and fairly are in the American Legion's corner.

Equally important, the American Legion is in their corner, too.

If they are willing to stand up and be counted the veteran's friend, then the American Legion must and will support them in the fight to preserve inviolate the present sound structure of veteran benefits.

There may be some who feel that if we can defend successfuly what we now have, we will have won a substantial victory. They are right to this extent only. The forces behind the expected attack on veteran benefits are powerful and influential. They are well organized and well financed. To defeat them will require our continued vigilance and effort, and will represent no small achievement.

Nonetheless, I submit that there is no victory in standing still. Especially is this true when conditions demand bold, decisive action, for example, to resolve the growing shortage of vitally needed VA hospital beds.

You service officers live with this mounting crisis. You know far better than I the number and kind of VA hospital beds needed now in your own communities and departments. But the address of Harvey V. Higley, former Administrator of Veterans Affairs, to our national convention in Atlantic City illustrates the growing gravity of this problem.

He noted, for example, that a 1,000-bed mental hospital is needed right now in Gainesville, Fla., and 250 additional general medical and surgical beds each for the VA hospitals in Bay Pines and Coral Gables, Fla. A 300-bed general medical hospital is needed to handle the increasing veteran population in southern Texas. Southern California urgently needs 500 additional general medical beds to care for its rapidly expanding veteran population. A 500-bed neuropsychiatric addition is required at Montrose, N. Y., while 250 additional general medical and surgical beds each are needed for the VA hospitals in New Orleans and St. Louis.

The examples I have cited, and they by no means cover all problem areas, reflect an immediate need for 3,300 new VA hospital beds.

The American Legion is confident that the Congress will act to resolve this crisis. But we are also certain that the Budget Bureau, if it follows past practice, will attempt to delay construction of necessary and authorized hospitals.

Such unwarranted and inexcusable Budget Bureau interference with the expressed wishes of Congress of the United States can no longer be tolerated. It has jeopardized not only the VA hospitals and medical program, but the authority and functions of the Veterans' Administration itself.

This is no exaggeration. The proposed VA budget for hospital and medical care, including construction and maintenance, for the fiscal year beginning next July 1 proves this. To save $6 million the Budget Bureau ordered a reduction of 1,000 tuberculosis beds in the average daily patient load. It is bad enough when this reduction must be made in the face of a rising incidence of TB in this country. But when it becomes an insufferable if not illegal usurpation of the constitutional powers of the Congress of the United States, then something must be done.

Despite the fact that the Congress has not yet had an opportunity to act on the VA's budget for the next fiscal year, the VA will have to begin shutting down TB beds on the 1st of April—just a little more than a month from now—to accomplish the directed savings.

To me this development dramatically demonstrates that the Budget Bureau has already decided what the Congress will appropriate for the VA hospital and medical care during the next fiscal year.

We, in the American Legion, seriously doubt that the Congress appreciates having its work done for it by the Budget Bureau. And we hope that you Senators and Representatives here tonight and your colleagues in Congress will take the first opportunity to let the Budget Bureau know how you feel.

The American Legion will back your hand.

Our effectiveness in supporting your effort to preserve and improve, as necessary, the present program of veteran benefits will be determined, to a great extent, by our membership strength. We know this, just as we know that the key to the success of the many positive and necessary programs carried out by the American Legion independently of the Government is membership.

We could not have this national rehabilitation conference, we could not maintain our second-to-none veterans' rehabilitation program without the strength in numbers and dedication of nearly 3 million Legionaires. And the same is true of our child welfare program, our program of national security, and such positive Americanism programs as American Legion junior baseball, Boy's State, and the oratorical contest.

If we are to remain a positive force for good in America we must maintain our membership strength. If we are to grow in our ability to meet the increasing needs of a growing America, we must have more members.

To help stabilize our present membership and strengthen the foundation for the future growth of the American Legion, our national executive committee, at a special meeting here in Washington last Saturday, authorized the establishment of a group-insurance program for our members.

Underwriter for this tremendous new privilege and opportunity for Legionnaires is the Occidental Insurance Company of California. The First National Bank of Kansas City, Mo., will be the trustee, and your national headquarters will administer the program.

I am not going to attempt to go into detail tonight and to explain how the program will operate, the benefits it will provide, requirements for participation, and other vital features of this plan. This essential information will be prepared and distributed to every Legionnaire as soon as possible.

For now, however, I would like you to know and to bring back home these essential facts about this group-insurance plan.

It is entirely voluntary. It is low-cost. The premium will be only $12 a year. In order to particiapte in the plan, an individual must be a member in good standing of the American Legion. To retain a policy, the individual must remain a Legionnaire.

I cannot predict what impact this plan will have on the future membership picture in the American Legion. But I can tell you this. We have received literally hundreds of calls in the Washington office since Sunday morning when the story on the adoption of the plan first broke in the Nation's press. And a substantial number of these calls were from eligible veterans who have not joined or no longer belong to the American Legion. They are interested in this plan. I am sure you are too.

If this plan encourages Legionnaires to renew their membership before the beginning of a new calendar year so that they will remain in good stand and thus be able to retain their group insurance, then it will have contributed tremendously to the strength of the American Legion. We will have enrolled our quota for the new year before the year ever begins. With this time-consuming difficult, and demanding task out of the way, we can concentrate on building the programs and privileges the American Legion offers our Nation and its war veterans. And if we can do this our membership problem will take care of itself.

There is another problem, however, of deep concern to the American Legion which will not take care of itself. That is the increasingly serious problem of unemployment.

Tonight, at this very moment, there are nearly 1 million veterans, including many American Legionnaires, in desperate need of a job. They have known the suffering and hardship of the battlefield, but I am certain that their present plight is far, far harder to bear. And for a very good reason. Now their families and loved ones are involved.

During the war, America's veterans, through their service and sacrifice, safeguarded and sheltered their wives and parents, sons and daughters. Now, those whom they would protect above all others, have been hit and hurt by their unemployment.

The man able to work but unable to find a job that will enable him to feed, clothe, and shelter his family knows a fear infinitely more demoralizing and destructive than anything he ever encountered on the battlefield.

A powerful enemy could not defeat him. But an impotent economy can.

We have to help America's jobless veterans somehow—and soon.

You and I, individually and as part of a concentrated post effort, must try to find jobs wherever possible for unemployed veterans in our communities. We must spearhead the drive for intensified interest and effort on the part of Government agencies and civic organizations in our communities to lick the unemployment problem. If this isn't enough, and it may well not be, then the American Legion must trigger into action the full resources of our Government to help jobless veterans find work and an end to their mounting despair.

This is veterans rehabilitation in the most fundamental and humanitarian sense of the word, for the finest kind of rehabilitation for any man is a full paycheck.

America's unemployed veterans don't want a handout. They don't want charity. They want to earn their own way. They want the dignity and pride, the sense of accomplishment and satisfaction that comes from honest, hard work.

If it is necessary to create such work, then this must be done. And if it is done, it must provide not only work for qualified veterans but lasting benefit to our Nation as well.

In my opinion, one of the most necessary and constructive employment-producing programs the Government could undertake would be to build the Veterans Administration hospitals needed by thousands of America's sick and disabled veterans.

Such a construction program would provide jobs for experienced, skilled veterans, and hospital beds for those in need of adequate medical care.

In serving this purpose and achieving this result, such a program would advance the high ideals and proud record of the American Legion's veterans rehabilitation program.

You service officers have made this program the finest of its kind anywhere in the world. Your dedication to the welfare of our Nation's war veterans, their dependents,

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

and survivors, is an inspiration to me as it must be to every American Legionnaire.

We are proud and grateful for your service to the American Legion and to our programs of service for America's veterans. I know that each of you will continue to give beyond measure of your time, your effort, and your heart to our great program of veterans rehabilitation. For you know, as does every Legionnaire, that through this program we consecrate and sanctify our comradeship by our devotion to mutual helpfulness.

Thank you for the privilege of being with you tonight.

Too Many Cooks at the Pentagon

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MELVIN PRICE
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 3, 1958

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, there was a wartime tale about a messenger boy who entered the Pentagon, wandered lost through its vastness, and was made a colonel before he got out.

If this story were to be told today, it might be that the messenger boy became an Assistant—or at least a Deputy Assistant—Secretary of Defense before he emerged. There is a whole platoon of Secretaries and Assistant Secretaries quartered in the Department of Defense. There has been a multiplication of Secretaries and no evidence that the increase in numbers has been accompanied by an increase in efficiency and creativity of ideas to strengthen our Military Establishment. Many of these Secretaries have the authority to say "No" to proposals; they usually canont say "Yes."

Along with this expansion in the number of Secretaries has come a rise in the number of committees that are supposed to develop plans and advise the top officials. There are over 200 of these committees, many of them with overlapping membership.

A reorganization of the upper reaches of the Pentagon is essential. New developments in weapons, impending decisions about space exploration, and the demands these will make on strategic planning will require an organization capable of dealing efficiently with these problems.

Chairman CARL VINSON, of the Committee on Armed Services, has introduced legislation which would achieve this objective. Among the provisions of this legislation, H. R. 11001, is a reduction in the number of Assistant and Deputy Assistant Secretaries to 14.

The following editorial dealing with the cumbersome organization of the Pentagon appeared in the St. Louis Globe-Democrat February 28:

TOO MANY COOKS AT THE PENTAGON

Like the prophets of eld, Defense Secretary McElroy and some of his top aids repaired to the desert last weekend to discuss the Defense Department. Their soulsearching evidently led them to some firm conclusions.

On his return, Secretary McElroy indicated that the meeting had quashed the idea of a single Chief of Staff to boss the Army, Navy, and Air Force. "I don't believe that that point of view is having predominant attention," he told reporters.

Shortly after, he also announced that he would ask Congress for an extra $1.3 billion—maybe even $1.7 billion—to spend this year. Some of the money would go to buy more B–52 jet bombers and more jet tankers, K–135s.

We hope that the parley also found some way to streamline a Defense Department that has become topheavy.

As the Wall Street Journal pointed out the other day, the Office of the Secretary of Defense alone has grown in 10 years from a staff of about 100 to some 2,400.

We have not only a Secretary of Defense, a Secretary of the Air Force, a Secretary of the Army and a Secretary of the Navy. We also have a deputy Secretary of Defense, 9 under secretaries, 20 assistant secretaries, 13 deputy assistant secretaries, and shoals of lesser civilian brass.

Recent testimony before Congress showed that Navy's Chief of the Bureau of Aeronautics top man for the design and buying of Navy planes, has 107 staff seniors in the Department of Defense. Each and all of them can call him in to explain what he is doing, and review his work.

What compounds the situation is that this jungle of top civilian posts is filled by a succession of men who file in and out as fast as if going through a revolving door.

What is needed is an able, manageable Defense Department—perhaps with its own military planning staff—to set policy, and freer rein for the military services to carry out policy, without being halted at every turn by review committees and study groups that are simply blocks in the path of progress.

The evidence is overwhelming that, as of now, the Defense Department has too many in, out and hold baskets; too many officials reading and initiating reports and staff studies; too many committees studying, reviewing and buckpassing.

As Congressman Price of East St. Louis declared in despair the other day, over the delay in building an atomic-powered airplane:

"We have studied this proposal to death."

That is an inscription that would evidently fit the tombstone of many a Defense Department project.

We hope Secretary McElroy will be guided by the philosophy that 2 heads may be better than 1, but 2,000 heads may be worse than none at all.

Virgil M. Simmons

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. E. ROSS ADAIR
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 3, 1958

Mr. ADAIR. Mr. Speaker, Fort Wayne, Ind., and the Nation, recently lost a leading citizen in the death of Mr. Virgil M. Simmons, who died suddenly while on vacation in Florida. He was widely known and respected, with a very large circle of close friends.

Mr. Simmons was one who believed that each individual owed a portion of his time and talents to the affairs of government—and this, he, himself, practiced.

The Fort Wayne Journal-Gazette, of which he was president and copublisher, had the following editorial, which I ask leave to insert in the RECORD:

V. M. SIMMONS

The entire Journal-Gazette family is stunned with grief and shock today because of the sudden and untimely death of our president and copublisher—V. M. Simmons.

Mr. Simmons suffered a fatal heart attack early Wednesday morning in Fort Lauderdale, Fla., where he had gone to spend a winter vacation.

He seemed in his usual good health when he departed for Florida. His mind was filled with plans for the future of this newspaper.

He was looking forward with eagerness to the date when the Journal-Gazette would move into its new home on West Main Street.

It is hard for us to realize that our warm personal friend, our brilliant and dynamic leader, and our valued adviser on so many matters will be with us no more.

Mr. Simmons was widely known in the State and Nation. He commanded the respect of his wide circle of friends for his outstanding achievements in many fields.

He was a lawyer by profession, who turned first to governmental service, and then to the newspaper business.

Ten years ago, when he became president of the Journal-Gazette, and its copublisher with James R. Fleming, he quickly mastered the fundamentals of journalism. He had brought with him to this important job a wealth of experience.

He regarded the newspaper field not merely a business, but a high calling in public service. He was keenly interested in the welfare of Fort Wayne and the Tri-State area of which it is the center.

Mr. Simmons believed that it was possible to secure the elevation of the Nickel Plate Railroad tracks, when others were filled with doubt. He personally directed the newspaper campaign in the Journal-Gazette which preceded the final success of the elevation which was then Fort Wayne's most important civic need.

Every movement for the growth and betterment of Fort Wayne had his active support. He served on numerous committees to advance worthwhile projects, while supporting them in the Journal-Gazette.

Many of these projects already translated into reality are monuments to his memory.

Mr. Simmons was proud of his long friendship with the late Gov. Paul V. McNutt. He played as big a part as any other individual in making McNutt Governor of Indiana.

He then served under Governor McNutt and Gov. M. Clifford Townsend as chief administrative officer of the Indiana Department of Public Works and commissioner of conservation. Conservation was one of the great interests of his life and the State park system will forever bear the imprint of his wise administration and development.

V. M. Simmons was born in Bluffton, the son of the late Abram and Jennie Mast Simmons. He was educated in the public schools of this city and an Indiana University where he took his bachelor of law degree. He was also a member of the Beta Theta Pi Fraternity.

When just out of law school he was appointed assistant United States district attorney and served for 3 years. He was a member of the law firm of Simmons, Dailey & Simmons for a number of years, until he joined the McNutt State administration. In 1941 McNutt called him to Washington to serve as Administrative Assistant in the Federal Security Agency.

These are just a few of the multitude of activities which filled the life of V. M. Simmons.

He was a lifelong member of the Democratic Party and was gifted in the art of

politics. He served for 18 years as a member of the Democratic State committee.

It was his sincere conviction that when a party came to power it owed the public the best service which it was able to give. That, he held, was the best way to win elections.

He was a frank partisan. He fought the opposition with determination and skill. Yet, when the battle was over, he cherished no bitterness and no ill will.

For many years, no Democratic State convention was considered to have a quorum until Mr. Simmons arrived at the hall. He was also a familiar figure in Democratic national conventions, where he helped to perfect and carry out the necessary arrangements. Naturally, he was personally acquainted with the top figures of the party in the Nation. They liked the smiling, intelligent, accommodating Hoosier.

Now his action-packed career has come to a close—although we cannot bring ourselves to a realization that this is true.

There is widespread sorrow, all the more poignant because everyone regarded him at the height of his usefulness with many years of journalistic and community service ahead of him.

During his 10 years as president and copublisher of the Journal-Gazette this newspaper enjoyed a decade of the widest acceptance in its long history.

Those of us who knew him best can testify to the excellent qualities of his mind and heart. We testify to our affection for him.

No man we have ever known was more devoted to members of his family than our fallen chief. To them we extend deepest sympathy.

The Sporting News Hits the Nail on the Head

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KENNETH B. KEATING
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 25, 1958

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, it would be a serious mistake for Congress to impose strangling antitrust restrictions on national team sports. Most people who understand these games know that any such approach would have drastic consequences.

Legislation I have introduced draws a vital distinction between the business and playing aspects of these activities. This distinction should not be confused by vague and unclear limitations which are nothing more than an invitation to litigation.

The Sporting News, often referred to as the bible of baseball, is an outstanding and respected sports publication. It knows the problems of baseball as few others do and has no ax to grind. The February 26 issue of this paper contains an excellent editorial in support of my basic position on sports legislation.

Under leave previously granted to extend my remarks, I insert this fine editorial.

The editorial follows:

JUST AN INVITATION TO LITIGATION

The Sporting News has nothing but respect for the congressional subcommittee which investigated organized ball and other professional sports in connection with bills designed to fix the status of those sports in relation to the antitrust laws.

But this publication must protest with all the eloquence at its command against House bill 10378, which Representative EMANUEL CELLER introduced late last month as the product of the lengthy inquiries.

We agree with Representative KENNETH B. KEATING, like CELLER a member of the subcommittee, that the bill as now worded invites endless litigation and would make the courts the arbiters of questions which could be settled by more specific language in the bill itself.

Fundamentally, of course, we're opposed to any legislation in this field, unless it would be the bill introduced by Representative OREN HARRIS, which would confirm by congressional action the immunity from the antitrust laws which was given baseball by the Supreme Court decision of 1922 and which the same Tribunal declined to withdraw in 1953.

The most recent inquiry was sparked by the Court's 1957 finding, in the Radovich case, that professional football is subject to the antitrust laws. Football people rightly argued it was absurd to snap the handcuffs on their game, while leaving baseball free to operate as it saw fit.

But why not achieve equality of status by bringing football up to baseball's favored position, instead of taking baseball back to share the gridiron game's distress? And distress it is, in spite of the pending House bill's exemption from antitrust coverage of such procedures and structural features as are reasonably necessary.

Those two words, as KEATING has pointed out, will be the cause of unlimited legal action if H. R. 10378 is passed by Congress in its present form.

Every individual or group with a complaint against professional sports will be able to challenge the reasonableness of sports laws and practices—and challenge them under the very antitrust laws from which the bill professes to give pro sports certain necessary exemptions.

To take a concrete example, would some former players who have filed triple-damage suits against baseball, on the grounds they had been unfairly treated as a result of the reserve clause, be less inclined to go to court if the proposed bill should become the law of the land?

At no point does this bill say the reserve clause is exempt from the antitrust laws. CELLER holds the opinion that the clause is reasonably necessary, but would this view be shared by every judge and jury who might be called upon to decide in individual cases?

CELLER believes the bill gives sports the right to reasonable control over television and radio broadcasts—but the bill actually says only that "the right to operate within specified geographic areas" is exempt from antitrust laws.

Can baseball count on every judge to agree with CELLER'S interpretation?

The language of the bill is far too vague to be effective. What may seem reasonably necessary to one man may seem pitifully unfair to another.

The bill which KEATING introduced is much more commendable on this score. It spells out at least some of the things its author considers reasonable.

But why should it be necessary to bring baseball—twice blessed by the Supreme Court—under the antitrust laws of any basis? Those laws were designed to protect the public interest against abuse by powerful corporations. They were designed, to put it another way, to keep down the cost of living. Is there anything in baseball's laws or practices which defeats either of these purposes?

Granted, there have been inequities. Baseball makes no claim to perfection. But between the authority of the commissioner and the organized influence of the players, it should be possible to work out difficulties within the baseball family. The minor leaguers are not so widely unionized as the major leaguers, but the president of the national association is a man whose integrity has not been questioned.

During such investigations as the Celler subcommittee conducted, much attention is paid—and rightly so—to matters which the Congressmen believe call for correction. But if it were practical to call in all the witnesses who would testify as to the great amount of good baseball has done, a more accurate picture would emerge.

Even without such testimony, the subcommittee must have been impressed by the honesty of purpose and the love of their game expressed by Ford Frick, Will Harridge, Warren Giles, and George Trautman. Convinced of their good intentions, why not give them further opportunity to eliminate what some may consider the "bugs" in the system?

Baseball is beset by many problems. Its leaders need all their time, energy, and mental gifts for the attempt to solve them. They should not be distracted by a law which threatens to keep them and their attorneys jumping between their offices and the courts. They should not be harassed by a legislative policeman, especially one whose duties and authority are so vaguely defined as they are in H. R. 10378.

The Desperate Need of the Newly Independent and Economically Poor Countries of the World To Achieve Fairly Rapid Technical and Economic Development Confronts the United States and Other Developed Countries With One of the Greatest Dangers and Opportunities of Our Time

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER H. JUDD
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 26, 1958

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an article by Barbara Ward, noted British author and former foreign editor of the Economist, London. The article appeared in the New York Times of February 23, 1958.

The article follows:

THE GREAT CHALLENGE IS NOT THE SPUTNIKS
(By Barbara Ward)

The annual debate on foreign aid is about to begin in Congress; but it has been carried on for so many years, and the arguments in the controversy have been bandied back and forth so repeatedly, that there is real danger of staleness creeping into the whole discussion. Yet this, of all years, is the last in which to give the issue only tepid attention. Some of the ground may be familiar enough. But in two vital respects, the problem has taken on a new aspect and there is now fresh urgency to all the old arguments.

The first point is the scale of the Communists' entry into the field of foreign aid and their evident intention to stay there. In the last 4 years, the scope of loans and barter deals made by the Soviet bloc has steadily widened. From piecemeal offers, they have begun to develop what looks like a generalized strategy.

At the recent Cairo conference organized by the Afro-Asian Communist-front organizations, the Russian delegates took the opportunity to offer sustained aid without strings to all underdeveloped nations. As proof of their intentions, they could point to the $1.9 billion in economic and military aid which the Soviet bloc has pledged since 1955. Meanwhile, the scale of the Russian economy and the number of trained Soviet technicians available for service abroad are steadily increasing. There is thus every reason to suppose that future assistance will be on a steadily expanding scale.

As a general instrument of propaganda, the Soviet offer is designed to influence all backward but ambitious nations—and they include nine-tenths of the human race. If a state of "backwardness" begins where per capita annual income is below, say, $300, very few areas escape. Western Europe, the white members of the British Commonwealth, above North America—where the figure exceeds $1,500—are comfortably beyond the definition. But most of Asia and Africa—and large parts of Latin America—lie at the other extreme; annual incomes per head fall to $50 and below. It is at these levels that the desire to break out of the vicious circle of poverty breeding ever more poverty reaches revolutionary force. It is here that any policy of sustained capital aid from whatever source must find the most eager hearing.

But the specific programs of Soviet aid are not so generalized. They follow a more immediate strategy. Virtually all the nations which have received direct assistance in loans and trade deals lie along the geographical frontiers of Communist power. They have been occasional wider excursions—trade negotiations with Argentina, barter offers to the Sudan—but the bulk of the $1.9 billion has been expended along the periphery of the Communist world, from the Levant through Afghanistan and India and on into southeast Asia.

The nations on this fringe offer the Communists important entry points for both political and economic infiltration. All of them—virtually without exception—emerged from western colonial rule only in the last dozen years. Although Afghanistan, Iran, and Thailand were never formally taken over and Iraq attained a measure of independence in 1932, all the other states were still under British, French, or Dutch control as recently as 1946. To their peoples, the anticolonial theme of Russian propaganda is instantly familiar and, since Russian imperialism never impinged directly on them, the Russian pretense of disinterestedness, of aid without strings, seems plausible to many.

The Communists have, moreover, been able to play on anticolonial sentiment by underlining to Asian opinion the extent to which western aid has been geared to military programs undertaken in alliance with the West. In western eyes such arrangements as the Baghdad and SEATO pacts may look like reasonable local efforts at self-defense. But in Asia, where, in the past, alliances between local states and western colonizing powers often preceded colonial control, it is easy to arouse Asian suspicion that today's alliances could be the prelude to renewed colonial control tomorrow. Russia, in giving military aid, asks for no guaranties or alliances and is thus free to attack the western pacts.

Another Russian asset is the very urgency of Asian economic need. All these states face formidable obstacles. Only two of them—the oil states, Iran and Iraq—have sufficient capital for development. Even they lack trained technicians and adequate, educated leadership. All the others are caught in a dilemma: Their populations are so poor that they can barely save, but saving is the only escape from poverty. In these economies, where the beneficent spiral of saving breeding further saving cannot be set in motion, capital and technical aid are the first aims of policy.

The Russians, who face no annual open debate on the desirability or otherwise of foreign aid, who do not need to stress self-interest to secure popular consent at home for foreign spending, who can detail officials for foreign service in any field, who need make no precise economic accounting of strict profit and loss in their aid programs, have a capacity both for quick decision and for sustained effort which the Western system inherently lacks. In 4 years, they have come within sight of catching up with the whole Western effort of a decade. In the key countries along the Asian fringe, the amount of capital assistance provided by them has already outstripped the American total by about half a billion dollars.

But it is not simply the new Russian effort that is at issue. There is a second point to underline—the falling away of world trade in the wake of American business stagnation. It can be argued that in the last year the Communists have profited more by Western mistakes and incoherences than by their own direct action. For among the underdeveloped areas are to be found most of the world's primary producers. Jute and tea from the Indian subcontinent and Ceylon, rubber and tin from Malaya, rice from Burma, cotton from Egypt, the Sudan, and Uganda—these are some of the products which underpin the unstable economies of Afro-Asian countries, and in the last decade, an almost unbroken boom in world commodity prices, sustained above all by the high level of American economic activity, has done more than any foreign-aid programs, from whatever source, to create a surplus from which savings could be drawn.

But in the last year the picture has changed. World metal prices have fallen by 25 percent, fibers by 15 percent; since 1955—in the 2 years leading directly up to independence—Malaya's rubber prices have dropped by 50 percent. All in all, according to the latest United Nations figure, primary producers lost $600 million to $700 million in export income in 1957 alone. This figure is more than half the total of American aid given to the Asian fringe since 1949. Thus Russia is expanding its program of aid and barter just at a time when normal trading has fallen away and has caused acute embarrassment to the local governments.

This, in essence, is the new situation which underlies this year's debate on foreign aid. The old arguments—of Asian need, of the West's interest in stable conditions, of the risks inherent in leaving the fringe states wide open to Communist blandishments—are all vitally reinforced by Russia's notable entry into direct, sustained competition in the field of aid and by the evidence that the whole western trading position has been gravely weakened by the economic stagnation of the last year. In fact, the new conditions of 1958 might best be summed up by saying that, while the Russians have evolved a long-term economic strategy for the Asian fringe (and beyond it, for the underdeveloped areas everywhere), the Western Powers appear to have no general policy of any sort.

Their patchwork of aid is not related to any long-term plan for sustained development nor do they coordinate their individual offers. The assistance they give with one hand is canceled by the purchases they no longer make with the other. The domestic breathing space becomes a near hurricane by the time the effect of falling business activity at the center slashes export programs on the fringe. In short, if there is any assumption behind the foreign economic policy of the Western Powers, it seems to be that the program can proceed by fits and starts, from emergency to emergency, and that neither care, study, forethought nor sustained effort is really required. So long as this illusion prevails, the Communists, with their long-term aims and determination, are likely to pull steadily ahead of the West in influence and sooner rather than later may reach their target of effective control.

This outcome would be all the more tragic for being unnecessary. The ingredients of a sustained and workable economic strategy for the free world have been discussed and canvassed and clarified in the West for more than a decade. In particular, since President Eisenhower first proposed a special fund for long-term lending, the advantages of a consistent, long-term loan program have been thoroughly explored.

The aim in each backward economy is to reach the phase where internal savings become self-sustaining. At primitive economic levels there is no local surplus for saving, and capital-creating investments—in transport, in power, in improved agriculture—cannot be fully supplied domestically. For a number of years external aid at low rates of interest or in interest-free loans or gifts, is needed to get this basic capital equipment into position. Then, as local output rises, aid can taper off and domestic savings take its place. The expanding economies will attract private investment. The emergency will have passed and more nations will have been drawn into the magic circle of modernised, advanced, technical societies. Such a program has a shape and a purpose and is self-liquidating. But nothing of the sort is possible if aid may end from one year to the next. The sustained pattern is ruled out. The risk is that even the aid that is given will be wasted for lack of a proper context.

Yet, given the cooperation of all the developed countries of the West, the scale of such a program would not be extravagant—in fact, it is not much greater than the totals for economic and military aid given in a haphazard way today. One percent of the advanced nations' national incomes would provide between $4 billion and $5 billion a year, and such a sum, made available over a decade, would be sufficient to get country after country through the sound barrier of sustained investment. It is a sobering thought that such a sum is spent every 3 weeks on military preparedness.

A long-term aid program on these lines is not even an innovation. Each year of the first Indian 5-year plan was underpinned by releases from India's sterling balances held in London. The most triumphant effort of postwar diplomacy—the Marshall plan—applied the principle of sustained aid to Europe with complete success.

Moreover, at the end of the war, when the Western World was perhaps more alert to the economic perils of the future than it is today after the long, recent spell of prosperity, the prospects for a functioning world economy included such institutions as the World Bank and the International Monetary Fund, both precisely designed to see that shortage of capital and disturbances in trade did not impede the growth of world commerce and prosperity. The error at the time was to set up these institutions with resources too modest for the task ahead. The error today seems to be in no longer even recognizing the essential nature of their functions. It can be argued that the most direct and effective method of securing a strong revival of international trade and a sustained expansion of world resources at this time would be to triple the sums available to the World Bank for lending and to the Monetary Fund for strengthening the international currency system on which trade depends—and incidentally of ending the kind of massive currency speculation that disrupted Europe's economic stability so seriously last summer and fall.

No, it is not lack of knowledge or expertise or means or even experience that inhibits

the West as it confronts the new, sweeping scale of Russian economic competition. It is quite simply a paralysis of imagination, a crisis of energy and will. Yet, if the implications of this new challenge—both for evil and for good—do not stir Western minds and hearts, it is difficult to conceive what will.

The risks involve an almost apocalyptic disruption of the world's present relationships. To bring what remains of Asia under Communist dominance would give Russia control of the eastern Mediterranean, of the whole land bridge to Africa, of the shores of the Indian Ocean and of the sea approaches to Australia. Such an extension of control would inevitable alter the whole strategic balance of East-West military power.

The political consequences would be as dire. With India under Communist direction, all East and South Africa would fall open to Communist influence playing directly on the hundreds of thousands of Indian settlers in Africa and indirectly on the restive, race-conscious African masses. Europe would shrink to a beleaguered fringe of the vast Eurasian land mass. Japan would be a pitifully isolated appendage at the other limit.

The physical resources of the Atlantic world would, even in such conditions, probably be enough to sustain the economic life of the West. Not even middle eastern oil is indispensable. But there would be a vast disruption of trade, confidence, and growth if the bulk of the world's remaining markets and sources of supply came under the arbitrary control of the Communist forces. No doubt, they would continue to trade, but as Russia's satellites have learned, trade under such conditions is constantly at the mercy of politics. No stable economic relations can be maintained when crucial traffic may be cut off in a day as a means of political pressure.

Above all, the transfer to Communist allegiance of all the world's emergent peoples, the loss to western concepts of freedom of the ancient cultures of Asia, the passage of the great African Continent from the tyranny of tribalism to the despotism of the absolute state—such disasters would test to the breaking point the spirit and courage of the free world. The risk is that they would so deepen the confusion of western counsel, so damp the light of hope, give such rein to fear and extremism that western society might lose the inner strength to withstand the strain. If the shock of seeing China lost to communism could help to create in America the miasma of McCarthyism, what new demagogs might not be brought forth by the loss of so much more?

But if the risks of western inaction are immense, the gains to be secured from a successful western initiative are on a comparable scale. Economically it has always been an illusion that in our interdependent international economy the Atlantic nations could continue to expand their economies and grow and prosper in a world otherwise condemned to stagnation and penury. The growing techical capacity of the West needs the markets and supplies of the rest of the world not much less urgently than the world needs western capital and technique. To underpin the growth and prospects of others is the surest way of insuring our own.

Politically, too, there can be no doubt that the nations of free Asia desire, provided alternatives exist, to hold themselves free of Communist control. For all the Communists' talk of aid without strings, their aim is ultimate domination, and the Asian governments are quite shrewd enough to know it. Hungary is not forgotten, in spite of all the Communists' efforts to cover it up. The danger is that, with no alternative sources of assistance, Asian leaders may be compelled by popular pressure to depend more and more dangerously upon Communist support. But given western backing, they want what the West wants for them—independence and control of their own affairs.

Above all, a concerted long-term economic strategy would enable the Western Powers to recover their own confidence and effectiveness, to regain the initiative from the Communists, and to restore in the world that image of western power and purpose which was theirs when, in the hours of victory in 1945 or at the peak of the Marshall plan in Europe, they acted as a functioning partnership, pursuing not simple defense and security but a positive vision of an expanding, prosperous world.

The last 6 months, during which Russian sputniks in the skies and Russian propaganda below have circled the globe, while the West sits hunched up in economic stagnation and political perplexity, have been a trial and tribulation to freemen everywhere. Nothing could so break the spell of stagnancy and restore energy and hope as a fully thought out, fully sustained, and accepted strategy for worldwide economic growth. The risks of inaction have never been so alarming; the political rewards of vision can never have been so great.

Dulles and Summit Conference

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WAYNE L. HAYS
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 3, 1958

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, in view of my contention that we have a foreign policy on a day-to-day basis the following article by Constantine Brown from the Washington Evening Star on Thursday, February 13, 1958, is interesting. It shows how Mr. Dulles has vacillated on the subject of a summit conference.

The article follows:

DULLES AND SUMMIT CONFERENCE—STATEMENT THAT FOREIGN-MINISTER TALKS AREN'T NECESSARILY CALLED SURPRISING

(By Constantine Brown)

The new summit political boulevard, lined all the way from Washington to Geneva (the prospective meeting place) with Judas trees, is being rapidly constructed. The meeting last Tuesday between President Eisenhower, with Secretary of State Dulles at his side, and Soviet Ambassador Mikhail Menshikov paved the way for the heads-of-state meeting long sought by Boss Krushchev. What new proposals the Soviet Ambassador was able to give our two policymakers is for the time being a well-kept secret. But at the press conference which followed the White House meeting almost immediately, Mr. Dulles announced, almost as casually as if he had said that he enjoys salmon fishing, that he sees no need for a conference of foreign ministers, preliminary to a summit meeting. This reversal surprised not only the newspapermen present but also a number of Senators who last week precipitated a debate on the Senate floor proclaiming their confidence in the Secretary of State's policies.

Nobody in this country opposes a conference which could bring about a relaxation of tensions and an end to the cold war which started within a few months after V–J day. What the American people are opposed to is another conference such as those at Yalta, Potsdam, and Geneva.

At each and everyone of those top level meetings the free world suffered serious losses and Communist tyranny gained either territorial or propaganda advantages.

President Eisenhower and Secretary Dulles are fully aware of the trickery and lack of faith on the part of the men in the Kremlin, be they Stalin, Molotov, Bulganin, or Khrushchev. Their tactics may differ. But their goals are the same, the destruction of the free world and its leader, the United States. After the lamentable failure of the Geneva Conference in 1955, President Eisenhower realized how badly he had burned his fingers. As a result of that sad experience he declared on numerous occasions that the Russians must prove by deeds their desire to relax the world tension before he would attend another meeting of heads of states.

Nowhere in Secretary Dulles' statement at the Tuesday press conference is there any mention that this essential condition is still a prerequisite to a top level meeting. According to White House and State Department sources, we shall insist that a number of substantive matters such as the unity of Germany be accepted in principle by the Kremlin before final arrangements to meet with Khrushchev and Bulganin are agreed on. It is hoped that President Eisenhower or Secretary Dulles will make a public statement to that effect in order to reassure the people here and in the countries determined to continue to fight communism that we are not taking the tortuous road of appeasement.

In the present international confusion, only those provided with rosy lenses can detect a genuine unity of purpose between this country and its major European allies. In the event of a Soviet provocation leading to a showdown, is it generally but reluctantly admitted we can count only on our own capabilities and on those of the minor allies such as the Turks, possibly the Greeks, and some of the Asians (Pakistan, Thailand, the Philippines, Nationalist China, and Korea).

Whatever the real meaning of last Tuesday's statement by the Secretary of State may have been, there is no question that America's faithful minor allies got the impression that we are following a diplomacy of "off again, on again, gone again, Finnegan." Such a policy is not conducive to the deep confidence required of international alliances these days.

Senators who rushed to Mr. Dulles' defense last week because the Kremlin told us in thinly veiled words that "Dulles must go" were surprised at what appears to have been a change in his position. The Secretary of State had told them that the actual work for a summit meeting must be made by the Foreign Ministers behind closed doors. It is they who establish definite agreements. The finished product is brought before the heads of states who sign it at a ceremonial meeting where toasts are drunk for a lasting friendship. Unless Foreign Ministers are able to come to some agreements on substantive questions, there can be no point for the heads of states to get together. The position, many of Mr. Dulles' supporters in the Senate feel, now appears abandoned.

Warning No. 5

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 3, 1958

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, the following item from the New York Herald Tribune of February 9, 1958, speaks for

itself; it is one of the many warning signs calling for immediate governmental action:

Business activity: The Herald Tribune index of general business declined for the seventh straight week, standing at 165.8 February 1 against 167.2 January 25 and 194.9 February 2, 1957.

Statement of Trinity County Delegation for Trinity Partnership Proposal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. HUBERT B. SCUDDER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 25, 1958

Mr. SCUDDER. Mr. Speaker, a three-man delegation representing the Trinity County Board of Supervisors opened up the recent hearings held by the House Interior and Insular Affairs Committee on the Trinity partnership bills.

They felt strongly enough on this issue to sacrifice time and money in directly appealing their case to legislators who will decide the fate of Trinity power.

The Trinity County Board of Supervisors has long endorsed joint development of the Trinity River Project over any all-Federal proposal. Not the least of reasons behind their past resolutions was the fact that Trinity supervisors are aware that Trinity County will collect additional taxes from P. G. & E. if this utility builds the power plants—that should the plants be constructed by the Federal Government, Trinity County will lose out on an added $236,100 each year in tax income from this one utility.

The official hearing statements of R. W. Brandes, Moon Lee, and John H. Steppling tell the Trinity story. I request that all three be included at this point in the RECORD as they were taken from the Weaverville Trinity Journal.

The statements follow:

STATEMENT OF DELEGATION AT WASHINGTON HEARING

(By R. W. Brandes)

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, my name is R. W. Brandes, and I live in Weaverville, Trinity County, Calif. Mr. Steppling, Mr. Lee and myself are here to testify before your committee at the request of the Trinity County Board of Supervisors on Public Law No. 386 and, more particularly, as to the partnership plan as recommended by the Department of Interior. I respectfully submit to you the following:

There are approximately 2 million acres of land that comprise Trinity County. Seventy-four and a fraction percent of this area is owned by the United States Government, and approximately 2 percent is owned by the State of California. This means that we in Trinity County have over 76 percent of our entire county exempt from local taxation. Our problem is and has been an adequate tax base to support our county. Our total county assessed valuation is just under $12,500,000. We do have a very difficult situation in endeavoring to run a county government with a tax base that is predicted on 24 percent of our entire land area.

We consider the development of power an industry, and if private enterprise were to develop this power it would create a new tax base that would be of tremendous economic value to our county. Therefore, this proposal represents a big industry in itself.

We must, because of the small area that constitutes our entire tax base, be always alert to all possibilities to increase this tax base. I was specifically requested by the chairman of the Trinity County Board of Supervisors to point out the following in respect to the original bill, H. R. 105, dated January 5, 1955, starting at page 5, line 7, section 4, and I quote as follows:

"The Secretary is authorized to make payments, from construction appropriations, to Trinity County, Calif., of such substantial additional costs of government as are incurred by it during the period of actual construction of the development and as are found by the Secretary to be properly attributable to and occasioned by said construction and to constitute an undue burden upon the county, including but not limited to (1) police, hospital, and welfare facilities, (2) the repair, maintenance, and replacement of existing roads, and (3) the establishment of new roads, meeting standards adopted by the American Association of State Highway Officials, which give access to the areas and communities adjacent to the project and reservoir sites, which roads shall include, though not be limited to, those giving the shortest practicable route from Weaverville to Lewiston, Weaverville to the vicinity of Trinity Center, and from the vicinity of Trinity Center to Tower House."

I now refer you to Public Law 386, approved August 12, 1955, and wish to quote as follows:

"That the Secretary is authorized and directed to continue to conclusion the engineering studies and negotiations with any nonfederal agency with respect to proposals to purchase falling water and not later than 18 months from the date of the enactment of this act report the results of such negotiations, including the terms of the proposed agreement, if any, that may be reached, together with his recommendations thereon, which agreement, if any, shall not become effective until approved by Congress."

It is primarily because of this clause that the Trinity County Board of Supervisors and many residents of Trinity County supported this bill.

Now the bill as passed does not provide us with assistance in police, hospital, and welfare facilities, all of which are of vital importance. It does and has, however, assisted us in the repair, maintenance, and replacement of existing roads. It also provides for an in-lieu tax, in that it authorized and directed the Secretary to pay to Trinity County annually on an in-lieu tax payment in an amount equal to the annual tax rate of the county applied to the value of the real property and improvement taken for project purposes.

However, we do lose tax base not gain because the aforementioned tax is to be paid on patented land acquired by the United States Government. This tax we have been previously collecting. However, approximately 44% of the total area which composed the Trinity River Diversion project was held by individuals as mining claims and we did collect a possessory interest tax on those mining claims upon which there were improvements. These taxes we will now lose, all of which adds to a net loss of tax base.

May I present the following figures: At present the annual tax paid to Trinity County by PG&E Company totals $161,000. Under the partnership plan, this amount would increase to an amount estimated to be $397,100. (This figure I secured from a representative of the PG&E Company). This is of course considerably less than the $2,562,000 paid to our neighboring county of Shasta this fiscal year, but it would nonetheless help us tremendously in overcoming the local problem of having 76% of our total area exempt from county taxation.

We in Trinity County understand that several incorporated areas as far down as the San Francisco area are interested in acquiring cheap power because they feel that the income they derive is important to their cities. Unquestionably it is and, in all probability, it would remove a tax burden from the taxpayers in their communities. However, we feel it would be at our expense, and taxwise it is my opinion that we are infinitely more distressed than most, if not all of these municipalities. I might further state that I am of the opinion that this could not be construed as being a democratic procedure, because if the power facilities were developed by the Federal Government it would prevent the county from collecting needed taxes that we would derive under the partnership plan in order to benefit a few communities elsewhere.

In the event you gentlemen should recommend the partnership proposal as recommended by the Department of Interior, it is my opinion that it would be the financial salvation of Trinity, the county of origin of the Trinity River Diversion Project.

BY MOON LEE

Honorable Mr. Chairman and Members of the Committee, I am Moon Lee, a third generation member of a pioneer family of Trinity County. I was born and raised in Weaverville and lived there all my life, near the site of the Trinity River projects.

I am one of the representatives of the Trinity County board of supervisors, also a member and past president of the Weaverville Chamber of Commerce, the North Fork Grange, and a delegate to the Inter-Chamber of Commerce of Northern California, of which I am a past president.

The interchamber comprises 6 counties—Siskiyou, Modoc, Lassen, Trinity, Shasta, and Tehama—and has 16 individual chambers of commerce.

The interchamber, the North Fork Grange, and the Weaverville Chamber have passed resolutions favoring partnership.

I worked with Hon. CLAIR ENGLE in securing the passage of Public Law No. 386. As you know, this law provides for diversion of much water from our county for the use of many people in other counties of the State to fulfill their needs.

We are giving up much water, a good natural resource, and we have a chance to be repaid.

The Secretary of the Interior, as Congress directed, offered to negotiate with any one Federal agency to purchase falling water. The negotiations with P. G. & E. have shown the biggest benefit to repay our county for our giving up this water.

The Trinity bill in section 4 says this, in part:

"Provided, that a first preference, to the extent of 25 percent of such additional energy, shall be given, under reclamation law to preference customers in Trinity County, Calif. * * *"

There are no preference customers in our county.

Only 2 months ago Congressman ENGLE appeared before our board of supervisors and urged the creation of a public utility district which would distribute this 25 percent of Trinity power. He told the board that this power would in effect be a $1 million-a-year gift to the county (Sacramento Bee, November 23, 1957).

The board chose to ignore Mr. ENGLE's suggestion and, instead, reaffirmed its support of the Trinity partnership proposal.

Forming a utility district and going into the power business is not practical in Trinity County.

The county has only 8,000 people spread over 2 million acres. It would be too expensive to build transmission lines for this.

Trinity County is much larger than either Rhode Island or Delaware.

Gentlemen, just put yourself in my position as a resident of the county in which this project is located. Wouldn't you come here today and urge a careful and thorough study in favor of the partnership plan?

We are not making this plea only for P. G. & E. or any other private agency. We are not interested in whether they make or lose money. We are interested only in what is best for Trinity County. We need this tax base. It would be a perpetual source of income to our county. It will always be there.

BY JOHN H. STEPPLING

My name is John H. Steppling. I am publisher of the Weekly Trinity Journal, fourth oldest newspaper in California—established in 1856 during the rough and tumble world of the Gold Rush Days. Down through the years, as a guide and principal outline of policy, is a statement originating in the first issue over a century ago and still on the masthead: Independent in Politics and Devoted to the Best Interests of Trinity County. Gentlemen, that is why I have asked permission to appear before your committee as, in my opinion, the proposed partnership would be in the best interests of Trinity County.

As an official representative of the Board of Supervisors of Trinity County, my remarks will pertain primarily to the county.

The county board has repeatedly gone on record favoring the partnership on the grounds of (1) increased tax base, and (2) would support private enterprise, an old American commodity. As men concerned with running the county government, they share the responsibility to establish a budget and set tax rates. In fact the board, as with most governmental agencies, is concerned with taxes and are constantly searching for additional sources of revenue to meet the expanding costs of government.

The offer of partnership by a private utility company in the Trinity River Division of the Central Valley project would bring hydroelectric plants within the borders of the county, plus substation and transmission lines. These facilities would go on the utility tax rolls, and subsequent taxes go to the county and to the schools and other special districts. The company's estimate of the cost of these facilities would be approximately $11 million. The partnership plan would add an estimated $236,100 to Trinity tax payments made by the Pacific Gas & Electric Co., bringing the total company tax payments to over $397,000.

Why is this important to Trinity County?

Our mountain county is located in the picturesque and colorful Trinity Alps. Geographically, it is a series of mountain ridges, interspersed with several small valleys, divided by the swift white-watered Trinity River plus high mountain lakes in old glacial cirques.

With a total land area of approximately 2 million acres, only 83,000 acres are nonforest. The county is impaled on one paved highway transversing east and west.

When the Journal was first started, gold was in its heyday. Millions of dollars' worth of gold has been taken out of its hills and valleys, but today at the pegged price of $35 an ounce, gold mining is unprofitable. Only one dredge is operating on the Trinity now. This dredge is working on land to be inundated by the Trinity project and will soon be another ghost of the things that once were. Mining for other minerals is negligible, with only sand and gravel the principal source of revenue for mineral production.

Timber is our big industry. Our species include white fir, pine, and a scattering of incense cedar. Following the close of World War II, with the tremendous demand for lumber, the virgin forest of Trinity County was tapped. In the decade following, we reached maturity as the sustained yield of approximately 260 million board-feet of timber has been reached. These figures include both public lands and the acreage owned by the Southern Pacific Land Co.

As of now we share with the rest of the timber-producing areas the brunt of a depressed lumber market. As Vic Rose, owner of the mill in Weaverville, said, "If it only would be as bad as last summer, it would be an improvement."

The Trinity River project, while of a temporary nature, has provided work for many hundreds, and has given the county and adjacent areas a considerable shot in the arm, economically speaking. The project is big news for the county, and always will be.

Our mountain valleys now support a limited agricultural economy; any expansion would be marginal.

Recreation is our only potential. A recent survey by the California State Department of Water Resources stated: "Without a doubt, recreation use will ultimately be Trinity County's largest economic activity."

All the products produced within the county and all the needs or wants of the inhabitants come and go over one State highway and its feeder lines. We cannot expect any large timber-processing industry to come to the county, due to this transportation problem.

But we do have water. The Federal Government with the Trinity River diversion is sending water from the Trinity drainage through an 11-mile tunnel to the central valleys of California. The California water plan envisages a series of dams across the Trinity and its tributaries and other rivers in northwestern California. This water is to be diverted to the thirsty areas of the State. Trinity County has the dubious feature to be not only a county of origin, but also a county of reservoir, with a series of lakes from its granite peaks to the western grassland.

We can't sell the water. But hydroelectric power can be generated and sold. There has been a proposal that the county form a public utility district and sell its 25 percent reservation of project power throughout the county. We don't want to. The efficiency of modern business precludes our mountain county of ever attempting to launch such a project.

The partnership proposal represents one specific industry with reasonable perpetual source of taxes needed for Trinity County to continue to function as a unit of government. As a public utility, it is efficiently controlled by State laws.

This is a rough thumbnail sketch of the county and of some of the economic factors affecting it. It is background for the opinion of the board of supervisors, and also my opinion, that the partnership will serve the best interests of Trinity County.

In conclusion, to review the basic advantages:

1. Bring industry to Trinity County.
2. Provide stable tax base for future growth.
3. Outlay alone would save the Federal Government an estimated $55 million. In this missile age all sources of tax moneys should be made available to support our national program of preparedness.

The United Nations, the Middle East, and the Missile

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 3, 1958

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, for 60 years, the Creve Coeur Club of Peoria has commemorated the birthday of George Washington with a banquet and address by a prominent figure.

On this February 22 just past, I had the pleasure of again attending this banquet and the high privilege of listening to a most thought-provoking address by Sir Leslie Knox Munro, K. C. M. G., K. C. V. O., president of the 12th session of the General Assembly of the United Nations and New Zealand Ambassador to the United States.

The address, entitled, "The United Nations, the Middle East, and the Missile," follows:

THE UNITED NATIONS, THE MIDDLE EAST, AND THE MISSILE

I have chosen the title of this address "Is Peace Possible Through the United Nations?" with some deliberateness because I have the honor of addressing members of an important organization in the United States, many of whom may be expected to share the hopes and expectations that I know so many millions of Americans nourish for the United Nations. Many judge it by its foremost objective: its capacity to maintain peace. I have often said that I am almost equally concerned with those who expect too much of the United Nations as with those who expect too little.

I would like you to take a middle view of the organization's possibilities; to realize that, while the United Nations is indispensable for world order and peace, it is only an instrument of the nations and cannot do more than its member governments are willing that it should do. Even a majority, as the case of Hungary has shown, cannot do more sometimes than express moral disapprobation. So long as that is the case, every member state in this imperfect world is justified in insisting upon the fundamental significance of power. It will forget this significance at its peril.

The United Nations is not a supraworld organization, and, indeed, the nations have surrendered little of their sovereignty to it. For a very long time to come sovereign states based on nationality will continue; indeed, you will be aware that a section of the people of this country is very much concerned lest United States sovereignty should be diminished by treaties, and, after all, the United States is a member of the United Nations by virtue of a document which is in effect a treaty, ratified, of course, by the Senate.

Had a military force been created for the United Nations pursuant to certain enabling clauses of the charter, then the use of this force for the purpose of preserving peace would have meant a substantial diminution of sovereignty so far as the smaller powers were concerned. But the force could never have been used against any of the great powers save with the consent of that power, which of course would never have been given. Unfortunately, due to the intransigence of the Soviet Union the international force intended to be created by the framers of the charter has never come into being.

But we have not wholly failed. The Assembly has done something of what the Security Council has been unable to do. The Assembly, by creating the United Nations Emergency Force, has established a police force in the Gaza Strip and in the area of Sharm al Shaikh and thereby has preserved peace in 2 strategic places.

The principal body, or organ as it is called, for the maintenance of international peace and security was intended by the framers of the charter to be the Security Council. The members of the United Nations have agreed to accept and carry out the decisions of the Security Council made in accordance with the charter. You all well know that the work of the Security Council has been largely frustrated by the

Soviet's constant and indiscriminate use of the veto.

The very basis of the framework of the world organization was the hope and expectation that the great powers, principally the United States, the United Kingdom, and the Soviet Union, would maintain the unity which they had displayed in varying degrees during the last great war. So far as the Soviet Union was concerned that unity was far from always sure, but substantially it lasted until the defeat of Germany and Japan. It is fair to say that no one of these three great powers would have entered the new world organization without the right of veto in the Security Council. Mr. Churchill, Mr. Roosevelt, and Field Marshal Smuts all realized that if the United Nations was to have a chance of success, the Soviet Union had to be a member. The field marshal thought that there was a reasonable expectation that with the joint power and influence of the United States and the United Kingdom the Soviet Union would be reasonable and would not follow a policy divergent from that of its two great wartime allies.

It is the misfortune of the world that this expectation has not been realized.

I would not have the work of the Security Council altogether minimized in spite of Russia's constant use of the veto. Thus, when Soviet troops persisted in remaining in the Iranian province of Azerbaijan, the United States Government let it be known through its representatives on the Security Council that if these troops were not withdrawn the United States would take action. This was sufficient to persuade the Russians to effect the withdrawal.

Then, of course, there is the celebrated case in 1950 of the invasion of Southern Korea by Northern Korean troops. The Security Council was immediately summoned. Fortunately for the world, the Russians made a mistake on this occasion and deliberately absented themselves from this historic meeting of the Council. The Council was thereby enabled to pass a resolution condemning the attack as a breach of the peace and recommending joint action by the members of the United Nations for the purpose of repelling the attack and restoring international peace. You will note that in this particular case the Council acted by way of recommendation only. It did not carry out its policy by means of a decision, which in terms of the charter would have been binding on all the members. A recommendation has only a persuasive effect, but the persuasive effect was considerable and 16 member nations joined in halting the aggression, and under the leadership of the United States eventually, as you know, hurled the aggressors, who finally included the Chinese back beyond the 38th parallel.

Great as was the cost in life and treasure of the Korean conflict, the United Nation's victory over the Northern Koreans and the Chinese was both a success for the democracies and a triumph for the United Nations itself.

The Russians speedily realized their mistake in not attending the Council, and I am afraid therefore that any future action of the nature taken in 1950 would be met by a Soviet veto in the Council. Indeed, this is precisely what happened in 1956 when the Soviet Union so brutally intervened to crush the brave people of Hungary. A resolution of the Security Council calling upon the Russians to remove their troops from Hungary was countered by a Soviet veto.

However, the United Nations is not wholly stultified under such circumstances. On November 3, 1950, the General Assembly adopted three resolutions of which the most famous is called the Uniting for Peace Resolution. The essential part of this resolution provides that if the Security Council, because of the lack of unanimity of its permanent members, fails to exercise its primary responsibility for the maintenance of international peace and security in any case where there appears to be a threat to the peace, a breach of the peace, or an act of aggression, then the General Assembly shall consider the matter immediately. The object of the Assembly will then be to make appropriate recommendations to members for collective measures. If there is a breach of the peace or an act of aggression these measures will include the use of armed force where necessary to maintain or restore international peace and security. Of course, the General Assembly might not be in session at the time. If that is the case, the Assembly may meet in emergency special session within 24 hours of a request for its meeting.

The Russians were once in the habit of querying the validity of the Uniting for Peace Resolution, but when it was invoked against Britain, France, and Israel at the time of the Suez crisis and following the British and French veto in the Security Council, the Russians found it convenient to fall in with the procedure of the Uniting for Peace Resolution and voted with those who requested the British, French, and Israeli forces to leave Egyptian territory. You will know that Britain, France, and Israel were responsive to the request of the Assembly and, heeding considerable world opinion, did evacuate their forces.

Nothing like this happened with the Russians following their invasion of Hungary and their veto in the Security Council. They flouted and still flout the resolutions of the Assembly calling upon them to remove their forces from Hungarian territory. They flouted and still flout the resolutions of the Assembly pursuant to the uniting for peace procedure, ostensibly because these resolutions involve interference with the domestic affairs of Hungary.

I am aware many people say that the Assembly sanctioned a double standard of morality in its attitude toward the Soviet Union over Hungary in contrast with its action toward the United Kingdom, France, and Israel over Egypt. Let me, with respect to this, quote some observations made by the distinguished Canadian statesman, Mr. Lester Pearson, who took such a leading part in the Assembly in 1956 and 1957 over the crises in the Middle East and Hungary. This is what he has said:

"Undoubtedly there is a question of a double standard of morality involved. It is a perplexing and worrying aspect of the matter. But it is not the United Nations as a body but certain of its members who are guilty of trying to establish this double standard. The Assembly, as a body has followed the same procedure in regard to Hungary and to Egypt. It requested the U. S. S. R. to withdraw from Hungary and the United Kingdom, France, and Israel to withdraw from Egypt. The Russians treated United Nations resolutions with contempt, and the other members (even though their actions were in no ways comparable with the aggression of the Soviet Union) complied. Is the guilt for this varied response to be placed on the United Nations Assembly? Or is it, on the contrary, to be placed squarely on Russia, where it belongs?

"To attack the United Nations as an institution for failing to save Hungary from Russia is misleading and perhaps unfair. The attack is based to some extent on the erroneous impression that the African-Asian group refused to condemn Soviet action in Hungary after having denounced the British and French Governments over Egypt. It is true that some members of this group were slow to recognize the brutal nature of Soviet aggression and inclined to suspect a deliberate effort to divert their attention from Egypt. When it was clear to them, however, what was happening, the great majority of them strongly denounced Soviet action, and only the hard-core Arabs abstained from the condemnation which was voted.

"The reason the United Nations did not save Hungary was that it could not; not that it would not. The fault lies not in the Organization as such, but in the hard facts of Soviet policy and the cold war, with peace balanced precariously on the edge of the atomic deterrent.

"It would be rash, and might be fatal, if we tried on all occasions to take U. N. enforcement action in order to see that justice is always done without any regard to the consequences; or without, to be perfectly frank, any regard to the big blunt fact of the Red Army. We certainly must not become the prisoners of our fears, for if we do our diplomacy is doomed, and the future would be grim indeed. But neither must we indulge in threats and gestures which may provide an easy escape for our emotions, but cannot be followed up by effective action. In the case of Hungary, for instance, if we had intervened through the United Nations by force, the first victims would have been the Hungarians themselves, and the rest of the world might have followed into the abyss."

It cannot be too often emphasized that the United Nations is plagued by the division of the world between the Communist states and the democracies. The hard reality, which we would obscure at our peril, is that the United Nations must do its work in a divided world, a world in which mankind has for too long been without dependable safeguards against the catastrophe of total war.

As I see it—and my tenure of office as president of the 12th session of the Assembly has confirmed me in my belief—it is this division of the world and the ideological struggle from which it grows which remains the central issue, overshadowing all others. This division, with its complex of action and reaction, its combination of pressure and resistance, of threat and counterthreat, has, since 1946, reduced the effectiveness of the United Nations, particularly through the veto of the Security Council, and restricted the capacity of the organization to realize its charter potentialities. It has cast in jeopardy the security of the uncommitted no less than the contestants and made them all its victims. It has given local and regional disputes a universal significance, perpetuating old antagonisms, creating new ones, complicating the solution of every one of them. Its consequences are not circumscribed: they range beyond the domain of politics, multiplying controversy even at the limits of intergovernmental contract.

But its corrosive effects are most directly felt in the political arena. This has been so at all previous sessions of the General Assembly; and the 12th session has been no exception.

Painful as is the effect of the ideological division of the world which still persists, I hope that you will agree with me that we must still persist, both inside and outside the United Nations, to settle the many problems which produce such a state of tension today and which, unresolved, could lead to war. Principal among them is the question of disarmament. This has been discussed in the United Nations ever since its foundation. Disarmament was discussed year after year in the League, and it was discussed in other places before the First World War. The path of these discussions is strewn with failures, but these failures with their melancholy consequences are warnings to us, especially in the nuclear and spatial age, to persist in our endeavors.

I believe that the world organization will continue to be the best forum for a solution of the problem. Private conferences between the great powers will not thereby be precluded.

I make no apology for discussing the crucial question of disarmement, for the solu-

tion of this problem by the United Nations would be the prelude to peace. I shall commence with a statement of a famous Spanish scholar and statesman, Senor S. de Madariaga, made as long ago as 1932:

"When the animals met to discuss disarmament, the lion looked the eagle in the eye and said, 'We must abolish talons.' The eagle looked squarely back into the lion's eyes and said, 'We must abolish claws.' Then the bear said, "Let's abolish everything except universal embraces.' "

It is the question of universal embraces from the bear which is principally concerning us today.

The truth, the unhappy truth, is that our last session began with a deadlock on disarmament, and has ended—at least, as matters stand today—with a deadlock.

Disarmament has a long and discouraging history in the United Nations. Since 1946, except for a period between 1950 and 1952, when the Soviet Union boycotted the negotiating bodies because of its objections to sitting down with the Chinese representatives, the great powers have been trying, with varying degrees of persistence, to reach agreement on a system for the regulation of armaments.

One landmark in the negotiations was the formulation of the Baruch plan, in 1947, when the United States was the only possessor of the atomic bomb. This plan would have created an international authority having the sole ownership of fissionable materials and empowered to ensure that atomic energy was being used only for peaceful purposes. The Soviet Union, which was working to develop its own nuclear weapons, rejected the Baruch plan, principally, as I understand it, because it was unwilling to make the considerable sacrifice of sovereignty needed to make the plan work. Instead, the Soviet campaigned for a ban on the use of atomic weapons and the destruction of existing stockpiles. This campaign made no concessions to the western views on the crucial problem of control and inspection.

At the beginning of 1952, the General Assembly set up a new body to deal with disarmament. This was the Disarmament Commission, made up of the 11 members of the Security Council, plus Canada. In 1954, after the Assembly had recommended that the powers principally concerned meet in private in a smaller group, the Commission formed a subcommittee of five members, the United States, the Soviet Union, the United Kingdom, France, and Canada. The subcommittee has met each year; and each year the General Assembly has debated its reports, heard the proposals of the great powers and of other countries and called on it to resume its efforts to find agreement.

Each year, as nuclear armouries have grown, and with them the threat of nuclear annihilation, the pressure has mounted within and outside the Assembly for at least a first move toward disarmament.

This pressure was reflected in the work of the subcommittee, which met last year in London, practically in continuous session, for 5 months. A number of encouraging advances were made, and there was some narrowing of differences. These advances should not be minimized. But the meetings ended with the Soviet rejecting a set of western proposals for a balanced first-stage disarmament program. There was widespread hope that this immediate reaction might be modified after the western offer had been considered in more detail by the Soviet Union and examined in the General Assembly. As far as the Assembly was concerned, both the western powers and the Soviet Union, along with the great majority of United Nations members, were in agreement that disarmament should be accorded the first priority at the 12th session.

It was against this background, and in the expectation that a great deal of attention would be devoted to the subject that I referred to disarmament in my first statement as president of the Assembly. With your indulgence, I should like to recall, in part, what I said on that occasion:

"It seems pertinent to refer to the universal concern which has accompanied the world's latest and most awesome technological revolution. The advent of the nuclear age offers the greatest promise and the greatest threat in human history. It is natural that close attention should be devoted to strengthening cooperation in the use of atomic energy for peaceful purposes. * * * It is natural also that the problem of disarmament should be given a prominent place in the deliberations of this Assembly. Time is not on our side. It is not necessary for me to stress the urgency of the problem, nor to dwell on its formidable difficulties. Surely we must all share the conviction that the need to reach a sound and workable agreement, however limited it may be in its initial state, becomes more pressing with every increase in the enormously destructive power of modern weapons."

These sentiments, I think, found a ready echo in the Assembly, both during the general debate and in the Political and Security Committee, which discussed the disarmament problem for almost a month. I have been struck throughout by the interest and sense of responsibility displayed by the small powers in respect of this dominating and terrifying problem.

All the major explanations of policy put forward in the Assembly emphasized the frightful dangers of further delay in checking the armaments race. The diagnosis of the evil was made in the most compelling terms.

Manifestations of concern were by no means confined to the three nuclear powers; and spokesmen from all continents joined in urging the necessity of an accord on a problem which Mr. Krishna Menon, for India, described as one of human survival. The recognition that all countries, great or small, must share the consequences of failure to end the nuclear stalemate found eloquent expression in the speech Mr. Eban of Israel made in the Political Committee:

"Neither vastness of territory, nor remoteness of situation, nor the separating shield of oceans, now offers security to any nation in the event of general war. Every nation is bound to every other nation in a covenant of mutual vulnerability. To believe in the ultimate possibility of a disarmament agreement no longer requires confidence in anyone's good faith. It is necessary only to believe that all powers have an equal passion for survival."

Nor were the economic consequences of competitive armaments overlooked. The representative of Indonesia, for example, gave voice—to use his own words—to "the deep concern of a nation which feels acutely the negative influences of the armaments race. As an underindustrialized nation emerging from the wasteland of our colonial past, the continuance of the armaments race would mean not merely giving up the possibility of a higher standard of living but even giving up the possibility of achieving a decent standard of living for our people."

The Foreign Minister of Ireland pointed to the danger of war inherent in the potential threat which each of the two tremendous concentrations of power represents for the other and cautioned against undue optimism regarding the outcome of disarmament talks. He also said—and I should like to quote his words:

"Where there is a vital conflict of interests, or mutual fear of deadly violence, between 2 set of human beings, peace can only be maintained in 1 or 2 ways: By the acceptance of the rule of law or by the superior force of a third party. We are all now in the inescapable dilemma that we have no third party except the collective judgment of mankind represented in this Assembly; unless we now make rapid progress toward the rule of law, we may soon have drifted past the last opportunity to prevent the use of ultimate weapons."

The disarmament subcommittee, as I have indicated, broke up its talks in London without reaching agreement. The positions taken by both sides—the Western Powers and the Soviet Union—were reasserted in the General Assembly; and although efforts were made by a small group of delegations to have the Assembly avoid a choice between the two sets of proposals put to it, the Assembly endorsed, by a large majority, the program sponsored by the western group.

As I understand it, the basic point at issue is the Soviet demand for an immediate end to the testing of nuclear weapons, to be followed by a general disarmament agreement, which is in conflict with the western position that the suspension of tests should not be isolated from other measures of partial disarmament, particularly the stopping of the manufacture of nuclear materials for use in weapons.

The six points in the western plan, which the Western Powers regard as fair to the security interests of both sides and fully capable of control, are as follows:

1. A suspension of test explosions as soon as a partial disarmament treaty is concluded;

2. An end to the production of fissionable materials for military purposes;

3. The reduction of armed forces and conventional armaments to agreed levels;

4. A beginning in the conversion of nuclear stocks to peaceful uses;

5. Guaranties against the possibility of surprise attack;

6. The use of outer space missiles exclusively for peaceful and scientific purposes.

In the Assembly, the Soviet Union maintained its opposition to this plan, which, in its view, unnecessarily complicated the simple question of ending tests. In the Soviet opinion, an end of tests would remove a serious health hazard and make the resolution of other disarmament problems less difficult. The Indian delegation, and a number of others, also argued strenuously that an end to tests should not wait upon a disarmament agreement. In the debate in the Political Committee, Mr. Krishna Menon drew on a large number of scientific opinions to support his Government's belief that the genetic hazards of radiation made it imperative to suspend tests.

This approach attracted only limited support, although there was no lack of concern—and, indeed, the expression of much genuine anxiety—about the long-term effects on man and his environment if tests were not brought to an end. But the great majority in the Assembly agreed with the western view that the real danger lay, not in tests in time of peace, but in the possible use of nuclear weapons for war. The West was convinced that the suspension of tests should be linked with what one delegate aptly termed the more fundamental problem of arresting and turning back the morbid tide of nuclear manufacture. The essential need was to check the nuclear arms race. The suspension of tests, carried out as an isolated measure, would in fact tend to endanger the balance of security. Those powers which had nuclear weapons and which had tested them could go on making them. Nor would there be anything to stop other countries from building up their own supplies of these hideous devices and from bringing about the situation to which Mr. Dulles referred when he spoke in the Assembly about the spread of nuclear weapons promiscuously

throughout the world, giving irresponsible persons a power for evil that is appalling even to contemplate.

As the apprehension that the radioactitivy from tests might reach dangerous proportions, the western spokesmen reaffirmed their deep concern to avoid even the slightest risk. They believed, however, that the possible dangers to human health must be kept in true proportion, against the background of the total effects of radiation from all sources. A scientific committee had been set up by the Assembly to investigate the problem. Its report was due in 1958, and this was expected to answer many of the urgent questions that had arisen concerning radiation.

The second element of the Soviet response to the western 6-point offer was the proposal for an absolute and unconditional ban on the use of nuclear weapons for an initial period of 5 years.

This raises the vital question of control and inspection which, I believe, lies at the heart of the differences between the West and the Soviet Union. For the West, to use Mr. Selwyn Lloyd's words, "Sham agreements, paper declarations, vague promises, are no good." It seems to me axiomatic that the deepseated distrust between the two sides—distrust springing from the long and bitter experience of 10 years' tension between the democracies and the countries making up the Communist system—demands the imposition of foolproof and knaveproof controls as a fundamental precondition to any worthwhile scheme of disarmament. The history of the postwar years, in too many areas of crisis, weighs heavily against the acceptance of unenforceable undertakings. If disarmament, however limited, is one means of building confidence, it seems equally true that the first stages must be completed in the absence of confidence. To insist that controls are not possible without confidence, that inspection is tantamount to espionage, is to condemn future disarmament talks indefinitely to the arid realms of propaganda.

The upshot of the debate, as I have said, was the approval of the western program in the Assembly by 56 votes to 9. The opposition was confined to the Soviet Union and its supporters. Eighteen delegations abstained. The proposals to end tests unconditionally were defeated.

There was, however, another important, and disturbing, development. I refer to the Soviet Union's decision to take no further part in the work of the Disarmament Commission and its subcommittee as then constituted. Intensive efforts were made after this was announced to find a formula which would increase the size of the Commission (without making it unworkable) and persuade the Soviet Union to change its mind. After days of negotiation and maneuver, a proposal, which was widely regarded as the ultimate limit of concession, was presented to the Assembly. This would add 14 more members to the commission, bringing its members to 25. The new members were of varying political hues and they appeared to represent the varying views of the world community. Just before the vote, Albania presented an amendment designed to destroy the new balance and to add another 7 to the enlarged commission: 2 of these were eastern European countries and the other 5 uncommitted or neutral countries. This amendment wrecked the larger initiative: the Albanian proposal was rejected; the 25-power commission was established, but the Soviet Union reverted to its earlier insistence on a Disarmament Commission made up of the whole Assembly and announced that it would have no part of the new body.

The impasse, on substance and procedure, therefore seems complete. The 12th Assembly began in apparent deadlock; it seems to have ended in double deadlock.

These dispiriting developments, accompanied by the recent evidence of the Soviet Union's impressive technological advances will, I should imagine, strengthen the cynical in their belief that talk about disarmament will get nobody anywhere and will multiply the prophets of doom who have already, in their minds, written the world off.

My answer is again: we must persist. The stakes are survival or destruction.

For let me say to you, we are indeed entering upon a new and amazing time. A little over 300 years ago there was no civilized man in this northern continent to comprehend the message of another era which, since Columbus, has transformed our times. But now, here, everywhere, a man throughout the world, if he has even the beginnings of education, knows that because a sputnik has circled the globe, human beings have the capacity to emerge from the limited universe we know and reach the moon and perhaps the stars. Is not that extraordinarily wonderful? And does it not constitute a terrific challenge to our leaders today and to those, tomorrow, who will give us our leaders of the future?

What are we going to do with it all? And where, too, and when, will we deal with this overwhelming problem?

As for when, I think that there is not too much time to go. The advent of sputnik means that very soon an intercontinental ballistic missile can traverse its terrible course. Surely that is a miserable use of a great discovery.

Where can we solve the problem of the spatial age? Is there any other place than in the United Nations? Already, the resolution of the last Assembly has declared, among other matters, that a disarmament agreement should be reached which will provide for the joint study of an inspection system designed to insure that the sending of objects through outer space shall be exclusively for peaceful and scientific purposes.

The President of this country, in his message of January 12 to Mr. Bulganin, has proposed that the United States and Russia should agree that outer space should be used only for peaceful purposes. Mr. Eisenhower said very forcefully that we face a decisive moment in history in relation to this matter and now is the time to stop using outer space for the testing of missiles designed for military purposes.

I believe that the only arena, in which this tremendous question can be debated and resolved, is the Assembly of the United Nations. I do not mean, far from it, that there should be lack of preparation for deliberation in the Assembly on the subject. I have in mind something in the nature of the conference of atomic scientists who met at Geneva before the International Atomic Energy Agency was eventually established. I think that scientists and diplomats should have a preliminary meeting on the prospects of the spatial age as soon as possible, so that in the Assembly we may usefully consider, with the benefit of their expert deliberations, the future of man in a spatial world.

Break This Bottleneck and Case for Another Judge

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. CARLTON LOSER

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 3, 1958

Mr. LOSER. Mr. Speaker, I wish to call to the attention of the House a condition in the United States District Court for the Middle District of Tennessee, that is well-nigh intolerable.

An editorial in the columns of the Nashville, Tenn., Banner and a news article in the Nashville Tennessean point up the need for an additional judge in middle Tennessee.

Since the death of Judge Elmer Davies all the work in this division of Tennessee has been done by Judge William E. Miller. The March term of the court began yesterday with 252 new cases on the docket—civil and criminal. There is a heavy backlog of cases carried over.

Nashville and middle Tennessee are entitled to an additional Federal district judge and I commend the reading of this editorial and news article to the very distinguished and able chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary, the Honorable EMANUEL CELLER, and his great committee. They follow:

[From the Nashville (Tenn.) Banner]

BREAK THIS BOTTLENECK

The March term of Federal court begins Monday with 252 new cases on the docket—criminal and civil—for which trial dates must be set.

That is in the middle Tennessee district, with one judge, William E. Miller, presiding.

There are in the Federal building two court rooms—with all the appointments and physical fittings for two divisions, to halve the work (theoretically) for each. But there is only one judge because Congress still has not created the additional judgeships that have been promised.

The 252 new cases are that in fact. Extra to that is the heavy backlog of cases unfinished and carried over, some of them as much as 2 years old, because it is impossible for one judge to keep abreast of this accumulating litigation. There isn't time in a single court for that.

However efficient, however robust, however dedicated, there are limits to what any judge can do.

In justice to all concerned, Congress should break the House Judiciary Committee bottleneck where this needed law creating new judgeships is gathering dust. Chairman Emanuel Celler is not rendering a public service by sitting on that bill. It should be jarred loose and passed.

[From the Nashville (Tenn.) Tennessean]

CASE FOR ANOTHER JUDGE

(By Nellie Kenyon)

Federal District Judge William E. Miller will face a hopeless situation when he starts the March term of court. There simply isn't enough time to try all of his cases.

While Congress ponders the question of creating a new Federal judgeship for the middle Tennessee district, hundreds of cases are pigeonholed waiting for some solution.

It probably would take 3 or 4 years for one judge to try the nearly 400 pending civil cases, plus the task of keeping up with the influx of only the new criminal cases.

Judge Miller has initiated pretrials and motion days in an effort to alleviate the backlog. This has helped some, but it will take the creation of another judgeship to solve the problem.

The absurdity of the situation is reflected in the fact that there are only 126 days available for trying cases during the March term, yet there are 255 civil and criminal cases listed on the call dockets in the Nashville division alone.

HAS TWO OTHER COURTS

The district judge is required to hold court in two other divisions in the middle Tennessee districts, Columbia and Cookeville. It may be assumed that there will be at least

100 cases on the call dockets in these districts.

There are bound to be at least 355 cases on the March criminal calendar and civil docket in all three divisions.

It is reasonable to suppose that half of them may never reach trial.

But the fact remains that it is impossible for the court to try even half the cases in the 126 days available.

The only obvious alternative to the impossible situation is that many of the cases listed on the March criminal calendars and civil call dockets will have to be carried over to the October term. How many is anyone's guess.

Several income-tax evasion cases are on the March criminal calendar for a trial date to be set where pleas of not guilty are entered.

A civil trial especially set for first 3 days in April likely will require a couple of weeks to try. Two suits have been combined in this case to conserve time. They involve suits of $500,000 each filed by Edward Lamb, Erie, Pa., newspaper publisher and radio station owner, in damages against Pat Sutton, former United States Representatives from Tennessee; WSM, Inc., and National Life Insurance Co.; and against Sutton and WLAC and Life & Casualty Insurance Co. Lamb alleges slander resulting from a radio-TV talkathon conducted by Sutton during a political campaign.

Aside from cases on the March call dockets there is a backlog of some 400 condemnation cases, some pending for several years. These suits grew out of the Government's condemnation of land for Old Hickory Dam and other similar projects.

Foreign Aid Whingding

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WAYNE L. HAYS
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 3, 1958

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Cleveland Plain Dealer on the foreign-aid whingding sponsored by Eric Johnston, which I think is worthy of reading:

FOREIGN AID WHINGDING

Washington reporters said they had never seen anything like it. Some 1,500 business and political leaders gathered in Washington for an all day and evening clinic on foreign aid, addressed by an all-star cast headed by President Eisenhower, former President Truman, Vice President Nixon, and Adlai Stevenson. It was like a Hollywood spectacular. And why not? For masterminding the affair was Eric Johnston, president of the Motion Picture Association of America.

It was openly and frankly a lobbying performance of great magnitude. Those who attended—at their own expense—and those who put up the money for the luncheon and dinner were told in no uncertain terms to go back home and talk up the administration's $3,900,000,000 foreign-aid program in an effort to put pressure on Congress to accept it.

After the meeting, the acting chairman of the House Foreign Affairs Committee, Representative MORGAN, Democrat, of Pennsylvania, said "a terrific job" would have to be done on the public and on Members of Congress if a substantial part of the program is to be salvaged.

Representative MORGAN is right. It will have to be a "terrific job" because large numbers of Americans are skeptical of the idea of foreign aid. They are wondering whether the $60 billion we have lavished on foreign aid since the end of World War II isn't enough and whether these handouts must be continued in perpetuity.

Why are people skeptical? For one thing they see us more and more becoming involved in entangling alliances. We give arms to Tunisia, and France takes offense. France bombs a town in Tunisia and the whole Arab world, as well as the Communists, accuse us of supplying the planes. Who can tell whether the planes used in the raid were bought from us by the French or given by us to them and what difference does it make if they were American planes?

In other words, the countries we have given aid to do not always remain friendly among themselves. Other examples are the Arab countries and Israel, Turkey and Greece, the Netherlands and Indonesia.

Moreover, there is no guarantee that the recipients of our aid will remain friendly to us. In some cases there is a suspicion of outright blackmail—"give us aid or we'll go Communist." And there is a great deal of skepticism about giving aid, especially military aid, to an outright Communist country like Yugoslavia. Finally, examples of foolishness and wastefulness are always turning up.

Some foreign aid will probably be necessary as long as it is our policy to maintain military bases all over the world. But Congress should not—and probably will not, in spite of Eric Johnston's spectacular—buy the entire foreign-aid package sight unseen. It should examine every project on its merits and approve only those it finds to be sound.

Samuel Cardinal Stritch

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES A. BOYLE
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 3, 1958

Mr. BOYLE. Mr. Speaker, at the suggestion of the dean of the Illinois delegation, Hon. THOMAS J. O'BRIEN, and on behalf of all of the Members of Illinois I take the floor to pay tribute to the most recent honor accorded His Eminence, Samuel Cardinal Stritch, outstanding religious prelate of Chicago. Our fair city is the seat of the largest Roman Catholic diocese in the United States. We congratulate him on his advance and wish him all success in his new role as the first American-born cardinal to be elevated to the Roman curia, the central government of the Roman Catholic Church. Cardinal Stritch was named pro-prefect of the Roman Catholic faith. This agency supervises the spread of the faith to the missionary areas of the world. That such a singular honor should be bestowed upon His Eminence is no mere coincidence. In our city of Chicago he has been called the cardinal of charity, stemming from his welfare efforts in orphanages and in hospitals of his archdiocese which treats upward of 200,000 patients annually. His energies and his efforts have added luster and stature as well as growth to the Stritch Medical School of Loyola University. His great devotion to the principles of education and higher learning have resulted in a woman's college and a Chicago high school named in his honor.

This man of unusual intelligence was ordained a priest at 22, and began a phenomenal rise, almost unheard of in ecclesiastical history. In 1917, he was made chancellor of the Nashville diocese; when 34 years of age, in 1921, he was appointed bishop of Toledo, Ohio, the youngest member of the church hierarchy in our country. In 1940, he was named archbishop of Chicago and raised to the rank of cardinal on December 23, 1945. Now, at the age of 70, His Eminence assumes jurisdiction of 25,000 missionary priests, 10,000 missionary lay brothers, and 60,000 missionary nuns on 5 continents, as well as 30 million Roman Catholics in Africa and Asia.

Cardinal Stritch with his demonstrated record of protector of the weak, guardian of the needy, and defender of the oppressed and their welfare will bring much intensity of purpose and love of hard work into an area which represents one of the most critical locations in the tournament for the battle of men's minds.

Pope Pius XII, the spiritual ruler of nearly half a billion Roman Catholics has done an honor to Chicago, to Illinois, and to the United States in singling out His Eminence Samuel Cardinal Stritch a true prince of the church, for such an honor.

Foreign Aid Farce

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN V. BEAMER
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 3, 1958

Mr. BEAMER. Mr. Speaker, in order that the Members of the Congress may learn the sentiments of Hoosiers on foreign aid, under unanimous consent, I include in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD editorials from the Indianapolis Star and Indianapolis News dated February 28:

[From the Indianapolis Star of February 28, 1958]

FOREIGN AID FARCE

The most accurate description we've heard of the White House Foreign Aid Conference this week came from Representative GROSS, of Iowa. "Democrats and Republicans," said GROSS, "at each others' throats over the weekend, plan a temporary truce during which they will bury their hatchets in the taxpayers' heads."

He is so right. This bipartisan extravaganza, played with all the stops pulled out, from God to mother to country and back again, was nothing but a gigantic attempt to bamboozle Congress and the American people into abstaining from all criticism or examination of foreign aid.

Participants, dominated by New York bankers and exporters and special interests, were told by Eric Johnston, the President's stooge, that they were there for a schooling. But they got slogans, not facts. They got propa-

ganda, not debate. The top political figures of both parties joined together in a massive attempt to silence all questioning of the huge $4 billion foreign aid request for next year.

Adlai Stevenson said that foreign aid was more important than missiles or atom bombs. Secretary of States Dulles said one reason for keeping up foreign aid was because it employs 600,000 people. All speakers but one told us that in this shrinking or complex or dangerous world we have to support and defend 73 out of the 106 nations we have been aiding, or disaster will follow.

But nobody raised this question: "How come, after spending $70 billion during 10 years on foreign aid, the Soviet Union is stronger and more threatening, the United States is weaker and less supported by our allies?" Why, when President Truman says we need bold new ideas, do we stick with the same old foreign aid program that failed to provide the Nation with either security or strength? If foreign aid is so good why hasn't it made things better for the American people?

All the speakers agreed that the American people are willing to spend all the money needed for national defense. They also agreed that the American people are not willing to spend more money for foreign aid—so they must be sold. It doesn't occur to them that the people oppose foreign aid because it didn't achieve what its supporters promised. Instead they are trying to pump hot air into a punctured balloon that is so full of holes it could never get off the ground.

Nobody pointed out this fact, either: The State Department has $9 billion in leftover funds which could be spent for foreign aid this year. If we add $4 billion more that will make $13 billion available. Douglas Dillon did admit, when asked by one excited lady if the $4 billion would be enough, that it would provide all the money we could spend for foreign aid.

Every speaker stressed the point that the real problem abroad is not military, it is economic and political. Yet the administration budget proposes three times as much money for military activities as for economic. How come? Even if the State Department is kidding the people and Congress by calling some economic aid "defense support"—as seems likely—the bulk of aid is still military, not economic.

President Eisenhower calls those of us who stress these persistent facts "ostriches," and implies that we are somehow betraying our country for opposing a program that has failed, is wasteful, is mismanaged and costly. But wasn't it the President himself who said in 1952, when we elected him, "The United States cannot be an Atlas; it cannot, by its financial sacrifices, carry all other nations on its shoulders and we should stop giveaway programs." What happened since 1952 to persuade the President that the foreign aid program works? Are our allies united? Is Russia weaker? Is the United States stronger by comparison than 5 years ago? Adlai Stevenson says, "The Soviets are succeeding in India and the Middle East" and in other parts of the world. But they have spent only $2 billion since 1950 and we have spent $50 billion. If foreign spending makes us successful against the Russians, how does one explain these figures?

Dulles says we have to keep up foreign-aid spending because the Soviets are now increasing their loan and aid programs. Foreign aid prevents communism, he says. But if foreign aid prevents communism, then the Communists are preventing communism with their foreign aid. Why not let them take over our job of preventing communism and save all that money?

Of course, this sort of reasoning is ridiculous. But the whole argument for foreign aid is ridiculous. It is built on such non sequiturs.

We send military aid to Saudi Arabia and economic and military aid to Iraq and Iran. All three of these countries have oil running out of their ears. Why can't they pay for their own aid?

We send military aid to France to kill Algerians. We send military aid to Britain so the British won't have to finance their own defense. We send it to Germany which is today the richest country in Europe. The truth is that Western Europe is today richer than ever before in its history. The December Fortune in an article titled "Europe's New Age of Abundance" notes that productivity is rising faster in Europe than in America, that Europeans are today better off than at any time in history. Before the war they paid for their own defenses. Why can't they do it now when they have higher living standards than they ever had?

The truth, also, is that the ostriches in America are the people like President Eisenhower and his advisers who refuse to face these facts. They refuse to admit that this foreign-aid program is a failure when all the evidence proves it. They believe their own slogans and their own propaganda. If the President would pull his head out of the bureaucratic sand for a moment he could see this—as he saw it in 1952.

We don't believe the people of this country are going to fall for all this synthetic whoop-de-do about disaster if we don't continue foreign aid. But who is going to represent the people in this matter? We have only one party in Washington when it comes to foreign affairs. The people's only hope lies in Congress—in men and women there who refuse to be ballyhooed into burying their hatchets in the taxpayers' heads. Why not write them and tell them so.

[From the Indianapolis News of February 28, 1958]

ACTION, NOT DOLES

The big party is over, and the show now will hit the road. We're talking about Eric Johnston's Washington party Tuesday night and his program to mass-produce public support for a new $4 billion foreign-aid program.

Influential Americans who attended the Washington shindig heard such foreign-policy experts as Harry Truman give hearty support to a bigger and better foreign dole. Mr. Truman helped preside over the loss of China, the futile Korean war, and many associated disasters. The guests also heard Adlai E. Stevenson. His foreign-policy counsel twice had been overwhelmingly rejected by the voters.

They did not, however, hear about the latest instances of the scandalous rackets involving United States military aid abroad. That disclosure came Tuesday from the Democratic-controlled House Foreign Affairs Committee.

And, in the welter of wearying platitudes that are supposed to justify fantastic foreign handouts, they did not hear about the Indonesian situation.

Unless something is done—something besides making sales pitches for more of the taxpayers' money to spend on tiled bathhouses for Arab sheiks—Indonesia is going the way of China.

The Communists know this and are quite happy about it. The only thing that worries them is that, by some magic, the United States will find the courage to do what it did in Guatemala—give the rebels the tools they need to overthrow the Reds, and never mind the niceties.

The New York Sunday Worker reflects this fear by accusing the United States of already doing that very thing.

Conditions in Indonesia, however, do not indicate that the United States is doing anything but continuing to aid the Communist-swayed Sukarno regime while the government of the colonies tries to hold out in Sumatra.

Handouts from Washington and pious hand wringing in the liberal press are not going to save Indonesia. But undercover action for which the Central Intelligence Agency is supposed to be equipped could do the job.

The late John E. Peurifoy, hero of free Guatemala, would know how to handle this thing. And the outraged screams of the Reds and their dupes would be ignored.

Now is a time for action—real action to save Indonesia from enslavement by the Kremlin empire. No amount of aid to uncommitted nations could make up for the loss of this fabulously wealthy island mass.

Will it be action—or more doles and a new disaster of the first magnitude? History, an indifferent observer, will record the answer.

Cruise Ship University Proposed for Americans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT J. McINTOSH
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 3, 1958

Mr. McINTOSH. Mr. Speaker, on March 1, the Washington Post and Times Herald carried an account of a speech made before the Civic Committee of the President's People-to-People Program and the American Municipal Association's Committee on International Cooperation by Mr. Les Biederman, president of the board of trustees of the Northwestern Michigan College in Traverse City, Mich.

In his speech, Mr. Biederman outlined a plan designed to launch a floating campus that would take students to the historical and cultural spots about which they are studying. Mr. Biederman has worked extensively on the project and has met with widespread enthusiasm and cooperation. Congressman ROBERT P. GRIFFIN, Senator CHARLES POTTER and myself, together with many others have been privileged to assist in obtaining a hearing for this imaginative plan. We sincerely hope that the cooperation of Government agencies needed to transform the plan from a dream into a reality will be wholeheartedly extended.

Under unanimous consent, I insert in the RECORD the Post account of Mr. Biederman's speech:

CRUISE SHIP UNIVERSITY PROPOSED FOR AMERICANS

(By Jack Eisen)

A Michigan television executive suggested yesterday that a floating university be sent on world cruises to let American students become acquainted with the people of foreign lands.

Les Biederman, operator of a station in Traverse City, made the suggestion during a luncheon at the Sheraton-Carlton before the civic committee of the President's people-to-people program and the American Municipal Association's committee on international cooperation.

Biederman said one of the Nation's surplus ships could be manned with an operating crew only. Housekeeping could be done by the students.

The students would be chosen carefully, he declared, to assure that they would be hard working and would make a good impression on people of the visited countries.

In addition to spreading good will, the students would gain an insight into the history and problems of other peoples, Biederman declared.

Biederman said he and others are trying to mobilize support for the idea. He warned that the people-to-people program should stop talking and start doing. The program was organized by the President to increase personal contacts between Americans and others.

The civic committee's chairman, Mark Bortman, of Boston, said the group agreed to explore organization of the program on a regional basis throughout the United States. In this way assistance can be given to communities needing guidance on how to participate, he declared.

A Floating College

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT P. GRIFFIN
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 3, 1958

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. Speaker, Les Biederman of Traverse City, Mich., is a man of vision and a man of action.

When he saw the need for radio and television service in northern Michigan, he moved into the area from Philadelphia and, on a financial shoestring, soon built stations and service that are the marvel of the small-market broadcasting industry.

Seeing the need for a college in northern Michigan, Les Biederman, who had no opportunity to attend college himself, mobilized local forces and, with volunteer labor and donated funds, built a college at Traverse City. The institution, referred to in some educational circles as Operation Bootstrap, is now known as Northwestern Michigan College, and Les Biederman is president of its first board of trustees.

Last Friday, Les Biederman laid before the civic committee of the President's people-to-people program a proposal which could have far-reaching effects on our educational system and our international relations. The proposal follows:

A PROPOSAL FOR A DEPARTMENT OF INTERNATIONAL STUDIES AT NORTHWESTERN MICHIGAN COLLEGE

(By Les Bierderman)

The proposal is that Northwestern Michigan College procure from the Federal Government a surplus ship fully equipped for carrying pasengers (roughly 400) and faculty, plus supervisory people and crew. This ship would be made a department of Northwestern Michigan College.

This ship would leave Northwestern Michigan College at periods corresponding roughly to college quarters. When classes started on campus, classes would also start aboard ship. The ship, however, would be underway around the Great Lakes, through the Welland Canal and St. Lawrence seaway, en route to Europe.

This ship would provide a substitute for expensive college buildings, as it included dormitories, food facilities, refrigeration, barber shop, library, classrooms, and so forth.

This proposal provides essentially for three different programs to be carried on: undergraduate study, graduate study, and adult education.

Studies would be carried on 6 days per week, and perhaps 4 hours per day to conserve expensive time. The ship would operate 4 quarters annually. As a result, the program would equate slightly higher than a normal college program.

When the ship arrived in Europe, lab sessions would be carried on with adequate supervision, educational points would be visited, and other areas visited. Personal relations with people of foreign nations would be a part of the plan.

There would be a fleet of small buses in the hold, so that when the vessel was in harbor, students would be able to travel approximately 150 miles from the ship.

The proposal assumes this ship would have a specific tour plan, and would repeat this tour 4 times per year. The ship would be appropriately equipped with library and other instructional aids for this particular journey.

Students presumably would perform some work on the ship (other than actual maritime work) such as serving meals, working in the kitchen, and performing usual housekeeping functions.

This would be a pilot program. For this reason it must be equipped to assure success. If the program is successful, the plan could be expanded by other States and other colleges so that not less than 200 ships would be used similarly. Such ships are now tied up, and could be made available.

Operation of such a fleet would have important relations to national defense and national interest. It would keep our bottoms at sea, keep in service trained maritime officers, give our students an opportunity of foreign travel, and give foreign neighbors an opportunity of meeting American students.

The quality of the educational program can be very high with a maximum of rich experiences for the student.

Every device for keeping the cost down is important, particularly in this initial pilot program, so a maximum number of students will have this opportunity.

There are thousands of ships of every description currently in mothballs. These ships are controlled by the Maritime Shipping Board, the Military Sea Transportation Service, and the United States Navy.

An ideal ship for the pilot program would be a C–4 personnel carrier, presently controlled by the Military Sea Transportation Service, under Admiral J. M. Will. The General Hodges type would be an ideal.

One of the most interesting factors in this proposal is the encouraging attitude of people in high places that have some say about the availability of the ship.

Some think that a similar program was attempted before, but this is not the case. In 1928 there was a program headed by Dr. Greenbie called the Floating University. This was not operated by a college, but was a commercial venture. The ship was not used as a part of a college. Tickets were purchased on various ships, and from time to time the student body were separated. It was a tour to circumnavigate the globe, rather than a program of particular studies. The library consisted of a collection of 500 volumes dealing with the entire world. Reference may be made to a thesis of Dr. Greenbie in the Library of Congress under the title "Educators Beyond Their Depth."

There are many ways to actuate this program, but much must yet be done. It is essential to have the cooperation of the other colleges and universities in the State. These institutions have generally indicated their interest. University of Michigan, Michigan State University, Wayne University, Northern Michigan College, and others.

It is essential to provide a good supervisory setup for proper recruitment of faculty, and to keep the ship properly supplied with materials and personnel.

It is essential to develop a program of publicity so potential students may know of its existence and its advantages, facilities, and other factors.

It is essential to have some financial subsidy. It is the opinion of the writer that existing foundations should be interested. It will take roughly $250,000 to provide the necessary facilities and working capital. From this point on, the proposal should be self-supporting.

Job Freeze

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN V. BEAMER
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 3, 1958

Mr. BEAMER. Mr. Speaker, there are some 4,000 homes in the 5th District of Indiana that have expressed a desire for natural gas for heating purposes. Under the Phillips case decision of the Supreme Court, the 18-year policy of the Federal Trade Commission and its interpretation of the Natural Gas Act were reversed. During that 18-year period, Indiana began to receive increased quantities of natural gas which was both more efficient and cheaper to the consumer than artificial gas had been.

Now, there are a few people who apparently are prompted by prodding and misrepresentations from one labor union leader to oppose the enactment of a Natural Gas Act that would bring better and less expensive natural gas to more Indiana consumers.

Equally, and even more important, this Natural Gas Act would bring more employment to citizens of Indiana. If Indiana industries are unable to secure their natural gas requirements then they may follow the policy of many manufacturers and move their plants to those States that produce natural gas in quantities sufficient for their requirements.

As one example of loss of employment resulting from lack of natural gas to one city, Indianapolis, I include under unanimous consent, an editorial from the Indianapolis Times dated February 20, 1958.

JOB FREEZE

Sometimes emergencies such as this week's extreme cold wave have a certain value in that they show us our shortcomings, some of which can be corrected.

This week more than 6,000 Indianapolis workers have been unemployed, not because of any lack of work to be done or any fault of theirs or their employers. Ordinarily this would seem fantastic, especially in these times when every worker needs all the money he can earn. We don't know how many thousands of men and women elsewhere in Indiana were similarly out of work because of failure of gas supplies for industry * * * and in the Middle West, which depends heavily on one pipeline, Panhandle Eastern, the

emergency unemployment must have run into hundreds of thousands.

This wasn't the fault of our local Citizens Gas and Coke Utility, nor do we think it suggests remissness on the art of Panhandle Eastern, their supplier. The local gas utility has rated capacity for 100 million cubic feet of gas daily. It comes both from the Panhandle area wells of the Southwest and from artificial manufacture here. It would be impracticable to expand artificial facilities here, since natural gas is much cheaper. Citizens Gas, its local lines taxed with overcapacity consumption of some 110 million cubic feet of gas daily during this cold spell has favored home consumers, as it should, by giving them gas which such industries as Ford, Chrysler, RCA, Link-Belt, etc., normally would have used. These plants had to close, meanwhile, and are only now reopening.

Thus, by simple arithmetic, we arrive at the conclusion that if Citizens Gas had been able to draw on only 10 million more cubic feet of capacity, this cold weather shutdown might have been avoided.

The fact is, that's exactly what Panhandle Eastern and Citizens Gas have wanted to do for a long time. On September 10, 1956, Panhandle filed a petition with the Federal Power Commission in Washington asking permission to drop Detroit from its line service so that it could more adequately serve the Middle West. Detroit has other gas sources. A month later Citizens Gas applied for 20 million more cubic feet capacity so it could use the gas thus released. Had the Commission acted in time, we would have more than enough gas, probably, for this week's demands.

Trouble is, it takes a long time to move a Government commission. The FPC staff, we understand, already has approved this expansion. But now a man called the examiner, must study and act on it. After that, the Commission itself may act. But there are a lot of other similar petitions pending, and it could take many months, perhaps years.

It occurs to us that since Congress just now seems highly interested in conduct of our various Federal commissions, they might include study of the Power Commission's efficiency and speed—or lack of it—in their investigations.

As soon as the Federal Power Commission says so, we will get more gas. Perhaps our Indiana Senators and Representatives could help in an effort to get some action.

Shops were closed, people have been out of work, because of what looks very much like a lot of paper shuffling in Washington.

Fifty Years in Show Business for a Great American Comedian

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MELVIN PRICE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 3, 1958

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, recently a majority of the Members of the House and Senate of the United States paid tribute to a great American actor who, through 50 years of a brilliant career, brought happiness and laughter into the hearts of millions of his countrymen. The legislators showed their personal appreciation of the contribution Jimmy Durante has made to the American stage by autographing a testimonial book which has been presented to him.

The autograph book expressing happy birthday felicitations was sent to Jimmy Durante on the occasion of his 65th birthday. As the book was presented the Las Vegas, Nev., Sun of February 9 carried the following account of Durante's remarkable career:

(By George H. Maines)

"Good night, Mrs. Calabash, wherever you are."

One dark night in 1909, through the dank, yellow mists that came up from the East River and covered Chinatown in New York, came the tinkling notes of a piano—running, bouncing notes, jazz notes.

They were a happy prelude to a career that has spanned 50 years in show business—the career of Jimmy Durante, who was a kid in a black sweater when Doyer Street in Chinatown was flooded by fog and jazz music.

"A bunch of boys were whooping it up in the Malemute Saloon."

Only it was the Chatham Club and it was Jimmie's first night club and it was important that he play loud, over the voices of singing waiters, clattering glassware, and shuffling feet.

"The starry-eyed kid at the musicbox was playing a ragtime tune."

And Jimmy, who will celebrate his 65th birthday tomorrow at the Desert Inn remembers with starry-eyed nostalgia.

"I was born at 90 Catherine Street on February 10, 1893, a few yards from Chinatown, near the Bowery in lower Manhattan.

"Now I don't exactly remember that event, but when I was 12 my folks wanted me to take piano lessons, classical piano lessons, that is. I remember a Professor Fiori who taught me, but a pal of mine, Joey McLaughlin, liked jazz and encouraged me to play it.

"It was at 15 that I got my first job down in Chinatown, N. Y."

"Dreamy, dreamy Chinatown."

Jimmie's parents weren't pleased with his choice, but there was glamour in Chinatown and jazz notes softened by the mists through which walked such men as Irving Berlin, then a singing waiter, and George White, a Postal Telegraph messenger boy whose "Scandals" productions made Broadway history.

Summers Jimmy played at Diamond Toney's at Coney Island, where his first week's pay of $25 was given to his mother. He often made, with tips, as much as $75 a week in the Chatham Club and the skells of the nearby Bowery knew him as a soft touch.

"Coney Island Down the Bay."

It was at the poor man's Palm Beach where Brooklyn juts into the Atlantic Ocean that Jimmy met a wide-eyed kid named Eddie Cantor. They became fast friends, working together at Kerry Walsh's place and cavorting after hours. Then came Maxine's in Dodgertown, the "toughest night spot in Brooklyn, but the police closed it in 1912 and I was out of work."

HARLEM BABY STRUTS ALONG

Jimmy's next job was at the Alamo, a downstairs club at 125th Street, near 7th Avenue, in Harlem, New York. There he started playing the piano for $45 a week, working from 8 p. m. to daylight. He stayed there for 5 years, solidifying his knowledge of his art and meeting great artists of his day who helped him along the road that would eventually lead him to the pinnacle of show business.

He grew up with music, lived and breathed jazz, and ecstatically pounded out the song hits of his times, and it was at the Alamo in 1915 that a man named Eddie Jackson cakewalked into his life.

Eddie's dad had come from Russia. His name was difficult to pronounce so he made it Jacobs and left it to Eddie to switch to Jackson.

It was not until 1917, however, that Jimmy, playing at the College Inn in New York, officially joined forces with Jackson. Jackson was appearing at Solar's Garden with a shimmy dancer named Dot Taylor. Jimmy got agent Al Davis to book them at his club, and, when Miss Taylor left the team, Jackson went to work for Durante.

That year saw the formation of Jimmy Durante's New Orleans Jazz Band. Drummer was Johnny Stein. Jimmy's first attempt at comedy was an attempt to razz Stein. This made a hit with the customers and Durante's career as a comic took partial form.

In 1921 Jimmy married Jeanne Olsen, a lovely singer who looked for a job, through an error, at the Alamo. The couple lived on 23d Street in Manhattan and Durante worked extra hard, saving money so they could move to an apartment on West 52d Street, in a swankier part of town.

They rented a room to a drummer, Jack Roth, and his wife. Roth is with Jimmy today.

Royalties came rolling in when Durante teamed with Chris "Ballin' the Jack" Smith and saved enough for him to spend his first vacation on Clear Lake in northern California.

The Durantes spent many happy days in this area until Jeanne's death in 1943.

Engagements at the Nightingale Club in New York, the Green Lake resort in the Catskills, then Durante took the plunge and became part owner of the Club Durant (minus the "e" due to a sign-maker's error) and was on his way as an entrepreneur.

Society of the day mistakenly thought automobile tycoon W. C. Durant, founder of General Motors, built the place as an exclusive club for the rich.

The club on W. 58th Street, east of Broadway, had a grand opening loaded with mink, sable, champagne, and its complement, caviar, but the mistake was found out and on the second day nobody showed up except a few died-in-the-wool nightclub hoppers.

However, word spread that Jimmy Durante really owned the club and it became a popular part of a circuit that included Texas Guinan's, Harry Richman's, The Montmartre, Bernstein's Kentucky Club, the Lido, the Mirador, and other spots.

Damon Runyon, Sime Silverman of Variety, Mark Hellinger, and other top newspapermen made a habit of dropping in. Durante, Jackson, and a singer, Harry Harris, were the entertainers. They were the "entertainer's entertainers" and show-people crowded into the Club Durant. Among them was a soft-shoe dancer, Lou Clayton, who had an interest in a night club.

The time was propitious, for Harry Harris wanted to retire. He sold his 25 percent interest in the Club Durant for $3,000 and the team of Clayton, Jackson, and Durante was started in 1923. Although Clayton died in 1950 on the day of the Jewish New Year, in spirit, the team has never been broken up.

Said Clayton once: "God gave Jimmy his great talent. A thousand Lou Claytons could never have put that talent into this man. I loved him, and I knew then, as I know now, that he was a true genius in his own way."

This appraisal of Durante is shared by many, vouched for by everyone who had had a chance to come into his life.

Eddie Jackson has been with Jimmy 40 years; Jack Roth about 35 years; Lou Cohen, his manager, and Jackie Barnett, his writer, for more than two decades. Pianist Jules Buffano has worked with him for 18 years.

One of the high spots of the team's activities was Duffy's Silver Slipper in Manhattan, but radio sent Jimmy to the top. In 1933 Jimmy got $5,000 a week to appear on the Chase and Sanborn Coffee Hour.

This was the beginning of an era that was to see Jimmy making half a million dollars

yearly. The Government, various charities and his old pals got much of it.

Jimmy's association with Gary Moore from 1943 to 1948 made his name a household word. He was one of the first stars to realize that too much exposure on TV could hurt an actor's popularity. At one time he refused to sign a TV contract which guaranteed him $200,000 yearly for 10 years.

Now, at 65, Jimmy plans to keep going so the boys can be working too.

His friend, Abe Lastfogel of the William Morris agency, can get Jimmy all the work he wants. His pal, Seymour Weiss of the Hotel Roosevelt in New Orleans once said, "I'd rather have Jimmy Durante than all of the stars in the entertainment world."

Jimmy will slow up, he claims, and work at selected places like Jules Podell's Copacabana in New York; Hal Halper's Chez Paree in Chicago; the Fontainbleau's Rondez Room at Miami Beach; Havana's Casino de Paris at the Hotel Nacionale; the Desert Inn; Mert Wertheimer's Riverside in Reno; and the Del Mar, near San Diego.

Slow up?

"Good night, Mrs. Calabash, wherever you are."

President Must See To It That Mr. Mack Faces Law

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. CARLTON LOSER
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 3, 1958

Mr. LOSER. Mr. Speaker, one of the most timely editorials that has come to my attention in some time appeared in the Nashville Tennessean a few days ago. It very pointedly refers to the shameful shenanigans of a member of the Federal Communications Commission brought to light by the special committee of the House.

The very distinguished chairman of this committee, the Honorable OREN HARRIS, of Arkansas, and his associates on the committee are doing an excellent job, and this splendid editorial should be read by all the Members of the Congress. It follows:

PRESIDENT MUST SEE TO IT THAT MR. MACK FACES LAW

For shameful shenanigans it is difficult to top the story now coming to light, piecemeal, concerning Mr. Richard A. Mack, Federal Communications Commissioner.

President Eisenhower, who appointed this Florida Democrat-for-Eisenhower to high public trust in 1955, professed in his press conference yesterday to know too little of the case to pass judgment at this point. Not so for a pair of House committee members who have watched firsthand the disclosures of undue influence.

Chairman OREN HARRIS, Democrat from Arkansas, and Representative JOHN B. BENNETT, Michigan Republican, have seen enough that one is convinced criminal procedures are in order while the other declares Mr. Mack should resign or be removed.

In the circumstances, we must agree with the former view—Mr. Mack should be prosecuted. And those circumstances, as thus far brought to light, are:

Mr. Mack, since his appointment, has received from one Mr. Thurman A. Whiteside, an old friend, loans totaling $2,650 which he has admitted he was never expected to pay back. Mr. Whiteside now insists that all but $250 has been repaid and that proof of this has been turned over to the House investigators. If such proof exists, the House group has not been able to find it in its files.

In addition, Mr. Whiteside has admitted giving Mr. Mack—cost free—a one-sixth interest in an insurance firm which has earned for the Commissioner $9,822 over a 4-year period. The fact that this insurance firm did business with National Airlines, which successfully vied with three other petitioners for channel 10 in Miami, was a happenstance, we presume.

Mr. Whiteside admits that he talked to his old friend concerning National's interest in the franchise, but one wonders just how much talking had to be done when a firm which was contributing directly to the Commissioner's purse was asking for his vote.

That National got that vote is a matter of record. Mr. Mack joined three other Commissioners in overriding the recommendation of an FCC examiner to award the license to the airline. How an airline happened to be interested in a television station has yet to be explained. The businesses are not exactly related.

Yesterday, still stranger circumstances were testified to by Mr. Whiteside. He also gave Commissioner Mack a firm called Andar, Inc., from which Mr. Mack has received $4,340. And the reason he gave his old friend this firm, says Mr. Whiteside, was so Mr. Mack could pay him back some of the money he has been lending him.

There are all sorts of side mysteries in this yarn—like the inability or unwillingness of Mr. Whiteside to explain the source of $75,000 in one of his bank accounts. And like Mr. Whiteside's insistence that he was not representing National at all, just wanted to help them along.

Hovering in the background of the affair is the shadowy figure of none other than Mr. Sherman (it's O. K. Ike) Adams, Assistant President, who has reportedly wielded a heavy hand in packing all the Federal regulatory agencies—supposedly independent of the executive—with Republicans and Democrats for Eisenhower. The law requires that all the agencies be bipartisan.

This being the case, it was not surprising that the President, in yesterday's press conference, cut off with an angry "I don't want anything more about that," questions concerning two letters which showed up in committee files disclosing that Mr. Adams, at the request of Mr. Murray Chotiner, Vice President NIXON's friend, had intervened with another of those independent agencies, the Civil Aeronautics Board.

This is not Mr. Adams' first such intervention, it is recalled. In the Dixon-Yates affair, he saw to it that the Securities and Exchange Commission postponed certain hearings which might have proved embarrassing.

And even now, it is reliably said that Mr. Adams is pulling the string to force Mr. Mack's resignation to take the heat off. That will not be a new maneuver for the Eisenhower administration either. If past performance is any indication, the administration will make no effort to prosecute Mr. Mack should he agree to step down quietly.

The Messrs. Harold Talbott and Robert Tripp Ross became embroiled in clear-cut violations of Federal conflict of interest statutes. They resigned and everything was smoothed over. There were no prosecutions.

The same thing happened in the case of Mr. Adolphe Wenzell, a Dixon-Yates consultant for the Bureau of the Budget while an official of the First Boston Corp. which, as Dixon-Yates financiers, stood to profit heavily. It was another clear-cut violation smoothed over.

Any law—conflict of interest included—is worthless if it is not enforced. It is the duty of the administration to see that law is enforced in the case of Mr. Mack. Representative HARRIS, loath to investigate this affair at the outset, now declares laws prohibiting outside interests by FCC Commissioners obviously have been violated. Let Mr. Eisenhower uphold the law he is sworn to enforce.

Then let him speak no more of Harry Vaughn and deep freezes. The general (Vaughn we mean) was a piker.

A Hungry Man's Best Friend Is Still the Mighty Potato

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. AL ULLMAN
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 28, 1958

Mr. ULLMAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include an article appearing in the February 20 issue of the East Oregonian. This article includes a poem, Ode to the Potato, written by Mrs. John Lauer, which vividly points out the versatility of the Oregon potato:

A HUNGRY MAN'S BEST FRIEND IS STILL THE MIGHTY POTATO

One of our local grocery stores is celebrating the fact this week that their company is the largest single purchaser of Oregon potatoes in the State. In fact, their goal for the 96 stores in their Portland division is to sell 2 million pounds of potatoes in one week.

In honor of the occasion, a potato-lovin' store employee has written the following epistle to Milord Potato:

"ODE TO THE POTATO
(By Mrs. John Lauer)

"If you want a balanced diet,
If your energy is low,
If you want a natural mineral
Rich in vitamins that grow;

"If you're too fat for comfort
Or too thin and want to gain,
Just try eating a potato,
The versatile food of fame.

"Now you can bake 'em,
Or you can roast 'em,
You can even eat 'em raw.
You can rice 'em,

"Or you can dice 'em,
Or you can grate 'em in cold slaw.
You can souffle 'em,
Or you can hash 'em,

"You can make a potato cake.
You can O'Brien 'em,
Or shoestring 'em,
Or make into potato flakes.

"A monument was dedicated piously
To God and Sir Francis Drake;
And the poor were benefited
And the rich were on the make.

"In this day of electronics
With the sputniks and satellites,
And tho we're up in the clouds now,
And our prices have soared out of sight—

"As long as we have the good earth,
And the potatoes have good eyes,
Our country will know no hunger
And our spirits will continue to rise.

"So take a tip from a housewife—
Whose budget is surprisingly low.
Buy potatoes at your local grocer's
And save yourself some dough."

Washington Report by Hon. Bruce Alger, of Texas

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BRUCE ALGER
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 24, 1958

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include my newsletter for week of March 1, 1958:

WASHINGTON REPORT

(By Hon. BRUCE ALGER, Fifth District, Texas)

MARCH 1, 1958.—A supplemental appropriations bill of $2.837 billion to get us through June produced some spirited debate. Another $175 million for the soil bank, beyond the $750 million already spent, was either "throwing good money after bad" or "being consistent, by extending aid to additional farmers," depending on your viewpoint. I opposed the increase. Additional funds ($10 million to each of 2 projects) for the upper Colorado River, the expense of 2 new "Federal cities": at Glen Canyon $12 million for housing 200 families; at Flaming Gorge $3½ million for housing 25 families. Also both have 7-lane roads planned, which in the smaller community would total 2 miles. All this as only a small part of this gigantic public reclamation and power project. This one passed also. My opposition was in the nature of protest over their spending so much more than their earlier estimate. This, of course, is all too customary in Federal planning. It's the foot in the door. Almost all power and reclamation projects greatly exceed original estimates (Uncle Sugar?). Lively debate accompanied other provisions: expanding immigration personnel ($375,000), additional U. N. contributions ($9.6 million), and more for the United States exhibit at the Brussels Fair. Causes for concern in the latter include: (1) Russia's $40–$45 million exhibit, the United States competitive stimulus, as earlier proclaimed, was revealed to be a $3½ million demountable building, whereas our beautiful exhibit building is permanent, (2) our expenditures were upped several times ($11.8 million—$2.2 million—now $9 million more) based on incorrect information, inept handling and general bungling.

Mutual security (foreign aid) was the subject of an amazing bipartisan array of public figures assembled to plead to a huge nationwide citizens group, for continued huge expenditures. Secretary Dulles said "600,000 Americans are employed as a result—the money is spent in the United States." (Is foreign aid intended as a subsidy to our industries?) Adlai Stevenson: "We must stop Russian expansion by creating strong nations and better customers. We must, in a global enterprise, push nations through stages of capital expansion so their savings expand, ending in solid economic apparatus of a modern state." (United States development took hundreds of years—also, is this the role of our Federal Government?) Reverend Dahlberg, Protestant; Rabbi Adams, Jew; and Bishop Sheen, Catholic, then gave the program the moral and spiritual backing of the church. These religious leaders, in fact, all the conference speakers, intentionally or not, revealed the anachronisms of our past Federal handouts, with strings attached, whether it be the economic, military, or political advantage we seek. One church leader claimed we have only one dimension to exemplify—the great religious and moral idea of our belief in God, individual dignity, and that government exists to serve man, not the reverse. Finally, his thought was to give the Federal money through existing religious missionary groups overseas in a true Christian spirit. Here then we'd join the church and state.

As I listened I marveled how we could all start, as Eric Johnston said, with just one purpose and reason as American citizens with love of country and come to such different conclusions. I felt the reasoning to be terribly wrong. Idealism had blinded many to the stark facts and lessons learned from giving $70 billion since World War II. Hardly mentioned was the heavily burdened taxpayer—or our present debt, or the failure of the program in so many ways. Could it be that trying to justify unconstitutional governmental activities only highlights the ideological self-contradictions? More of this later.

Former President Truman's criticisms caused many members to proclaim the total absence of facts in his statement. For example, Mr. Truman vigorously—almost gleefully—condemned unemployment, blaming the administration; yet, in 1950 when unemployment was even greater, he himself, said "a certain amount of unemployment, say from 3 to 5 million is supportable. It is a good thing that job seeking should go on at all times—this is healthy for the economic body." Well, as I see it, Mr. Truman's planned economy is not the American way. Secretary of Commerce Weeks countered by saying "the Democratic gloom and doom brigade's whole program boils down to three words: 'Sell America short'." My concern—do people see through the political charges and countercharges?

Briefs: Reuther calling Senator GOLDWATER a moral coward provoked Republican HOFFMAN, of Michigan, to compare the war record of the two—GOLDWATER, a pilot in service; Reuther (classified 3–A—Reason? married) at home leading strikes which killed 41 people (1937–46). Hoover Commission summary shows 77 percent of recommendations accepted, but Congress hasn't acted on 50 recommendations. The farm program—a $3,500 wage earner, for example, pays (in taxes) $31.79 for just wheat, corn, and cotton supports, plus higher prices in the stores on these commodities. Secretary Benson, in trying to return the farmer to a free market, now takes the beating for us all who are tired of double taxation.

Twenty Million Educated by TV

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHESTER E. MERROW
OF NEW HAMPSHIRE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 3, 1958

Mr. MERROW. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include therein an editorial from the Derry News, Derry, N. H., on Thursday, February 20, 1958, entitled "Twenty Million Educated by TV":

TWENTY MILLION EDUCATED BY TV

A recent tabulation shows that 20 million can now take advantage of educational television programs in the United States. This is the largest educational TV audience potential since the advent of television after World War II.

Educational television has grown slowly since its birth 6 years ago. At that time over 250 TV channels were set aside by the Federal Communications Commission for educational television. Only recently, however, has educational television really begun to catch on.

In fact, Ralph Steetle, executive director of the Council of Educational Television says that the recent rate of expansion in educational television is truly phenomenal.

There are, currently, 29 educational TV stations on the air and several others will begin broadcasting in the next few months. By the end of the year it is estimated that at least 50 educational stations will be in operation.

In time, all of these educational television channels will be utilized and we hope that advocates of pay television will not succeed in gaining access to any of these channels which have been reserved for educational purposes.

In fact, the Federal Communications Commission is morally obligated to keep all those television channels which were allocated some years ago free, in view of the fact that the public bought millions of sets on the assumption that television would be free, and because of the probability that pay television would drain the best shows away from free television, reducing the quality of viewing for those who could not pay the price for pay television.

Opposition to Reduction in National Guard

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MELVIN PRICE
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 3, 1958

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement before House of Representatives Armed Services Committee by Gov. James T. Blair, Jr., of Missouri, March 3, 1958, in opposition to reduction in National Guard:

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, I appear before you today in a threefold capacity: As the Governor of the State of Missouri and commander in chief of its military forces; as a member of a select group of State chief executives; and as an individual American citizen.

I am here because, in each of those capacities, I share with my colleagues a keen interest in the security of the United States, and, in particular, in the Army National Guard as an integral part of the first line of defense of this Nation.

The long and proud history of the National Guard is convincing evidence of its volunteer contribution to the development and security of our country. In its dual status, unique in our governmental system, it serves the States in time of peace and provides the Republic with a ready Reserve force for defense in time of war. We Missourians are exceedingly proud of our National Guard, both Army and Air, and of the service rendered to the State in times of disaster and to the Nation in combat. In my opinion Pentagon planners are prone to treat the National Guard only from an aspect of the Federal Government, while discounting its value to the States. Our presence here today is overwhelming evidence and proof of the importance we attach to any program which would unfavorably affect the guard. I am seriously concerned with the apparent attempt in certain quarters to downgrade our existing conventional forces. While I favor the increased emphasis being placed upon the development of ultimate weapons and programs designed to reinforce our country's scientific and technical leadership, it is my firm opinion that our military posture must not be weakened by further decrease of our Reserve force.

For some time, we have been engaged in the dubious procedure of reducing the strength of the Active Armed Forces. Now, the national budget for fiscal year 1959 would decrease the only effective Ready Reserve force available to the Army—the Army National Guard—by 40,000 officers and men.

Concurrently reports have reached me that the Army has developed a revised troop basis for the Army National Guard which proposes to elimination six divisions and many hundreds of nondivisional units.

Such actions can only be ascribed to our retarded entry into the space satellite arena and the consequential hysteria which would have us place all of our eggs in the missile basket at the expense of our Active and Reserve ground forces. Moreover, we cannot dispel the thought that the current situation provides an excellent cover for those whose continuing aim has been to downgrade the Army National Guard and relegate it to a secondary and minor role.

The fact that plans to materially reduce the number of units in the Army National Guard have been developed in an air of secrecy and under the cloak of security classification is most disturbing. Such action effectively precludes any attention on my part to illustrate for you the actual losses in strength and organizations which would confront us in Missouri in the event of their approval. I am aware, however, that distinguished and competent officers of the National Guard already have appeared before this body and that they have furnished you with specific information applicable to these matters.

I have always considered the National Guard in the nature of a joint venture between the Federal Government and the States. As a matter of fact, this arrangement envisaged and provided for by our forefathers is as old as our country. As in any such system, both parties share a part of the burdens, and to both, mutual advantages should flow from the common enterprise. When changes or modifications are required in this type of partnership, the necessary plans should be developed through mutual participation and cooperation. Apparently the Department of the Army does not view the guard in this light and intends to present Missouri and the other States with a finalized and completed blueprint on a take-it-or-leave-it basis. This is in contravention of existing Federal statutes which provide that changes of this nature in troop branch and allotment may not be effected without the consent of the governor of the jurisdiction concerned.

As the Governor of the State of Missouri, the National Guard is more to me than mere numbers of bodies and rosters of units; it is a living, vibrant organization made up of individuals who have volunteered above and beyond the obligation of Federal requirements and have placed themselves at the disposal of their State. It is a vested part of the community life of my State; it provides full-time and part-time employment for our citizens; it supports civic activities; it assists in preserving order, and it provides excellent training and discipline for our young men. In addition, it is a definite economic force in the smaller towns and communities which cannot be discounted.

In the State of Missouri, we have 801 officers and 7,051 men in our Army National Guard. The force is organized into 112 units and dispersed throughout 60 communities. We have a tremendous investment in State-owned armories and other facilities, together with hundreds of thousands of dollars invested in joint State-federally constructed installations. We have a competent State military headquarters engaged in the control and direction of this military force. The problems confronting the Missouri Army National Guard are our day-to-day concern. It would take vitally important and cogent reasons to convince us of the wisdom of any plan designed to cost adrift our guardsmen, eliminate our units, and charge off our investment. From any standpoint, military or economic, Federal or State, such a course cannot be supported by valid arguments.

It is my understanding that the present attack on the guard is twofold. It consists on the one hand of an attempt to reduce 40,000 members, nationwide, by means of reducing appropriations in the national budget for fiscal year 1959. Concurrently, and from another quarter is the proposed plan to eliminate six divisions and over a thousand additional nondivisional units. I stand solid against either action. I am opposed to any reduction which would decrease the number of volunteer citizen soldiers, and I am equally opposed to any plan that arbitrarily directs the destruction of organized units. Rather, it appears to me to be a far wiser course to accelerate the conversion of the units and organizations of the Army National Guard into the pentomic structure. This should be accomplished within the present framework of the guard and designed to take maximum advantage of existing personnel, equipment, and facilities. Missouri does not wish to maintain units which do not meet the requirement of support desired by the Army, neither do we wish to destroy the handiwork of years by the stroke of a Pentagon pencil.

I am aware that this committee and the Congress at large has ever been a refuge of the National Guard when hundreds have sought its destruction for the purpose of concentrating military power in the Pentagon. Today the Army National Guard constitutes the largest and most effective ready Reserve Force available to the Army. This is adequate evidence of the past wisdom and foresight of the Congress. On you rests the present responsibility of preserving this force and enabling it to perform its historic role for the country. I know that this responsibility is in good hands.

Benson, Brannan Cost Compared

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES G. POLK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 3, 1958

Mr. POLK. Mr. Speaker, in the Washington Post and Times Herald of Monday, March 3, 1958, in Mr. Drew Pearson's column, the Washington Merry-Go-Round, there is a very thought-provoking comparison between the administrations of the United States Department of Agriculture under Mr. Charles Brannan and Mr. Ezra Taft Benson. The figures are official and come from the Agriculture Department itself. I suggest the membership of the House should read this article which is as follows:

[From the Washington Post and Times Herald of March 3, 1958]

THE WASHINGTON MERRY-GO-ROUND

(By Drew Pearson)

BENSON, BRANNAN COST COMPARED

President Eisenhower's stanch defense of Ezra Taft Benson results first from the fact that Benson is a sincere gentleman with whom nobody can differ personally; second, from the fact that Ike's brother, Milton, is Benson's strong champion. Ike always relies on Milt, who served under Secretary of Agriculture Henry Wallace, for his farm advice.

However, in the latest report of the House Appropriations Committee on agriculture are some interesting figures which neither Ike, nor Milton, nor most farmers of the Nation know much about. They tell a significant story of what's wrong with Ezra Taft Benson's administration of American agriculture.

The figures are official and come from the Agriculture Department itself. They show that between the time Benson took over the Department and today he has added almost 20,000 extra bureaucrats and $1 billion of expenses. This billion does not include the cost of crop supports or the soil bank. It only covers the actual barebones operation of the Agriculture Department.

Here is a breakdown of the figures:

In 1952, the Agriculture Department budget under outgoing Secretary Charley Brannan was $706 million. Under Benson, the 1958 budget for operating the Department is $1,728,000,000.

The overall agricultural budget as Brannan went out of office, including the cost of storing surpluses, crop-price supports, and everything else was $1,045,000,000.

The overall budget under Benson today is $7 billion. This is an increase of about 700 percent.

Seven billion dollars more

The big question is, How did the overall budget jump from less than $1 billion to more than $7 billion in 5 short years, when Benson simultaneously reduced price supports from 90 percent of parity down to below 75 percent of parity?

He was reducing price supports in order to get rid of surpluses, yet his costs and his surpluses increased. What is the reason?

Though it cannot be spelled out in a few words, here is part of the answer:

1. Bureaucrats versus volunteers: Benson immediately fired the farmers' committees which were enforcing the farm-acreage program, and substituted paid bureaucrats. The volunteer farm committeemen had been paid $57 a year, chiefly for travel to attend meetings. The bureaucrats are each paid around $5,000 a year.

This not only increased Benson's budget, but it tended to put policemen in charge of farm-acreage restrictions. Volunteer farm committees did an excellent job of restricting acreage. They knew exactly what each neighbor was doing and let no one get away with anything.

But when paid bureaucrats took over, the psychology of the program shifted. It was like the Russian peasant who is always out to beat the Soviet inspector on the collective farms. So there was less compliance with crop reduction, less cooperation with the Agriculture Department.

2. Middleman's profit: Benson has operated the Agriculture Department with an eye to helping the middleman, not the farmer.

To illustrate:

In 1956-57 when Benson moved into the hog market to support the price of pork, he omitted from his hog-purchasing contract a clause which requires packers to buy hogs at parity prices. He signed contracts with the meatpackers to buy up pork, with a guarantee to take it off their hands. But he did not require them to pay the farmer a guaranteed price.

Thus, they could step into the hog market and buy below parity, and sell to Benson at a guaranteed price—which was exactly what they did. Result was that the price of hogs went below parity, the farmers didn't benefit, the packers did benefit, and the taxpayers paid out $98,600,000 supposedly to support the price of pork, while the price of pork simultaneously was going down and down.

In contrast, Charley Brannan stepped into the market to support hogs in 1949, but put a clause in his contract by which the packers had to buy hogs from farmers at parity prices. As a result, the price of hogs did not drop

below parity except on one day. Brannan then gave his surplus hams immediately to the school-lunch program, thus saving the cost of storage. The total cost to the taxpayer was $16 million.

The farmers and schoolchildren, not the meatpackers, profited.

And if you want to see who is making the big money today, take a look at the stock market quotations during last fall's Wall Street slump and see what happened to the big packers and middlemen's stocks. They went up while the stock market went down.

More on Mr. Benson's snafus in an early column.

Is There Any Real Hope for Peace in Negotiating and Signing New Agreements With Governments Whose Dogmas Preach Bad Faith and Whose Record Demonstrates It?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER H. JUDD
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 10, 1958

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following news release on world affairs:

NEGOTIATE-NOW BOYS URGE VEILED SURRENDER

(By Edgar Ansel Mowrer)

Simultaneously with the Kremlin's vociferous attempts to split the West by offers of negotiation, many of our European friends have formed a new anvil chorus directed against the inflexibility of present American foreign policy. And they are receiving a lot of support from Americans.

Just what is it these people want?

They start with the assumptions (a) that weapon development has made impossible the use of nuclear force in international relations; and (b) that the U. S. S. R. and company is now the equal, and within a decade or two will be the superior, of the free world.

Hence—they insist—since the Kremlin is ready to negotiate, it is up to the Western Powers, and chiefly to the United States, to find "some way out of the present deadlock, for some way there must be." Therefore, far from imitating the Kremlin's intransigence, western leaders must "explore every avenue that may lead to peace."

In other words, what they want is "something fresh and new in the way of American policy." Leaving aside the questionable nature of their basic assumptions, which 5 years from now may seem just temporary superstitions, I agree that United States policy should strike out on a new line.

It will not, however, be in harmony with the most popular suggestions of the more nervous partisans of immediate negotiation with the Russians. For these suggestions—however good or bad—are essentially a rehash of former policies which have notoriously failed.

Let's look at the record.

RETURN TO 1930'S

It is now proposed, among others by Harold Stassen, that the United States accept a ban on nuclear tests, even though such tests can now be held without being detected abroad. This is nothing more or less than a return to the early 1930's when the United States extended diplomatic recognition to the U. S. S. R. in exchange for certain unenforcible promises—which were speedily violated. Yet the negotiators are still willing to trust the Kremlin.

It is urged that the western governments should offer to neutralize a united Germany. This is a return to the original occupation policy in which the West persisted for several years—until it became apparent the U. S. S. R. did not accept any form of united Germany which would not result in Communist control. Why suppose Moscow has changed—even were such a proposal to be desirable, which it is not?

Europeans and some Americans think Washington should adopt a new policy of recognizing Red China. This is a rehash of what they have been saying since Ernie Bevin's visit to that country in 1949—and makes no more sense now than then.

Finally, critics of our present policy mostly accept the view that through negotiations the West accept the Soviets' subjugation of the East European satellites as final. This would be not only a betrayal of Poland (the original united nation) and Czechoslovakia and a permanent obstacle to peace but a return to the devastating slogan current around 1945 that Russia has a right to friendly neighbors.

Leaving aside the fact that a bandit state like the U. S. S. R. has no claim to anyone's friendship, the proposal is old—and turned out to be disastrous, since without it the United States forces might have liberated Berlin and most of Czechoslovakia, with results incomparably more favorable than what we got.

No, all such proposals are attempts by certain individuals to obtain from the United States in 1958 a return to previous policies—except toward Red China—which have been tried and failed.

SIX-POINT PROGRAM

What is needed—I admit—is a new policy. And I submit the following six-point program which was recently offered to the Washington Star by a Mr. David Keyser:

1. Beef up our United States arsenal.

2. Realize we shall have neither peace nor freedom until Soviet communism is eliminated as a world power.

3. Drop any idea that we can provoke the U. S. S. R. into starting world war III. "Our biggest provocation * * * is not surrendering."

4. Plan now to give practical help next time there is a revolution behind the Iron Curtain.

5. Form national militia units of refugees ready to assist their compatriots in any new revolt.

6. Get tangible help to any rebels against communism pronto.

Here I suggest is a really new policy. It would require fortitude. Yet it is more promising than any of the veiled surrenders that the negotiate-now boys are so shrilly crying for.

Governors Oppose National Guard Reduction

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OVERTON BROOKS
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 3, 1958

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, the Governor of the State of Illinois, the Honorable William G. Stratton, came before Subcommittee No. 1 of the Armed Services Committee and made a very powerful plea for a strong National Guard. He went on record as being against a cut in the size of the National Guard of 40,000 guardsmen. He is chairman of the Governors Conference of the United States and headed the delegation of governors appearing before this subcommittee. He was ably supported by Gov. J. Hugo Aronson, of Montana; Gov. James T. Blair, Jr., of Missouri; and Gov. Theodore R. McKeldin, of Maryland.

The governor's statement is as follows:

STATEMENT OF GOV. WILLIAM G. STRATTON, OF ILLINOIS, CHAIRMAN, UNITED STATES CONFERENCE OF GOVERNORS, BEFORE SUBCOMMITTEE NO. 1 OF THE COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, MARCH 3, 1958

PREAMBLE

The executive committee of the United States Conference of Governors, in session at Denver, Colo., today, unanimously approved the following resolution adopted by the Western Governors' Conference:

"Whereas the Army National Guard, with a strength of 400,000 citizen-soldiers organized in more than 5,500 units, trained and equipped, constitutes the Nation's largest and most ready military force; and

"Whereas this Ready Reserve force is dispersed in more than 2,500 communities in every State, the Territories, the District of Columbia and Puerto Rico, and by virtue of this dispersion would prove to be of inestimable value in assisting civil defense agencies during the period of initial recovery in the event of a successful massive air attack on this Nation; and

"Whereas the National Guard represents the most fundamental American tradition of citizen-soldiery at the grassroots level, offering the maximum national defense against attack from within as well as from without, and at the same time offering young men an opportunity to perform their military service in their own home communities; and

"Whereas the National Guard has served the Nation, the States, and Territories with honor and valor in times of peace and war and, largely by virtue of its own initiative and determination, has achieved a high degree of mobilization readiness, and is prepared to undertake more advanced type training, and to effect necessary reorganization within existing organizational structure to properly complement the active military establishments; and

"Whereas the Department of Defense has proposed a reduction of 40,000 men from the Army National Guard and the application of a revised troop basis which would bring about the elimination of many units of the Army National Guard; and

"Whereas such action is considered to be not in the best interest of national defense as it would reduce the capacity of the National Guard of the States and Territories to render assistance in the event of emergencies or disaster; and

"Whereas such reductions of personnel or units of the Army National Guard would constitute a writeoff of many millions of dollars in Federal and State funds already invested in the National Guard and its existing facilities: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved*, That the governors of the 11 Western States and the Territory of Hawaii in conference assembled here at Colorado Springs, Colo., on February 24, 1958, petition the President and the Congress of the United States to take necessary actions to maintain the strength of the Army National Guard at the 400,000-man level; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That necessary action be taken to assure that any required revisions of the troop basis of the Army National Guard be accomplished with the cooperation and con-

sent of the governors of the States concerned, and that such reorganizations be accomplished within the existing structural organization of the Army National Guard; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That the secretary of this conference be directed to send copies of this resolution to the President of the United States, the President of the United States Senate, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, to the chairmen of the Armed Forces Committees of the Senate and of the House, to the Secretary of Defense, the Secretary of the Army, and to the governors of all States not represented at this conference."

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, I appear today before this distinguished committee in my capacity as chairman of the United States conference of governors and I would like the record to show that I am accompanied by the Honorable J. Hugo Aronson, Governor of Montana; the Honorable James T. Blair, Jr., Governor of Missouri; the Honorable Joe J. Foss, Governor of South Dakota; the Honorable Theodore R. McKeldin, Governor of Maryland; the Honorable S. L. R. McNichols, Governor of Colorado, and the Honorable Robert B. Meyner, Governor of New Jersey.

As chief executives and elected representatives of our respective States, we are seriously concerned with the common defense, and vitally interested in any matter affecting our National Guard—the military forces of our jurisdictions. Our preoccupation with the National Guard is understandable, for each State and Territory has a vested interest in its own military forces. Moreover, each of the more than 2,500 communities throughout the Nation, which fosters and supports a National Guard organization, has a vested interest therein.

While military planners in the Pentagon deal only with impersonal figures, we in the States and Territories, and in our cities and towns, deal with individuals —the American citizens whom those number represent.

As governors, we are confronted with the day-to-day problems of implementing the Pentagon plans and policies as they relate to the National Guard. It is at our level of government where the impact of such plans and policies upon the people must be considered. This is something that I am certain you gentlemen, as elected representatives, understand.

The maintenance of strong ready reserve forces for our active military establishment is a matter to which, on several occasions in the recent past, the United States conference of governors has turned its attention.

As I speak to you today, I reflect the grave concern of the governors of each of our States, of our Territories and of the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, over evidence that the National Guard will be further reduced in strength of personnel, and of reports that a revision of troop basis will result in a substantial loss of divisions and other guard units. We are convinced that any such action will dangerously weaken our national defense.

In the matter of our Nation's defense, and the problems confronting us today in this area, I would like to say that I favor the increased emphasis being placed upon the development of our nuclear and missile capability, but I also share the views of those who insist that we must maintain a balance in our military forces and that there is distinct weakness in any plan that neglects existing conventional forces as nuclear and missile programs are being developed.

This Nation must keep its leadership in the fields of military science and engineering, but this must not be done at the expense of our existing conventional forces, including a strong and adequate reserve force.

As a former Congressman, I am aware that we have a strong National Guard today as a vital part of the country's deterrent force for peace only because the Congress through the years has insisted on maintaining and providing for this important segment of the defense team. While the Constitution provides in times of peace our National Guard shall be maintained as a State force, it has developed as this country's strongest ready reserve force.

It is the feeling of those of us who are concerned with our military reserve programs, especially the role of the National Guard on the defense team, that the reserve program of the Army has been unrealistic and lacking in stability. There have been vacillations in the program—first a program for a million young Americans to be trained and a National Guard of 600,000; and then, in recent months, a complete about-face with a reduction in all of the reserve forces.

I have the impression that the Army doesn't really know what it needs or wants in the way of a Reserve. A few short years ago the Army was calling for a massive Reserve force. The Congress met this request by:

1. Requiring that persons entering active Federal service participate in Reserve training upon release from active duty;

2. Authorizing a 6 months active duty training program for those who entered the Reserve components without prior military service.

This active duty training program, unpopular at the beginning, became an unqualified success only after the original Pentagon plan was modified by this committee 1 year ago by reducing the period of obligated Reserve service.

And, now—the Army has suddenly decided that it requires a much smaller Reserve force. It appears the planning, for the most part, is to meet those Reserve requirements from men released after 2 years of active duty who have a continued obligation to participate in Reserve training. To my mind, this puts the prior servicemen in the same unfortunate position in which they found themselves during the time of the Korean conflict, when those who had previously served were again called upon to leave their homes, families, and jobs for more military duty, while hundreds of thousands of others rendered no military service whatsoever.

A year ago I strongly favored a program requiring 3 consecutive months of basic training for all young men who volunteer for service in the National Guard or Reserve. This is a program that would be unanimously accepted by every mother and father, the educators, church groups, veterans' organizations, industries, and the young men themselves. It is economically sound, as 35 percent or more young men could receive basic training for 3 months at the same cost which is now in the budget for 6 months training. I advocate the 3 months' training program and commend it to you for your serious consideration, and, I hope, speedy affirmative action.

I believe I can best convey the thoughts of the Nation's governors by briefly expressing my views as they pertain to the National Guard of my own State, and by placing before this committee certain facts and figures as they relate to the Army National Guard of Illinois.

During the current fiscal year, as of February 11, 1958, a total of $4,795,250 in Federal funds has been apportioned to the State of Illinois to support its Army National Guard.

For the period July 1, 1957, to June 30, 1958, a total of $2,903,216 in State money has been appropriated.

In addition, both the Federal Government and the State of Illinois have substantial investments in armories. Illinois has 50 armories located in 42 communities. Forty-three armories were built wholly with State funds, and seven with Federal and State matching funds. The total investment is over $23 million. Illinois expenditure is $21,776,501 and the Federal Government expenditure is $1,223,499.

More important, however, is the investment of time and dedicated service over the years of the officers and enlisted men who serve in our National Guard, and the demonstrated support rendered to National Guard organizations by the thousands of communities of which they are a part.

Permit me to show you just what return the Nation and our State receive from this investment.

The Illinois Army National Guard has a strength of 11,000 officers and enlisted men. Over 90 percent of these officers are veterans of World War II or Korea, or both of these conflicts. A high percentage of our noncommissioned officers have had active duty in World War II and Korea.

The major organization of the Illinois National Guard is the 33rd Infantry Division. Our nondivisional units include a regimental combat team and an antiaircraft artillery group. In all, 166 units are located in 42 communities.

The activities of the Illinois Army National Guard are supported by a hard corps of 614 full-time employees, all but a few of them hold key positions in units, and who would enter active Federal service with their unit, in event of mobilization. This full-time staff is an important element in our defense force.

In my years as Chief Executive of the State, I have observed the training of our National Guard. I have noted, particularly in the past 3 years, a vast improvement in its training. I am aware, for example, of the fact that a great many of our Guardsmen give willingly of their free time far in excess of that required to qualify for pay.

In the past 5 years 1,558 officers and enlisted men from Illinois took leaves of absence from their civilian pursuits and attended Army service schools to increase their professional capabilities.

A large number of our young guardsmen are qualifying for appointment as second lieutenants through participation in our officer candidate school. These men we must depend upon for leadership in a future disaster or war.

I am proud to report to this committee that during the period September 1, 1956, to August 31, 1957, 165 units of the Illinois National Guard were each inspected three times. The inspections were the annual general, the field training, and the ordnance technical inspections. On these inspections 83.5 percent of these ratings were "very satisfactory" or better—39.1 percent were rated "superior," and 29 percent rated "excellent."

The only thing that is really important in a program as vital as national defense is the result obtained. Just what has been the return on the defense dollars, Federal and State invested in the Illinois National Guard?

The records prove the Illinois National Guard has reached a high level of training and a high degree of mobilization readiness. It is prepared within the limitations of time and Federal restrictions to perform its Federal mission as a ready reserve force.

This in itself, in my opinion, constitutes a high return on the investment. But, there is yet an added dividend that accrues to the State.

It is a source of great comfort to me and all Governors as well as the people that we have a trained military force that on a moment's notice can be mobilized to serve in a disaster. Our National Guard is such a force—organized, dispersed, trained, equipped, and fully competent to render efficient service.

The mission of our National Guard is to train for combat, and that it is doing, and

doing well. This is evidenced by the reports on field training last year when United States Army inspections rated 75 percent of the 4,454 Army National Guard units inspected with ratings of "very satisfactory" or better. United awarded "superior" ratings totaled 121.1 percent and 32.3 percent were rated "excellent." But we would be less than realistic if we failed to admit that in the event of a surprise nuclear air attack on this country every military organization would have to be pressed into service to assist civil-defense agencies during the initial recovery period. This is a most reasonable assumption for until some recovery has been made, most of our military forces would probably be immobile, unable to function in their military mission. Let no Pentagon planner take a head-in-bag attitude in this regard. There is no doubt in my mind that in the event of successful enemy air attack, the most effective immediately available force during the recovery period will be our National Guard.

In every State we are relying upon our National Guard to assist in the initial recovery, for I know of no other force better dispersed, or better organized, equipped, and trained to establish field hospitals, mass-feeding kitchens, to rebuild bridges, control traffic, provide needed communications, and perform hundreds of other emergency functions.

We must not forget that the National Guard gives a twofold return on every Federal and State tax dollar we invest in it. Any reduction of personnel or wholesale elimination of units would weaken our existing military position, and could mean the difference between life and death for millions of our fellow Americans in the event of a nuclear attack. Moreover, the reduction of personnel and of units would further limit opportunity for young men to undertake voluntary military training, and would place the burden of service again directly upon the shoulders of those who have already performed 2 years of military training, if our enemies were to undertake limited or "brush fire" actions in the future as they have in the past.

If the 360,000 Army National Guard strength proposed in the fiscal year 1959 budget is approved, the Army National Guard in my State will be reduced to a point where effective unit training will become exceedingly difficult and the efficiency of this force in being will be greatly impaired. This is a matter of grave concern to me and the members of the governors conference.

I am aware that as tactical concepts change and more advanced type weapons become available, certain changes in troop basis are necessary, not only in our active Army, but in the reserve components. I desire that changes be made in our National Guard to assure that it will properly complement the Army organizations, and further, to assure that it will be properly trained and equipped to fight effectively and to survive on a battlefield where nuclear weapons may be made ployed. I urge that these changes be made as rapidly as possible, but that they be executed within the framework of the existing National Guard.

There is no logic in any plan that will deactivate or reduce an established unit of one component in a community where it has long enjoyed support, and subsequently at some later date activate a unit of another reserve component. Any such plan is lacking in wisdom.

There is no logic in a plan that will write off the tremendous investment that the Federal Government, the States, and communities have in the National Guard. This is a matter of tax sense, of judicious use of public funds. I am fearful that some Pentagon planners are not always as aware of economic problems as are, fortunately, the Membersof the Congress. As governors, of course, we are acutely aware of the tax load our people bear.

In closing, may I say, on behalf of the governors of the States and Territories, that the members of this committee, experienced as you are in military matters, will make an objective appraisal of any plan that forces a further reduction of our National Guard. I know that this committee will act in the best interest of the Nation's security.

It is with our Nation's security uppermost in our minds that the United States conference of governors strongly opposes any action which will weaken or destroy the National Guard, and we recommend for your consideration and support:

1. That the National Guard and Reserve program be stabilized through firm planning and implementation.

2. That no Federal agency with fiscal powers be permitted to limit or reduce a defense appropriation once made by the Congress.

3. That the enrolled strength of the Army National Guard be fixed and maintained at a minimum of 400,000.

4. That sufficient funds be appropriated and expended to support that strength.

5. That the active duty for training of young men without prior service be for a period of 3 consecutive months of basic training instead of the present 6 months period.

6. That a minimum of 50,000 3-month trainees be authorized for the Army National Guard and that sufficient funds be appropriated to support the program.

7. That all units presently in the Army National Guard structure be maintained. These units to be converted or redesignated as required to provide pentomic or other type units needed in the missile age. Thereafter, units rendered surplus to be released by the States.

8. That conversion of present infantry and armored divisions to the pentomic type division be authorized by the Army without further delay.

9. That all National Guard units be maintained at the same levels of strength, equipment, and amount of training.

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, I wish to express the appreciation of the members of the United States Conference of Governors for this opportunity to appear before you on a matter which we consider of such vital importance to the Nation. It is our fervent hope that out of these hearings will come a stabilized program for the National Guard and Reserve, with sufficient funds to support the program.

Thank you for the courtesy you have accorded me today.

PRICE OF THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

The Public Printer is authorized to furnish to subscribers the daily RECORD at $1.50 per month, payable in advance.

Remit by money order payable to Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D. C.

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board, or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D. C., at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer plus 50 percent: *Provided*, That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized bookdealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by bookdealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

CHANGE OF RESIDENCE

Senators, Representatives, and Delegates who have changed their residences will please give information thereof to the Government Printing Office, that their addresses may be correctly given in the RECORD.

RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD is located in Statuary Hall, House wing, where Mr. Raymond F. Noyes is in attendance during the sessions of Congress to receive orders for subscriptions to the RECORD at $1.50 per month, and where single copies may also be purchased. Orders are also accepted for the printing of speeches in pamphlet form.

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. No sale shall be made on credit (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).

Appendix

The Outlook for Science in America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOS. E. MARTIN
OF IOWA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, March 4, 1958

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. Mr. President, on Saturday, March 1, the Massachusetts Institute of Technology conducted a regional conference on the outlook for science in America. Dr. James R. Killian, Jr., president of Massachusetts Institute of Technology, who is on leave to serve as special assistant to President Eisenhower for science and technology, made an important address at the closing session of the conference.

Science and technology will play an increasingly important part in the lives of all of us. It was my good fortune to hear Dr. Killian's address, and I believe it is of such importance that I am requesting unanimous consent to have it printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNDERWRITING THE FUTURE STRENGTH OF AMERICAN SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY

(Address of Dr. James R. Killian, Jr., special assistant to the President for science and technology, at a dinner of the regional conference of Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Saturday evening, March 1, at the Shoreham Hotel, Washington)

I derive deep satisfaction in the opportunity tonight to rejoin my MIT colleagues in welcoming our friends and guests to this regional conference and in sharing in this discussion of America's future scientific strength.

My position and experience here in Washington have reinforced my conviction that MIT is a major component of our Nation's scientific resources and progress, and that she bears an immense responsibility to maintain her long-established role of being a pace-setting institution and one of the world's great centers of scientific research and education.

The fact that I could go on leave of absence to accept my present responsibilities here in Washington and the fact that so many other members of MIT's faculty and administration have been active in public service continues the strong tradition and policy of the institute that it has an obligation not only to be strong in its program and activities in Cambridge, but to be generous in making its people available when there is a need for their special talents in the public service. When members of its staff, such as myself, enter the public service it throws increased burdens on those who remain in Cambridge. These burdens they have accepted in good spirit and with great competence, and it should be emphasized that those who pick up these extra burdens are also making important contributions to the Nation. Our chancellor and acting president, Dr. J. A. Stratton, is doing a magnificent job in administering both his office as chancellor and the office of the president. Under his skilled and steadfast leadership the institute is experiencing no loss of momentum; in fact under his able and firm leadership it is moving steadily ahead.

My remarks tonight are directed at the theme of this meeting. In fulfilling this assignment I wish to dwell on the importance of balance and proportion in our national scientific effort. I include technology as well as science in my discussion because they are so closely related and interact upon each other in such profoundly important ways.

Let me make my conviction immediately clear that the United States today is scientifically and technologically strong and growing stronger. I do not believe that we have lost our technological leadership, nor that we are predestined to lose it in the future—provided we do not fail to remedy our weaknesses. We have great strength, we have great resources. We also face relentless, able competition that demands of us poise, high-quality performance, and indefatigable effort.

The first industrial revolution was ushered in by Great Britain. As one of my MIT colleagues has observed, the United States leaped over the first industrial revolution and ushered in the second. Is Russia leapfrogging over the second industrial revolution and moving swiftly toward a third, leaving the United States still preoccupied with the second? It is in the light of this that I discuss our present concerns about the future. The launching of sputnik and our growing knowledge of the great educational and technological advances in Russia has given many people the idea that the Soviets have achieved a technological superiority over us. In my conviction they have not. In many fields the Soviets have been pushing rapidly ahead, as for example in rocket propulsion, oceanography, theoretical mathematics, space medicine, and certain phases of electronics.

But while this has been taking place the United States has also been making progress. We continue to be outstanding strong in nuclear physics, in solid-state physics, in polymer chemistry, and in high-speed calculating machines. In high-energy nuclear physics the Soviets are developing fast and may indeed grow to excel. But in low-energy nuclear physics which is directly related to applications, the outstanding position of the United States is beyond dispute.

What Russian progress has shown is not that leadership has passed from the United States to the U. S. S. R., but that we must expect in the future more examples of Russian challenge to our scientific and technological leadership. Clearly the problem before us is not our leadership in technological strength today; the challenge we face is of the maintenance of this position tomorrow against the challenge of the surging technological revolution occurring in the U. S. S. R. and other countries.

Within our lifetime we have seen how scientific leadership moves from one place to another: in the 1920's and on into the early 1930's, a majority of the fundamental scientific discoveries were made in Europe, and then there was a shift. In the 1930's and on the United States became outstanding. After having obtained very few Nobel prizes in science before 1930, the United States has received more than half of those awarded since 1945.

What are some of the things that we must do to maintain our great relative strength in science and technology?

Let me look at some of the requirements for sustaining and augmenting our research effectiveness. We must currently give attention to at least five requirements.

The first of these is the need to make the adjustments in the level of support of research necessary to offset inflation and to meet new needs and opportunities. Administration proposals now before Congress call for a substantial increase in research funds for a number of Government agencies and departments. Simply to increase public funds for research, however, is not enough. There must also be an increase in the support provided by private agencies—industry, foundations, and individuals.

Second, we need to stabilize the support of research by both public and private agencies. Starts and stops, ad hoc commitments, and modification of research programs have at times kept the national effort off balance, and have occasionally served to dissipate our efforts rather than to augment them.

Third, we seek to achieve a national policy and program for the provision of large scientific instruments, as for example in nuclear physics. Such a national policy and program seems essential if we are to achieve the best distribution of our financial resources. It is recognized that in a number of experimental research fields, our ability to maintain world leadership depends on the availability of new and more powerful research tools. Not only do we need new instruments; we also need to modernize existing research instruments and to find ways to more fully employ machines which we now have.

Are there areas which need more effort and support, as for example, geology, geophysics, meteorology, oceanography, materials research and propulsion? The overlapping or converging areas which involve the participation of more than two sciences are increasing in importance, for example, biophysics and biochemistry, and the application of information theory to neurology and linguistics. There seems to be accumulating evidence that the life sciences are going to be one of the great areas of interest and discovery in the years ahead and warrant increasing attention.

Of course, in pointing out areas which may need more emphasis and support, we must not forget that the direction and course of science is largely determined by the imaginative individual scientist following his own interest and making his own determination of what is most challenging.

The next area which we must give special attention to in the period immediately ahead is our organization pattern for scientific research. We have come to think of basic research as finding its natural home in the university, and indeed the university seems to be the best instrument for conducting basic research. This has not always been true, and we may well be entering a period when other forms of organization will compete with the university in the field of basic research. A few great industrial laboratories have strong basic research programs and an increasing number of government-operated

or government-sponsored laboratories conduct basic research as indeed they should and must.

Recognizing that other nonuniversity organizations have a compelling need to enter the basic research field, we nevertheless need to give careful attention to the overall pattern of our basic research effort. Research is an essential part of the effort of a university because the education of scientists must be carried on in an atmosphere of research and through their participation in research activities. If basic research moved out of the universities, we would certainly reduce our capacity to educate future scientists. Indeed as Dr. James B. Conant has pointed out, every time we remove a scientist doing basic research from a university, we reduce our capability to train future scientists. As we extend our total national program of research, we need to keep clearly in mind the importance of basic research to the educational strength of our universities and make sure that we do not create a pattern which tends over the long pull to attract basic research away from the universities.

But we must also recognize that our research needs are going to require special kinds of institutions separate from the universities. This comes about largely because of the magnitude of equipment and facilities required for much of modern research. The great particle accelerators required by nuclear physics are reaching such size and cost that they no longer can be financed by a university or limited in their use to a single institution. This is becoming true in other fields. In a recent report by the National Academy of Sciences Committee on Meteorology on needs for research and education in meteorology, it urged the establishment of a National Institute of Atmospheric Research which could provide the research facilities on a scale required to cope with the global nature of the meteorological problem as described in this report. These facilities would include "modern scientific and technological tools such as a large-scale, high-speed electronic computer, a meteorological flight squadron, a laboratory for fundamental research on techniques for probing the atmosphere by electromagnetic radiation, and a laboratory for fundamental research on the use of satellites and rockets as probes of the atmosphere." As envisioned, such an institute might be sponsored by a group of universities and would offer opportunities to university scientists and graduate students, but it would be an autonomous institution standing separate from any single educational institution and planned to serve all institutions responsible for research and education in meteorology. Other examples could be cited where we need to find new institutional patterns and relationships to provide research facilities adequate to deal with modern research techniques but too expensive to be confined to a single institution. We must develop the counterparts of the research institute in Germany and the U. S. S. R., but we must do it by properly relating them to our universities, and thus avoid a serious weakness in the foreign institutes.

It is also increasingly clear that within institutions it is going to be necessary to create groups of a size sufficiently large to be effective in achieving an integrated approach to certain complex scientific and technological problems. We need to think of how we can establish institutes within educational institutions which make possible a multiple-discipline attack on a problem. MIT has sought to do this through interdepartmental laboratories, as for example the research laboratory of electronics or our nuclear science laboratory. These regroupings and consolidations of research activities bring special problems of finance and organization that will require careful attention at the national level in the years ahead. The need for such integrated groups of sufficient size and scope to effectively tackle many of our problems in science and technology should never, however, overshadow the importance of the individual scientist who is working alone or in small groups. He needs to be afforded the opportunity to work in this fashion, and we must find ways to insure him freedom to do so and adequate support. It sometimes proves easier to get support for a project for a large laboratory than it does for the individual scientist working independently with his own graduate students.

In addition to policies affecting basic research, intensive attention must be and is being given to improving the collection and dissemination of scientific, technical and engineering information.

One of our most immediate tasks is to find mechanisms to make more generally known to the scientific community the availability of information already in hand. While we have problems of collection we have greater problems in distribution. The Librarian of Congress reports that a check of the Library's science receipts, against Knizhnaia Letopis, the Soviet national bibliography, indicates that "60 percent of the Soviet materials currently published in the natural sciences and 41 percent of those published in technology are being obtained by the Library. Of the 930 Soviet periodicals (titles) issued in 1950–54, the Library received 501 or 54 percent." The Library of Congress has come to be a great national library of science.

It must be added that there is not enough coverage by the total national translating activity of the significant material being produced by the Soviet bloc. Some 40 Soviet scientific and technical journals are presently being translated: 20 by the Federal Government and 20 by commercial concerns. In addition, a large number of abstracts of the Soviet literature are being produced in selected technical fields. Translation coverage is particularly inadequate in the fields of biology, physics, geophysics, electronics, and the earth sciences.

As efforts are being made to improve Government procedures and efforts in the collection and dissemination of technical information, we need at the same time to give attention to nongovernmental services. We need to find a way to increase the support of numerous United States scientific journals so as to expedite the publication of scientific papers. The situation is such that considerable delays attach to the publication of scientific papers.

Next, we must encourage and provide for the study of the Russian language by increasing numbers of American students. Not only do we need more people who can do the translating that we need; we also need more scientists who can read Soviet scientific publications for their own benefit. A recent estimate indicates that of all the items now published in the field of science in the world, about half are published in English. The next largest number are published in Russian.

In the field of education there are many improvements available to us for strengthening our scientific and engineering education. The liberal arts colleges are the principal sources of candidates for our graduate schools of science. Recent studies have emphasized how remarkable has been the success of a number of small liberal arts colleges in preparing men and women to become distinguished in science. This points to the importance of still further strengthening the teaching of science in this type of institution, and thus attracting more college students to major in science and to proceed on to graduate school. Increasing the number of science majors in the liberal arts colleges is one of the quickest ways available to us to increase the number of scientists. This will require better laboratory equipment and facilities for these colleges and better professional opportunities for their science professors so that able ones can be attracted and held. It will require, also, an attitude in these institutions that does not underrate science—an attitude, as I shall emphasize later, that sees an understanding of science as one of the requirements of effective, liberal education in our technological society.

Next, we face the requirement that our American schools of engineering and our institutions of technology command more understanding and support. We witness the much-needed mobilization of national understanding and effort on behalf of medical education. We must achieve a comparable national effort in behalf of schools of science and technology, where inadequacy can be as perilous to the national welfare and safety as inadequate medical education.

Until now our chief reliance in engineering education has been on undergraduate preparation, a system which has not universally risen above the training of technicians. While there will long continue to be an appropriate and essential place for the really professional 4-year undergraduate engineering program, it must be supplemented by expanded graduate study in engineering.

Many industries have been ahead of the colleges in recognizing this need. As a consequence, they have evolved training programs of their own to carry their engineers beyond the levels of their 4-year undergraduate education. If we had the graduate-school capacity to handle these men, it would be more appropriate and advantageous in the long run for them to receive their advanced training in the university, rather than in industry. The engineer, no less than the scientist, can benefit from an atmosphere of uncommitted research, and our technological advance would be more certain if top graduates of 4-year engineering courses proceeded on to graduate study.

Against the higher compensation and other attractions offered by industry and other noneducational organizations, engineering schools are now more vulnerable and more in danger of serious deterioration than other educational institutions using scientists. They are more vulnerable, even, than the schools and departments of science. The scientist finds himself at home in our academic environment. This environment is not the natural habitat for engineers, whose professional work lies so much in industry and in the field.

The engineering schools are especially vulnerable now because their young and imaginative graduates and teachers—especially those in the advancing, growing fields of technology—are more in demand for noneducational employment than any other group in our educational institutions.

If engineering education is to meet this challenge and reverse or even retard the spreading scarcity of quality in engineering schools, it must find a way to make engineering schools a more attractive environment for topflight engineers and thus for topflight teaching of future engineers.

Even though their enrollments have been down, the teaching loads in our engineering schools—exceptions exist, of course—are very high, with the result that their faculties have too little opportunity for the creative work that leads to further professional development both as teachers and engineers. An informed observer recently estimated that only 10–20 percent of our engineering schools had average teaching loads as low as 12 hours per week or less. When we reflect upon the fact that these institutions are hard-pressed to maintain their present level of staffing, we can readily surmise how difficult it will be greatly to increase enrollments and to enlarge graduate study without further burdening faculties and without a reduction in the quality of education.

The success of engineering education in attracting and holding more first-rate teachers will depend upon accelerating the development of more and stronger graduate programs. The graduate school and the research associated with it can provide engineer teachers with the opportunities for professional activities and growth as engineers which they now find chiefly in practice outside of educational institutions. In those engineering institutions where strong graduate schools exist and where there is a fruitful alliance with basic science, an environment satisfying to first-rate engineers has been better achieved.

We must achieve this advance in the education of engineers if engineering is to achieve a professional quality and status comparable to that of medicine or law. We will not have solved our engineering manpower problem until we educate more engineers who unmistakably fulfill our society's standards of true professional excellence; men who have a profound understanding of their specialty, coupled with a broad and human culture. The development and growing numbers of this kind of highly educated engineer will serve to make engineering the profession it must be if it is to attract and hold its proper share of high talent.

Next, in my platform for maintaining our technological and scientific leadership is the correction of the popular image of science.

Because science is required for the maintenance of military strength and because it has made spectacular contributions to the development of weapons, it has come to be thought of with disportionate emphasis on its military significance. This distortion needs correction, and it is heartening to note current efforts to reemphasize the humane values of science and to underscore its immense contributions to the good life and the good society. Through medicine—through the creation of a better environment—through its contributions to a higher standard of living and of life—through its enhancement of man's dignity by its enlargement of his understanding—through the values it has established for our society—science has come to be one of the great humane and constructive forces of our time.

The best description of science that I know comes not from a scientist but from a philosopher—Charles Frankel. "Science," says Professor Frankel in his eloquent book, The Case for Modern Man, "is an example par excellence of a liberal art—a deliberate, selective reordering of experience, which releases men from the narrowness and urgency of their routine affairs, carries them beyond the limitations and accidents of their lives, and makes it possible for their commerce with the world to have scope, order, and systematic consequences. It has been used as an instrument of * * * war, but its primary function is more humane and, as it were, aesthetic. And its relation to practice is the relation of any fine and liberating art—it carries men beyond the foreground of their experience, and enlarges the dimensions of human choice by acquainting men with the alternative possibilities of things * * *"

And to this description can be appropriately added the following observation of Dr. Warren Weaver of the Rockefeller Foundation. The facts, he said, "do not support the concept of science as some sort of super creed, magical and mysterious as it is all-powerful, arrogant from its successes, and avid to invade and conquer, one after another, all the fields of human activity and thought. This viewpoint does not justify the notion that science is so special as to be unique, as well as so curious as to be incomprehensible. This does not depict scientists as strange creatures who are in one sense so objective, judicial, and precise as to be incredible, and in another sense so apart from life as to be selfish and sinister.

"On the contrary, these descriptive comments picture science as the servant of man, not his master; and as a friendly companion of art and of moral philosophy. This is a science that is the way it is because man wants it to be that way. It is a natural expression of both his curiosity and his faith."

If we can make science understood in the terms of Frankel and Weaver, we can gain much for science and culture. We can still further break down the antagonism between the domain of science and the domain of the humanities and social sciences, with the result that both will join together to further man's wisdom and understanding. It is this concept of science as a servant of man, and as basically a humanistic discipline, that helps to strengthen my optimism about progress being real and technology benign.

It is important that this image of science be clearly seen as well as its image as a builder of weapons. This is another objective, this image of science in its true humane proportions, that we need to achieve as we seek a balanced science program for the future and a proper place for science in our national life.

With these examples of some of the current opportunities and problems facing us, let me conclude by emphasizing the great responsibility which rests upon American science today in the light of the extraordinary opportunities which have been given to participate in the formulation of national policy. The growing linkage of science and technology with Government demands of scientists a new order of poise, steadiness and statesmanship. The current emphasis on science, if it is not to cause reactions adverse to science, also requires of the scientific community humility and a sense of proportion. It requires of scientists a recognition that science is but one of the great disciplines vital to our society and worthy of first-rate minds; a recognition that science is a partner—sharing and shouldering equally the responsibilities which vest in the great array of professions which provide the intellectual and cultural wealth of our society.

In touching, however, superficially, upon the special responsibilities of scientists to walk humbly as their responsibilities increase, I also am expressing my faith in the growing opportunity of science not only to deepen our understanding and enlarge our views of the world—not only to enhance our sense of beauty and order—not only to augment our power and wealth—but also to minister humanely, benignly, and responsibly to the needs of our fellows, our Government, and our country.

Man of Courage

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. NORRIS COTTON
OF NEW HAMPSHIRE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, March 4, 1958

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, the leading editorial in the March 2 edition of the Sunday Star, entitled "Man of Courage," commends the steadfastness and forthrightness of Ezra Taft Benson, Secretary of Agriculture. It says some things that have long needed to be said. It also quotes from an excellent speech concerning Secretary Benson delivered in the House of Representatives by my able colleague from New Hampshire, Representative PERKINS BASS.

I ask unanimous consent that the editorial may be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MAN OF COURAGE

Spring seems to be coming a bit early this year for Ezra Taft Benson. At any rate the chilling winds which have been blowing over the Secretary of Agriculture are being tempered a bit by a warming political climate.

For one thing, farm prices were up 2 percent in February—a total increase of 8 percent over a year ago. For another, more and more Congressmen are beginning to speak out in Mr. Benson's behalf.

Of course, a determined band of midwestern Republicans are still after Mr. Benson's scalp. They say, and they may be correct, that Mr. Benson and the Benson program will cost the GOP from 20 to 30 House seats in November. Even if they are right, however, a lost battle does not mean the loss of a war. It looks as though Mr. Benson may be winning the war.

Farm prices are improving. The President is backing him to the hilt. And his supporters in Congress are beginning to rally around. Representative BASS of New Hampshire has just made an excellent statement of the case for Mr. Benson—a speech which was warmly endorsed by a surprising number of his colleagues. It is too bad, from the point of view of the taxpayer, that Mr. BASS' remarks cannot be published in full. They should be read. The heart of the speech, however, is in these two paragraphs:

"When our taxpayers realize what farm price-support programs are costing, and what the costs mean to them individually; when they realize that they (the support programs) are a failure and will not solve the farm problem, then they will be strong for Benson's proposals.

"Secretary Benson has courageously proposed a way out of this nightmare of economic nonsense. It is the way of more flexible and lower agricultural price supports. It is the only way that leads toward an ultimate solution."

For our part, we welcome this budding support for Mr. Benson. We welcome it because we believe that the Benson program will be proved right in the long run—right for the farmer and right for the consumer. We also welcome it because Mr. Benson is something of a rarity in public life, and it would be a shame if he were to be sacrificed on the altar of political expediency.

He is a man of courage. More significantly, he is a man of principle and integrity. As the election draws nearer every demagog in the land will be yelling for his head. But this will not divert Mr. Benson from his chosen course. He firmly believes that he is right, and that in the end he will be proven right. Considerations of political expediency (short-range expediency in our judgment) will not move him. This makes him something of an uncommon man on our political scene. Our country needs more like him, not fewer.

Immovable Mr. Benson

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN J. WILLIAMS
OF DELAWARE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, March 4, 1958

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in

the Appendix of the RECORD a timely editorial which appeared in the Wall Street Journal, Monday, March 3, 1958, entitled "Immovable Mr. Benson."

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Wall Street Journal of March 3, 1958]

IMMOVABLE MR. BENSON—HE STANDS STEADFAST AND SURE BEHIND A FRIEND NAMED IKE

(By Albert Clark)

WASHINGTON.—How does Ezra Taft Benson, though almost down to his last friend, manage to hang on to his job?

The simple answer, but not the explanation, is that his main surviving friend happens to be a man named Eisenhower. But this alone cannot account for the Benson paradox. What then, is the source of the embattled Secretary of Agriculture's strength with his Chief in the White House?

The explanation perhaps, lies in the almost mystical relationship between two men who think they are right, or at least that their opponents are wrong. Thus convinced, Mr. Benson refuses to resign for the sake of political expediency; and Mr. Eisenhower, who can be a stubborn man, "stands like a stone wall," as one Benson foe put it, between his farm chief and Republicans who want to fire him.

To understand the Eisenhower-Benson story, one could go back to a Minneapolis hotel room in the fall of 1952. One of candidate Ike's advisers, now a key member of the White House staff, explained the GOP candidate's farm philosophy. With prophetic accuracy, this Ikeman forecast that, as President, Mr. Eisenhower would compromise on most things, but not on the farm price-support question. General Eisenhower, he said, was convinced that the solution to the farm problem lay in less Government instead of more.

In another hotel, this time in New York City, an apostle of the Mormon Church was ushered into the office of President-elect Eisenhower. Mr. Benson had been invited by Mr. Eisenhower's advisers to talk with him about becoming the first GOP Secretary of Agriculture in 20 years. Up to then, the two men had never met. The President-elect's caller insisted he did not want the job. Besides, he had been a Taft Republican.

Mr. Eisenhower's only question: Would this make any difference in doing his job? Mr. Benson replied in the negative, and a new member of the Eisenhower team was chosen. Thus began the personal relationship that has now lasted more than 5 years.

RELIGIOUS ZEAL

To the agriculture job, Mr. Benson brought all the religious zeal of the Mormon churchman. Even his foes testify to his honesty; they only argue that his policies are wrong or, often more candidly, that Benson will cost the party votes.

To all this, Mr. Benson argues, publicly and privately, that increasing Federal intervention in farming not only is economically unsound, it is morally wrong. Moreover, he is convinced that if one is right, and sticks to his beliefs, ultimately the voters will be with him. And he presents his case with all the evangelical sincerity of a Billy Graham.

The strong moral tone of Mr. Benson's approach to his job showed up in his latest reply to new demands for his political scalp.

"I have a responsibility which I take seriously," he said. "As long as God gives me strength I shall continue to do all within my power to help our farmers. * * * I am convinced that the American people desire to see programs based on sound principles in agriculture."

So convincing is Mr. Benson, or at least so apparently sincere, that farm audiences have been known to boo him when he rose to speak, applaud him lustily once he had finished. Through all the criticism, Mr. Benson has never departed his course, though on occasion even he has been forced to give ground to the potent farm bloc. Indeed, one Washington observer, with not much exaggeration, recently remarked that "Benson is the only member of the Eisenhower administration who still talks like he did when he first came to Washington."

THE MORAL VIEW

The key to the Eisenhower-Benson kinship lies not only in the nature of Mr. Benson but in the nature of Mr. Eisenhower. Like his farm Secretary, the President also takes a moral view of his job, and this approach shows up vividly on question of farm policy. Moreover, Mr. Eisenhower more than once has given the quick boot to a subordinate tinged with wrongdoing; but he can become stubbornly loyal to an official he believes to be right even though out of favor with the politicians.

One interesting aspect of the President's farm views also is his apparently broad knowledge, even in technical detail, of what essentially is a complicated subject. Mr. Eisenhower's critics often accuse him of not being well briefed, even in some instances of not particularly caring. He once, for example, referred to "the Federal Reserve Board and all that stuff." At one of his recent press conferences he had difficulty remembering even the name of the credit-managing agency, finally settling for the Federal Board.

But when it comes to farm matters, the President speaks with unusual conviction and apparent knowledge of what he is talking about. The latest example was at Mr. Eisenhower's most recent press conference. To a question about whether he intends to obtain Mr. Benson's resignation, the President not only defended the embattled farm boss but launched into a philosophical discussion of the farm problem itself.

The purpose of all farm programs, he said, is to help the farmer. He noted that many programs have been tried, none of them with complete success. But by and large, he went on, "this administration believes, certainly I believe, that we are going to be better off the more we can free farmers from regulations and the more they can participate in their own activities * * * under the general influence of economic forces that apply to the rest of the economy."

As to Mr. Benson personally, the President characterized him as "a man of acknowledged courage and honesty in his great effort to find proper, reasonable, sensible programs that can be recommended by the Congress."

BADLY MISTAKEN

"Now, I think this," Mr. Eisenhower emphasized, "when we find a man of this dedication, this kind of courage, this kind of intellectual and personal honesty, we should say to ourselves, 'We just don't believe that America has come to the point where it wants to dispense with the services of that kind of person.'" Thus, Mr. Eisenhower reasoned that people who want him to fire Mr. Benson are badly mistaken.

Whether Mr. Benson's job is as secure as the President's sentiments suggest is questionable, at least. The men who want to oust him also are dedicated men—dedicated, that is, to the proposition that Benson must go. In any event, even if Ezra's last remaining friend happens to be President, the campaign to get him goes on unabated.

Senate-Approved Postal Rate and Salary Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THRUSTON B. MORTON

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, March 4, 1958

Mr. MORTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a very excellent editorial which appeared in the Washington Evening Star on Monday, March 3, 1958, concerning the Senate-approved postal rate and salary legislation.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

COMPROMISE OR ELSE

Tempering initial elation over the Senate's forthright approval of higher postal rates, including a temporary 5-cent rate for first-class mail, is the realization that the postage bill has been tied to a highly controversial postal pay measure. It is true that the administration has urged that postal fees be increased along with postal salaries—but the pay raise proposed by the Senate is far greater than President Eisenhower had suggested. There is serious doubt that the President will accept a postal pay boost double that which he had recommended.

The President and Postmaster General Summerfield justifiably have been concerned over the ever-mounting postal deficit, now climbing toward the billion-dollar mark. That is why they have insisted on higher postage coincident with higher pay. The Senate-approved bill would increase postal revenues more than $700 million a year. But the pay hikes for postal workers and for classified employees voted by the Senate would more than offset the increase in revenues.

Furthermore, the Senate pay plan would discriminate unfairly in favor of postal employees as against classified personnel in other departments of the Government. Whereas 1 million classified workers would receive an increase of about 7.5 percent, postal employees would get an average of 12.5 percent. During the debate in the Senate, administration spokesmen indicated that the President might go along reluctantly with an 8.5 percent raise for both postal and classified employees. They expressed belief, however, that he would not accept any higher raises for either group—and that he strongly believes that no favoritism should be shown either group.

It is clear, therefore, that the pay issue will have to be resolved in conference, if it is resolved at all. The House already had voted for pay increases for postal and classified employees so high that a Presidential veto has been predicted. It should be easier to resolve in conference the differences between postal rates than those arising over pay proposals. The House has approved rate increases substantially the same as those approved by the Senate—except that the Senate wisely has indorsed a 3-year 5-cent charge for first-class mail, as compared with the 4-cent fee proposed by the House. The 5-cent rate would apply only to out-of-town letters. After 3 years a 4-cent fee would be charged for all first-class mail, as the House has recommended. The additional revenue

from the 5-cent rate would be used to improve postal services.

Congress should face the rate and pay problems with a determination to reach a compromise that will not meet with a Presidential veto. The Senate's approval, at long last, of a reasonable postal rate increase provides a supreme opportunity for Congress and the President to deal effectively with the enormous postal deficit. And, simultaneously, the opportunity is at hand to adjust Government pay to a level that will help to stabilize Federal employment and promote governmental efficiency. The chance to achieve these things should not be lost through petty bickering and politics.

Federal Taxes Reduce State and Local Revenue

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STROM THURMOND
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, March 4, 1958

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, the Index-Journal of Greenwood, S. C., published in its edition of February 24, 1958, a most informative discussion of the relationship between Federal and State taxation written by the able columnist, George E. Sokolsky.

I ask unanimous consent that the article, entitled "Federal Taxes Cut State, Local Revenues," be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Greenwood (S. C.) Index-Journal of February 24, 1958]

THESE DAYS

(By George E. Sokolsky)

FEDERAL TAXES CUT STATE, LOCAL REVENUE

One problem that must be solved sooner or later is the relationship betwen Federal and State taxation. The Federal Government takes so large a share, what with income and payroll taxes and excises that State and municipal governments find themselves hamstrung. Local taxers realize that the load is getting too heavy and no politician desires to add the straw that will break the camel's back.

When one realizes, for instance, that in 1957 the Federal Government took out of New York State $15 billion and put back into the State $289 million, it is truly a frightening situation. The reason, for instance, that so many educators want Federal aid for education, which ultimately will mean control of education, is the Federal taxes being so high, the States and municipalities are running short of money for this and all other services.

Way back in 1910, Senator HARRY F. BYRD's father, Richard E. Byrd, speaker of the House of Delegates of Virginia, opposed the income tax and the State of Virginia did not ratify the 16th amendment. Speaker Byrd, with rare prophetic vision, foresaw what this tax would do and what he then said has come to happen. He said:

"It (the 16th amendment) means that the State must give up a legitimate and long-established source of revenue and yield it to the Federal Government.

"It means that the State actually invites the Federal Government to invade its territory, to oust its jurisdiction, and to establish Federal dominion within the innermost citadel of reserved rights of the Commonwealth.

"This amendment will do what even the 14th and 15th amendments did not do—it will extend the Federal power so as to reach the citizen in the ordinary business of life. A hand from Washington will be stretched out and placed upon every man's business; the eye of a Federal inspector will be in every man's countinghouse.

"The law will of necessity have inquisitorial features, it will provide penalties. It will create a complicated machinery.

"Under it businessmen will be hauled into courts distant from their homes.

"Heavy fines imposed by distant and unfamiliar tribunals will constantly menace the taxpayer.

"An army of Federal inspectors, spies, and detectives will descend upon the State. They will compel men of business to show their books and disclose the secrets of their affairs. They will dictate forms of bookkeeping. They will require statements and affidavits. On the one hand the inspector can blackmail the taxpayer and on the other, he can profit by selling his secret to his competitor.

"When the Federal Government gets a strangle hold on the individual businessman, State lines will exist nowhere but on the maps. Its agents will everywhere supervise the commercial life of the States. * * * I am not willing by any voluntary act to give up revenue which the State of Virginia herself needs, nor to surrender that measure of States rights."

To this, one only needs to add a few sentences of the Declaration of Independence, written by another and earlier Virginian, Thomas Jefferson:

"He has erected a multitude of new offices, and sent hither swarms of officers to harass our people, and to eat out their substance."

It is surprising that the meeting of Governors each year does not forcibly demand that Congress call a convention of States to deal with this problem before it is too late. For if we reach the point of no return, State and municipal governments will not be able to tax at all and all our local institutions will be controlled by swarms of wasteful and bossy officeholders, out of Washington, who will rule over us as though they were our masters, just as we saw them in the horrible OPA days when we were told what to do with things we bought and paid for.

We shall cry out more and more loudly against this plague of double taxation as the recession continues, for we must ask ourselves where the money is to come from. Not only are Federal taxes high but they are insolently collected, and as the Internal Revenue Service grows more honest and efficient, we realize what a monster we have created against ourselves.

Pay Television

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RUSSELL B. LONG
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, March 4, 1958

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial relating to the controversial issue of pay television, entitled "Let the Public Decide," published in the Washington Evening Star of yesterday.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LET THE PUBLIC DECIDE

The question of free TV versus fee TV is one for the televiewing public to decide. The Federal Communications Commission was justified, therefore, in planning a 3-year test of television-for-pay. But a request by the House Interstate Commerce Committee for a delay until Congress specifically approves such an experiment has resulted in postponement of the test at least until after Congress adjourns. Actually, the FCC has plenty of authority now to sponsor the test. The congressional request for delay, therefore, was out of order. The FCC's decision to comply with the request is understandable, however, in the light of current investigations of the agency's operations.

The House group acted after spokesmen for the free-TV industry strongly opposed the proposed experiment. In fact, several of them asked for an outright ban on pay TV, largely on the ground that the fee system would encroach on the right of the public to free television programs. But the FCC has made it plain that it is not weighing one system against the other with a view to substituting one for the other. Its attitude is the sensible one that if the public demonstrates in the test that it wants the opportunity to choose, on a particular day, between competing programs offered by fee and free TV, it should have that opportunity. And the fact that there would be competition for the public's favor in the programing of entertainment, public events and other attractions should tend to assure the TV fans of higher quality programs than have been offered at times in the past.

Truth About the Red Moon

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
Hon. EVERETT McKINLEY DIRKSEN
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, March 4, 1958

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Apendix of the RECORD an article entitled "White Slaves Plant the Red Moon." The article came to my attention following its publication in a newspaper in Germany. I had the article translated by the Library of Congress.

I believe this article will be of interest to a great many persons.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[Source: German weekly Welt Am Sonnabend (World on the Weekend), October 26, 1957]

WHITE SLAVES PLANT THE RED MOON

HERE IS THE TRUTH ABOUT OUR SCIENTISTS

(Reported for Welt Am Sonnabend by K. in der Beek)

A weak beep, beep, heard by all radio stations of the world, has revolutionized the face of our world overnight. Signals sent out by the Russian moon baby—the satellite sputnik have torn the curtain between the earth and the space and have shown to shocked humanity the way into the universe. How was this sensational achievement of the Russians possible?

President Eisenhower was forced to declare that German scientists have essentially helped the Russians in the construction of the earth satellite. The Moscow Sender

promptly rejected this statement. What is the truth? In between.

Among the 6,000 German scientists and engineers who were deported to the Russian research centers in 1946, there was a man called Adalbert Bärwolf. In his book Prayer is the Only Help (Muth Publishers, Düsseldorf) he clearly answers the question to what extent German scientists had participated in the construction of the sputnik.

Immediately after the collapse, the Red army succeeded in establishing the names of all those scientists who used to work in the German Rocket Research Center at Peenemünde. The Americans did the same in their zone of occupation of Germany. But while the Americans hunted for big names and tried to win for themselves some famous individual, the Russians would go about the matter systematically. They would spread their dragnet over every man who used to work in rocket research: scientists, engineers, technicians. The Raabe Institute near Bleicherode played a special role. It is there that the rocket constructor Gröttrup rallied the specialists from Peenemünde. At first it did not matter if they were the tops or the underlings. The selection would be made later on, some place in Soviet Russia.

On October 22, 1946, at 4 a. m., the big haul started. Open trucks loaded with furniture and household articles, among them men, women, and children, moved fast on East Berlin's streets. In just one resettlement action 6,000 German specialists were brought to Soviet Russia. Trains with both passenger and freight cars were waiting at the East Berlin's railroad station.

In the darkness of the October night flashlights glimmered; Red army soldiers surrounded the place with a circle, each man standing close to the other, with bayonets on their rifles. When the transport was reloaded into trains with Russian gage tracks, 92 trains were counted.

Six thousand German specialists, 20,000 deported family members. The dragnets were without loopholes. Then the booty of brains was distributed: some were brought to Monino, others to Mitishi, Kimri, Sagorsk, Podberesje, Sovrino, Obirolovka, Ustashkov. The most valuable catch of the haul: The V-2 team Dr. Eitzenberger and Dr. Buschbeck, the rocket specialist Dr. Schulz.

The German scientists and researchers lived as white slaves, 3,000 kilometers away from their homeland, in a strange, mysterious, obscure country. Little devilish tricks made their lives annoying and brutal.

After a few months the Russians separated the brains from the puppets (tools). Now the reward was measured with achievements; premiums of all kinds, tricky and with a definite aim, were given. These premium regulations excited wild envy and ill will among the Germans.

Suddenly, a man in a black coat would appear: "Come over to the chief's office." There questions are put: "You did it in such and such a way, why not like this? Do you want to hide something?"

No piece of paper is allowed to lie around in the office: this is sabotage. Early in the morning paper is distributed, every sheet numbered. At lunch break everything has to be surrendered, drawings go to department 1—the secret deposit room. Then they are distributed again and so it goes, 2 or 3 times a day; in addition, the speed of work is hectic and hard pressed.

All of a sudden the work is interrupted. All drawings and designs are sent to Moscow. There Russian teams work toward the same objective.

Now they continue the research started by the Germans on the basis of the material received. This is the basis of Moscow's allegation that the sputnik is a product of the Soviet scientific genius. Naturally, the Germans are not told where their work went. but they learn about it by accident or because of limited experience of the Russians in this field. Suddenly an inquiry would come back because the Russian team in Moscow could not understand one thing or another. And now the Germans know what is wrong with the Russians:

Whenever a bold idea or a free handling of a problem by the Germans break the frames of the Russian routine scheme, Russian researchers become unsure.

In America Wernher von Braun has risen to fame. In this reach for the third dimension, the German working team under Dr. Schulz is (von Braun's) counterpart in Russia.

Dr. Schulz, Albring, and Gröttrup has developed the Russian rocket which can easily cover the intercontinental distance of 3,000 kilometers.

The Braun rocket and Schultz rocket are based on the same principles: their basic concept is a liquid-fuel rocket. Braun's projectiles are full of complex and splendid solution. On the contrary, Schultz' way of working is simple, nearly primitive. His genial idea aims at reducing the material used. He lets his rocket rise slowly, so slowly that the high speed is not reached until the air—30,000 meters high above the ground—becomes so thin that the air resistance does not present a problem any more. Schulz launches his rocket directly from his assembly bench in the underground plant. He has increased the fuel capacity by nearly 100 percent; he created an easily separable connection between the warhead, which can fly independently, and the fuel container which is thrown away by the warhead when the height of 30,000 meters is reached.

This is the revolutionary idea which made the sputnik circle the earth. Sputnik is nothing else but a warhead which, by proper setting of its instruments, can be brought to the place previously calculated according to the law of ballistics.

The rocket which shot sputnik into space is only a technical development of Dr. Schulz' genial idea and of his conical rocket.

Bärwolf's white slaves have both planted the Red moon, and made its start possible.

After the Germans had worked in Russia for 4 years, the Soviets knew enough. Their scientists had taken off the cream by directing the genius of the German researchers into their own workrooms. In 1952 the works were finally over. The Germans were not needed any more. In the middle of Russia an Iron Curtain fell down around their lives. Moscow put the brains of the German scientists under quarantine. For 2 years they stayed in their camp villages; 2 years in an agony of waiting. Two years without any work—until the Russians knew that the living contact of the scientists with the results of their work had faded.

Then, in 1954, the time arrived. Until a few hours before the crucial moment their return was kept secret from the Germans. Then, out of the 6,000 specialists who were taken to the East as white slaves in 1946, 5,959 were sent back home. Only 50 remained in Russia. Whether they returned to Germany or stayed on in Russia, whatever their achievements and their life's work—a veil of Russian silence fell over their fates.

The Harried Boss

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GORDON ALLOTT
OF COLORADO
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, March 4, 1958

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "The Harried Boss," which appeared in the Denver Post of January 9, 1958.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE HARRIED BOSS

Referring to the article in the Denver Post, issue of December 29, informing the people that a new bill is to be introduced in the January session of the Colorado Legislature by State Representative Ben Klein, Democrat, of Denver, to raise salaries of State officials, judges, and other employees of the State government. I criticize his action.

The people of the State of Colorado are overburdened with taxes at the present time. The greater number of them are having to skimp to the bone to provide themselves and their families with food, clothing, pay their rent, and other necessities they must have in order to live with any degree of comfort and well-being.

Today, we find that legislatures and city governments all over the United States have no compassion nor consideration for the taxpayers of our Nation, the forgotten people, whose money is taken from them with the greatest of ease in order that officials of our governments can live in luxury and let the taxpayers barely exist.

What to do about it is a question that the taxpayers will have to look into, if justice is to be done them.

ALBERT D. NELSON.

DENVER.

Fake Tax Cut

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN J. WILLIAMS
OF DELAWARE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, March 4, 1958

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a timely editorial which appeared in the Washington Daily News, February 8, 1958, entitled "Fake Tax Cut."

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FAKE TAX CUT

A tax cut, if you believe everything you hear, has much in common with the old-time patent medicines which would grow hair, remove corns or gravy stains, cure rheumatism, catarrh, cancer, dandruff, and consumption.

A tax cut is similarly advocated by a lot of quack economists as a remedy for a variety of evils to which our economic flesh is heir. Last year it was good for inflation. This year it will help business.

Taxes should be as low as possible—lower than they are now—on the theory that the man or woman who earns money should have the right to keep some of it and spend it as he pleases.

But it isn't taxes primarily that make business good or bad. It's the way taxes are spent or, more accurately, what the Government uses for money.

Most current tax proposals, including those of business leaders who should know better, blandly ignore the spending angle. Few suggest seriously that Government expenses be cut so that taxes can be cut. On the other hand practically everyone in authority wants to spend more.

Taking in less and spending more is a hard trick for the private citizen, but it isn't so hard for the Government, which controls the money supply.

The Government can just print the money and, no matter by what fancy name you call it, that's what deficit financing amounts to.

This printing-press money is, in effect, counterfeit. It dilutes and degrades the supply of honest dollars, making each one of them worth proportionately less. If a dollar bought 6 loves of bread before, under this printing-press inflation it buys 5, or 3, or 1. The housewife trying to stretch a paycheck over the family bills knows how this works.

It is bitterly ironical—or maybe just a characteristic con-game principle—that most of these funny-money panaceas have as their principal advocates people who are trying, or think they're trying, or say they're trying, to help the underprivileged—those with low incomes.

Low-income families are the first and worst victims of inflation. Faced with rising prices, they simply have to go without their normal food and shelter.

And deficit financing doesn't cut taxes, anyhow. It merely postpones them, and not for long. The sky-high taxes of today result from past deficit financing which multiplied the costs of government, along with everything else.

A tax cut with a balanced budget should help business. A tax cut which started the Government printing more money might give business a temporary flush and it might not.

It certainly would further dilute the dollar, causing further inflation. It would take the immediate cost of this unsound pump priming out of the hides of the poor people whom these big-talking economists think they are—or say they are—trying to help.

Federal Troops at Little Rock

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STROM THURMOND
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, March 4, 1958

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, the fact that the administration made a shocking mistake in sending Federal troops into Little Rock last September is becoming more widely recognized every week. Not only was this display of force dangerous as an assault on constitutional government; it was also a classic example of administrative ineptitude.

Some of the legal aspects of this heartrending situation are discussed by the able columnist, Holmes Alexander, in an article entitled "President's Civil-Rights Allies Wavering," and published in the News and Courier of Charleston, S. C., on February 28, 1958.

I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PRESIDENT'S CIVIL-RIGHTS ALLIES WAVERING
(By Holmes Alexander)

WASHINGTON.—Is there such a thing as Federal common law? The confirmation proceedings of W. Wilson White, a Philadelphia lawyer, to be assistant attorney general for civil rights may take an interesting turn on this seemingly obtuse point of constitutional law.

It would be an overstatement to say that Mr. White, who did the research work on President Eisenhower's Little Rock proclamation, may be denied confirmation. But he seems in a fair way toward being denied a unanimous decision, or even a decision that connotes a Senate vote of confidence in the President of the United States.

Southern Democrats will certainly continue to question, if not forthrightly oppose, this nomination. Conceivably, they may be joined by the same western Democrats who last year refused to accept the administration's suspension of jury trial in the civil-rights bill. And it is even more possible, if this issue catches fire, that some of the western Republicans who supported the President on civil rights may leave him on this one. Nothing fails faster than a losing cause. The Little Rock episode is now a fiasco of backfire and ineptitude. Senators may be willing to scuttle the whole works which, from first to last, have been botched at the White House and the Justice Department.

Mr. White personally has not made anybody angry with him. He was doing a routine job for former Atty. Gen. Herbert Brownell in digging up law under which some 2,500 of the toughest fighting troops in the country plus 10,500 National Guard men were sent to quell a civil disturbance in which a mere forty-odd arrests were eventually made. This was swatting a fly with a sledge hammer, but more than that it was taking action under the bar sinister called common law and not by either the Constitution or the written statutes. There was this dialog in the Senate Judiciary Committee where Mr. White was being heard:

Senator ERVIN. "I was asking you whether there was to your knowledge any statute, any Federal statute, which undertakes to give the President specific and expressed authority to use the armed forces of the Nation or the National Guard of any State to enforce a court order?"

Mr. WHITE. "Not to enforce an order, Senator, but to prevent the breakdown of law and order when an order is threatened."

Senator ERVIN. "Now, under the law generally * * * it is the duty of the United States marshal to enforce court orders."

Mr. WHITE. "Well, the duties generally of the marshal, of course, do that."

Senator ERVIN. "Now, was any effort ever made in this Little Rock situation to enforce the order * * * through the instrumentality of the United States Marshal?"

Mr. WHITE. "To answer it specifically, I would say 'no'."

White went on to argue, in effect, that without benefit of constitutional authority or statutory law, the President as commander in chief can do almost anything to preserve law and order. Senator ERVIN contended that even while wearing this military hat, the President is bound by his oath of office. The President cannot skip over such steps as: (a) Calling upon disorderly mobs to disperse; (b) requiring the United States marshal to perform his duty; (c) waiting for the United States marshal to deputize able-bodied civilians to help him at the duty; or (d) following the lawful procedures in any action.

ERVIN said: "While nobody can deny the President the right to act as commander in chief in these cases, Congress has undoubtedly the authority to say how he shall act as commander in chief."

The issue is the same one which tripped up President Truman a decade ago when he acted from temper, as it is supposed that Mr. Eisenhower did, and tried to seize the steel mills. In Mr. Truman's case there was a prompt appeal, and the Supreme Court ruled against the President in language that clearly applies today:

"The President's power, if any, to issue the (seizure) order must stem either from an act of Congress or from the Constitution itself * * * the Constitution is neither silent nor equivocal about who shall make laws which the President is to execute. The first section of the first article says that 'All legislative powers herein granted shall be vested in a Congress of the United States * * *'."

By common law we usually mean an unlawful practice which has persisted over a period of time and is socially acceptable by sufferance, not by approval. That's no way to run a country.

Coosa-Alabama River Story

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KENNETH A. ROBERTS
OF ALABAMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 4, 1958

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include for the RECORD the first of a series of eight articles which I have prepared on the great Coosa-Alabama River system in Alabama:

THE COOSA-ALABAMA RIVER STORY
PART I: INDIANS AND EARLY HISTORY
(By KENNETH A. ROBERTS, Member of Congress)

Indians, first to reap benefits in the Coosa-Alabama River basin, dominated the virgin valley for nearly three centuries.

Their role in the area's history dates back to an ancient tribal town named "Coosa," located on the west bank of the river in what is now Talladega County.

It was at Coosa that Hernando DeSoto, the Spanish explorer, rested his men and horses during his ramblings in the Coosa River Valley. He had entered the valley in 1540 by crossing the river in the present St. Clair County.

Traveling south, DeSoto later fought, near the Alabama River east of Selma, what has been called the bloodiest battle ever waged between whites and Indians on the North American continent. But it was far from the last such fight.

In the 18th century, Bienville, French former governor of Louisiana colony, found his way into the Coosa Valley. In need of a post among the Creek Indians in warring with the French, Bienville in 1714 built Fort Toulouse.

From this fort at the junction of the Coosa and Tallapoosa Rivers, Bienville was to conduct an extensive missionary campaign among the Indians. The effort would foreshadow the first permanent white settlement of a large Alabama area.

More white men were drawn to the Coosa basin. Andrew Jackson's warring with the Creeks during the War of 1812 brought him deep into the valley.

He built Fort Strother on the Coosa in the land which would become St. Clair County; he used the river to move his flatboats southward, ultimately to fight the Battle of Horseshoe Bend.

It was the beginning of the end of the Indians' bountiful life in the woods and valleys of the Coosa basin. When Jackson vanquished the Creeks, the Coosa River became the line beyond which the Indians could not wander.

In 1818, the last Indian fight west of the river was fought because a handful of Creeks,

refusing to obey the treaty, were roaming along the wrong side of the river and were killing the new white settlers.

Shortly thereafter, in 1819, Alabama became a part of the Union. First capital of the new state was Cahaba, near the Alabama River in Dallas County.

From DeSoto's entry into the Coosa Valley to Alabama's admission to the Union had been an eventful 279 years. The mighty Coosa-Alabama waterway and its first inhabitants had been a significant part of it all.

Next: Steamboats and Freight.

Coosa-Alabama River Story

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KENNETH A. ROBERTS
OF ALABAMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 4, 1958

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include for the RECORD the second of a series of eight articles which I have prepared on the great Coosa-Alabama River system in Alabama:

THE COOSA-ALABAMA RIVER STORY
PART II: STEAMBOATS AND FREIGHT
(By KENNETH A. ROBERTS, Member of Congress)

Paddle wheels churned the placid waters of the Coosa-Alabama River in the 19th century as steamboats heralded the arrival of the basin's most colorful era.

The steamboat *Harriett* in the fall of 1821 ushered in the era. Numerous boats followed.

The *Coosa* steamboat ran between Greensport, in Calhoun County, and Rome, Ga. Later, on the Alabama, a 155-foot stern wheel snag boat, the *Wm. J. Twining*, was put into a service by the Government to remove snags and keep the waterway clear.

Economic and social development which had clung to the meanderings of the river and its tributaries at the turn of the century now took on new increase under the influence of the paddle wheelers.

Even before the War Between the States, industrial products were transported. Iron produced in Calhoun County, for instance, was flatboated to market in Wetumpka.

During the war, the riverway helped move the materials of destruction and even the battles themselves ultimately reached the Coosa-Alabama's banks.

An intriguing incident was when Cummins M. Lay (father of the organizer of Alabama Power Co.) steered the steamboat *Laura Moore* from Rome to Mobile to prevent Union forces from taking it. The harrowing trip was the first and only by a steamboat through the rapids of the Coosa.

Later, in the 1870's the Government made improvements on the river.

Saffold Berney, a chronologer of the day, reported this result on the Alabama: "The work done has resulted in clearing the channel of dangerous snags and overhanging timber; in improvement of the worst bars. * * * Boats run by night as well as by day, at all stages of water."

In 1890, an estimated $10 million in freight was carried on the Alabama River. Three large steamboats were making regular weekly round trips between Montgomery and Mobile.

On the Coosa, water travel was less ambitious. From Greensport to Rome, steamboats navigated at all seasons; but south to Wetumpka, the river's 142 miles was a tortuous route, with varying pools, high shoals, and jagged rocks.

If these obstacles could be removed, leaders reasoned, the river could be navigable from Rome to Mobile. Interest in such a plan sparked creation of the Coosa-Alabama Rivers Improvement Association by William Patrick Lay and other valley residents.

The Government in the eighties built a series of low-lift locks and dams on the upper Coosa, but they were determined impractical and were abandoned. Upland silt settled in the stream beds, making them too shallow for large boats, and railroads began assuming most of the responsibility for hauling freight.

A hopeful era was dying and a blossoming dream had received its first disappointment.

Next: Strength of a Dream.

Coosa-Alabama River Story

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KENNETH A. ROBERTS
OF ALABAMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 4, 1958

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include for the RECORD the third of a series of eight articles which I have prepared on the great Coosa-Alabama River system in Alabama:

THE COOSA-ALABAMA RIVER STORY
PART III: STRENGTH OF A DREAM
(By KENNETH A. ROBERTS, Member of Congress)

The sanguine dream of a fully developed Coosa-Alabama River has proved its durability.

It has withstood depression, wars, and three-quarters of a century of delays, setbacks, and near failures.

But the dream persists. It is shared by many groups—Alabama Power Co., the United States Government, the Coosa-Alabama Rivers Improvement Association, chambers of commerce, city and county governments—and by many men, from Congressmen to businessmen.

The dream gained sustenance when, in 1870, the United States Army Corps of Engineers began investigating the practicability of improving the Coosa and the Alabama Rivers.

But the first Federal project, authorized in this era of bleakness for the South, fell short of expectations. A series of low-lift navigation locks and dams, built on the upper Coosa, were found to be impractical and were abandoned.

Alabama Power Co. was an early part of the Coosa dream. Organized in 1906 to facilitate development of the river, the company had to overcome Government refusal to make survey material available before it finally obtained the right to build a dam on the Coosa. In 1914, following a long struggle to get money for the project, Lay Dam (named for Alabama Power's organizer, William Patrick Lay) was completed north of Clanton. Plans were already underway to build more dams.

But the plans ran aground in 1912 when President Taft denied Alabama Power's application to erect a plant south of Clanton. Taft said such applications should await creation of a Federal agency to act upon such matters and he contended that enabling legislation should let the Government tax waterpower.

A fight to maintain State rights ensued and it was 1921 before the power company got its second license. The waterpower bill of 1920 had not included the Federal taxation idea and the way was paved for Mitchell Dam.

This dam completed, the company began more constructions. By 1930, it had a third dam on the Coosa (Jordan, above Wetumpka) and three other dams on the Tallapoosa, which merges with the Coosa to form the Alabama River.

Meanwhile, the Corps of Engineers made its surveys. Then, in 1934, it entered a report calling for a system of locks and dams on the Alabama River and on the Coosa above the existing dams; and for locks in the three existing dams.

A 9-foot-deep channel for navigation upstream to Rome, 650 miles above Mobile, and for additional power, was recommended.

The fiber of the dream seemed more stable. But the road to fulfillment lay ahead, rough and shaky, in the indefinite future.

Next: Boost for the Coosa.

Coosa-Alabama River Story

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KENNETH A. ROBERTS
OF ALABAMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 4, 1958

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include for the RECORD the fourth in a series of articles which I have prepared on the great Coosa-Alabama River system in Alabama:

THE COOSA-ALABAMA RIVER STORY
PART IV: BOOST FOR THE COOSA
(By KENNETH A. ROBERTS, Member of Congress)

Congressional action of a summer day in 1954 assured activity which can turn the Coosa-Alabama River Basin into a second Ruhr Valley.

The historic event evoked comment from the Secretary of the Interior and from the President. In Alabama, it caused sheer jubilation.

Here is the background for the event:

In 1941, the United States Corps of Engineers, which had been studying the Coosa-Alabama for a number of years, submitted a report calling for comprehensive development of the basin's water resources in accordance with plans of the Chief of Engineers.

Congress approved the program in the River and Harbor Act of 1945, thus authorizing development of the river system for navigation, flood control, power, and other purposes. The work would be done by the Federal Government.

Then, Alabama Power Co.—which had built three dams on the Coosa and had long shown interest in the river's growth—reentered the picture. Now, the company said, it was ready to further develop the power potentialities of the river.

The company proposed to build a series of new dams, if the Federal Government would relinquish its plans to do something similar. Federal officials agreed.

In June of 1954, the 83d Congress cleared the way. It suspended operation of the Rivers and Harbors Act so Alabama Power, and not the Federal Government, could build the dams.

Secretary of the Interior Douglas McKay hailed the action as an endorsement of the of the partnership principle. President Eisenhower, in his 1955 state of the Union speech, called the Coosa River development as example of Federal Government working with private industry to coordinate developments.

Alabama newspapers, Congressmen, and civic leaders were unanimously joyous. Not only would the river system be improved as early as practical, but the work would be done by an Alabama concern.

Alabama Power applied for license to build four new dams—near Centre, in Cherokee County; near Ohatchee, Calhoun County; at Howell Mills Shoals, south of Pell City; and near Wetumpka—and to rebuild and heighten the Lay Dam north of Clanton.

Last fall, Federal Power Commission gave final approval to the multi-million dollar project and Alabama Power said it will begin work shortly on the Weiss Dam near Centre.

Next: Navigation the Goal.

Businesslike Reform

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL G. ROGERS
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 4, 1958

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call to the attention of the House an editorial from the Evening Star, March 4, 1958, Washington, D. C.:

BUSINESSLIKE REFORM

In his budget message last January, President Eisenhower told Congress that legislation now pending "to place Government appropriation requests on an accrued expenditure basis should be enacted, in accordance with the recommendations of the Hoover Commission. This is a businesslike approach." The President was referring in that instance to budget reform legislation that had bipartisan sponsorship and won unanimous Senate approval in the first session of the 85th Congress. Companion legislation, differing only slightly, is scheduled for House consideration this week.

In brief, the legislation would restore to Congress a "power of the purse" which historically is considered one of its proper responsibilities. It would do this by placing appropriations on a year-to-year basis, although not limiting the existing power of legislative committees and of Congress to authorize long-term programs or projects. Federal agencies would be required, however, to submit annual progress reports to justify additional fund requests. Under current budgetary procedures, Congress has in many cases appropriated total funds for Federal projects and has exercised no further control or review over the timing or the effectiveness of actual spending. One of the results has been the carryover of huge unexpended balances which may be disbursed without regard to sound budgetary considerations in any year. Some of these carryovers remain available for years, through changes in administrations and in both domestic and world conditions. Recent attempts at governmental economy through reducing appropriations were nullified by expenditures from carryover appropriations.

Opposition to the pending legislation has come principally from the House Appropriations Committee and from agencies having a large reservoir of carryover funds. Significantly, however, in addition to Senate approval and indorsement of the President, the proposal has the unanimous backing of the House Committee on Government Operations and indorsement of the Director of the Budget and of the Controller General. The House bill specifically proposes a trial period until July 1, 1961. The legislation should be approved.

Statement Opposing Financial Institutions Act of 1957

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GORDON L. McDONOUGH
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 3, 1958

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement:

STATEMENT OF MILTON O. SHAW, SAVINGS AND LOAN COMMISSIONER OF CALIFORNIA, BEFORE THE BANKING AND CURRENCY COMMITTEE OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, WASHINGTON, D. C., FEBRUARY 4, 1958

My purpose in appearing before this committee is to oppose certain sections of the Financial Institutions Act of 1957 which I believe invade the rights of the States, and to oppose certain recent proposals of the Federal Home Loan Bank Board which, it would appear, would completely take over the rights of the States as regards savings and loan associations.

My name is Milton O. Shaw. My residence is Los Angeles, Calif. I am now and have been for the past 4 years savings and loan commissioner of the State of California. I have served in the division of savings and loan of the State of California for more than 27 years, having successively held the positions of chief examiner, assistant commissioner, acting commissioner, and commissioner. I am a graduate of Ohio State University in business administration. I have been a certified public accountant for more than 30 years. During the year 1957 I was president of the National Association of State Savings and Loan Supervisors and am now a member of the executive committee of that organization. Also during the year 1957 I was appointed to and served as a member of the Federal Savings and Loan Advisory Council.

CALIFORNIA HAS THE MOST

California has a greater volume of savings and loan association business than any other State in the United States. The total assets of State associations in California are now approximately $3,300,000,000. California is the first State in the United States to have the assets of its State savings and loan associations exceed the $3 billion mark. In addition to this huge total for State associations in California, Federal associations now operating in the State have total assets of $2,700,000,000.

Nearly all of the California savings and loan associations have their accounts insured up to ten thousand dollars by the Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation. I would like to emphasize to you that the Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation has not been called upon to make good a single dollar of loss as a result of insuring any State association in California since the Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation was organized in 1934.

I would also like to point out that the California laws governing savings and loan associations are quite comprehensive and in many respects are more restrictive and provide greater safeguards than do the laws govering Federal savings and loan associations.

In this presentation first I would like to cover those items now in the Financial Institutions Act of 1957, S. 1457, which seriously invade the rights of the States.

1. Title VI, section 404 (c) authorizes the Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation "to impose such conditions to insurance, which conditions may be conditions precedent or conditions subsequent, as it may deem necessary." This provision would give the Insurance Corporation unlimited authority. Any provision authorizing conditions precedent should define the scope of any such conditions and should require that such conditions be applied uniformly to all associations. Unlimited authorization for conditions subsequent should be eliminated. All insured associations should be governed by the same laws and regulations and special conditions which could be applicable to particular associations and could be without limit as to duration should not be sanctioned.

The last sentence of section 404 (c) provides "any such conditions heretofore imposed are hereby validated." This sentence would, of course, have the effect of validating ex post facto all agreements which the Insurance Corporation has required of the various associations as a condition for the granting of insurance. By this provision you gentlemen are being asked to validate agreements without knowing the nature of the agreements you are being asked to validate.

Let me tell you about one of these conditions which seriously affects State associations. For a period of years the Insurance Corporation has required new State associations applying for insurance to agree that such new association will transfer to reserves 25 percent of its income before paying the investing public interest on its money. Now let's analyze this provision. The prevailing rate of interest paid to savings account holders in most California areas is currently 4 percent per year. A newly chartered association cannot hope to obtain sufficient money to operate profitably without paying a rate equal to that paid by all others. In order to have a net profit sufficient to pay 4 percent and transfer this 25 percent to reserves, the association must make a net return on its loans of at least 7.3 percent. So that you may understand, to the 4 percent paid on savings must be added the cost of doing business, which for a new association is 2 percent plus approximately 1.3 percent in order to meet the 25 percent of earnings transfer requirement. Of course, this assumes that the new association will have all of its money loaned out, which it should not do. In such a situation, a new association cannot have the protection of any FHA insured or servicemen's guaranteed loans in its portfolio, because of their low rates. It must seek high-rate, high-risk loans. This committee, I know, has been vitally concerned about the high cost of home financing. You are being asked by this very provision either to put new State associations out of business or that the cost of financing homes be tremendously increased. This is only one of many conditions imposed on new associations by the Insurance Corporation. In fact, new conditions not heretofore used are always being devised by the Insurance Corporation, and no applicant for insurance can know in advance what conditions it will be required to meet. I am advised by counsel that in imposing these conditions the Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation is acting totally beyond its statutory authority. Certainly if these agreements which have been extracted from the new associations asking for insurance of accounts are valid, there is no need to ask the Congress at this point to validate them.

2. Title VI, paragraph 404 (e) (p. 221 of the bill) gives the Insurance Corporation unlimited authority over mergers and transfers. Under this proposal approval of said Corporation would be required should a State-insured association sell even one loan to another State-insured association. Such a transfer could not affect the insurance risk and the provision is unnecessary. No loss to the insurance corporation is believed to

have resulted from existing laws and procedures regarding mergers and transfers.

It seems incontrovertible to me that the interest of the Insurance Corporation should be limited to the protection of its insurance risk. I believe that as far as State chartered associations are concerned any requirement of approval by the Insurance Corporation of mergers and transfers would be an invasion into matters which should be determined by State law. In any event, any regulation or law on these subjects should be concerned solely with the safety of the continuing or acquiring institution as tested by the adequacy of its reserves, and let me point out a standard requirement applicable to mergers and transfers in California. No mergers or transfers are approved unless the reserves of the acquiring association equal or exceed 9 percent of total savings accounts after the transaction is effected.

3. Section 403 (c) (6) of the bill gives the Insurance Corporation the right "To adopt and amend bylaws and to adopt, amend, and require the observance of such rules, regulations, and orders as may from time to time be deemed necessary for carrying out the provisions or purposes of this title or for the protection of its insurance risk." This new provision is, in my opinion, too broad and delegates to the Insurance Corporation powers and rights which should be reserved to the Congress. The law itself should limit the subjects upon which rules and regulations may, from time to time, be issued and not leave such broad powers in the hands of a governmental corporation which, as you know, is now an independent agency and responsible directly to Congress. Under such a broad authorization, rules, regulations and orders could be promulgated which would adversely affect only State-chartered savings and loan association. A blank check such as this should not be signed by Congress.

Let me now proceed to the new and startling recent proposals of the Federal Home Loan Bank Board, which, if enacted, would take away most of the rights of the States regarding savings and loan associations.

1. The Home Loan Bank Board requests an amendment to subsection (d) of section 4 of title IV of the Federal Home Loan Bank Act which would add a new provision giving the Board authority to regulate the sales plans and practices and the advertising of uninsured members of the district Federal home loan banks. It has never been my understanding that the district Federal home loan banks are in any way concerned with supervising or regulating the member institutions. These banks are supposed to do a banking business for members. In ordinary practice the bank will establish a line of credit for a member institution and make the loans or advances to that member upon submission of adequate collateral. The Board cites as a need for this authority the practice of giveaways for opening or increasing savings accounts. It is difficult to understand what effect the use or nonuse of giveaways by an association would have on the collateral which is submitted to the banks as security for advances. I submit that this is merely a reaching out for power by the Board and the only justification is a desire on the part of the Board to control the uninsured State chartered bank members.

Let me now proceed to the Board's proposal to add a new subsection (k) to section 403 of title VI dealing with the capitalization of a State-chartered mutual-type institution. This, in effect, is an attempt by the Board to control the form of corporations within the various States. I would like to point out that the capitalization of a State-chartered mutual institution includes the addition of considerable capital, always not less than 2 percent of savings accounts, and that this additional capital which goes into the association is permanent, is nonwithdrawable and must remain with the association as a guaranty that no savings account holder will ever have any loss on his account. Thus a considerable additional protection is provided not only to the Insurance Corporation but to the savings account holder. Therefore, not only is the insurance risk not increased, it is materially lessened, by the introduction of this new capital. The loose statements of the Board on this subject are that the reason for this proposal is the problem of assuring adequate protection to the interests of the mutual shareholders. As a matter of fact, by this proposal the Board is seeking to prevent the mutual shareholder from having additional protection. This proposal approaches this subject in a backhanded manner and provides that no State-chartered association may issue any security not having the same characteristics as a security of such institution previously issued and currently outstanding. I submit for the committee's consideration that during the many years I have been in the savings and loan division there have been numerous capitalizations of mutual-type associations. There has never been any loss to the Insurance Corporation as a result of the capitalization of any such association. The reserves of the mutual institution continue for the life of the association in the same capacity for which they were created, and in every case the guaranty or permanent stock has acted as an additional protection to both the Insurance Corporation and the savings account holder. There has not been one valid reason given that would justify this proposal and I ask that it be refused by this committee.

3. The Board has also asked that a new provision be added to section 404, which would require the approval of the Insurance Corporation for the establishment of a branch by any State-chartered insured savings and loan association. In this proposal we have another serious attempt to impair the jurisdiction of the State. So far as I have been able to ascertain, no claim has ever been made by the Insurance Corporation that the licensing by the States of branches has ever jeopardized the insurance risk. In fact, there are many States which do not permit branches at all, and in other States the approval of branches is severely limited by law.

As far as California is concerned, if we have any Federal law limiting branches it should be one to limit branches of Federal associations. In California we have adopted standards which must be met by all associations seeking branches, and the requirements of law are exacting. An applicant for a branch in California must file a formal application setting forth the facts which will support the legal requirements, which include a showing that the area is not now adequately served; that the association's financial program is sound; that it would be in the interest of the association to have the branch and that the public convenience and advantage would be promoted. Also a public hearing must be held at which any person has a right to appear and orally, or in writing, show cause why the branch application should not be approved. Briefly, I would like to enumerate the standards that the division of savings and loan enforces in California. We require that there must be 25,000 population per savings and loan office; an association must have more than 7 percent of reserves and capital to savings accounts, and the association must have assets of at least $3½ million ($5 million for the larger cities), in order to qualify for 1 branch.

In the Los Angeles metropolitan area I have been able to get the Federal Home Loan Bank Board to agree to substantially all of these standards. In other parts of the State of California the Federal authorities have no standards for the approval of branches and I can cite numerous examples of Federal associations being approved where a State association cannot qualify, and in fact a number of Federal branches have been approved in identical areas in which, within a few months prior thereto, a branch of a State association was denied by me because it failed to meet the standards.

4. Now with your permission I would like to direct your attention to the Board's proposed amendment to section 407 which would give the Board power to issue an order of removal against any director or officer of a State chartered savings and loan association. Under this proposal it becomes a Federal criminal offense if after the issuance of such order of removal such director or officer participates in any manner in the management of the State chartered association. Hearing and the limited judicial review provided would coming afterward. This preemptory manner of removing officers and directors of State chartered associations is not given to the State officials of the State of California. Therefore this would not be merely a transfer of power from State authorities to the insurance corporation but it would be a transfer of the powers of shareholders and management of these associations themselves to the insurance corporation. In addition to other reasons, this proposal provides that directors and officers may be removed for engaging in unsafe and unsound practices. Neither the law nor the Board has ever defined what constitutes unsafe and unsound practices. It would be impossible for the management of an association to know in advance what practices might be termed unsafe and unsound by the Board.

Let me state right here that so far as California is concerned we in the division of savings and loan are more frequently in touch with the management of associations and we are in a much better position to know whether the affairs of the associations are being conducted properly than are members of the Federal Home Loan Bank Board in Washington. We are perfectly capable of acting in cases where officers and directors violate their trust and I submit that this is another case of reaching out for power over State associations. This proposal should be rejected.

Finally I would like to suggest that the provisions already contained in the bill as well as the various new proposals be carefully screened with a view to eliminating those provisions which give the Federal Home Loan Bank Board blanket power so that our savings and loan associations will be governed by law rather than by men.

Theodore Roosevelt

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EMMET F. BYRNE
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 4, 1958

Mr. BYRNE of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I would like consent to pay tribute to a great President of the United States, inaugurated 53 years ago today. His party is my party—the Republican Party, and the man is Theodore Roosevelt. I would like my remarks to appear in the Appendix of the RECORD.

Few men are without ideals and dreams. Theodore Roosevelt was what so many of us would like to be. He was

fearless and had infinite courage; a high sense of honor, and was dedicated to raising the standards of public life by refusing to let personal cost deter him from public service. He was a man of action always. It was not possible for him to wait for things to happen. This characteristic manifested itself early in his life. Whatever the endeavor or task, he gave it his best.

It was Theodore Roosevelt who recognized the fact that America must prepare for the new forces at work in the world. Things were changing in 1900, just as they are now. It was incumbent upon us to begin to enforce the Monroe doctrine. We could no longer confine ourselves to devoting our energies solely to internal affairs and a larger role in international affairs was slowly but certainly being thrust upon us.

April 10, 1899, Theodore Roosevelt addressed the Hamilton Club in Chicago. I find his remarks timely today:

I wish to preach not the doctrine of ignoble ease but the doctrine of the strenuous life. Far better it is to dare mighty things, to win glorious triumphs, even though checkered by failure, than to take rank with those poor spirits who neither enjoy much nor suffer much because they live in the gray twilight that knows not victory nor defeat.

We must remember not to judge any public servant by any one act, and especially should beware of attacking the men who are merely the occasion and not the causes of disaster.

In the capital of Illinois, Springfield, on July 4, 1903, Theodore Roosevelt had this to say:

A man who is good enough to shed his blood for his country is good enough to be given a square deal afterward. More than than no man is entitled to, and less than that no man shall have.

This great President of our Republic lived as he believed. Life was an adventure for him, a great one and full of fun, too. These things and many more too, are why he is beloved by Americans and spoken of as Teddy Roosevelt by so many of us. I am happy and privileged to serve as a member of the Centennial Commission honoring him.

Unique Antelope Valley

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDGAR W. HIESTAND

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 29, 1958

Mr. HIESTAND. Mr. Speaker, a unique development in defense spending comes to light in the operation of an Air Force flight testing and production facility in California. This project, identified as Air Force Plant No. 42, is located at Palmdale in Los Angeles County just 60 miles north of the city of Los Angeles in the vast booming Antelope Valley.

In this unique project the Department of Defense has provided a jet aircraft center—a bargain from the taxpayers' point of view.

In this unique example of organizational ingenuity, the Department of Defense has brought together large, highly competitive aircraft-manufacturing companies: Convair, Lockheed, North American, Northrop and soon Douglas—to make use of flight-testing facilities on a joint occupancy basis resulting in savings of millions of dollars.

A unique management team: a committee of Defense Department and aircraft company personnel establish operating procedures for a single installation, thus insuring maximum utilization of expensive facilities which otherwise might have to be quadrupled.

This unique location in the great Antelope Valley, surrounded by desert and mountains, conforms to security defense standards and dispersal policies.

Unique weather conditions permit an average of 360 flying days a year, free of smog, fog, and overcast.

Uniquely designed for efficiency and maximum use, Air Force Plant No. 42 at Palmdale is self-contained, complete with utilities independent of any municipal system.

Unique planning, in cooperation with local civic leaders, assures safety and favorable community relations. A mile wide buffer strip surrounds the airport, zoned to permit complementary industrial development but to exclude high density commercial and residential buildup.

Unique in its air field equipment, scientifically designed buildings, and runways more than 2 miles long, Air Force Plant No. 42 at Palmdale is the last word in efficency in flight testing and assembling jet aircraft.

Unique in its location close to the great Edwards Air Force Base with its vast dry lakes, its equipment and scientific experimental facilities and relative convenience to the great airframe and parts factories of southern California, it is also convenient to the extensive scientific centers like Caltech and others. Adequate community facilities and housing at very reasonable costs have been installed together with schools, highway, rail, and air service.

This unique defense installation in the Antelope Valley constitutes a commendable military, industrial, and civic achievement in the interest of national security and is a tribute to the far-sighted leaders in all three of these fields who made it possible.

The Development of Creative Minds

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUGH J. ADDONIZIO

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 4, 1958

Mr. ADDONIZIO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to insert the following letter from a constituent on a subject of particular concern at this time when recent scientific achievements have made us aware, as the writer points out, of our dependence on creative minds. I am sure that Mr. Redpath's remarks will be of interest to all my colleagues:

NEW YORK, N. Y., *February 24, 1958.*

Hon. HUGH J. ADDONIZIO,
Congress of the United States,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. ADDONIZIO: I have read with great concern the article in yesterday's New York Times by John W. Finney, reporting the position within the United States Navy against the promotion and other important recognition of Rear Adm. Hyman G. Rickover, developer of the first atomic submarine.

The events of the past year have revealed our country's dependence on the contributions of creative minds, particularly in the rapidly growing margins of human knowledge where new scientific theory is being applied. Up through the present time we know too little about the combinations of factors that result in the development of these rare creative capacities or genius. Still lacking assembly lines from which we can assure a flow of geniuses, our American society's defense, in many areas, is especially dependent, for a long time in the future, on the accidents of personality, reflecting in the genius.

I believe that basic ethical principles dictate individual and group monitoring of the tendency (unfortunately prevailing in most of us in some areas) to criticize those individuals whose ideas or even personal habits differ from our own. Without implying that any individual is automatically right because of his difference, or the converse, that a group is automatically wrong in exercising those responsibilities for criticism, I believe that the preservation of civilization, as we have come to cherish it in the Western World, depends to a great extent on society's capacity to identify, incorporate, and recognize the cost of the contributions of the genius.

For the gifts of genius, manifested in any field including sciences, arts, and even religion, have more often than not been produced by anguished, even tortured individuals whose personal lives outside the areas in which their genius manifests itself evoke little appreciation from those nearest to them. Their loneliness and lack of appreciation compounds so as, often, to render more difficult that portion of their genius which must be applied not just by themselves but with the cooperation of others. To the threat that is often involved in the new idea which they have conceived is added the personalized resistance or antagonism which their isolation makes easy for others to feel.

I do not presume to know the extent to which any of the above thinking may apply in Admiral Rickover's case. If any does I hope it might be accepted as a more generous and perhaps scientific way of accounting for the resistance among his professional associates to the attempts of a mind of high creative capacity and proven patriotism to help apply the results of his own individual genius, harnessed to the group of scientific personnel who help bring into existence our atomic submarines.

There is much talk about the costs involved for the country in interservice rivalry. Apparently in company with a good many closer observers and abler minds I know of no easy single way of remedying this admittedly dangerous situation. However, we increase the jeopardy to which we are already exposed if we allowed our national attention to be limited to the costs involved in interservice rivalry and pay no attention to the less obvious but equally important factors at work in intraservice rivalry, as exampled by Admiral Rickover's career in the Navy.

I hope that you may do everything in your power to make certain that within every branch of the Armed Forces everything possible is done to assure the development in greater numbers and continued usefulness of creative minds of his caliber.

Cordially yours,

ROBERT U. REDPATH, Jr.

Help Clean Up Smut in the Mails

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ELMER J. HOLLAND
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 3, 1958

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. Speaker, in the report of the Committee on the Judiciary of the United States Senate on juvenile delinquency, it was shockingly disclosed the extent to which ponography has reached our young children, and the terrible influence such filth has on their conduct. After holding hearings in New York, it was estimated that the traffic in erotic photographs, illustrated playing cards, phonograph records, movies, slides, illustrated books, and pamphlets totaled $300 million to $400 million a year.

Although we have many groups in the city of Pittsburgh, in addition to the churches, trying to combat the indecent literature, the purveyors of filth still require strong legislation that will reach the peddlers of smut, not only in the mails but by personal car, truck, American Express, or any other means used. The receiver as well as the sender and the manufacturer should be made responsible.

I am pleased to place an editorial that appeared in the Pittsburgh Catholic entitled "Help Clean Up Smut in Mails." It covers this subject very thoroughly, and I am sure that every Congressman will support any legislation to break up this $300 million business that is destroying the morals of our young people.

HELP CLEAN UP SMUT IN MAILS

When the Army post-exchange magazine racks overseas were being polluted with filthy reading matter, Father Patrick O'Connor revealed that disgraceful fact first and exclusively for the Catholic press in an article he wrote for the NCWC News Service. As a result, and despite some very red faces among the Army brass, the indecent publications quickly vanished.

Last week, NCWC News Service uncovered a more startling scoop. As printed in the Pittsburgh Catholic and other diocesan papers, the story told of the latest and more dastardly scheme of the "sewer salesmen" to defile and corrupt the youth of our land.

A slimy syndicate doing more than $300-million-a-year business is now flooding our homes, here in Pittsburgh and in every other city and town in the United States, with pornographic material so vile it would make Satan himself blush while he danced with glee.

Through mailing lists diabolically gathered from the innocent victims themselves, this dirty deluge is directed chiefly at unsuspecting teen-agers.

And it is delivered, at the expense of all taxpayers, through the United States mails.

But don't blame your mailman. Postal officials are well aware of the evil that rests in the mail pouch that reeks. But they must operate according to the law, since the purveyors of pornography operate cleverly within the law. The only remedy is to change the law, to put some teeth into it, sharp enough to frighten off or to kill off the merchants of immorality.

And that is where you and you and you and you come in. If you are the parent of one or more teen-agers, naturally you have a vital, personal interest in protecting our youth. So, too, if you are a grandparent, an uncle or an aunt. If you are one of the targets—a teen-ager concerned about saving your own immortal soul—then it is your soul which is involved.

But parent, relative, teen-ager or not, Catholic, Protestant, or Jewish, you have a stake in this, our America, and an interest in guarding its freedom and its liberties.

Public sentiment, as aroused by the Catholic press, cleaned out the rotten reading matter in our PX's abroad. Surely, public sentiment is more concerned about the defilement of our youth right in our own homes, and at Government expense, to boot.

Write your Senators and Congressman now. They are your Representatives. Tell them to enact the kind of laws you want to protect your children and to save your country. As FBI Chief J. Edgar Hoover points out:

"Too often the purveyor of filth reaps a rich reward as a result of lackadaisical public opposition to his evil occupation. Public opinion and coordinated action can sound the death knell for the obscene material peddler."

Snow, Flood, and Dams

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 4, 1958

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include a very thought-provoking editorial which appeared in the Boston Daily Globe on February 26, 1958:

SNOW, FLOOD AND DAMS

The worst is not likely to happen now, but it could. Water content in the snow of the upper Connecticut and Merrimac Rivers basins is one and a half to three times the normal amount, say the Army Engineers.

In Franconia Notch, which feeds the Merrimac, there are in places 120 inches of snow—the equivalent of 12 inches of water.

The odds are that no great damage will accrue. Ordinarily, frost, alternating with thaw, permits melting to be gradual. But winter, though it may have unpleasant surprises in store, is definitely on the wane. The daily mean temperature in Boston normally rises above freezing February 27; which is tomorrow.

If the next few weeks should be as unseasonably warm as the last two have been unseasonably cold, there could be serious trouble.

That New England's flood-control protection was inadequate became evident 3 years ago when waters, unloosed by the backlash of Hurricane Diane, did damage of more than a half billion dollars.

Programs were set in motion thereafter in the basins of the Connecticut, Blackstone, and Thames Rivers, but nothing was done to add needed protection in the valley of the Merrimac, which had suffered relatively little from that storm.

Army engineers recommended more reservoirs in the basin of this river. But when Massachusetts asked Congress to appropriate funds for these it was refused because New Hampshire would not agree.

That State, where the reservoirs would be built, saw it would lose tax money from the flooding of wide areas for the projects whose chief benefits would accrue to Massachusetts. Last year the two States signed a compact, under which the Commonwealth will compensate New Hampshire for 70 percent of the loss she will incure from the construction.

A Merrimac River Flood Control Commission has been set up by the two States to determine what the Commonwealth shall pay for currently planned and future reservoirs, and to simulate public interest in such projects.

The Army engineers presently plan a project of two dams at West Hopkinton, N. H., on western tributaries of the Merrimac River. Money has been appropriated and $1,200,000 has been asked for next year.

But it is uncertain whether the administration's decision to start no new flood-control projects now will prevent this appropriation. Even if it does not, the development of added protection in the Merrimac Valley will be painfully slow.

The last dam in this basin was completed in 1946. Those at West Hopkinton, as things now stand, will not be finished until 1964.

The odds are somewhat against a bad flood in the Merrimac Valley this year. Many winters and springs may pass before there is serious trouble. But swamping waters did $46 million damage on this river in 1936. (Army engineers say this could have been reduced by three-fourths if the West Hopkinton dams had been in existence).

The worst could happen anytime, nevertheless. It would be highly desirable, as Massachusetts Congressmen should be made aware, to speed up this construction. Why is it that in flood-control projects we are seldom forehanded? It should not require a major disaster to make us carry out urgently-needed improvements.

UNCLE DUDLEY.

Leveling-Off Period

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL B. DAGUE
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 4, 1958

Mr. DAGUE. Mr. Speaker, it is quite often that we cannot see the woods for the trees, and our preoccupation with the endless game of politics so often colors our statements and our judgment to the extent that we fail to evaluate the true state of our affairs. In the present instance the feverish activity of some folks to try to talk us into a depression has dulled our awareness of the true facts of the economic situation.

The editor of my hometown paper, the Downingtown Archive, underscores this unbalanced thinking by reference to a local employment situation where a firm has recently laid off 100 employees while still retaining on its rolls twice as many people as were employed less than 3 years ago. The editor points out:

We are thinking (or being told to think) in terms of the recent cutback rather than in terms of total gain of our economy in past war years.

The full text of this splendid editorial is included in full as follows:

LEVELING-OFF PERIOD

Despite former President Harry Truman's Cry Wolf speech, we find it hard to believe that this Nation is in serious financial difficulty at the present time.

We can go along with the former President's point that a drop in business, production, employment is a drop, call it what you will. But, to get panicky because our economy has not remained at its postwar peak is ridiculous.

To illustrate our point, we can take one local industry, Beloit Eastern Corp. In November 1955, Beloit acquired ownership of the former Downingtown Manufacturing Co. facilities. At that time, the plant employed about 285 persons and, at that time, there was no talk about a recession.

Beloit expanded their production facilities with new buildings and additions. The work force rose to close to 800. Two months ago approximately 100 employees were laid off. The same plant that 28 months age (when there was no talk of recession) employed less than 300 persons, today employs well over 600.

This situation is not peculiar to Beloit Eastern, it is happening all over the Nation. But, most of us are losing sight of this fact. We are thinking (or being told to think) in terms of the recent cutback rather than in terms of the total gain of our economy in postwar years.

Although there are some contributing factors to these recent cutbacks, the main reason is overexpansion of production facilities which allowed supply to catch up with demand.

Of course, the basis of our economy is that supply and demand should counter-balance each other to set the price of a particular product. But supply and demand are never in perfect harmony, there is always more of one than the other and they operate in more or less of a leap-frog fashion.

As we see it, there is little that Government can do to effectively change the present situation short of creating an artificial demand by offering to buy all the surplus products that the Nation's industry can produce at specified minimum prices—sort of a farm price-suport program for industry.

This idea is ridiculous. We would soon have tremendous stockpiles of everything imaginable, with no possible way of getting rid of them.

Rather than look on the Nation's present financial status as a recession we look on it as a leveling-off period, a period that is inevitable if we are to have a sound capitalistic economy.

Family Life

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EMMET F. BYRNE
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 4, 1958

Mr. BYRNE of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I extend my remarks in the RECORD relative to a belief and concern I have for the family in remaining the center of American life.

Often I have read from wise men that if one look at the family life of a nation, you will know many other things about it, its strength and weaknesses.

Lately I have been reading of the serious incidents occurring in our schools in different parts of the United States. My reactions have not been approving. I cannot help but wonder if one had the time to examine the backgrounds of those involved, the evidence disclosed would overwhelmingly point to laxity and callousness about the family unit, and in many instances family living as I know it would be nonexistent in a great number of cases. As a defense counsel for many, many years, I have seen what the lack of respect, absence of authority in the family, does to young boys and girls or young men and women.

Some schools of thought it seems consider acknowledgment of the sanctity of the home as out of step with today. A person who adheres to this belief is thought to be old fashioned. Be that as it may, as the father of eight, I know the need for a close family unit. Many virtues are needed in meeting the challenge today if our future leaders are to have the principles we know to be right. Infinite love, patience, understanding, intelligence, and commonsense and a genuine interest in our children's life are but some of the cardinal ingredients necessary, if these children are to mature into solid citizens, possessed with a steadfast belief and faith in God, Almighty, and a primary desire to serve God, country, and State with honor and devotion.

Parents are confronted with the need to be constantly alert to influences which seek to destroy the ideals we endeavor to inject into our family life.

This week's Washington Post and Times Herald reported that information released recently by the Kinsey Institute for Sex states there is an increasing frequency of illegal abortions in the United States. I was heartened however to note that Dr. David Allman of Atlantic City, N. J., who is president of the American Medical Association, does not altogether agree with the statistics released by the Kinsey Institute.

There are other signs to make the picture brighter. I wish to commend and congratulate a family in my constituency, Mr. and Mrs. Walter W. Fulton, of 8035 South Emerald Avenue, Chicago, on the arrival of their ninth child. The Fulton's with their nine are one up on the Byrnes since we are only eight.

The father of this fine family is a Democrat precinct captain and I knew him when I was a Republican precinct captain.

I sincerely hope that Walter Fulton is successful in finding that they are "cheaper by the dozen."

This family is a wonderful example of the kind of family life needed. The Fulton children have the security of a united family. The more examples we have of family life as the Fultons live it, the better it augurs for the future of our country and the moral fiber of our citizenry.

Whether we have one or a dozen children, parents must offset the avenues leading to delinquency with plenty of healthy, wholesome family living.

I commend the Southtown Economist for giving such wholesome news coverage on the first page of its Sunday edition, February 23, 1958. The Fultons indeed can feel gratified.

United States Relations With Latin America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THEODORE FRANCIS GREEN
OF RHODE ISLAND
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, March 4, 1958

Mr. GREEN. Mr. President, a few days ago the Senate had the privilege of hearing a very cogent analysis of the situation among our neighbors to the south. The analysis was made by the junior Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS].

The situation among our Latin American neighbors is very serious. As the junior Senator from Florida pointed out so ably, they have come to feel that the United States is paying far more attention to the rest of the world.

The facts are that we have neglected our own neighborhood, and no man can be strong unless he is respected and liked in his own community.

The Washington Post and Times Herald yesterday reviewed the speech of the junior Senator from Florida in an editorial. I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OUR RESTIVE NEIGHBORS

Is the United States, through blindness and apathy, letting its prestige dip to a perilous low in Latin America? The recent elections in Argentina and Guatemala both showed a troubling common element. Candidates most friendly to the United States trailed badly, while extremist critics of this country surged in strength. A survey of 20 Latin diplomatic missions in Washington, taken by United Press reporter Henry Raymont, shows dismaying results. Speaking off the record, Mr. Raymont reports, the diplomats "are frustrated and bitterly critical about what they term the apparent lack of interest of the men guiding United States foreign policy."

In a searching and cogent speech, Senator SMATHERS, of Florida, put his finger on the crux of the matter: economics. Latin America, rich in resources, is an area in a hurry to raise living standards, rub out illiteracy and forge stable political institutions. Our neighbors want loans—and a fair chance to trade in the United States market. The United States has everything to gain by helping. Nearly every dollar that goes to Latin America comes back to the United States in the form of purchase of our goods.

Yet, as Senator SMATHERS points out, this country seems to be drifting aimlessly in its response—and, by inaction, inviting Soviet trade penetration into our very back yard. The State Department has drenched in cold water most Latin suggestions for a broad development program, without suggesting much of an alternative. Further, it is widely believed that Argentina and Brazil were denied credits in Washington because both

countries are determined to develop some resources by government monopolies. Is it any wonder that both countries resent this seeming dictation and are tentatively looking east for help denied in Washington? Isn't it a sad commentary that more help was given the anti-American Peron dictatorship than the pro-American Aramburu provisional regime in Argentina?

In the marts of commerce, there is grave danger that the tourniquet of protection may choke off interAmerican trade. The United States has wisely given its blessings to the creation of a Latin American common market. Yet, while urging free trade elsewhere, the Government has boosted "voluntary" oil import restrictions and is considering a sharp increase in lead and zinc tariffs—all primary Latin export commodities. Senator Smathers has suggested some form of direct subsidy for domestic industries, in distress, rather than the indirect subsidy of a tariff. This may not be the best solution, but at least there ought to be a conscientious search for a less mischievous remedy than the wailing off of our ports. Palpably, there is need for constructive discussion. Much can be done, if the problem is faced. There are, Kipling said, 100 ways to build a tiger trap and all of them are good. The important point is to recognize that a menacing tiger is afoot.

Loans for Development of Asia and Africa—Plan by Senator Monroney

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MIKE MANSFIELD
OF MONTANA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, March 4, 1958

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Loans for Development of Asia and Africa—Plan by Senator Monroney," written by Raymond P. Brandt, chief washington correspondent of the St. Louis Post-Dispatch, and published in the issue of that newspaper for March 2, 1958.

I make this request because of the fact that this is a statesmanlike proposal. The distinguished junior Senator from Oklahoma has come forward with an idea which will get us away from the giving of grants in our foreign economic-aid program, and instead will substitute long-term loans on a low-interest rate basis.

I think the suggestion of the Senator from Oklahoma is not only statesmanlike, but worthy of the consideration of the Foreign Relations Committee in its discussion of the foreign aid bill.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the St. Louis Post-Dispatch of March 2, 1958]

LOANS FOR DEVELOPMENT OF ASIA AND AFRICA—PLAN BY SENATOR MONRONEY—NEW AGENCY UNDER WORLD BANK PROPOSED TO MEET NEEDS OF UNDERDEVELOPED AREAS—AN ANSWER TO COMMUNIST ECONOMIC SCHEMES THREATENING TO ATTRACT LOYALTY OF MAJORITY OF MANKIND

(By Raymond P. Brandt)

WASHINGTON, March 1.—With hopes of stopping the propaganda here and abroad about Uncle Sugar and Uncle Shylock, Senator A. S. MIKE MONRONEY proposed this week the creation of a second mortgage international bank that could first reduce and perhaps eventually end congressional appropriations for American economic aid to underdeveloped countries.

After 18 months of study, the Oklahoma Democrat came up with the first detailed plan for meeting the Kremlin's long-term, low-interest loans to newly independent nations that are long on manpower and natural resources but short on dollars and other hard currencies.

As a member of the House Banking and Currency Committee more than 12 years ago, MONRONEY participated in the establishment of the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development, usually called the World Bank, under the Bretton Wood agreement. As a member of the similar Senate committee, he is chairman of the International Finance subcommittee which will hold hearings in about 2 weeks on his proposal for an International Development Association, to be closely allied with the World Bank.

In summary, the new banking organization, capitalized with a billion dollars in hard currencies supplied by the countries underwriting the World Bank, would have the following objectives:

1. Long-term loans, up to 40 years at 2 percent, repayable in local or soft currencies to supplement the World Bank's hard currency loans, limited to a maximum of 20 years at rates from 4 to 6 percent.

2. Maximum use of foreign currencies available to the United States through the sale of agricultural surpluses and other programs by devoting a portion of these currencies to such loans.

3. Placement of the loans in a way to eliminate any possible implications of interference with national sovereignty.

During his study of the foreign economic aid problem, MONRONEY first thought it would be necessary to have a Bretton Woods type of conference to create the auxiliary World Bank. After talks with administration and World Bank officials, he came to the conclusion that with bipartisan American support, the World Bank directors had or could be given ample authority for its establishment. The resolution he introduced this week merely says that it is the "sense of the Senate" that consideration should be given to the establishment of the Development Association. Witnesses scheduled to be heard on this resolution include Treasury Secretary Robert B. Anderson; Under Secretary of State Christian A. Herter, and his economic deputy, C. Douglas Dillon; President Eugene Black of the World Bank; economists and private bankers.

Black, whose private banking reputation was impressive before he became head of the World Bank, has cautiously said for publication that the MONRONEY idea is one the World Bank should explore. He has consistently favored multination loans over bilateral arrangements for public development projects.

MONRONEY has not been able to get the support of Secretary of State John Foster Dulles for favorable action on his resolution at this session of Congress. There are several reasons for this. The first is that the Eisenhower administration is concentrating on getting the full $3,942,100,000 authorization for the mutual security program the President has recommended for next fiscal year. The second is that the Monroney resolution asks the Senate to approve the transfer of the uncommitted $300 million voted last year to the development loan fund to the proposed international bank.

Furthermore, MONRONEY has not endeared himself to Dulles by saying that if he cannot get the initial $300 million away from the International Cooperation Administration fund, from which not a single loan has been made, he will ask Congress to reject the administration's request for an additional $625 million for the ICA loan fund and appropriate the money directly to the proposed International Bank.

From the practical parliamentary and political viewpoint, it does not appear that the new bank could be established this year, even if the Senate acted favorably on the Monroney resolution. Although the United States supplied 30 percent of the original capital for the World Bank, and as a result has 30 percent of the voting strength on the board of directors, it would probably require 2 or 3 years before the World Bank could have a billion-dollar auxiliary in shape to make sound soft-currency loans on approved projects.

It would be logical and practical, however, for the Eisenhower administration and the Democratic Congress to follow through on the Monroney proposal as a long-term proposition, while the economic aid parts of the present mutual-security program are gradually tapered off.

MONRONEY told the Post-Dispatch that as he envisaged the new bank's operations, full and immediate use could be made of the World Bank's trained personnel and its comprehensive studies of economically sound projects in specific countries throughout the world.

"The World Bank and its personnel," he said, "command the highest respect. Because its loans are in hard currencies for relatively short periods at comparatively high interest rates, many countries cannot meet its terms. But if we could make use of the soft local currencies the United States has accumulated from its foreign-aid programs, and from the sale of agricultural surpluses, together with the soft-currency deposits and credits of the other free and the uncommitted countries, second mortgages would make new World Bank loans practicable."

Walking over to a huge map of Asia on his office wall, MONRONEY pointed to the northwest part of India, where it joins western Pakistan, and said:

"One of the world's great trouble spots is in the relationships between India and Pakistan. The root of this trouble is far more than Kashmir. The struggle is for the use of the waters of the six-river watershed that originates in India and Tibet and goes down through Pakistan.

"If India alone developed the waters of this great river system, Pakistan would perish through loss of the water necessary for its economy.

"For more than a year, engineers of Pakistan and India have worked together on a joint plan for a huge TVA type of development for this section of Asia. The program probably would cost around $400 million. As a hard-currency World Bank loan, requiring payment in 20 years at 4 percent interest, this would not be bankable.

"Under the International Development Association, the plan could be financed with safety to the tremendous good of two countries whose disagreements threaten trouble in the Far East.

"As a second-mortgage operation, the IDA could take perhaps 50 percent of the $400 million loan, subordinating it to the first claim of the World Bank, which would take the primary loan. The secondary loan would be for 40 years at 2 percent interest, repaid not in dollars or hard currency, but in the local currencies of India and Pakistan. This would be on better terms than the Russians and their satellites are offering.

"In designing the dam and other works, the IDA could lend funds for engineering in German deutschemarks. It could furnish funds for earthmoving equipment in French francs, with certain dollar or hard currency additions to make the loan attractive to the

French. Cement could come from some 10 countries, purchased in local currencies. Thus with a worldwide shopping list, wise banking administration could make full use of local currencies, including those accumulated from the sale of our agricultural surpluses, which will run into the equivalent of several billions dollars over the next 5 years."

MONRONEY said other members of the World Bank could individually contribute local currencies they have on hand, such as India's block sterling credits in England. This, he said, would give flexible and judicious use of many presently frozen assets.

In a greatly limited way, the development loan fund of the International Cooperative Administration could theoretically make loans of the sort MONRONEY described. The basic difference between the development loan fund and the IDA is that ICA loans, when made, will be bilateral between the United States and the borrowing country while the IDA loans would be multilateral, with the responsibility diffused among the countries now supporting the World Bank.

MONRONEY argues and many administration officials concede that the present bilateral arrangement on much of the present foreign aid, military and economic, is the reason the United States is called Uncle Sugar and Uncle Shylock. The arrangement also permits the Communist propagandists to proclaim that the American economic aid program is a thinly disguised operation for economic and military domination of the uncommitted, underdeveloped countries.

Adlai E. Stevenson had a similar idea to MONRONEY's in his speech this week to the national conference on the foreign aspects of United States national security. He did not specifically endorse the second-mortgage world bank but his ideas could be included in the IDA proposal. He told the gathering assembled by Eric Johnston:

"I think it is time we coordinated our economic efforts with our friends instead of going it alone. The whole of the industrialized free world has the same interest in seeing the underdeveloped areas make the transition to self-sustaining growth while maintaining their independence.

INTERESTS IDENTICAL

"Our interests are identical. This is a global enterprise, and it should be organized on that basis. For Western Europe and Japan this coordination would give a badly needed sense of common constructive purpose at a time when military problems alone seem to hold the center of the international stage. Moreover, coordination would also make possible useful contributions from some of the smaller States of the free world.

"I do not believe it is necessary to commingle all our funds to set up a single international fund. But the governments of the free world should gather, assess what they are doing, and make common cause in enlarging their efforts in both technical assistance and the supply of capital. Before the NATO conference, I suggested that the Organization for Economic Cooperation in Paris might offer a useful gathering place for this new enterprise. That Organization, a product of the Marshall plan, has the flexibility, the staff, and the tradition of constructive purpose to do the job. I am confident that from such collaboration a new spirit would emerge in the free world, a new sense of the powers and constructive possibilities of democracy, annuity based on hope rather than fear.

"Against the background of an enlarged and stabilized American program, weaving together the great resources of the industrialized nations, giving play to private as well as Government initiative, we could well invite Mr. Khrushchev to coordinate his efforts with ours if he is really interested in the economic development and political independence of these less-fortunate countries. Such cooperation—and I hope we leave no stone unturned in our effort to cooperate—could avoid the waste and hazard of blackmail that results from competition in this kind of effort. And if the Soviets are not interested in joining our international effort, such an offer would at least unmask the motive behind their assistance."

OPEN TO CHANGES

MONRONEY is open to changes in his proposal, saying details can be worked out after the hearings before the full Banking and Currency Committee or the International Finance Subcommittee.

"I am convinced that most of the objections to the secondary bank can be ironed out." he said, "We will seek the testimony of the best authorities we can find. The proposal can and probably will be modified and improved, but I believe the time is right to make a dramatic change and improvement in our methods of handling foreign economic aid.

"No footall coach could use the same old plays year after year in the same conference without winding up in the cellar. What is true of football is also true of foreign policy.

"The Communist economic penetration has been concentrated in the areas where we are the weakest—the countries of Asia and Africa, especially those which make up the periphery of the Communist geographical hegemony. These nations are currently the most susceptible to political and economic infiltration. Many have broken the bonds of Western colonial power only within the last 10 to 12 years.

"The greatest desire of these nations is economic independence and control of their own affairs. Our aim should be to regain the initiative from the Soviets. We need to finance them in a way that is proof we have mutual interests at heart rather than any desire for economic or military control. This I believe can be handled best by an international arrangement.

"The United States has more to gain from international development than merely forestalling Soviet strategy. As more nations break through the development barrier and are able to join the select group of countries with rising living standards, the market for western goods will simultaneously expand."

DECIDED IN COMMITTEE

The fate of the Monroney plan at this session of Congress will be decided by the committee hearings and by the votes in both Chambers on President Eisenhower's $3,942,100,000 mutual security recommendation. The committee hearings will disclose whether the administration officials are ready to endorse publicly the second mortgage international bank. Debates on the mutual security recommendation will reveal the extent of congresisonal criticism of the economic aid portion, particularly the development loan fund, for which $300 million was urgently requested at the last session, and from which the first loan is yet to be made.

The Unemployment Situation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL B. DAGUE

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 4, 1958

Mr. DAGUE. Mr. Speaker, in considering anything having to do with the national economy and unemployment in an election year it is necessary to discount heavily the part that politics will play in any negotiations looking toward a remedy. A leading daily in my district, the Daily Local News of West Chester, Pa., made some pertinent observations in its editorial of February 27 entitled "Jobs or Politics." The high point in the editorial was the reference to Senator MARTIN's letter to Governor Leader, of Pennsylvania, in which he pointed out that the Governor should avail himself of existing Federal programs before looking for additional funds from the national level. At the same time, the majority of the Pennsylvania Republicans in the House suggested that the Governor should use his not inconsiderable influence with the congressional Members of his own party to try to release bills now tied up in committee, which are designed to alleviate the very conditions over which he professes an understandable concern.

The editorial referred to is included in full with these remarks as follows:

JOBS OR POLITICS?

With an estimated 435,000 people idle in Pennsylvania, the unemployment situation is growing more serious daily. Concerned with the problem is Gov. George M. Leader who has been traveling over the State trying to whip up interest in his crash plan to put people back on the job. He was in Pittsburgh Monday night, and next Thursday he will be in Philadelphia.

But things aren't going as smoothly as one might expect. The governor ran into a nasty snag when he invited the Pennsylvania delegation in Congress to meet with him in Washington today to discuss the situation. A few days ago Mr. Leader received a reply to his invitation from the Republican side of the delegation. In part it said: "Jobs, not political pow-wows, are the vital need in Pennsylvania's economically depressed areas at this time."

The Republicans then proceeded to inform him how Democratic Members from Pennsylvania have failed to cooperate with the President's program to create jobs. "Consequently," the tart communication concludes, "we reject your appeal for a political parley. Such a call appears to be further evidence of your unwillingness to act in areas where you, as governor, have authority to do so."

As if this were not enough to impress the governor, Senator EDWARD MARTIN added his own volley in a letter. He wrote: "Might it not be well to put Pennsylvania's house in order in terms of maximum use of available Federal funds to create job opportunities, in view of the Federal Government's accelerated program to help our people?"

From the other side of the political fence, the governor called the Republicans' rejection of his invitation to talk things over, an intensely partisan action.

So while there will be no pow-wow in Washington today so far as the Republican delegation in Congress is concerned, neither will there be any jobs created. The unfortunate part of the situation lies in the fact that such feuding between Harrisburg and Washington does nothing for the jobless in the way of paying the rent or putting meat on the table.

Senator MARTIN, in his letter, laid his cards on the table and, in effect, called both the governor and the Democratic delegation in Congress to account. Doubtless there is a way out of the present dilemma, but it can't be achieved through bickering on the part of

Pennsylvania's two political elements. The Senator's plea for Pennsylvania to put its own house in order can hardly be overlooked in these difficult days. The jobless, in the meantime, twiddle their thumbs and wait.

A Chemical Engineer Visits the U. S. S. R.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, March 4, 1958

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, among the increasing number of Americans who have recently visited the U. S. S. R. is Prof. Edgar L. Piret of the department of chemical engineering at the University of Minnesota. In the December 1957 issue of Chemical Engineering Progress, Dr. Piret reports on his visit. His article is entitled "A Chemical Engineer Visits the U. S. S. R."

I ask unanimous consent that the text of this article be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A CHEMICAL ENGINEER VISITS THE U. S. S. R.

(By Edgar L. Piret, department of chemical engineering, University of Minnesota, Minneapolis, Minn.)

Recently, as a member of a five-man technical mission[1] arranged by the United States State Department, I had an opportunity to visit and study for a 3-week period the large peat industry of the U. S. S. R. It was also possible to visit Soviet institutions of education and research, including several devoted specifically to chemical engineering. This paper will serve as background for a later report on chemical engineering in the U. S. S. R.

Soviet engineers and professors were always cordial, open, and informative in their discussions. The officials place no restrictions on the taking of pictures and several requests to see laboratories and special items of interest were granted. As a consequence, the trip proved most interesting and informative. The fact that we were official guests of the Ministry of Fuel and Power undoubtedly eased these visits greatly.

A visitor to Russia will frequently and most forcefully be struck by the seemingly sudden Soviet scientific development, and by the sharp contrasts in advancement which he sees. He will find it difficult to draw conclusions, because at one moment he may see a modern laboratory or apparatus of advanced design, yet in the next moment he will see equipment, a design, or working methods of several decades ago.

Perhaps a more startling experience is to discuss a right up-to-the-minute engineering subject with a Soviet engineer thoroughly familiar and up to date in his field, and then a few minutes later suddenly discover that despite his obvious good will, intelligence, and high education, this same engineer's knowledge of the true economic, social, and political conditions in the United States is highly inaccurate and out of date by 25 or more years.

In several laboratories, I noticed very recent issues of American chemical engineering and chemical journals and it was easy to talk with Soviet chemical engineers and other technical men about modern engineering problems—for example, a theoretical or experimental aspect of the unit operations. They were well informed, talkative, and described their interests and problems in education and research in an open, stimulating manner.

In almost terrifying contrast because of its significance, I saw not a single American or, for that matter, English or other West European newspaper or popular magazine on sale in any hotel lobby, railroad station, department store, bookstore, or bookstand.

One sees many such American items even in the lesser cities of France, Finland, Germany, Italy, Sweden, etc. Lack of interest in the United States or inability to read English[2] most certainly is not the cause of this conspicuous absence of information. Time and again in the U. S. S. R., I (and others of our group) was asked by people in the streets, by students and others, for any American book, magazine, or even scrap of newspaper that might have wrapped a package in our luggage.

When I speak of English language and Western European publications, I am of course excluding such newspapers as the French Communist Humanité, Moscow News (published in Moscow), copies in libraries, books by James Fenimore Cooper and other classics of years ago, and especially what to me were obviously carefully selected volumes of highly unrepresentative Western writers. These publications unfortunately leave the Soviet man with the erroneous impression that he is well informed about the outside world. He does not even know that he doesn't know.

Thus, on one hand we see that the Soviet engineer has ready access to, and uses, the latest technical literature of the West. On the other hand, the same man has no effective access to our newspapers, or even to our most popular magazines or representative contemporary literature. Most tragically, what I did hear on every hand about our country and its people was highly inaccurate and warped. It recalled to me the parallel situation I met in Germany in 1936.

The need for a broad and early flow of information and understanding is all too clear.

Certainly, the people I came in contact with professionally in the Soviet Union are intellectually capable of better understanding us and our way of life, given more information. So there is a chance that efforts in that direction would result in substantial gains.

It is generally known that the U. S. S. R. is now, in a highly planned and vigorous manner, concentrating much effort on the technology and mechanization of its basic industries. Also, it appeared to me that Soviet Government policy is to give the highest priorities—and to support on a scale unprecedented in world history—to its scientific, engineering, and industrial research and development personnel and laboratories. Still more significant, because of the certainty of the effects within 10 to 15 years, is that this expansion of industry and of basic and of applied research is now being supported with a vigorous modernization and expansion of the educational centers for the training of engineers and scientists. Automatic control and the use of recording instruments seem to be particularly emphasized in the chemical engineering educational program.

The present status of Soviet science and engineering, as related to that of the Western World, is of course difficult to assess accurately in a short visit to the country. But it was evident to me after having seen several laboratories—and particularly after observing in detail the methods and the scale with which they are carrying on the peat industrial research program—that the Soviets have, in that field at least, advanced to where they are using modern engineering techniques, modern methods of industrial product and process development, and modern managerial techniques.

For example, we were shown an extensive laboratory program in which comprehensive and accurately taken data were being used to calculate economic optimum for projected processes. For other similar projects several pilot units were testing the laboratory results. Surprisingly, several large-scale semiworks operations were also being run in parallel to decide, under essentially full-scale conditions, the costs of competing processes. Within a single ministry and program the Soviet system allows for the evolution of more than one process all the way up to and including full-scale production. Each stage is evaluated in terms of rubles/ton, including such items as raw materials, labor, transportation, amortization of plant, amortization of equipment, safety clothing, etc. The only items I have found missing were interest on capital and social security.

The concentration of effort and of funds on technical education, research, and development for heavy industry and for the military is inevitably taking place at the expense of the living standards of the people.

Certainly the people of Moscow, Leningrad, and of the smaller towns and villages I saw have a Spartan or less existence. They see few, if any luxuries. The living standards of the Russians are far below our own, but as far as I could tell, these standards were not so low as to provoke violent discontent. Most Russian people simply have no knowledge of the conditions in the outside world. Their basis of comparison is their past. After all, the history of Russia has always been an unhappy one, with oppression and grinding poverty the lot for nearly everyone.

The Russian people I saw in the cities were adequately, if only roughly clothed and seemed adequately nourished. It was stated that a great improvement in clothing had occurred in the past 3 years.

The accompanying table shows that he lot of the young Russian engineer is today poor when compared with his American counterpart. For example, about 10 percent of a young Soviet engineer's monthly salary is gone when he buys a single pair of very ordinary quality shoes. A similar pair of shoes would cost a young American less than 2 percent of his monthly salary of $475. A good pair of shoes is practically unobtainable for the young Russian since he would have to pay nearly 2 weeks salary for them. A small Volga car, whose equivalent here would cost the young American about 4 months salary, represents so many months of work (15) for the Russian that it is clearly out of reach.

The table appears to show that as far as his monthly earnings are concerned, the starting salary of the young Russian engineer is only a little above that of other workers in the country. However, special privileges of many kinds typically reserved for select groups in the Soviet system, status, and earnings potential as indicated in the table make the young engineer's situation an enviable one when compared to others in Russia. He is also at a decided advantage relative to highly trained professionals in nontechnical fields.

Then, too, if he, for example, manages to become a staff member and ultimately a pro-

[1] Sponsored by the Iron Range Resources and Rehabilitation Commission, State of Minnesota.

[2] Sixty-five percent of the students in the Soviet institutions of higher learning study English, according to the recently released report on Soviet education by the United States Office of Education.

fessor at an institute of engineering education, he achieves not only one of the most remunerative positions, but one held in highest honor in the community.

The Russian of the cities must be particularly conscious of the educational and technical advancements of his country which are displayed before him in the form of elaborate, permanent educational exhibitions intended to excite him with their implied promises for the future. High buildings, ornate subways, and immense stadia also feed emotional hungers. Amusement parks are lined with posters showing industrial production curves, with increasing slopes for the future, and slogans inciting the Russian to greater efforts (much like our own wartime posters). There are no advertisements increasing his appetite and urging him to buy. Nor is knowledge of the outside world, or of what he does not have, available to disturb him from his tasks. The Russian citizen is apparently expected to feel that he has considerable economic freedom since he can within his organization criticize work methods, foremen, etc. Political freedom he has never had and probably does not miss. Morality is identified with the good of the party and religion is mere superstition.

The decision to concentrate much effort on education for science and engineering, on research and development, etc., at the expense of other facets of national life, is, of course, a result of policy decisions which can most easily be imposed on a nation by decisive authority from above.

The new buildings of the University of Moscow represent one recent, peak result of such a policy. This large group of structures located on the Lenin Hills overlooking Moscow, cost $300 million to build. This is a recent project, built in 1949–53, and consists of a main 32-story building and 36 other buildings situated in a parklike area of some 800 acres. With its 43 elevators, marble halls and corridors, it is impressive. Its design, however, leaves much to be desired from the viewpoint of efficiency. The main point to be noted is that this new University of Moscow, with its 23,000 students, trains scientists exclusively—chemists, physicists, mathematician, geographers, geologists, etc. The literary and other less favored faculties are still located in the antiquated, crowded buildings of the old university in downtown Moscow. This new palace of education-for-science on Lenin Hills, the many well-supported institutes for engineering, education, and research, and the incentive of high rewards are clear indices of the great value which the Soviet Government attaches to the advancement of science and engineering and to education for these fields.

All this concentration on technology, of course, fits in with the materialistic philosophy of the Communists. However, it should not be inferred that there is no cultural activity. A visit to the ballet at the Bolshoi Theater or to an outdoor performance at the Kyrov Stadium, or a recalling of modern Soviet composers will quickly show that this is not so. I was told that there has been a most extensive development over the whole country of many schools of music and that there is a strong interest in poetry. The paintings that I did see, however, appeared completely unimaginative and stagnant. The multitude of crowded bookstores and bookstalls lining the main streets of Moscow, of Leningrad, and other towns we saw is indicative of a wide interest in reading.

One sees in city parks, along highways, in the subway stations, and also in small towns, statues and posters showing a young man or girl studying a book. These apparently are ideals to which the Soviet youth is exposed. The presence and significance of such statues is less surprising when one is informed that in the last 40 years the Soviets have raised themselves by their own bootstraps to increase the number of students in their schools from less than 10 million to more than 34 million today and that universal secondary education is planned by 1960. Illiteracy has been essentially eradicated. A new nation has taught itself within 2 generations, young and old alike, to read and write and has produced in 1955 young scientists and engineers at double the rate of our United States of America—the most advanced and powerful industrial Nation of the world. Today Russia is reported to have 70,000 or so doctors of philosophy in science and engineering.

There are now 33 Soviet universities and a multiplicity of technical institutes and research organizations which inevitably have affected and will continue to raise the scientific and technical skills of the Russian.

A visitor naturally searches to find the incentives used to promote so much advanced study and research in the U. S. S. R. The answer came quickly. Money and prestige, as might be expected, are the incentives used even in Russia today. They are a measure of the value of the individual's contribution to the state.

A Soviet student enters a higher technical school through severe competitive examinations and is considered to be working for the State as he would in an industrial plant. There are no tuition fees since last year, and all successful students have substantial scholarships. Retention of these scholarships (as well as their amounts and privileges) is related to scholastic performance, as is the job to which the graduating student has access. As has been pointed out, the rewards available to the engineering graduate—and particularly to the engineering educator—are considerable.

The directions in which the best talent tends to flow under such circumstances are obvious and the effect upon the quality and number of high-grade engineers and scientists available to the nation follows.

Our own industrial experience has demonstrated, in no uncertain terms, that it is essential for a corporation to have a strong research and development program if it is to maintain its position relative to competition. Our earnest competition for the future is no longer largely between corporations: it is between our Nation and the U. S. S. R. It is a challenge to each one of us.

The effects of the Russian policy for education and research on the development of the Soviet State are already clear. If the United States invests heavily in better education and basic research it can be certain of a high return in a few years in the welfare and material wealth of the American people. It is a good investment even without considerations of national security. Its achievement, however, will take more than investment.

IMPRESSIONS THAT REMAIN

The high personal qualities and drive of the men who received us in their laboratories and plants.

The burdens evident in the faces of the people we saw in the villages—a reminder of our common humanity, problems, and hopes, and the need for justice and for peace in the world.

Two Hundred and Tenth Anniversary of the Birth of Gen. Casimir Pulaski

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT W. KEAN
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 4, 1958

Mr. KEAN. Mr. Speaker, we in New Jersey know well the name of Casimir Pulaski, for we have named a monumental skyway which soars over the meadows between Jersey City and Newark in his memory.

Today, March 4, marks the 210th anniversary of the birth of Pulaski, that great Polish patriot and hero of the American Revolution.

General Pulaski is a fine symbol of the brave people of Poland and the people of Polish ancestry who have contributed so much to the cause of freedom over the centuries. His entire life was spent fighting for the traditions of freedom which we all cherish.

From the days when Pulaski fought so bravely in the American Revolution, we Americans have had a friendly feeling for the Polish people and sympathy with their struggles for liberty.

The Polish people were one of the first in Europe to show a liberal spirit and, in spite of continual attacks by their neighbors, that spirit of liberty has persisted.

Those who live in that land and those here and abroad who take pride in their Polish descent pray for that day when tyranny will be wiped out and the principles of freedom for which General Pulaski fought so valiantly will again be restored.

The American Legion and American Rights

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OTTO KRUEGER
OF NORTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 4, 1958

Mr. KRUEGER. Mr. Speaker, correspondence has previously appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD between National Commander John S. Gleason, Jr., of the American Legion, and Mr. John D. Silvera, a past post commander in New York, on the subject of civil rights. In order to complete this exchange of correspondence, I include the following letter:

FEBRUARY 27, 1958.

Mr. JOHN D. SILVERA,
670 Riverside Drive,
New York, N. Y.

DEAR MR. SILVERA: This will refer to your letter of February 2 addressed to me, which I have read in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. To date I have not received your letter of February 2 at this headquarters. I am impelled, however, to reply inasmuch as you have made your comment public.

The American Legion has, from the time of its organization, accepted into membership honorably discharged war veterans of all races and of whatever creed. The national constitution does not permit discrimination on either score.

Article IV, section 1 of the bylaws of the national constitution provides that each post of the American Legion shall be the judge of its own membership. Upon this principle of autonomy, the entire organization is built. Because of the autonomous operation which the American Legion has, I do not have any authority to order an American Legion post to permit or refuse to permit the use of its post facilities to any group except subversive groups.

With reference to the matter of post No. 214 in Jackson, Miss., there is not presently any

action pending before the national organization submitted to us by either the department of Mississippi or the post. As a past post commander, you should know that if there is any injustice in the withdrawal of any charter for whatever cause or in the trial of a member, there is recourse under the constitution of the American Legion. There are channels through which grievances can be adjudicated and any post or member has the right of appeal all the way to the national executive committee, which is comparable in this regard to the Supreme Court of the United States.

The American Legion is pledged to maintain law and order. The American Legion supports and professes the obligation of all American citizens to abide by laws and regulations promulgated by duly constituted courts and agencies of the Government. The American Legion does not and has never sanctioned the willful disobedience by any citizen or group of citizens of the law of the land.

The American Legion is dedicated to the rehabilitation of sick and disabled veterans of all races and creeds; to care for the children of America of all races and creeds; to the development of an ever stronger Americanism amoung our people of all races and creeds; and to service of all races and creeds for community, State and Nation. In these areas we are most active, and I believe successfully so. As long as we devote our attention to programs based on the above objectives, we shall continue to render great and valuable service to the whole Nation.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN S. GLEASON, Jr.

Marketing Margins for Dairy Products, Beef and Pork, United States and Sweden

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. VICTOR L. ANFUSO
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 3, 1958

Mr. ANFUSO. Mr. Speaker, as chairman of the Consumers Study Subcommittee, data on marketing margins have been made available to me showing the comparative marketing margins for dairy products, beef, and pork in Sweden and in the United States in recent periods.

Because of the greater distances involved in the United States as compared with Sweden, transportation charges take a larger part of the consumer's food dollar in this country. Also, in the United States a much higher percentage of the pork is processed into cured and manufactured products than in Sweden. This is a factor in the larger percentage of the consumer's dollar going for packing and wholesaling pork in the United States.

There are, of course, other factors which limit the direct comparability of these data. They are of interest, however, for ready reference and are as follows:

Marketing margins for dairy products, beef and pork, United States and Sweden

[Percent of consumer's dollar]

Commodity	Sweden, spring 1954 [1]	United States, April–June 1954 [2]
Milk (bottled and sold through retail stores):		
Farmer's share	62.6	45.0
Transport, wholesale margin, etc.	23.6	55.0
Retail margin	13.8	
Retail cost	100.0	100.0
Butter:		
Farmer's share	68.5	[4] 65.0
Transport, factory cost, etc.	21.4	18.0
Wholesale margin	2.2	
Retail margin	10.1	17.0
Retail cost	100.0	100.0
Cheese:		
Farmer's share	57.9	[4] 45.5
Transport, factory cost, etc.	14.4	37.9
Wholesale margin	4.5	
Retail margin	23.2	16.6
Retail cost	100.0	100.0
Beef:		
Farmer's share	[4] 72.8	[5] 62.5
Packing plant, wholesale margin, etc.	8.2	16.0
Retail margin	19.0	21.5
Retail cost	100.0	100.0
Pork:		
Farmer's share	[4] 70.0	[5] 53.3
Packing plant, wholesale margin, etc.	8.7	21.7
Retail margin	21.2	25.0
Retail cost	100.0	100.0

[1] Swedish Dairies Association, December 1955.
[2] USDA Agricultural Marketing Service.
[3] Ibid. Marketing and Transportation Situation, Jan. 31, 1955, p. 16.
[4] Swedish beef and pork statistics are 1955 average prices. Sveriges Slakteriforbund (Farmers' Co-op Organization) EPA project 285: Marketing and Distribution of Livestock Products.
[5] United States beef and pork statistics are 1955 average prices. AMS Misc. Publication 741, tables 51 and 53 and Marketing and Transportation Situation, Jan. 30, 1957, p. 12.

Citizenship Responsibility

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE S. McGOVERN
OF SOUTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 4, 1958

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, one of the finest statements that I have seen on the moral responsibility of American citizens to the cause of good government is a sermon delivered by the Reverend N. L. Langholz, pastor of the St. John American Lutheran Church, of Sioux Falls, S. Dak. The sermon was delivered on November 4, 1956, just prior to the general election of that year.

Entitled "ABC's for a Responsible Christian Citizen," the sermon by Reverend Langholz was awarded the George Washington honor medal in the spiritual division by the Freedom Foundation at Valley Forge.

American democratic principles rest on a religious foundation. Jefferson recognized the firm relationship between moral and political values when he penned the words:

We hold these truths to be self-evident: that all men are created equal; that they are endowed by their Creator with certain inalienable rights.

As Reverend Langholz points up so well in his sermon, the American citizen not only has certain moral and political rights, but he also has very real responsibilities that he must heed if democracy is to function. I believe that the members of Congress will be interested in reading the award-winning sermon by Reverend Langholz which follows:

A B C's FOR A RESPONSIBLE CHRISTIAN CITIZEN

(Rev. N. L. Langholz, pastor at Sioux Falls, S. Dak., St. John American Lutheran (1957 winner of George Washington Honor Medal, presented by Freedom's Foundation, Valley Forge, Pa.))

Text: Matthew 5: 13–16.

Next to the weather, politics is probably the most discussed topic of the day. We citizens of this beloved United States of America often complain about politics and Government, but we often fail to realize that we are the ones whose responsibility it is to look after them. So often we have been, like Little Boy Blue, under the haystack fast asleep. It is high time for us to wake up to review again the A B C's for responsible Christian citizenship; for Christians should be responsible citizens, citizens of the highest type.

First of all, Christians are responsible citizens by Divine plan. Christ, in our text, says that we are to be the "salt of the earth * * * the light of the world." You and I are living in this world. We are social beings who are dependent upon government as God's way of maintaining order, and we are therefore indebted to government.

Paul says in Romans 13: "Let every soul be subject unto the higher powers. For there is no power but of God; the powers that be are ordained of God. Render therefore to all their dues: tribute to whom tribute is due; custom to whom custom; fear to whom fear; honor to whom honor." J. B. Phillips translation (Letters to Young Churches) probably makes it even clearer: "The Christian and the civil law. * * * Every Christian ought to obey the civil authorities, for all legitimate authority is derived from God's authority, and the existing authority is appointed under God. To oppose authority then is to oppose God, and such opposition is bound to be punished.

"The honest citizen has no need to fear the keepers of law and order, but the dishonest man will always be nervous of them. If you want to avoid this anxiety just lead a law-abiding life, and all that can come your way is a word of approval. The officer is God's servant for your protection. But if you are leading a wicked life you have reason to be alarmed. The 'power of the law' which is vested in every legitimate officer, is no empty phrase. He is, in fact, divinely appointed to inflict God's punishment upon evildoers.

"You should, therefore, obey the authorities, not simply because it is the safest, but because it is the right thing to do. It is right, too, for you to pay taxes for the civil authorities are appointed by God for the good purposes of public order and well-being. Give everyone his legitimate due,

whether it be rates, or taxes, or reverence, or respect."[1] Thus God's holy spirit speaks to us through His instrument, Paul.

We sometimes take for granted the things that the Government performs for us, and are not fully appreciative of them; for instance, conservation of our natural resources which we need so much for living—water, oil, various ores, and so on; conservation of the beautiful parks of our Nation where we can spend vacations or weekends of relaxation and inspiration; fire protection; police protection; and a host of other items. We take these things so for granted. And yet think what it would be without them.

Dr. Sven Lerfeld, of Copenhagen, Denmark, at a recent theological conference at Augustana College, Sioux Falls, S. Dak., said that during World War II when the Germans invaded their country, they took away all police protection. He stated that "this was the worst form of oppressive persecution * * * not knowing when your home might be robbed * * * not knowing when your wife or daughter might be viciously attacked * * * not knowing when someone might decide to murder you; for when there was no policing * * * no punishment * * * crime ran wild. We don't realize the blessing of the policeman on his beat, the patrol car roaming the streets. And one could take so many phases of the government's work, and go through similar questions. How would we like to be without it?"

Sometimes it takes the freshness of a foreigner's belief in America to shake us from our Little Boy Blue or Rip VanWinkle sleep. When people come from a land where there has been little freedom, little privilege, little opportunity, and land on the shores of this land of liberty, they realize what the blessings of American Government are. One can just see the joy on their faces as they spot the Statue of Liberty, symbol of American freedom; or as they, weeping, kneel and kiss American soil for the first time.

Christian citizens, we need to maintain good government for our own welfare. Think what it means to have a Government that gives us freedom of the press, freedom of speech, freedom of religion.

The American Credo[2] outlines many of the political and economic rights which protect the dignity and freedom of the individual here in our beloved America:

Right to worship God in one's own way.
Right to free speech and press.
Right to assemble.
Right to petition grievances.
Right to privacy in our homes.
Right of habeas corpus—no excessive bail.
Right to trial by jury—innocent until proved guilty.
Right to move about freely at home and abroad.
Right to own private property.
Right to free elections and personal secret ballot. (Which we Americans have just had the privilege of doing!)
Right to work in callings and localities of our choice.
Right to bargain with our employers and employees.
Right to go into business, compete, and make a profit.
Right to bargain for goods and services in a free market.
Right to contract about our affairs.
Right to the service of Government as a protector and referee.
Right to freedom from arbitrary government regulation and control.

[1] Letters to Young Churches, J. B. Phillips, the Macmillan Co.
[2] "American Credo" of Freedom's Foundation, Valley Forge, Pa.

Ours is a "Constitutional Government designed to serve the people." These are the things the forefathers of our country fought for. These are the things our gallant Armed Forces have sought to defend. These are the things we as responsible Christian citizens must uphold! "To maintain the American way of life and pass it intact to succeeding generations is the responsibility of every true American", of every true Christian!

Our Nation was founded on the fundamental belief in God. We as responsible Christian citizens must ever see that these God-given freedoms are preserved in our American way of life! Christians are responsible citizens!

Think, my friends, of the privileges, and freedoms, and opportunities that are ours as American citizens, and then by contrast, look at communistic Russia.

What if we had to go about every day fearful of our speech . . . fearful that someone else, perhaps even someone in our own family, was taking what we said and using it against us . . . so that just because of a few words we would be liquidated or shipped off to a far Siberia?

Think of the privilege of reading newspapers which can be free to express their opinions. In Russia the Sioux Falls Argus-Leader would not have dared to say something against the Governor of its State, as the paper so freely did this past week. Whether or not we agree with what we read—we glory in the fact that we have the privilege to read these things!

And what it means to have freedom of religion, to worship as we please, whether we be Protestant, Catholic, or Jew. To be able to gather together week after week here in the house of God to sing our praises to Him and to hear His Word . . . what a great American privilege this is.

Sometimes, as in East Germany and the satellite countries, this privilege has to be taken away before people realize its worth. Church members who show up only occasionally at church show that they do not realize the great privilege which is theirs to worship the God who created them and preserves them * * * who redeems them and sanctifies them. How we as Christian citizens must work to maintain these great religious privileges which are ours as Americans.

We Christians are under the command of Christ. We have been given the power to be the kind of people the world needs. We have been forgiven, enlightened, strengthened. Luke tells us in Acts 1: 8 the words of Christ: "Ye shall receive power after the Holy Ghost has come upon you, and ye shall be witnesses unto Me * * * unto the uttermost part of the earth."

We are indebted to Christ to use this power for the good of the world He loves. Christ has made the debt we owe Him payable, in part, to others. We are debtors, Scriptures tell us, to all men.

Yes, by divine plan we Christians are to be responsible citizens. And we are also to be responsible citizens for a divine purpose.

First of all, to let God's will be known. Our text says: "Let your light so shine before men, that they may see your good works, and glorify your Father which is in heaven."

What is God's will in relation to citizenship? He wants us to understand the issues in politics. He wants us to have a knowledge of the candidates. He wants us to discover what proportion of our self should be given to the government—in the service of the country and of its people—and the people of the world.

The Christian should be the highest type of citizen. We discover what God's will is for our life, and then we want to share what His will is for others. "We are not to hide our candle under a bushel basket, but we are to put it in a candlestick on the lampstand, so that it might give light unto all."

We should let our light shine, by expressing our convictions, through party activity, by being an example to others.

We Christians are responsible citizens for the purpose of letting God's love be shown. "We are the salt of the earth * * *" Salt must be applied and used if it is to do any good.

Motivated by the spirit of Christ, we should be willing to sacrifice self-interest * * * willing to show a concern for others. We should honor the office which people hold. As responsible Christian citizens we should take advantage of our privilege to vote. We should confer by writing and in person with one's representatives in office, and let them know of our Christian convictions on issues. We should be willing to assume responsibility by functioning in a political party * * * by serving in public office * * * by paying taxes. Yes, it costs; but again we ask, would we like to be without these government services?

Christians are responsible citizens by Divine plan. We are in the world. We are under the command of Christ. We Christians are responsible citizens for a divine purpose * * * to let God's will be known * * * to let God's love be shown.

We have been discussing the fundamentals, the ABC's, of Christian citizenship. Now, following the pattern of our ABC books of childhood, let us take each letter of the alphabet, and let each letter of it be a directive to us in being more responsible Christian citizens.

A: Accept both the rights and duties of a citizen as a trust from God, and as an opportunity through attitude, word and deed to influence others toward accepting goals for which the Christian strives.

B: Believe that all authority is from God, that men and nations owe supreme loyalty to Him alone, and that He will weigh their conduct on the scales of His justice.

C: Consider the interest of other persons and groups as fairly as you do your own in taking sides on any political issue, resisting appeals to prejudice and rejecting extravagant promises that cannot be fulfilled.

D: Devote time, effort, and funds to the work of the political party of your choice or of some nonpartisan group dedicated to the promise and the practice of good government.

E: Examine carefully, in the light of Christian teachings, the claims for and against both the issues and the candidates which invite your support, as well as the groups and interests which support them and what they hope thereby to gain.

F: Face jury duty, military service, cooperation with law-enforcement officers, and attendance at open meetings of lawmaking bodies as being among the rightful duties of a citizen.

G: Give candidates and officials, especially representatives in the lawmaking bodies, the benefit of your Christ-minded thinking on issues needing discussion.

H: Honor public officials as men to whom God has entrusted special responsibilities as His agents to promote the well-being of their fellow men, yet if necessity arises, humbly remind them of their accountability to the Lord of heaven and earth.

I: Inform yourself on the workings of your government: the principles on which it rests, the structures it uses, the pressures that bear upon it, and the ways in which it reaches its decisions.

J: Judge men and parties not so much by their promises or even by their professions of religion as rather by their performance under the responsibilities and temptations of power.

K: Kindle enthusiasm for responsible participation in governmental affairs, en-

couraging qualified men and women to offer themselves as candidates for elective and appointive governmental positions.

L: Let the love of Christ for the forgotten, the friendless, and those with little power or influence guide you in taking a stand on issues.

M: Make certain that church and state do not become intermixed, and insist that the church not use powers of state to achieve church objectives, and that the state not use the church for its ends.

N: Nurture and promote attitudes of loyalty, patriotism, pride in citizenship, and love for country, but do not let these become and excuse for prejudice, oppression, or disregard for the rightful interests of other people and nations.

O: Obey all laws that are in accord with the laws of God and if necessary work to amend or to repeal any man-made laws which are out of date or opposed to God's law.

P: Pray for God's blessing of a good and honest government and for His guidance and protection of faithful public servants.

Q: Question actions and decisions of governmental agencies and officials which seem to violate Christian standards of honesty, justice, integrity, or morality, remembering that only righteousness exalteth a nation.

R. Recognize the reality and ravages of sin in human life, humbly repent of your own shortcomings, forgive those of others, and rely upon the power of the Holy Spirit to bring men to lead better lives.

S: Support conscientious, faithful, and capable public servants with words and deeds of appreciation, encouragement, and support, strengthening them to act in accord with the courage of their convictions.

T: Treasure your tax payments, made honestly, willingly, and promptly, as a means whereby you help to advance good and to curb evil.

U: Unite your efforts with those of like-minded persons and groups to seek goals pleasing to God in ways beyond the reproach of men.

V: Vote conscientiously, prayerfully, and with a discrimination based on your study of candidates and issues as this has been guided by the Holy Spirit.

W: Work for laws, practices, and attitudes that insure honesty, justice, impartiality, morality, protection for the weak and helpless, and opportunities for the full exercise of responsible freedom.

X: X is the mark to make in expressing your careful choice on the ballot you cast at each local, State, and national election.

Y: Yearn that all the rules of men would yield themselves to God and join Solomon in praying for wisdom, knowledge, and an understanding heart.

Z: Zealously study God's word, the example of Christ, and the lives of His Saints for the light they shed on the realities of political decisions and responsible Christian citizenship in the time and place to which God has called you.[3]

These are the ABC's, the fundamentals of responsible Christian citizenship. Our Lord has a plan for the governing of this world which involves us for the purpose of showing His love, by maintaining an ordered society. This year let Christians awake from their Little Boy Blue and Rip Van Winkle sleep, for we as Christians are responsible citizens.

"God save our native land
And make her strong to stand
For truth and right;
Long may her banner wave,
Flag of the free and the brave.
Thou who alone canst save,
Grant her Thy might."[4]

Amen.

[3] ABC points from tract of American Lutheran Church social action committee.

[4] American Lutheran hymnal, No. 499. Tune: H. Carey. Text: J. H. Seelye, 1892. Credits also to sermon by J. Hoeger, of Overland Park, Kans., and J. A. Schiller, Lenexa, Kans.

Will H. R. 8002 Do What It Says?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GERALD R. FORD, JR.
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 4, 1958

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, H. R. 8002, the so-called accrued expenditure appropriations bill, comes up for consideration this Wednesday, March 5. The paramount question is, will it do what it says it is designed to do? It says it will do three things. They are stated in the opening paragraph, as follows:

It is the sense of the Congress that revisions in presentation of budget estimates and estimates for deficiency and supplemental appropriations are essential in order to provide a more informative basis for the enactment of appropriations by the Congress, to reduce or eliminate the large carryover balances of appropriations from one fiscal year to another, and to bring about economy in Government expenditures. It is therefore the policy of the Congress that estimates for proposed appropriations will be determined on an annual accrued expenditure basis.

It will not do any of these things as now written. I urge all Members to consider the following facts on each of these three things:

WILL H. R. 8002 PROVIDE A MORE INFORMATIVE BASIS FOR THE ENACTMENT OF APPROPRIATIONS?

H. R. 8002 would delude the people for 1 year, and to some extent for 2 years, into thinking that a lot of money was being saved by the reduction of appropriations and the substitution of contract authority. Such a program would look attractive and painless, but the day of rude awakening would of course come in confusion and frustration.

If, for example, we had converted last year's budget to this accrued expenditure basis of making the appropriations, we could have shown a cut of about $24 billion. But it would have been completely phony.

Generally, in appropriation bills we now fully finance long-range programs for aircraft, ships, and other long-lead time items. Congress and the country know in advance just how big and expensive the programs are. Under H. R. 8002 we would follow the confusing process of changing the appropriation bills to provide the following: (a) Funds to liquidate prior contract authority; (b) funds for the regular annual functions of the Government; and (c) additional contract authority for partially completed programs and for the initiation of new programs.

This would make less effective the work of the Appropriations Committee, it would be confusing to members of the committee and to Members of Congress generally, and it would tend to conceal from the people the fiscal actions of Congress because the press would have difficulty in reporting to the people just what was happening to them under this installment-buying dollar-down contract-authority hodge-podge.

WILL H. R. 8002 "REDUCE OR ELIMINATE THE LARGE CARRYOVER BALANCES OF APPROPRIATIONS FROM ONE FISCAL YEAR TO ANOTHER"?

Yes; it will. But therein is the catch. Note the word "appropriations." That is the catch, because it says nothing whatever about what would happen to contract authority carryovers. If you will look at section 2, and the committee report, you will see that contract authority is to be substituted for appropriations for things that run beyond 1 fiscal year. What would happen there?

What would happen if the shift were made to the suggested basis of appropriating, would be the elimination of large unexpended appropriation balances—which, of course, is not cash in the Treasury—and substitution of large unfunded contract authorization balances. Under either system, the grant of authority to obligate the Treasury to future cash expenditure occurs at the outset. A fiscal system cannot change the operating realities of the vast and complex programs of the Government or the point of time at which the necessities of the situation make a claim on the Treasury. Under either system, the large carryovers—and there will be similar large carryovers under both—will consist of (a) outstanding obligations and (b) unobligated amounts. Under either system, the die is cast as to eventual payment when the obligation is created. On this important point of timing of the obligation to future payment, therefore, the proposition is essentially a distinction without a difference. The day of reckoning—the day of payment—is inevitable and, furthermore, the payment will normally occur at the same time under either system. Once the obligation or commitment sets the machinery in motion, the Congress can do little if anything to postpone the day of cash payment.

This is partial funding. And the present Budget Director, who urges H. R. 8002, is against partial funding. Here is what he stated in a letter of May 17, 1957—see CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, May 23, page 6689:

I believe we should continue to follow the sound procedure of fully funding the procurement of all items necessary for the full operation of such major things as airplanes, tanks, and ships when the initial appropriation is made. We would lose budgetary control of these programs if we adopted a policy of partial funding for such items.

This statement from the executive branch—from one who is supporting H. R. 8002—ought to be read and reread by those who advocate H. R. 8002, because H. R. 8002 would require exactly what the Budget Director says should not be done.

WILL H. R. 8002 "BRING ABOUT ECONOMY IN GOVERNMENT EXPENDITURES"?

Some of the proponents have said it would, but it will not. The people have been told it would. The Hoover Commission never said it would save a specific sum. The task force expressed a belief that about $4 billion annually could reasonably be expected to be saved. Merely a belief. No proof. No evidence. Just picked out of the air.

Now, what do they lay their belief on? The main objective of his bill, so they say, is to compel a systematic review and reauthorization each year of the large unexpended carryover balances. They suggest that, somehow, a formal, prescribed procedure for such review will bring vast savings. But not a shred of evidence to prove savings has ever been offered—because none exists.

The standing practice of the Committee on Appropriations has been to review the balances each year in the hearings in order to be able intelligently to arrive at determination of new appropriations to be added to the carryovers or balances to be transferred or withdrawn. The Budget Bureau does the same thing. Mr. Brundage—and the strange thing is that he supports H. R. 8002—made this statement in a letter of May 17, 1957 to Senator SALTONSTALL. It appears in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of May 23, at page 6689:

In preparing the 1958 budget we gave very careful consideration to the use of balances wherever possible in lieu of requesting new authority for 1958.

But what about the vast savings? Will the bill in its present form save money? Mr. Brundage, the Budget Director, is for the bill. And he makes up the budget. If it will save vast sums, he surely ought to be the one who could put his finger on any savings and tell us where, how much, and in what manner.

But what is Mr. Brundage's opinion as to the validity of claimed savings? Here is his opinion—and it is devastating. Here are quotes from hearings of the Committee on Appropriations of June 18, 1956:

Mr. CANNON. I would be glad if the Director would tell us how they propose by this change in the budgetary system to make a saving of $4 billion annually.

Mr. BRUNDAGE. The chairman of the task force, Mr. CANNON, said that he had estimated the $4 billion by taking 8½ percent of all the controllable expenditures per year and, quite frankly, I would rather not express an opinion on either the computation or how they got it.

Mr. CANNON. That is what we are anxious to have you do. You know a saving of $4 billion annually is a very impressive objective. * * * I would like to know how you propose to save $4 billion by this change in the system.

Mr. BRUNDAGE. I would not say we would save $4 billion in this way. I think it will save money and give better control, but I have never been willing to estimate what any savings would amount to. It is too intangible.

Mr. CANNON. This idea has been sold to the country. I am getting letters asking "Why do you not adopt this plan and save $4 billion every year?"

Mr. BRUNDAGE. I avoided mentioning any savings in any testimony or correspondence I have on the subject.

Mr. CANNON. I am not differing with you. I am not objecting. I merely want more information on the subject.

Mr. BRUNDAGE. I feel satisfied that we will save several million dollars.

Mr. CANNON. Several million?

Mr. BRUNDAGE. Yes.

Mr. CANNON. There is a great difference between several million and the $4 billion advertised. The fact that you are satisfied does not necessarily satisfy us.

Mr. Speaker, there it is in black and white. Not billions of savings. Not even millions. Just a feeling of satisfaction that it would save several million. And, Mr. Brundage even avoids any mention of that in testimony or correspondence.

Mr. Speaker, hard experience of the Committee on Appropriations over the years shows that this bill, as now written, will cost more money, not save money. It will do so partly because it requires that we return to the use of contract authority as a substitute for appropriations which run beyond 1 year.

More Junk Mail

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. E. ROSS ADAIR
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 4, 1958

Mr. ADAIR. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include an editorial from the Kendallville News-Sun, Kendallville, Ind., which I think is particularly timely just now:

MORE JUNK MAIL

With President Eisenhower dispatching another letter to Russian Premier Bulganin, the world's attention is called again to this unique but remarkably unfruitful correspondence.

Some historian may one day wrap these letters into a single bundle and publish them as has been done with some of the memorable correspondence between great literary figures.

But he will not do it under any misapprehension that these are literary gems. Nor can it be done with the conviction that the letters represent significant progress in understanding between the two most powerful nations in the mid-20th century.

In truth, all they represent on the Russian side is one more propaganda device designed to convince the world's gullible peoples that the Soviet Union is hard bent for peace and disarmament. It is a weapon of pressure, and the Russians are quite good at initiating pressure.

On our side, the President must answer Bulganin's letters because not to do so would only compound the impression the Kremlin seeks to impart—that it is Russia which really is concerned for peace.

Since we must answer them, we try to put them to some real use by sounding out the Russians on such matters as terms of disarmament, conditions for a summit meeting, etc. But we do this without any illusion that we will get straight replies. We just play the chance that we might.

This correspondence, begun by the Russians and couched in tones which suggest a warmhearted approach to the mutual problems of two great states, merely serves as one more weary illustration of how a ruthless marauder may poison all the channels of contact between peoples who surely desire peace above all else.

Chicago's Triden League

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EMMET F. BYRNE
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 4, 1958

Mr. BYRNE of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I will insert a few remarks of mine with an accompanying letter from the Triden League, 6313 South Harvard Avenue, Chicago, Ill.

The Triden League is a nonprofit, nonpartisan association of neighbors of the Englewood area who are interested in improving civic, social, and educational affairs of their community.

As a result of the formation of this league, the success with which they are meeting, other similar groups are being formed in various parts of Chicago. The work of this group of public-spirited men and women is of great worth to the residents of the Englewood area.

The Chicago Daily Tribune's editorial writer, Joseph Egelhof, has written many interesting and helpful articles about the activities of this splended group.

The Tribune and Mr. Egelhof are to be commended for this community service. I wish the RECORD to show a letter from the Triden League to Mr. Egelhof:

THE TRIDEN LEAGUE,
Chicago, February 26, 1958.

Mr. JOSEPH EGELHOF,
Editorial Department, Chicago Tribune, Chicago, Ill.

DEAR MR. EGELHOF: The undersigned officers of the Triden League remember with appreciation the helpful and interesting articles you wrote about our Englewood problems a few months back and we write to report progress even though there may be no point for a story.

First. Your articles enabled us to get Capt. Edwin T. LeFevour to replace Captain Brietzke. Captain LeFevour and the entire personnel of the Englewood Police Station are giving us 100 percent police coverage of the district and cooperation efficient and cheerfully—in fact they are visiting us and with us every day and evening and asking us often what more help can they give us. The district still seems to be an area which the lawless like to visit and work but the police treat them rough. Robbery with gun, strong-arm robbery, rape, attempted rape, burglary, and pocket-book snatching are still the major crimes. Notwithstanding, the police are doing all and everything they can. We could not ask more.

Second. Our escort service has grown to nearly 600 trips per month; most are middle-

aged women who work late at night, get off the bus, elevated, streetcars, Rock Island at 63d and State, and Western Indiana Railroad at 63d and Wallace Depots. We have about 40 with autos who work 2 hours once a week, escorting; and also about 40 volunteers who do desk service answering calls, etc., and about 20 young fellows who do investigating securing information for the police. Our relationship in this latter-service has proven helpful in numerous cases. It is surprising how many pick this area to commit deeds, apparently unmindful of how diligently it is now being policed.

Third. Several communities are at work now organizing similar organizations. No one gets paid for service and for some of the volunteers this is the first civic service they have rendered and seem to enjoy the work which is systemized to a couple hours per week—some give more.

Fourth. The operation goes on 6 nights per week and if you care to come out and see the persons coming in for escorts and those going and coming with their cars in use, some Friday from 6 to 10 o'clock would be a good time.

Again thanking you for the help you gave us in getting straightened out in police cooperation, we are

Sincerely yours,

TRIDEN LEAGUE OF ENGLEWOOD,
JOHN H. LYLE, *Attorney.*

The name Triden was chosen since it symbolizes the manner the members use in tackling a problem. A triden is a prod with sharp points.

The league's declaration is as follows:

DECLARATION

Every citizen has a constitutional right to walk the streets of Chicago and to carry with him, in safety, funds for his current needs. Every woman has a constitutional right to use the streets and public places in Chicago, and on those streets and in those places to be secure in her person and to be free from molestation, robbery or assault.

Now, therefore, be it known that the Triden League, and all members thereof, mutually pledge assistance each to the other and express intent to employ, individually or by concerted action, any and all lawful means necessary incuding support and assistance to law-enforcement authorities to aid and protect its members and will, by such course, make certain the security of these rights.

THE TRIDEN LEAGUE.

Ezra Has Got To Go, Says Politics

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES B. UTT
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 4, 1958

Mr. UTT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I would like to insert the following article, entitled "Ezra Has Got To Go, Says Politics," which appeared in the advertising copy of the Laguna Beach (Calif.) Lumber Co.:

EZRA HAS GOT TO GO, SAYS POLITICS

It is a political year and of course every politician of any party must feel sorry for the farmer. Crops of all kinds are very abundant, despite controls, supports, subsidies and Government money going for the feeding of racehorses. But the political crop is colossal.

Politicians want their jobs or some other politician's job and their records are as a rule nothing with which to point with pride; rather they should be viewed with alarm. But no politician will assume blame when a goat is handy. So Ezra Taft Benson, who still clings to the idea that basic economic laws cannot be abridged for long by politics * * * is the goat.

Ezra is of course to blame for the falling off in sales of automobiles. After all, farmers buy autos and trucks and quota sales are off because Ezra Taft Benson sticks to his guns on economics.

Ezra is guilty of causing whatever slump there is in building in the United States, all because he thinks farmers deserve fair but not partial treatment by the Government. Ezra has got to go.

Ezra is at fault because the stock market cannot make up its mind which way to jump on what day. Farmers unsure of their subsidies will not speculate in stocks, so Ezra must go.

The United States Navy is having trouble getting its Vanguard off the testing ground. Undoubtedly Ezra is to blame some way or another.

It may be a thin thread of circumstantial evidence, but Ezra is the best available goat. The politicians say he has to go.

He believes in fair, impartial treatment for all segments of our economic life and thinks farmers are really honest enough as a whole to accept fairness instead of special treatment. But he's wrong. Ezra has got to go. Politicians must feel sorry for farmers. It's traditional.

But Ezra does not know this. He is honest, sincere, and right. No laws, politicians or nation can long ignore a basic law of economics, as this Nation is trying to do. Because Ezra stands up and says so and causes the faces of politicians to turn red and white by turns, he must go.

There are elections to be won. Ezra Taft Benson is standing in the way. He is right. Farmers and politicians know it. But he must go. This is a political year. Honesty and commonsense are not political assets, yet Ezra insists on sticking with them and the politicians are stuck with him. It's just too much in an election year. Ezra has got to go.

LAGUNA BEACH LUMBER CO.

If We Fall, They'll Come, Too

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WINT SMITH
OF KANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 4, 1958

Mr. SMITH of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, last week there was held in Washington, D. C., the big pep rally for foreign aid. Some 500 persons attended this day long session at which President Eisenhower, ex-President Truman, Dean Acheson, Vice President Nixon, Adlai Stevenson, Tom Dewey, and so forth spoke. It was a gala occasion.

This meeting was "unprecedent," to use the word of Eric Johnston, motion-picture czar. Mr. Johnston says, he will organize regional meetings throughout the United States to further the purposes of this propaganda drive. There is only one basic design for these meetings; namely, to put the pressure on Congress for a $3.9 billion foreign aid appropriation when there is already $8 billion available for the doubtful purpose of foreign aid. Seldom has such a drive been made on the Congress. It certainly is unprecedented.

But while this drive was being made in Washington, the editors back home in rural America were looking at this propaganda campaign in a different light. Here is what a widely read rural editor, Mr. Ned Huycke, of the Ellsworth Reporter, Ellsworth, Kans., had to say in his editorial:

IF WE FALL, THEY'LL COME, TOO

At long last the reaction of public sentiment is beginning to penetrate the hide-bound squanderers and globetrotters at the Nation's Capital, and if some of these law makers would stay at the post to which they were elected long enough to hear the voice of the people they would receive the mandate from the taxpaying public that they are up in arms against foreign-aid spending.

Monday of this week, President Eisenhower called a meeting of handpicked politicians for the purpose of formulating a policy whereby this committee, with the President's blessing, could issue propaganda as to why "foreign aid is such a drastic necessity for the protection of our country from enemy attack."

No doubt there will be those who will become alarmed over any news which these learned men will send forth over the waves of propaganda—but to us this method of defense is getting awful threadbare and ragged around the edges. Since World War II we have been "warding off the enemy through foreign aid"; but in our opinion, had foreign aid never been conceived, we as a country and as individuals would have been much better off. The countless billions spent in the name of foreign aid have bought only blackmail, and made enemies of nations which would have accepted our leadership on an honorary basis, without the tint of scandal and envy of our country because of our boast of wealth.

It is rather late to try to right the wrong which foreign aid created for the United States in the world of nations; we can only hope that the peoples of the world will understand that the Common John Citizen of the United States is not to blame for the arrogant methods which have been in the foreground by those at the head of our Government spending. We hope that these peoples of foreign lands will understand that the common man in America is working hard for his daily wage and in addition is taxed to desperation so that money can be squandered to all corners of the world by those in power.

Here is just a word of sensible advice to the "chosen committee," and all other factions dealing with the spending of our money—we cannot take any more taxes—in fact the American public is up in arms for a cut of the already existing taxes, regardless of whether unemployment continues to rise or fall. Income taxes are pulling us, the common people, to destruction, and when we fall we will take those who are squandering our life's earnings, along with us.

His Job: Tell the President

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FLORENCE P. DWYER
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 4, 1958

Mrs. DWYER. Mr. Speaker, the current issue of Newsweek magazine con-

tains a very perceptive article about Dr. Raymond Joseph Saulnier, Chairman of the President's Council of Economic Advisers.

I should like to call the attention of my colleagues to one of the points well made in this article—a point frequently overlooked in the mass of debate on the floor of the House concerning the present business recession. I refer to the fact that the Federal Reserve Board, an independent agency, was responsible for the so-called tight-money policy during the period this policy was in effect. And, further, that Dr. Saulnier as the President's chief economic adviser opposed the continuation of the tight-money policy in advance of the Board's eventual decision to relax this policy.

Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include this article on Dr. Saulnier:

HIS JOB: TELL THE PRESIDENT

Raymond Joseph Saulnier, a trim, well-groomed economics professor who is known to friends as Steve, could very likely walk through the White House press room without being recognized. Yet, as Chairman of the President's Council of Economic Advisers, he is the key figure in Washington's No. 1 political issue. Saulier, more than any one man, molds administration opinion on the course of the economy—and masterminds its current campaign to restore confidence to United States businessmen.

A deliberate, thorough, but unspectacular worker, Saulnier sees himself as a confidential aid to the President. He thus refuses all bids for TV appearances, public speeches, or press interviews. His tight schedule leaves him no time for all this, even if it weren't against his policy. He hasn't, for instance, had a chance to play golf (in the low 80's on a good day) since coming to Washington, leaving him his only other form of exercise—long walks. Nor does Saulnier join in Washington's social whirl.

BOLD FORECASTER

Saulnier's business forecasting record is one to inspire confidence. Last fall, while some of the administration were still preoccupied with holding down inflation, Saulnier played a leading role in convincing the President that the economy was slowing down and that bold budgeting for the coming fiscal year was in order. The President beefed up his expenditure programs and went ahead with heavy contract placement for military orders. Without these decisions, many economists believe, the recession might be far more severe. (But right now, some economists criticize Saulnier for trying to fight the slump with what they call a "jawbone campaign" to restore confidence.)

CEA Chairman Saulnier's job is often confused with that of special Presidential assistant Gabriel Hauge. But Hauge is concerned mainly with the practical, political problems of economic policy (for example, if the President has to decide on a tariff escape clause, Hauge checks with agencies and Congressmen affected). Saulnier's advice, more technical and theoretical, must get to the heart of purely economic problems.

Saulnier's economic views are somewhat similar to those of his predecessor, Arthur F. Burns (who still talks to the President by telephone occasionally). A graduate of Middlebury College with a doctor of philosophy degree from Columbia, Saulnier has known and worked with his predecessor for some 20 years. When Burns went to Washington in 1953, Saulnier, then teaching economics at New York Barnard College became a CEA consultant (he was made a full council member in 1955). Saulnier often reverts to his professional habits in small group discussions—taking off his watch and lecturing for a prescribed period.

QUIET BATTLER

But while politicians on Capitol Hill rate 49-year-old Saulnier as less forceful than either Burns or the last Democratic CEA Chairman, Leon Keyserling, he is no pussyfooter. He carried on a quiet but vigorous battle with Federal Reserve officials when they persisted in pursuing their tight-money policy last year even as economic trends (in Saulnier's view) called for a stimulus. He waged an equally vigorous (and victorious) fight with Budget Director Percival Brundage against a spending holddown for the current fiscal year.

"We didn't all agree with him," said a member of the Joint Economic Committee after hearing Saulnier testify on the economic situation recently, "but we were all impressed with his savvy. He's the kind of a guy who doesn't make up his mind in too much of a hurry. But when he does, he's got the guts to go to bat for his ideas."

An Urgent Problem

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JACK WESTLAND
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 4, 1958

Mr. WESTLAND. Mr. Speaker, I am again calling attention to the urgent problem of the dairy farmers of my district by inserting in the RECORD a letter addressed to me by the directors of the Whatcom County Dairymen's Association on behalf of their 1,600 members.

This letter, dated February 25, 1958, indicates what is happening all over the country as far as the dairy farmer is concerned. These farmers are getting less money for their product, while at the same time their costs of operation are rising.

This is why the farmers of my district urge, as I do, that dairy price supports continue at 75 to 90 percent of parity, and that the Congress be given the opportunity to consider the dairy self-help plan.

The letter follows:

WHATCOM COUNTY
DAIRYMEN'S ASSOCIATION,
Bellingham, Wash., February 25, 1958.
Representative JACK WESTLAND,
House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: As directors of the Whatcom County Dairymen's Association representing 1,600 dairy farmers, we wish to urge you to do everything possible to maintain the present parity on dairy products.

It is a well known fact, that when the farmer's economy is affected, the entire national economy is depressed. The drastic steps being taken to lower parity to 75 percent will further reduce an already inadequate income, and aggravate national economy.

There is no justification for lowering returns to farmers who are already badly underpaid compared to other living standards, and particularly when the manufacturing and processing of their products are constantly rising through labor and equipment costs. We have just completed labor negotiations which will cost our members an additional $75,000 per year.

We are in favor of a well organized, self help plan. There is no reason to doubt but that an equitable self help program for the dairy industry can be evolved, but until such time that such a plan can be put into effect, parity prices should be maintained at the present level.

We appreciate your past cooperation, and ask that you take a firm stand to maintain parity at the present level.

Yours very truly,
WHATCOM COUNTY DAIRYMEN'S ASSOCIATION,
LYLE HUNTER.
C. M. VANDER GRIEND.
ROBERT EASTERBROOK.
WILLIAM MIZE.
HENRY F. POLINDER.

Direct-Mail Advertising and the Welfare of Small Business: The Need for Facts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES O. PORTER
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 24, 1958

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, how many of the 250,000 third-class permit holders are small-business men who need and deserve a measure of subsidy with respect to the direct-mail advertising they use? The Postmaster General does not know, the Department of Commerce does not know; even Harry J. Maginnis, the candid and able representative of the Associated Third-Class Mail Users, does not know.

It is high time we found out.

I do know that many small-business men in southwestern Oregon and elsewhere in the Nation will be hurt by drastic and sudden increases in the cost of sending third-class mail. I also know that many huge corporations flood the mail with third-class communications and do not need or deserve any measure of subsidy.

Attempting to draw a legislative line is a duty Congress has long ignored. If no such line can be feasibly drawn, then the rates should be increased until the users are paying their full allocated costs for the service they get, but this should not be done so suddenly as to put many valuable small-business enterprises into bankruptcy or at least into the ashcan.

I think Harry Maginnis makes some good points in the following statement he had printed on a full page of Roll Call February 5, 1958. Certainly Mr. Summerfield did not sustain the burden of proof when he proposed the drastic increase in third-class mail rates. On the other hand, as I have often told Harry Maginnis, there is also a duty on the part of the third-class mailers to bring before the Post Office and Civil Service Committees impartial evidence showing the effect of these increases on enterprises validly called small businesses and to help us draw that legislative line between those who may deserve a measure of subsidy, at least for a period, and those who should pay their full allocated cost.

Under unanimous consent, I include the following statement by Harry J. Maginnis in the Appendix of the RECORD:

NOBODY READS IT, NOBODY WANTS IT, EVERYBODY THROWS IT AWAY

This often-heard generalization refers, of course, to direct-mail advertising. Unfortunately, some Members of Congress use the phrase when attacking the advertising-sales tool of the 250,000 third-class permit holders in the United States, 90 percent of them small businessmen.

A few equally silly generalizations are:

You should hold your breath when passing a Chinese laundry.

A broken mirror means 7 years bad luck.

Gentlemen prefer blondes.

All fat people are happy.

Politicians are crooks.

ARE BUSINESSMEN IN YOUR STATE DEMENTED?

Third-class mail has existed since 1863. In 1957 businessmen put 15,700,000,000 pieces of such sales literature in the mail. They paid $281 million in third-class postage. Nobody knows for sure how many hundreds of millions of dollars were spent to create and produce this sales literature, but the amount is substantial. Enough goods ($15 billion worth in 1957) were sold to provide a livelihood for 4 to 5 million American citizens. These businessmen are proceeding on the assumption that it is not sinful to sell the goods produced by American labor and to enjoy a profit. Their use of this deferred service category mail—which is handled by the Post Office during slack periods—has been beneficial all around. They pay bleacher prices and don't expect box-seat handling of their mail. Remember these facts the next time you hear that old chestnut, "Nobody reads it, nobody wants it, everybody throws it away."

THE NEWSPAPERS AND CONSTITUENT MAIL

"All very true," Members of Congress will say, "but what about all the complaints I am getting about 'junk' mail."

The answer is very simple.

In spite of all you may have heard about the divorcement of editorial policy of newspapers from the business end, publishers still depend on the advertising dollar to keep their presses running. They are constantly after more advertising dollars and some of them don't like it one bit when the small-business man discovers third-class mail to be an ideal selling tool.

Of course, the best way to destroy competition is to tie a dirty label on it. Thus the continuing "junk" mail attacks by some newspapers. Constituents read these editorials and then write to you. Unfortunately, the 250,000 small-business firms and the 4 to 5 million Americans who make their living through direct-mail sales don't have editorial columns. Representatives and Senators rarely get a glimpse of their side of the case.

THE TRULY SAD PART OF THE STORY

For better or for worse, all these thousands of small-business firms have going for them is the undersigned and a few Members of Congress who understand the economics of the second largest advertising medium in the world. We have appeared before House and Senate committees seven times. In 1952 we did a pretty bad job. The Congress hiked the third-class rate 50 percent. The 250,000 third-class permit holders are still shouldering that substantial increase, and at a time when the administration is trying to hold down the cost of living.

Buried on some remote page of the pending postal rate increase bill is a provision which would make the increase 150 percent—yes, 150 percent. (From $10 per thousand letters in June 1952 to $25.) If this is legislation designed to help the small-business man in an era of mammoth corporate mergers, we will be pleased to distribute gratis somebody's explanation of the great gains which are about to be heaped on the little fellow.

THE SMALL BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION AND SINCLAIR WEEKS

We don't expect Members of Congress to plow through volumes of postal-rate hearings to learn what spokesmen for business in the Eisenhower administration have said on behalf of thousands upon thousands of small-business mailers.

We can save you the trouble. Neither Mr. Weeks nor Mr. Barnes has the slightest idea what will happen to the 250,000 small-business mailers if and when the 150 percent third-class rate increase is approved.

Calvin Coolidge achieved a steep increase in third-class postal rates. Within 3 years he had to come to Congress and ask for a reduction in the rate to its former level. Let's not repeat that legislative bobble.

CANINE RETRIBUTION

There's one generalization we didn't list at the beginning. It is said that "every dog has his day." It just may happen that the small-business mailer eventually will ask: Why was it too much trouble for my Representative in Congress to ask Mr. Weeks or Mr. Barnes for some facts before putting me out of business with a 150 percent increase in rates?

Putting people out of business may be a good way to improve the postal service and increase Federal revenues but we still prefer to believe that brunettes have their appeal and that there are some unhappy fat people in the world.

HARRY J. MAGINNIS,
Associated Third Class Mail Users,
Washington, D. C.

Clothing for Needy Children

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER ROGERS
OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 4, 1958

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in the House of Representatives to insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a most appropriate editorial written by my friend, Jimmy Gillentine, who publishes the Hereford Brand at Hereford, Tex. The editorial is as follows:

"We certainly appreciate the public's response," said Principal L. C. Thomas, of Central School, in reference to a deluge of clothing which appeared this week as the result of an appeal to keep needy children warm.

Mr. Thomas, standing beside a small mountain of clothing, pointed out that much of it was new, no doubt purchased and brought to the school in answer to the appeal.

Like Mr. Thomas, many others of us are humble when we pause to give thanks for the bighearted generosity of people. For a brief time we are prone to forget the world's evils, the sputniks, the ever-growing toll of traffic fatalities, even the murders, sex crimes and banditry which appears in the day's news.

Most people are basically good. Their response to such occasional call is sincere and spontaneous. Hereford and west Texas may be above the general average on this score, but when we view the answer to United Fund drives and other appeals in our large cities, we find them a little different from most other Americans.

As human beings, we often malign and criticize the human race; our pastors, our newspapers and our magazines head the vanguard in this all-American pastime. When everything is said and done, though, we do have a wonderful country, and some of the finest people the world has ever known.

"The People of America Cannot Be Secure if They Are Progressively Separated From the Information That Guides the Nation's Leaders"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES O. PORTER
OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 24, 1958

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, the title above is a quotation from an important editorial in the Portland Oregonian for Sunday, February 2, which editorial is entitled "Security Should Not Be a Political Tool." The editorial also points out that "the real security and necessities of the war and postwar years in Washington have been used as an excuse to extend the practice of security into the service of interests that are purely political, departmental or personal, whereas real security embraces only national interests."

That is an excellent statement of the situation as it exists. I pledge myself to continue to do what I can to uncover such perversions of security and to denounce them for the great danger they are to our form of government. Under unanimous consent, I include the following editorial:

SECURITY SHOULD NOT BE A POLITICAL TOOL

The resolution of the major conflicts between the undeniable right of the President to withhold certain confidential matters from the legislative branch of the Government, on the one hand, and the people's right to know, on the other, is growing more important every day. Currently at issue is the Gaither report, which Mr. Eisenhower commissioned as an aid to the policy-making functions of his administration and access to which he has specifically denied both to Members of Congress and to the public at large.

First, the precedential unassailability of Mr. Eisenhower's position must be made clear. Every United States President, beginning with George Washington, has, upon occasion, found it necessary to exert the Executive's independence of the legislative branch by denying the latter confidential information. The authority to do so is essential to the principle of the separation of powers. Congress also has its executive sessions and secrets from which the executive branch and the people are excluded. Mr. Eisenhower has a point in explaining that he cannot expect responsible persons to prepare for him confidential reports unless those reports are actually to be kept confidential.

As it happens, however, the Gaither report is a poor example of executive security. Its first printing totaled 200 copies and, in the very nature of things in official Washington, a number of these got into the hands of executives who found it in their particular interest to leak essential excerpts. Some newspapermen obtained copies long enough to scan the findings and recommendations. As a result, both Congress and the public

are left with apprehensions based on second-hand reports that may or may not be truly representative of the information available to the President.

Moreover, there can be no doubt whatever that officials in the executive branch have abused their authority to withhold sensitive information. In some instances they have gone so far as to leak classified information to selected units of the press as a means of advancing the selfish interest of a single service or agency. For example, a spokesman for the Air Force not long ago passed to the New York Times a high-altitude photograph of the carrier *Forrestal*, presumably to illustrate the vulnerability of the Navy's big craft. The Pentagon, however, refused to release the same picture or any others in a series of the *Forrestal*. In November 1956, the Central Intelligence Agency leaked to favored newspapers the fact that it had given the White House 24 hours' notice that a British-French-Israeli attack would be launched on Egypt. This leak came on the eve of a congressional committee investigation of the CIA budget.

The bureaucratic attitude that results in such expedient violation of the executive branch's own security regulations is perhaps best exemplified in the following paragraph of an Air Force memorandum setting forth its information policy "lasting through mid-1958."

"Flooding the public with facts is very helpful," the memorandum advises key Air Force officers and executives. "But facts, facts, and more facts are quite useless unless they implant logical conclusions. Facts must be convincing, demonstrated living salesmen of practical benefits. These are the only kind of facts that mold opinions and channel the vibrant tensions of public thinking."

Here, in bold relief, is a shocking misconception of the Government's authority and duty to withhold only that information that could be of possible benefit to a potential enemy or a menace to the national security.

The real security necessities of the war and postwar years in Washington have been used as an excuse to extend the practice of security into the service of interests that are purely political, departmental, or personal, whereas real security embraces only national interests. Separation of powers by no means implies the complete mutual exclusiveness of the three branches of Government. Nor does it sanction in any way the exclusiveness of departments or services within a branch; it is utter folly, for example, for the Army to keep secrets from the Navy and vice versa.

Most important of all is this consideration: The people of America cannot be secure if they are progressively separated from the information that guides the Nation's leaders. In the long run, such separation is a threat to the national safety much greater than any possible consequence of a policy of free access to the Government's business.

Statement of Gov. Averell Harriman, of New York, Before the Senate Subcommittee on Roads

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES C. HEALEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 4, 1958

Mr. HEALEY. Mr. Speaker, I would like to insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the statement made by Governor Harriman, of New York, before the Senate Subcommittee on Public Roads, on February 21, 1958:

I am grateful to Senator GORE and the members of this committee for the opportunity to appear here today.

Since taking office as Governor of New York State 3 years ago, I have given continuous attention to the improvement of our highway systems. My concern has been for both the reconstruction of existing State highways and the creation of an interstate system of expressways connecting the major centers of population and industry throughout the United States.

New York is the most populous of the States. It leads all others in manufacturing, and is the most important financial and commercial center of the Nation. New York draws visitors from all over the country and in fact the world. It is the second highest State in the number of registered automobiles, and in annual motor fuel consumption. As such, it contributes a large percentage of the revenues available to the Federal Government for highway purposes.

With these factors in mind, I vigorously supported the efforts of Senator GORE and his colleagues in the Senate and the House during 1955 and 1956 when they faced the difficult task of preparing legislation to establish a national program to meet highway needs. I believe the Gore-Fallon Act which resulted is basically sound legislation. Under its provisions, many States have been able to take long steps toward the realization of the ambitious goals set by this program.

A construction program of this size not only improves our transportation facilities, but serves as an important stimulus to unemployment and to the strengthening of our general economy. Now, with unemployment at 4,500,000 and expected to climb to 5 million this month, with production lower than in 1953–54, with steel plants operating at slightly more than 50 percent of capacity, with national spending for plant and equipment declining, it is essential that there be no scaling down of the highway construction contemplated by the act. Last week, I and 10 other governors respectfully urged the President to accelerate the highway program in order to revive activity in the vital construction and related industries. In his reply, received yesterday, the President stated that, among other measures, steps had already been taken by the Federal Government to provide greatly increased expenditures under the national highway building program. I had not been aware that the administration has taken steps to increase the program beyond the provisions of the 1956 act. And, in fact, other spokesmen of the administration have stated that the program would be slowed down. I am here today to enter objection to any reduction in the 1956 program, and to ask that it be increased.

New York State, well aware of the importance of this program, has from the start been among the leaders in getting work underway on the Interstate System, as well as on our regular urban, primary, and secondary systems. We have geared ourselves to absorb to the full our share of the apportionments established in the 1956 Federal act. The latest tabulations of the Federal Bureau of Public Roads show that New York State has $174 million of interstate projects under construction. This is a larger volume of work actually underway than any other State in the Nation. Through the advance of State funds, we are making early use of Federal assistance which was originally scheduled to be available in July but which, we have been advised, will not come to us until December. We have already opened a portion of our Empire Stateway running through the center of our State from Pennsylvania to the Canadian border. By next year, we expect to have several more major sections of toll-free interstate mileage opened to traffic.

During the design and construction of the 570-mile throughway, New York State obtained knowledge and experience in planning and building modern highways. Each section of these major expressways requires upward of 2 years of survey and design at considerable expense before actual construction is started. For this reason, it is vitally necessary that the States have firm assurance, at least 3 years in advance, of the amount of money they will have available for highway work. It is a well-known fact that, in any major construction program, a steady volume of work reduces costs and nothing is more expensive than fluctuation in the workload.

I believe it was the intent of Congress when the 1956 Federal act was passed to see to it that the various States had a firm basis upon which to plan future construction schedules. Thirteen years was set as the period within which the Interstate System was to be completed. New York State went ahead with plans and surveys on this assumption.

At the present time we have in various stages of design over $1,250,000,000 of highway plans for all of our State highway systems. Of this, approximately $580 million is for interstate projects. A program of this magnitude cannot be carried out efficiently, if we are constantly beset by uncertainties as to future Federal allocations.

It was not until midway in 1957 that we began to hear representatives of the Department of Commerce speak of the possibility of stretching the program out to 16 or even to 20 years. I feel sure that a 20-year program is just as contrary to the intent of the sponsors of this act as it is to the desires of New York State. If these expressways take 20 or more years to construct, they will be inadequate before they are completed.

We are given to understand that this talk of stretch-out is due primarily to increases in the estimated cost of the Interstate System, and a failure of revenue to meet estimates. Congress authorized appropriations of $2.2 billion for each of the fiscal years 1960 and 1961, but we are now told that the money available in 1960 will be $1.6 billion, and in 1961 will be reduced to $1.2 billion.

If these reductions are put into effect, 36 States will find that they have less to spend on interstate work than they had in 1958–59. By 1961, 46 States will have to cut back their programs as a result of shrinking Federal allocations.

This means that while New York State will receive $142 million for interstate construction in 1959, our allocations will drop to $79 million in 1960, and to $59 million in 1961. This is progress in reverse. With $580 million worth of interstate projects now under design, it is difficult to see how we can maintain a steady rate of construction based on a sharply descending scale of Federal aid.

Instead of seeking ways to preserve and to supplement the highway trust fund, the administration has advanced proposals which would deplete it by charging to it the costs of the forest-land highways and expenses incurred by the Treasury and Labor Departments incident to the interstate program. I hope that the Congress will be alert at all times to attempts to divert this trust fund from the express purposes for which it was created.

In spite of the progress we have made, New York State finds itself in a particularly unfortunate position with regard to its apportionment of mileage and funds for the National System of Interstate and Defense Highways. This position is shared by some 15 other States, all of which have toll roads designated as interstate routes. Of the 1,210 approved interstate miles within our border,

over 500 miles are a part of the New York State Thruway. The new formula for apportionment of Federal interstate funds makes clear the need and the justice of some form of compensation for those States which find themselves similarly situated. This formula, as you know, is based upon each State's percentage of the cost to complete the whole National System. In other words, New York's annual allocations will be based not upon the cost of our 1,210 authorized miles, but upon the cost of the 700 miles which remain to be built. This inequity will prevail as long as the program lasts.

When the New York State Thruway was designated as a part of the Interstate System, it was assumed that some method of reimbursement would be worked out. Reimbursement for toll roads was recommended by the President's committee, chairmaned by General Clay, which reported its findings in 1955. The 1956 Federal Act directed that the Department of Commerce conduct a study of the reimbursement problem. I understand that the results of this study have been submitted to Congress. This report will show that the cost of toll road construction on New York's Interstate system will come to approximately $1 billion. It would be a glaring injustice if no provision were made to compensate those States which, like New York, have moved forward with the construction of large portions of their Interstate networks without Federal assistance. The Federal Government would in effect be penalizing those very States which have had the foresight and the initiative to provide the Nation with the sort of major transportation system it so desperately needs.

Congressman BUCKLEY, of New York, who has consistently sought to rectify this injustice, has recently introduced a bill amending the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1956 in such a way as to give the States having toll roads on their Interstate systems a more equitable share of Federal-Aid. This bill would permit the Secretary of Commerce to designate as part of the Interstate system other routes within the various States equal in mileage to the length of the toll roads within their borders. The cost of the construction of these interstate miles would then be added to the total cost for completing the Interstate system. I strongly recommend favorable consideration of this bill by the members of this committee.

New York State already has applied for the inclusion of an additional 453 miles in the Interstate System. These major routes are fully justified as interstate highways from a standpoint of traffic use, economic factors and defense. New York State needs and should have more than one outlet to the west. Last year, when an additional 2,102 miles was to be allocated, New York State applied, among other projects, for inclusion of major portions of Routes 17, 15, 219 and an extension of the Empire Stateway from its northern terminus to the Ogdensburg Bridge. The Department of Commerce passed over our application. If the Buckley bill becomes law, these routes can be made a part of the Interstate System. In fact, Route 17 can then be developed as part of the interstate network for its entire length, as I have consistently believed it should be. And there are routes connecting with other States which are badly needed.

In spite of our recognition of the importance of the Interstate System, New York is not concerned with this type of highway alone. We share with the Members of the Senate and the House an equal concern for the reconstruction of the many thousands of miles of urban, primary and secondary highways on the Federal aid system. This concern was spelled out in the 1956 Highway Act when Congress declared its intent to progressively increase the sums authorized for these various systems by $25 million each year through 1969.

The administration now recommends that beginning in fiscal year 1960 this program be frozen and no further increases be granted. This move we regard as shortsighted in the extreme. Now is not the time to talk of cutbacks and stretchouts. With unemployment moving steadily upward, it is more than ever necessary that the Federal Government make sure that the highway construction program is carried on at a rate sufficiently high to make it an important factor in halting the current recession. This is the time when bold action is needed. I, therefore, recommend a substantially larger increase in the appropriations for the primary, secondary, and urban systems than has been contemplated. These feeder routes, including farm-to-market roads, are every bit as important as major expressways. New York State has been able to absorb all of the Federal aid assigned to these systems. The voters of our State have approved a $500 million bond issue for highway purposes. Our design program is such that we are capable of handling substantial increases. We are ready to move ahead with the placement of contracts. Men can be put to work promptly on the job and in the factory.

Another matter I want to touch on is the matter of billboard advertising on the Interstate System. The Interstate and Defense highways will pass through some of the most beautiful areas of our Nation. For much of their distance, they will be entirely on new location, opening up vistas hitherto unseen by the public. To preserve the natural beauty of our countryside and to promote highway safety, steps must be taken to prevent billboards from cluttering up our expressways. Already, they are appearing along recently opened Interstate sections. In New York, I have recommended to the State Legislature a measure which would restrict billboards within 660 feet of these highways. It is proper that the various States take the initiative. However, since this is an Interstate System, a uniform national policy should be established. I recommend that this committee reexamine the legislation introduced last year by Senator NEUBERGER. Action now to protect our tremendous investment in new expressways is imperative.

I am convinced that the 1956 Highway Act, in whose creation this subcommittee played so substantial a part, was a most courageous and farsighted piece of legislation. But it will not remain so if it is whittled down and dwarfed from its original conception. This is a 13-year program. It makes no sense to turn it into a 20-year program. Nor does it make sense to ask the States to constantly lower their sights by reductions in the yearly apportionments of funds for construction of the Interstate System. This network is known as the National System of Interstate and Defense Highways. When we set about deciding just how badly we really need these expressways, let us not forget the word "defense." Let's not make this one more example of shortsightedness and false economy. New York City particularly needs more interstate routes for civil defense and evacuation.

New York State is prepared to do its share, as it has in the past.

As I have indicated, with increased Federal assistance, we would be in a position to expand our program and place contracts rapidly, which would not only help us to meet our highway requirements, but would be a stimulus to employment and our lagging economy.

Foreign Aid and Practical Politics

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEON H. GAVIN
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 26, 1958

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by David Lawrence:

FOREIGN AID AND PRACTICAL POLITICS
(By David Lawrence)

RECESSION SEEN RAISING TOUGH HURDLE FOR ASSISTANCE AND TRADE PROPOSALS

Everybody knows there's trouble ahead in Congress for the foreign-aid program—and likewise for the extension of the reciprocal trade agreements. So a highpowered sales job was undertaken here this week by a group of conscientious persons in both political parties who think these projects are vital to world peace.

But, as with a lot of meritorious ideas, the proponents talk mostly to themselves. They do not perceive the considerations of practical politics that present the real obstacles.

It is not popular, for instance, to be arguing in Washington for the expenditures of large sums for aid abroad when there is unemployment and recession going on among the people back home, the promotion of whose well-being is the primary obligation of the Members of Congress.

It's not popular to talk about extending reciprocal trade agreements and lowering tariff barriers when so many constituencies throughout the country would be adversely affected if foreign goods—manufactured at lower wage costs than prevail here—were permitted to enter the United States in great quantities.

Many Senators and Representatives in both parties face a condition, not just a theory, in these matters. It's true that prominent Democrats like Messrs. Truman, Stevenson, and Acheson are joining with President Eisenhower, Vice President NIXON, and Secretary Dulles in espousing the two programs, and there are, moreover, very good arguments for these proposals. But vote-getting is something else again, and the congressional elections are just a few months away.

Who is to take care of the unemployed in these industries? What about the loss of investments in the businesses that would be injured by the breakdown of tariff walls?

It's easy enough to offer high-sounding arguments about the importance of building up foreign economies, and how the rest of the world must be able to sell their goods in our markets if we are to produce a prosperous economy for everybody. But the voters who see their textile plants hurt by a tariff are up against a concrete fact—namely, the possible loss of their jobs.

The question of tariff walls has been before the American people for many decades. A gradual reduction has been made over the years, but lately the opponents have argued not so much against changes in tariff rates—for even the present duties are not high enough to protect some industries—but in favor of some kind of quotas actually to restrict or limit imports from certain countries. The Europeans use the quota system. Even American magazines started since 1945 are kept off the newsstands of Great Britain because the Government there wishes to limit the competition with British

periodicals. The Canadian Government, moreover, put a high tax on certain types of Americal publications to discourage their doing business in Canada.

It may be thought that the opposition in Congress to the extension of the reciprocal trade agreements is inconsequential and can be overridden. The tariff question, for instance, is being linked to the foreign aid program. Members of Congress who don't want to see tariffs disturbed are likely to withhold votes from the appropriations for foreign aid as a weapon for compromise.

The effort by a well-organized group in Washington last week to create a favorable public opinion for foreign aid and for the reciprocal trade agreements is perhaps the most spectacular in a long time. But it doesn't answer the question of what happens to the Congressman or Senator who has a lot of unemployed back home and still votes for aid to foreign countries. It doesn't help the Members of Congress, either, who must fight against the importation of cheaper-made products that compete with industries in certain districts or States.

The problems are complex but not insoluble. It will cost money really to protect industries that may be affected by tariffs. They are, to be sure, as important as any casualties in the economic world ever assisted by Government before. It will cost money to help generally the unemployed at home, and when that's done the Congress may be better disposed toward the whole foreign aid project and reciprocal trade agreements.

The indubitable fact is that the current recession now is uppermost in the minds of the people and is the basic concern of all Members of Congress. Charity begins at home is an age-old slogan, and maybe it is too narrow in its implication—but, politically speaking, it is broad enough to influence a good many voters in the next election.

Franklin D. Roosevelt

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS L. ASHLEY
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 4, 1958

Mr. ASHLEY. Mr. Speaker, as Americans throughout the Nation join in paying tribute today to Franklin D. Roosevelt on this 25th anniversary of his first inauguration, it is well to pause and give thought to an era that made history, following our national economic collapse only 25 years ago.

The following years of prosperity in which all our citizens shared began with the leadership of President Roosevelt—leadership that united the American people in a common bond to support his bold and courageous programs and leadership that pulled this country out of the depths of a national depression and started it up the road of national prosperity.

Franklin D. Roosevelt inherited a depression economy when he took office on that fateful March 4, 1933. Millions of unemployed stood in breadlines, millions of others worked for subsistence wages, factories stood idle, farmers were turned off their land.

"I pledge you," he said, "I pledge myself, to a new deal for the American people." And he made good that pledge. A confident people began to buy goods from a confident business that began to produce it. A new agricultural program that helped to put the farmers back on their feet had its impact in developing purchasing power for that important segment of our economy. Land utilization, conservation, reforestation, were all long-range programs that paid off in increased agricultural production providing a decent living for farmers and protecting the Nation's natural resources.

Federal bank insurance closed the tragic chapter when lifetime savings were wiped out in bank failures.

Unemployment insurance, social security, minimum-wage laws were all measures to prevent a repetition of the extreme suffering and hardships of another economic crisis.

The memorable first 100 days of the New Deal were exciting and vigorous. The legislative proposals were imaginative and were eagerly accepted by the American people.

Now after only 5 years of a Republican administration we find a parallel to that earlier era in the serious economic problems again facing us. We have mounting unemployment, an increasing rate of small-business failures, a deepening depression among American farmers, and a record high cost of living. But these problems are not being met with the vigor and determination that made history just 25 years ago. We see none of the urgency and excitement, the courage and leadership from the highest office in the land which united the American people in their faith and confidence for the present and future. From the President of the United States today, there is only vacillation and indifference to the economic suffering, with soothing assurances that everything is going to be all right. There are calls for confidence and faith—but there is no leadership to rally that confidence and faith.

This attitude is epitomized in the words of former President Herbert Hoover, who chose to repeat the same old Republican chins-up philosophy on February 22, 1958, that he stated on February 22, 1931. It is a philosophy that is as deeply ingrained in the Republican administration of President Eisenhower as it was in that earlier Republican administration of President Hoover.

Today's economic problems call for aggressive leadership from the President of the United States if we as a Nation are to meet and solve them. They call for the same kind of leadership that rallied our citizens in confidence and in faith by the man to whom we pay tribute today—Franklin D. Roosevelt.

Congress Receives America's Democratic Legacy Award from the Antidefamation League of B'Nai B'rith

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EMANUEL CELLER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 4, 1958

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the Democratic Members of the House of Representatives, I accepted America's Democratic Legacy Award given to the Congress by the Antidefamation League of B'nai B'rith at a dinner in the Mayflower Hotel, Washington, Monday, March 3, 1958. The text of my remarks follows:

ON BEHALF OF CONGRESS REPRESENTATIVE EMANUEL CELLER RECEIVES AMERICA'S DEMOCRATIC LEGACY AWARD BY THE ANTIDEFAMATION LEAGUE OF B'NAI B'RITH, MONDAY, MARCH 3, 1958

I believe all of us here tonight recognize how significant, how profoundly moving, this moment is—and without precedent. The Congress of these United States receives the America's Democratic legacy award of the Antidefamation League of B'Nai B'rith for the passage of the first Civil Rights Act in 82 years and for the high level of debate that accompanied the passage of this act.

In recognizing Congress for these achievements, the Antifamation League of B'nai B'rith is paying tribute actually to the Nation, for Congress mirrors the Nation and only those principles can survive to which the Nation is dedicated. Let me add, too, that Congress reflects as well the weaknesses, the fears, the doubts, the prejudices, the strength, the moral fiber, the integrity, inherent in all people everywhere.

Congress is not building chambers, committee rooms, Statuary Hall, and underground passageways. Congress is 531 men and women behind whom press 170 million people who inhabit this country. There is no one more representative group in the world than the Congress of the United States and in this great debate on civil rights the Congress revealed all that is best in America's legacy.

Congress reflected each diversity of opinion and the freedom which is inherently ours to give expression to these opinions, convictions, passions and prejudices. Let it be noted the world over that while the majority conviction rested on our fundamental principle that the United States guarantees to all its citizens, regardless of race, creed, or color, equality of opportunity no one, no one, was denied the right to express his opposition to this conviction.

On the opening day of this great debate, which I profoundly hope shall serve forever as the model for Congressional decisions, I said on the floor of the House, and I believe it bears repeating:

"When there is a denial of constitutional rights to any person or to any segment of our society, it is the duty of Congress, a duty which it has shriked much too long, to provide the remedy.

"What we have before us is not a question of conscience, ethics, morality, or custom. What we have before us is a matter of rights, rights guaranteed by the Constitution, rights that have been withheld, and, as a consequence, we have done a singular dishonor to our Constitution.

"This is not to say that the acceptance of the proposals before us will be a simple matter, that the acceptance will not be painful to many in our country who have absorbed uncritically a regional way of life. The breaking of a pattern is never easy but we, the Congress of these United States, cannot permit any longer constitutional guaranties to be submerged and drowned by a pattern which has been permitted to harden and encrust the basic values of democracy.

"I personally deplore the necessity for engaging in argument which must necessarily bring pain to many Members of the House who represent a southern constituency, but if the espousal of the bill that bears my name touches the raw nerves of those so deeply and emotionally involved, I cannot retreat. It is not that I have any less affection for my colleagues from the South but rather it is I have a compelling adherence to the Constitution and to its

guaranty of civil rights to all the people, regardless of race, color, or creed. To have the color of one's skin determine whether the Constitution governs him or not is a thesis for which I can have no stomach.

"I realize the sectional differences obtaining in these fair United States. We have always had dissidence to contend with from our very beginning, when we were a mere confederation of States, but we soon learned that each section cannot have its own measuring rod. That leads along an endless trail of absurdity and confusion, which tends to national ossification. We cannot have the Constitution meaning one thing to one section and another thing to another section. Our Constitution must be one thing to all men—not many things to many men. Otherwise, we belie our history."

I believe that the debates on the floor of the House and the Senate should be required reading for all. When we keep in mind how intense, how passionate, and how deep were the emotions involved in this debate, we as a Nation have reason to be proud of the discipline, the restraint, and the scholarliness which all participants—and I stress all—exercised. I have listened to debates in the Bundestag of the West German Republic, in the House of Commons of Great Britain, in the National Assembly of France, in the Senate at Rome, in the Council of the Workers at Belgrade, in the House of the People in New Delhi, India, in the Knesseth in Israel—but never have I heard a debate in those chambers that was on a higher plane—or as dignified—or as courteous—and parliamentary—as the debate on civil rights in the House. This is a great tribute to our American tradition of fair play and free speech. It is to the everlasting credit of the Anti-Defamation League that it recognized and acknowledged the magnificent quality of this kind of debate which bespeaks to the world the real meaning of the democratic tradition. And after the great debate, sectional as it was, the ranks closed and there was no sediment of bitterness left behind.

However, let us acknowledge that the Civil Rights Act is only one step forward. It leaves many, many troublesome areas untouched. Its enactment symbolized victory in only a skirmish. There is still need to shed light in some dark places. The past history in a number of States has not been a creditable one as far as civil rights were concerned and the past seems to gnaw at the future of those States. They still remain recalcitrant. The remedy applied must be continued. I know it may bring great discomfiture, if not pain, but suffering is the price that must be paid for the prevention and the cure. While we cannot change the past, we can mold the future. This we can no longer do—preserve segregation against the tide of history. We cannot any longer accept the separate but equal doctrine to be applied anywhere in these United States, as against the imperatives of the law, as against the Supreme Court decision. If we are to have liberty, it must, in the ringing voice of Leviticus, be 'liberty throughout the land, to all the inhabitants thereof." Liberty is one thing you can't have—unless you give it to others. It cannot be the privilege of the white man alone—it must be shared with all.

It has been said that justice is the bread of the Nation, because all hunger for it—white and colored.

Indeed, justice is denied if civil rights are trampled.

To those who disparage the Negro and at the same time boast of their nobler blood, I say send your noble blood to market and see what it will buy.

To those who boast of their forebears and their better traits, I say a man can't very well make for himself a place in the sun if he keeps continually taking refuge under the shadow of the family tree.

I am not interested so much in race, color, creed, or national origin, as I am in character. Character is what you are in the dark. Character is what you do when no one is watching. Woodrow Wilson said: "Character is a byproduct; it is produced in the great manufacture of daily duty." Rudyard Kipling said, "It is not good to be a Negro in the land of the free and the home of the brave." We must so conduct ourselves as to make repetition of that thought unthinkable.

There are before the Committee on the Judiciary, of which I am chairman, 18 comprehensive bills which will carry us forward into greater realization of civil rights for all.

Let it not be thought that, having enacted the Civil Rights Act of 1957, we shall remain smugly content. This is a promise. As chairman of the House Judiciary Committee, I shall hold hearings on the bills pending—more particularly on the comprehensive bill I offered. I shall endeavor to have it reported favorably to the House. When that time comes, as it inevitably will, for the further enactment of the necessary laws to curb the still-rampant denial of civil rights in sections of this land, it is my fervent hope—I might even say prayer—in which all of you I know join with me, that once again in this most delicate of areas when we meet on the floor possessed by divergent and conflicting convictions, we will speak, persuade, and vote, in humble acknowledgment of America's democratic legacy of freely expressed opinion—without rancor and without recrimination, in fairness and openness, in the highest of American tradition.

Wisdom is knowing what to do next—skill in knowing how to do it and virtue in doing it. I am sure the Congress possesses that wisdom, that skill, that virtue.

On behalf of the Democratic Members of the House of Representatives, I accept in all humility this tribute to the Congress of the United States.

Neighborhood House Month

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANCES P. BOLTON
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 3, 1958

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing a concurrent resolution requesting the President to designate the month of March in each year as Neighborhood House Month.

Established in 1886 to improve living conditions on the lower East Side of New York City, the settlement and neighborhood house movement has grown throughout the United States so that there are now more than 700 such establishments. They are located in almost every community of over 100,000 population. In my home city, Cleveland, Ohio, there are 12 settlements.

These settlements and neighborhood houses are helping to stimulate the interest of people in cities throughout our country in the conservation of their neighborhoods and the redevelopment and renewal of their cities. It is befitting that the public be made aware of the vital contribution of these centers to the sound well-being and cultural development of the cities of America. Therefore, I am introducing this resolution to designate the month of March of each years as Neighborhood House Month. It is my hope that the Commitee on the Judiciary and the Congress will take favorable action on it during this session.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include the resolution herewith:

Concurrent resolution requesting the President to designate the month of March in each year as Neighborhood House Month

Whereas the settlement movement in the United States was established in 1886 to improve living conditions on the lower East Side of New York City; and

Whereas the settlement house movement has grown throughout the United States so that there are now more than 700 such establishments in almost every community over 100,000 population in this country; and

Whereas settlements and neighborhood houses have enriched the lives of their neighbors of all ages, races, and creeds through skilled services and social reforms; and

Whereas the National Federation of Settlements and Neighborhood Centers, a federating body of many settlements and neighborhood houses, has for 47 years contributed much to the civic progress of our cities; and

Whereas settlements and neighborhood houses are helping stimulate the interest of people in cities throughout the United States in the conservation of their neighborhoods and the redevelopment and renewal of their cities; and

Whereas the settlements and neighborhood centers represent the voluntary efforts of citizens to improve their own environment and that of their fellow citizens; and

Whereas it is befitting that the public be aware of the vital contribution of settlements and neighborhood centers to the social well-being and cultural development of the cities of America: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the President is authorized and requested to issue each year, beginning with the year 1959, a proclamation designating the month of March of such year as Neighborhood House Month and calling upon the people of the United States to observe such month with appropriate ceremonies.

The Bogey of International Zionism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 24, 1958

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, the following article from Congress Weekly of February 3, 1958, points out the true source of the trouble in the Near East and shows how former President Truman's worthright position on the state of Israel embodies a correct view of the situation:

THE BOGEY OF INTERNATIONAL ZIONISM

A curious dichotomy has long been evident in American attitudes toward Israel. Side by side with the traditional sympathy for the Zionist cause, which attained its supreme expression in President Truman's prompt recognition of the Jewish state in 1948, there has existed in the State Department an attitude of ill-concealed hostility. Leading officials in the Department considered the creation of Israel a gross mistake, and today, while grudgingly admitting Israel's right to exist, they give vent to their

hostility by preaching the dogma that international Zionism is at the root of the troubles in the Middle East, that Zionist ambition is the chief obstacle to peace in the area. Two recent public utterances offer an illustration of these conflicting attitudes.

Former President Truman, himself a victim of much criticism for his Palestine policy, speaking at a dinner given by the World Academy of Higher Jewish Studies in Jerusalem, vigorously defended his recognition of Israel 10 years ago. "If we had been against Israel when Israel finally emerged as a living fact on the stage of Jewish history," he declared bluntly, "we would have violated our announced traditions and policies." In answer to those who regard Israel as a threat to the Arab peoples, Mr. Truman stated, "We ought not create the impression that we will not support the State of Israel. If we remain firm in the position that the State of Israel is here to stay and that a great future of relations between Israel and the Arab people is possible with good will on both sides, then I believe a just settlement can be worked out."

Nowadays, when hostile propaganda has made Israel the whipping boy for all the troubles in the Middle East, it is good to hear these forthright words. They serve as a corrective to an address by Harold B. Minor, former United States Ambassador to Lebanon and currently employed by the Arabian American Oil Co., delivered before the Southern Assembly sponsored by Tulane University. The remarks of this former State Department official are typical of the current anti-Israel line. "There will be no improvement and no peace," he said, "until the American Government and the American people face up to a distinction between an Israel as an integrated Near Eastern nation and an Israel as a goal of international Zionism. * * * An Israel supported by tremendous contributions of money and other means by international Zionism, in which force is substituted for understanding, and based on intransigence as regards United Nations resolutions and large-scale immigration, is in my opinion, untenable."

It need hardly be pointed out that Mr. Minor's assessment of Middle East affairs takes its cue from official Arab propaganda, which has long obscured the true issues. Further appeasement of the Arabs will neither cure nor mitigate the troubles in the area. The disorder in the Middle East is deep, endemic, and of long standing; Mr. Minor's tidy doctrines can do little to alleviate it. On the contrary, his mixture of distortion, animosity, and oversimplification does great harm to advancing the cause of peace.

As against the prejudiced views of Mr. Minor and other pro-Arab propagandists, we prefer to think that Mr. Truman's is the more authentic voice of America.

Newspapers and the Rights of Individuals

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARENCE J. BROWN

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 4, 1958

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include therein a speech made by the Honorable Cranston Williams, general manager of the American Newspaper Publishers Association, at a dinner of the Newspaper Advertising Executives Association of the Carolinas, held at Durham, N. C., on the night of February 22, 1958, which is entitled "Newspapers and the Rights of Individuals."

NEWSPAPERS AND THE RIGHTS OF INDIVIDUALS

(Speech of Cranston Williams, general manager of American Newspaper Publishers Association, at dinner of Newspaper Advertising Executives Association of the Carolinas, Durham, N. C., February 22, 1958)

This speech needs no title or slogan. I have nothing to sell this audience. For purposes of the printed advance program I have used the title "Newspapers and the Rights of Individuals." I hope I can recite some things of interest to each of you in the newspaper business and guests, all interested in the public welfare.

Most of my life has been spent in newspaper work. In my position as general manager of the American Newspaper Publishers Association, I have a better than average chance to view some fundamental problems in a perspective that gives me a view of the newspaper business as it is related to the future of our country. I promise to leave out the technical details and statistics; but I think you will be interested in some things happening today that have a direct bearing on each individual in our free society.

Members of the Newspaper Advertising Executives Association of the Carolinas know that critics of newspapers and of advertising are working overtime and those critics do not ask for time and a half. We see and hear their blasts at us on television and radio and we read in our own newspapers what they have to say. I rejoice in their freedom of speech to sound off as they please, and I hope our critics as well as ourselves will always have freedom of speech as well as freedom of the press. I emphasize that point now, and I shall come back to it in these remarks.

Self-examination is good for anybody, and I know of no business that does more self-appraisal than the newspaper business. Every time two or more editors, publishers, advertising men, circulation men or mechanical men get together they invariably discuss ways of doing their jobs better. The public every day appraises our work to the extent of buying more than 57 million copies.

I hope tonight we can do some self-examination on its broadest aspects.

Newspapers must give their readers what they want, what they expect, and what they pay for if they are to continue to exist as a free institution.

Most of us, I think, take newspapers for granted. We get up in the morning—feeling fine, feeling badly, with a headache, feeling grouchy, or feeling pleasant—but however we feel we instinctively turn to our newspaper. We expect the newspaper to be there. In the afternoon we have the same feeling of expectancy in reading our newspaper. We expect that newspaper to give us information. We would be most indignant if the newspaper did not tell us about sputniks or the explorers that are circling the globe. If we had to wait for a Government handout to get such information we would feel that our rights were being infringed. And this would be true because our Constitution guarantees to us the right to information if we demand it. We are at liberty to read, to agree, or to refute, but one of our inalienable rights is the right to have information—whether we like it or not, or whether or not we agree with what we read or hear.

The newspaper, with its news of our community, our Nation, and our world, and its advertising on all sorts of subjects about all varieties of commodities and services, preserves for us as citizens our rights which were written into our Constitution.

The phrase "freedom of the press" came into question among some at one time because there were people who said newspapers fought for freedom of the press selfishly and for their own ends. I know of no newspaper publisher who thinks that freedom of the press is a right guaranteed to him. It is a right guaranteed to the people for which the newspapers are only the trustees. As honest and alert trustees they fight for that right whenever it is in danger; but their fight is for the people and their right to know.

I think all of us are aware that there is a destructive force attacking our right to know. Governments, both Federal and State, seem to feel that the handout—the formal release in mimeographed form—is the method through which the people should be informed. Bureaus seem not to realize that those in authority in Government are there only through the will of the people and that they must perform according to the will of the people or not long remain in power in our Republic. Or perhaps it is because the bureaus realize the truth only too well and therefore seek to hide from the people their errors both of omission and commission. For such a purpose the Government handout is ideal.

None of us can accept their theory of how the people shall be kept informed. The people have the right to know everything that is going on. It is the duty of the newspaper to see that they are informed. Neither the people nor the newspapers wish made public those things which can endanger us as a Nation. There is no quarrel with Government when it attempts to keep secret information which if in the hands of our enemy could endanger us. It is different when the enemy knows something but it is kept from our people. There are many things which Government servants would hide from their masters—the people—under the guise of national security which is actually in many cases Government bungling and misconduct.

As it is with news, so it is with advertising, and most of my hearers tonight are concerned greatly and specifically with advertising.

It is not only in the realm of news that the public is entitled to have information. They have the right to know of every product, of every service that is offered legally. They have the right to know its quality, its packaging, its price. They have the right to decide as between two commodities of almost equal quality. Advertising gives that information.

I say that truthful advertising should not be suppressed. Some Federal and State governmental agencies and others outside of government say otherwise. They want to control even truthful advertising. They want to say that product A meets with their approval and can therefore be advertised, but product B does not and therefore should be banned from the public's knowledge. I know you will not agree with that theory.

Lawyers and doctors say, "We will not advertise." If that is their will, that is also their right. But when lawyers adopt a code of ethics for themselves which bans advertising should Government agencies adopt that code of ethics or canon promulgated by a private organization for a group of private citizens, to keep from the public the right to know? Yet that is being done. Only recently the Patent Office in the United States Department of Commerce proposed a rule that no one appearing before it can advertise. They base this proposed rule on Canon 27 of the American Bar Association which forbids attorneys to advertise. When the ANPA raised a question we were informed that other governmental agencies had adopted the same canon of a private organization to guide the Government in its public functions.

The Patent Office and others have no criticism of advertising as being untruthful or false or misleading. It is advertising per se to which these governmental agencies object,

guided and influenced by a canon promulgated by and for lawyers. And so the private code of a relatively small private group is being forced on others who do not accept the concept that paid advertising is something unprofessional to be avoided.

This theory of keeping from you the facts of which you should be aware has been adopted by others who seem to feel that their professional stature will be enhanced by a no advertising rule for the members of their profession. Dentists, optometrists, and, more recently, funeral directors (or morticians, as I believe they prefer to be called) are seeking to enforce upon their entire group an antiadvertising code. And because they have not been successful in their efforts through a voluntary code which they seek to enforce on all in their business, they are going to lawmakers in each State seeking force of law to put their ideas into effect.

Not all members of these groups agree with the no-advertising theory, and therefore a voluntary code could not be enforced; so resort to law seems to be their next logical step.

Those seeking to impose their no-advertising will upon the entire group would deprive the advertising group of licenses to practice. Why? Simply because, apparently, in some of these groups minorities are no longer recognized. It is the majority will which would govern completely.

In this connection a rather amusing incident might interest you. In one State powerful interests representing a segment of the optometric profession obtained the introduction of a bill to prohibit advertising by all members of that group. In due course hearings were held. Advocates of the law mustered their forces to tell the lawmakers why such a law was necessary and desirable. However, the opponents were not asleep. They also had some facts to bring out at this hearing as to the merits and demerits of the proposal. When the time for the hearing came, the opponents' spokesman presented to the legislators page after page of "news" which had been sent to the newspapers for free publication by the same people who were seeking a law ot prevent advertising: Handouts about Better Vision Week, Have Your Eyes Examined Week, See Your Oculist Week, and so on ad infinitum. The opponents' spokesman read these various gems of news and pointed out that apparently it was not advertising in itself the proponents of the bill sought to stop but merely advertising which had to be paid for. The measure was defeated—I am told amidst gusts of laughter by the legislators.

Do you believe these private groups have the right to limit your knowledge of their ability to serve you? If you should move into a new town, would you not want to know about the doctors, dentists, optometrists available—I will not say funeral directors, although the sad time comes to all of us when we need their services? Do you believe these groups have the right to keep that necessary information from you? Should a small group determine the ethics for the entire group and then seek to impose their will on every member of that group? It seems to me that each member of the group should determine for himself what he wishes to do.

It has occurred to me that this distaste for paid advertising might have some element of monopoly involved. This has occurred to me because State boards in some of these professions and in some States have ruled: no advertising may be "larger than or substantially dissimilar * * * to that used by the majority of other practitioners." It does not state that the advertising should not be misleading. It merely states that it should be similar to that of other practitioners.

Recently in South Dakota an optometrist was threatened with loss of license. Why? Because he used a 2-inch, 2-column ad, while the South Dakota board had decreed only a 1-column, 1-inch ad could be used.

These are only some of the absurdities that affect you, the public, in depriving you of your right to information about goods, wares, and services that are available to you.

Freedom of speech and freedom of the press are guaranteed in our Constitution. But remember a free press was clearly guaranteed in the Constitution of Argentina but that did not stop Perón, who, by the way, is maneuvering to get back.

Just before starting to Durham I read a book with great interest. It is called Pearl and Promise, written by a native Tar Heel, Gerald W. Johnson, a newspaperman who at one time was with the Greensboro News. Mr. John says: "So it works down to this—freedom of expression, which is inseparable from freedom of opinion, will inevitably disappear unless there is a strong and insistent demand for it; and there will be no strong and insistent public demand unless freedom of expression is obviously valuable to the public."

Further on Mr. Johnson states:

"Freedom of opinion and expression, which included freedom of the press, has no guaranteed future in the United States and the sooner that fact is faced the better for all concerned.

"The press cannot be the guarantor because a free press is the creature, not the creator of freedom. If that were not conclusive, there remains the fact that the press is divided against itself, both by the conditions under which it operates and by the tempermental qualities of its operatives. Potentially it is as effective an instrument of tyranny as of freedom and, as we have seen, some ineradicable influences thrust it in that direction. Since its power is derivative and its direction uncertain the press can hardly be considered an effective guarantor.

"As for the Constitution, it is just as strong as the people's approval of its provisions and no stronger.

"* * * We cannot rely on anything but ourselves. In the last analysis it is the people who must protect both the press and the Constitution, not the other way about.

No nation ever had a free press except one that demanded a free press. No nation ever kept a free press except one that was harshly intolerant of every tendency toward slavishness exhibited by its press. When the opposing forces operating on the press are almost equal, and it wilvers uncertainly, then the third force that will tip the scales is the weight of public opinion. When the people are convinced, or even half convinced that there is something more precious than freedom, you will find a large segment of the press agreeing with them and reinforcing the delusion; but when the people demand liberty first, and peace and prosperity second, then the press becomes a mighty engine for the defense of freedom."

Mr. Johnson says in effect that it is up to you as one of all our people to protect your freedom; that the newspapers cannot do the job alone.

The newspapers are fighters, however, for your freedom, for your right to know. Today, various newspaper organizations are strenuously fighting against the tendency of many Federal Government agencies to keep secret news about their activities. They are receiving cooperation from some Members of Congress.

There is a House Government Information Subcommittee headed by Representative JOHN E. Moss of California. For more than 2 years his subcommittee has been studying the laws of our country to find out what steps can be taken to eliminate roadblocks to free flow of information, and stop unnecessary secrecy in Government.

This subcommittee found that a so-called housekeeping statute enacted in 1789 when George Washington was President and dealing merely with custody, use and preservation of records by various governmental department heads was actually being used as authority to withhold information from the public. The Moss subcommittee therefore is promoting a bill the effect of which would be to prohibit the use of that law to keep information from the public. The subcommittee has unanimously sent the bill to the full House Government Operations Committee of which Congressman FOUNTAIN, of North Carolina, is one member.

The Moss subcommittee proposal would not interfere with the right of Government to keep confidential information relating to national security and other types of records which should be kept confidential. It would stop, however, the right of the department heads to determine that certain information should not be divulged for any or no reason. It is significant, I think, that this proposal is being strenuously opposed by all of the 10 departments of the Federal Government headed by men who form the President's Cabinet.

It is our business as newspapermen to report the facts constantly. This principle, and the preaching of it, is as vital to advertising men as to editors. It is interesting to note that when big problems arise those very Government officials that advocate withholding information from the public turn to the newspaper and other communications mediums for help in educating the public. It has never occurred to them that the public may lack education in such problems because they have not been kept informed as they should have been through a step by step report as to activities of their public servants. If the Moss subcommittee proposal is enacted into law many Department heads will find themselves in a position of being stopped from keeping much news of their activities a dark secret.

I have talked too long but I have tried to arouse you with some of the thinking not only of newspapermen but of thoughtful citizens who are disturbed over the ignoring of minority groups, the attempt by some to impose their will on others; the theory that the public has no right to know all that is happening, and the attacks that are constantly and consistently being made not only upon newspapers but upon all communications mediums.

Joseph Pulitzer, a great newspaper man, who continued to supervise several great dailies years after he went blind, gave a message years ago which will appeal to you now: "Pry into the dark corners. Turn on the lights. The people have a right to know."

Pepe Figueres Declares Defense of Human Rights a World Responsibility

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES O. PORTER

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 3, 1958

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, a leader of the free world, now completing an outstanding term as President of Costa Rica, Pepe Figueres, gave the following interview to the Americas Daily. It appeared on their front page for February 19, 1958, and is worthy of the close attention of my colleagues, of the executive branch, and

especially of Secretary Dulles and the President:

DEFENSE OF HUMAN RIGHTS A WORLD RESPONSIBILITY, PRESIDENT FIGUERES DECLARES—OAS, UN DECLARATIONS ON RIGHTS OF MAN RECOGNIZE THAT, HE SAYS—PRAISES THE AMERICAS DAILY FOR WORK TO ACHIEVE GREATER INTER-AMERICAN UNITY

In publishing this interview, which, no doubt, will be of great interest to our readers the Americas Daily wishes to thank President Figueres for his kind words regarding our work to promote better Inter-American relations, as well as his words of encouragement for our democratic endeavor, commented in a manner which honors us by the illustrious Latin American statesman.

To questions submitted by our editors, President Figueres said:

"I am very pleased to give you, for the Americas Daily, this exclusive interview. Your newspaper has my goodwill because, in addition to fulfilling the objective necessity of informing about what goes on in Latin America, its editorial policy is within the bounds of increasingly powerful democratic currents which will eventually sweep out the few dictatorships still infesting Latin America."

Question: "What was the determining factor in your Government's decision to request the United Nations to send observers to the elections held in your country on February 2?"

Answer: "The movement which brought me to power has always maintained that human rights have ceased to be a matter under the exclusive jurisdiction of each nation, to become an international responsibility. The American Declaration of the Rights and Duties of Man, adopted in April 1948 by the Ninth Inter-American Conference held in Bogota, and the Universal Declaration of Human Rights adopted by the United Nations General Assembly in December of that same year, 1948, recognizes this fact. Among these basic rights of men, internationally recognized, is that of participating in popular elections, where balloting will be clean, secret, periodical and free. Therefore, we deemed it convenient that foreign observers, selected from a list submitted by the United Nations Secretary General, come to our country to observe the electoral process and inform that world organization of the manner in which Costa Rica fulfilled its international obligation of respecting the rights of her citizens to freely exercise the privilege of voting.

"We believe it would be advisable for other democratic nations to benefit from our experience as concerns requesting impartial observers for the electoral process from the United Nations, or the Organization of American States. Thus, a reality would become of what the aforesaid declarations of human rights have proclaimed in theory: That the observance of the basic rights of humans is a matter that concerns the international community, and not just a particular state, inasmuch as the rights of man do not have their origin in the fact that he is a national of any one country but in the fact that he is a member of the human race."

Question: "Some persons have criticized the step taken by your Government of requesting United Nations observers, alleging that this was a slight to Costa Rican sovereignty."

Answer: "I believe there is no foundation for such criticism. It is based in an absolute concept of national sovereignty which, in reality, it has never been possible to apply. Least of all now, that international law has progressed so much as to produce regional organizations like the OAS or world organizations like the United Nations. Just as individual liberty, ample as it may be, is restricted by the obligations imposed by community life, sovereignty, conceived as the right which nations have to guide their own destinies, has always been subjected to the limitations imposed by the international community, especially in the case when these international obligations have been freely acquired by the government of the particular countries.

"If Costa Rica consciously and sincerely accepted to become a part of the United Nations and the OAS, by that same acceptance she agreed to limit her sovereignty, renouncing to the unilateral decision of international matters which may fall within the scope of action of either organization.

"Human rights, as I stated in answer to your first question, are not an exclusively domestic matter of each state. They are the responsibility of the Inter-American community or of the international community, in spite of the fact that there are still insufficient instruments for either agency to protect them adequately. Those of us who truly believe that human rights should be respected, are obliged to do everything within our power so that these international organizations will actively participate in their protection.

"On the other hand, I quote, 'a good payer needs no security.' If a government is certain that it has taken all necesary measures to insure that balloting will be free—as our government did—instead of being inconvenienced by the presence of international observers, we derived great satisfaction from them. We were certain that their report could not be any different from what they rendered. That is, that the electoral process was carried out in a clean and orderly manner, with absolute respect on the part of the authorities for the free play of political parties, and for a free casting of ballots."

Question: "To what reasons do you attribute the victory of the opposition in the Presidential elections?"

Answer: "The answer is obvious: To the division of our party into two factions: The majority, which fostered the candidacy of Francisco José Orlich, and the minority, which backed the candidacy of Lic. Jorge Rossi. Combining the votes that the members of the Liberation Party cast for the mentioned Orlich and Rossi, they totaled a definite majority over the votes cast for Lic. Echandi by the four coalition groups of the opposition.

"This problem of electoral divisiveness within the Democratic Party is classic in Latin America. It is the product of a 'caudillo' heritage. It will only disappear when our citizens become amply educated in the concept of the ideological and permanent party as the organ of expression of their political thoughts.

"In the elections for members of the legislative assembly, the opposition groups were divided in two factions: That of Mr. Echandi and that of Mr. Ulate, on the one hand, and that of Dr. Calderón Guardia and the Communist, on the other. The only faction of the National Liberation Party elected the same number of deputies as all the opposition factions put together. The Rossi faction of National Liberation elected a sufficient number of deputies so that, when added to the majority group of Orlich, our party will have absolute control of the legislative power."

Question. "If the Communist Party was part of the coalition which gave the victory to presidential candidate Echandi and voted for the Calderonista slate for members of Congress, do you feel that Communist influence will be felt in the new Government?"

Answer. "As is known, in 1942 the Communist Party of Costa Rica made a public alliance with the then President Dr. Rafael Angel Calderón Guardia. From that time, control of governmental policies passed into the hands of the Communists. In our country we saw for the first time applied the methods of terrorism and electoral fraud through which the Communists gained control some years later of the eastern European nations. After a mockery was made of three successive elections, the people of Costa Rica expressed their decision to no longer support the Calderón communistic regime. It fell upon me to direct the popular uprising that, following 5 weeks of bloody fighting which left in its wage 2,000 dead, overthrew the Communists and their Calderonista allies from power.

"Since then, 10 years ago, the Communist Party has been unable to participate in electoral campaigns because the organization was outlawed. But in the recent campaign, its former associates, the partisans of Dr. Calderón Guardia, again sought their votes. The Calderón-Communist alliance was revived, except that this time, for obvious reasons, it was not made public in documents, although it was no secret, since the top leader of Costa Rican communism, Manuel Mora, made a speech exhorting his comrades to vote for the Calderón Guardia slate.

"The number of votes cast by the Communists is between 15,000 and 20,000. Lic. Echandi, having won the presidential election by a margin of less than 6,000 votes, it is logical to assume that the Communist vote was decisive for him. The Communists had denied their decision to vote for Echandi. But in a speech made yesterday, Red leader Mora admitted that he had given secret instructions to his followers to vote for Echandi, and he suggested that the opposition's victory was due to his party's decision.

"I do not know what promises Mr. Echandi may have given the Communists to get their votes. Perhaps he made none. It appears that the least the Communists expect is that their party be given legal recognition, thus permitting them to benefit from all the advantages that the law offers to democratic parties. The group that solicited the Communist vote must feel morally obliged to this recognition.

"In any event, our party retains the majority in Congress, it continues to have a program of economic progress and social justice which will permit it to face the advance of communism whether on its own or through its former allies, the Calderonistas, or its new allies, the partisans of Messrs. Echandi and Ulate."

Question: "What do you plan to do, Mr. President, when your term of office is ended?"

Answer: "What don't I expect to do, you should ask me. I have so many projects in mind, and I have so many obligations. However, I can summarize my future activities in these few words: Read, write, collaborate with my party.

"Government duties have prevented me from keeping up to date with my reading. I have dozens of books to read. I plan, also, to write three books, the outlines of which I have had in mind for some time. The first will be a historical book about 'The National Liberation War of 1948,' that is, the civil war against communism and calderonism, which had taken over the government since 1942. The second book will be about economic development problems in Latin America; and the third about inter-American relations and the fight for democracy within our hemisphere.

"Of course, I feel it is my duty to actively participate in the task which now falls upon my party, to be a responsible opposition.

"I will also devote some time to my private enterprises, which I have been unable to attend to seriously during the past 8 years."

Agricultural Men of the Year

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PETER F. MACK, JR.
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 24, 1958

Mr. MACK of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, 500 farmers in Macoupin County have been highly honored for their work in soil conservation. They have done such outstanding work in stopping erosion and conserving the soil that they have been named the Agricultural Men of the Year.

I am proud of the job that these men have done in my home county and I am especially proud of my friend and neighbor, Mr. Leo Young, of Carlinville, who was awarded a distinguished service plaque for 1957 for his long and exceptional service in soil conservation.

Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include an editorial from the Illinois State Journal on the work these men have done.

AGRICULTURAL MEN OF YEAR—MACOUPIN COUNTY'S SOIL SAVERS

For their exceptional achievements in soil conservation, we nominate the 500 farmers who worked with the Macoupin County Soil Conservation District in 1957 as Illinois' agricultural men of the year.

At a meeting the other night in Carlinville, Harley Briscoe, soil conservation district farm planner, ticked off a list of impressive accomplishments that would fill a volume.

Examples: The farmers completed 9,111 acres of conservation rotation by alternating grain and legume corps; built 58,168 feet of underground tile to give their land proper drainage; constructed 87 new ponds as means of conserving water for use in case of droughs; planted 340 rods of multiflora rose hedges, which conserve soil and moisture by acting as windbreaks. In addition, the hedges give protection to wildlife, particularly birds.

Besides this, the farmers constructed 5 miles of water diversion ridges, which are built on the principle of a terrace; built 20 drop inlets and 13 drop spillways to prevent land from being washed away by field streamlets; fenced off 288 acres of woodland; laid out 105 acres of contouring, and put in 3,609 acres of clover crops.

What makes the achievements particularly impressive is that Macoupin County is not among Illinois' most fertile areas. The county, particularly in the southern part, is hilly and the soil in some places is thin.

But these 500 farmers were not to be stayed by any disadvantages they had. They rolled up their sleeves and went to work to improve their land. Where they lacked money to carry out projects, they substituted their own brawn.

Some parts of Macoupin County, like other Illinois areas, have in past years washed badly. Because of its hilly terrain, erosion can easily occur. Only proper soil-conservation methods can stop the erosion.

Terracing where workable, diversion of rainfall, the growing of trees and hedges, the rotation of crops—all these can play an immense role in conserving soil that is prone to wash away.

These 500 farmers are wisely aware of their problem and have tackled it from a number of angles.

Probably the one farmer in the county who was most acutely aware of the importance of soil conservation was Leo Young, Rural Route 4, Carlinville, who was awarded a distinguished-service plaque for 1957 for his long and exceptional service in soil conservation.

Young traveled all over the county selling the idea of soil conservation. He was one of the organizers of the Macoupin County Soil Conservation District. He has been a member of the district's board of directors for years. And he has set an example for other farmers by adopting all the conservation techniques that could be applied to his farm. Young, indeed, deserved the plaque in recognition of his unselfish efforts in behalf of an important cause.

In whatever form undertaken, soil conservation's importance can never be overemphasized. City dwellers as well as farming people have a stake in the soil. Ninety-nine percent of the items on the grocer's shelves come from the soil.

The Journal salutes the farmers of Macoupin County who participated in soil conservation in 1957. We say keep up the good work.

Futures Trading in Onions

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MARGUERITE STITT CHURCH
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 4, 1958

Mrs. CHURCH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am inserting the following telegram, dated March 3, in which the 500 members of the Chicago Mercantile Exchange express the reasons for their opposition to H. R. 376:

CHICAGO, ILL., *March 3, 1958.*

Hon. MARGUERITE STITT CHURCH,
House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

Passage of H. R. 376 would prohibit futures trading in onions on supervised commodity exchanges. For first time sanctity of right to make supervised contracts would be abridged. This dangerous precedent could spread to all commodity and security markets. Question of why prohibition instead of regulation has never been answered.

United States Department of Agriculture has never recommended passage of this bill. The Chicago Mercantile Exchange has 500 respected members in cities throughout the United States and the following well known firms are all clearing members of the exchange. Many are members of the Chicago Board of Trade, New York Stock Exchange and Cotton and other exchanges. They have thousands of employees and customers involved daily in this essential commerce.

We urge you to oppose passage of H. R. 376.

Araness Corp., Auster-Siegel Trading Corp., Bache & Co., Beatrice Foods Co., Becker Brokerage Co., Birks Brokerage Co., W. B. Brodsky & Co., Inc., R. Carl & Co., H. C. Christions Co., John E. Coleman, Inc., D. R. Comenzo & Co., Dauber Bros., Frank A. Donnelly Corp., Francis I. Du Pont & Co., Fahnestock & Co., Fox De Luxe Foods, Inc., Miles Friedman, Inc., Guerkink & Co., Fred J. Geurkink Co., Howard Golz & Co., Goodbody & Co., Great Western Food Distributors, Gross Egg Co., Harris, Upham & Co., Helfer-King & Associates, Inc., Henner Bros., E. F. Hutton & Co., Ilebar Trading Corp., Chas. Keeshin, Inc., Kelly-Black Co., Inc., Lamson Bros. & Co., MacKenzie & Co., Marwyn Dairy Products Corp., John V. McCarthy & Co., Meadow Brook Produce Co., Inc., Merrill, Lynch, Pierce, Fenner & Smith, Miller & Co., G. H. Miller & Co., Mitchell Hutchins & Co., Mulmat Bros. Co., Murlas Bros. Commodities, Inc., Paine, Webber, Jackson & Curtis, Priebe & Sons, Harry H. Redfearn Co., Inc., Reynolds & Co., Daniel F. Rice & Co., Sol Rich & Co., M. Richter Sons, The Earl K. Riley Co., Rodman & Renshaw, S. K. Produce Co., Schneider Bros., Inc., L. D. Schreiber & Co., Inc., Chas. K. Schulte & Co., Shearson, Hammill & Co., Sincere & Co., Saul Stone & Co., Swift & Co., Sirots & Co., Thomson & McKinnon, Uhlmann Grain Co., Walston & Co., Inc., Weinberg Bros. & Co., Sol Weinger Co., Dean Witter & Co., Woodstock, Inc., all in Chicago.

EVERETT B. HARRIS,
President, Chicago Mercantile Exchange.

Seaman's Lot Improves

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN F. SHELLEY
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 4, 1958

Mr. SHELLEY. Mr. Speaker, my home city is San Francisco which is one of the great ports of the world. Through the Golden Gate ships of every maritime nation have sailed for generations, and the brave men of the sea have come ashore there to find their land legs.

The merchant seaman has come up in the world, I am happy to say. Through the persistent efforts of the maritime unions he has finally arrived at the point where he makes an honorable salary. His skill and courage which fit him for battles with the elements are now rewarded by suitable compensation.

The merchant seaman's life is admirably portrayed in this feature article written by Saul Pett of the Associated Press. I myself am a former merchant mariner and the economic aspect of the seaman's life is especially significant to me since I feel I have taken some small part, as an active member of the American labor movement, in improving his lot.

Under unanimous consent, I include a feature article from the Chicago Sun-Times, Sunday, February 23, 1958, describing the life, thoughts, working conditions, and economic aspects of the American merchant mariner.

SEAMAN'S LOT IMPROVES, BUT HE'S STILL A CARPING CRITIC

(By Saul Pett)

BOSTON.—Of all American breadwinners, the merchant seaman may easily be the contrariest.

At sea, he can't wait to get home. At home, he can't wait to get to sea. He always wants to be where he's not. He is an escapist, a cynic, an incurable romantic, carping critic, loyal, sentimental friend.

He brags about the vast improvements in his working conditions the last 20 years, but the ship he's now on almost invariably is a "lousy feeder." The last one was the best. The next one will be better still. But, anyway, he's through with the sea; he's going to settle down and start a chicken farm.

His moments of reunion at home are intense. Every return is a honeymoon, almost. But after 2 weeks go by he looks out the front window. He looks out the back window. He looks out the side window. He tries talking with the neighbors but can't get interested in who is getting an office promotion, who is having a baby, who is expanding his expansion attic. He goes down to

the waterfront for conversation he can understand. Pretty soon, he signs on again.

This picture of American seamen is drawn by an American seaman, Ray Grandy, 46, who has been sailing 28 years on freighters and passenger ships.

HE READS, DISCUSSES WOMEN

"To kill time at sea," he says, "the seaman reads anything he can lay his hands on—Shakespeare, comic books, or labels on cans. His No. 1 topic of conversation is comparing ships he's sailed on. His second favorite subject is women."

The incurable sailor wants the details of normal shore life only when he wants them. He goes to sea to escape them. And then he finds himself thinking, "Let's see, it's 6 hours earlier at home. The kids are just going to school. Is young Bill's cold better? Did the plumber fix that bathroom leak yet?"

Hitting a foreign port, the seaman disembarks in a hurry to get a beer, to mail letters home and, if he's single or not working hard at his marriage, to find female companionship, sometimes professional.

Often it is purely companionship he seeks. He may never leave the parlor, prefering instead merely to talk to the girls and sailors he knows off other ships.

"Seamen," says Grandy, "learn to be more tolerant of human weakneses than shore people. Having spent much time drinking, fighting, chasing women, they don't look down at the Magdalenes of the world. They realize that morals frequently are only a matter of economics."

FROWN ON PIER WELCOMES

Returning to home port, the sailor is anxious to read an American newspaper first and then call home. Most seamen, especially the older ones, frown on their wives meeting them at the pier.

"Sailors don't want their wives hanging around docks," Grandy says. "They consider this improper. You see, they like their women rough and raw except when they marry them."

In total, Grandy says, the average seaman does not drink or raise more hell than other men. But since his fun is more compressed—since it's longer for him between drinks—his fun is more intense, more noticeable.

"He also is a responsible citizen," Grandy adds. "More than 70 percent today are married. In the old days, they couldn't afford to be. Today they have families. They want their kids to go to school. They worry, for example, about things like Federal aid to education."

Grandy stands 6'1, weighs 230 pounds, has thinning brown hair, kindly gray eyes, and generally lacks any of the broken-nosed belligerence usually given to merchant sailors in grade B movies. He is highly articulate. His formal schooling stopped at the eighth grade, but he has been reading voraciously since.

He has sailed all the seas to all the continents, docked at most of the world's major ports, and at many so tiny and primitive he can't remember their names. He has shipped out as a cabin boy, ordinary seaman, able seaman, and ship's carpenter. For the last year, he has been beached, working in an elective position for the National Maritime Union, meeting ships, collecting dues, listening to grievances, calling out jobs in the Boston hiring hall of the NMU.

His union job will end in a few months and Grandy will ship out again. He can't wait—an impatience not shared but understood by his wife. She lives in their house in Old Orchard Beach, Maine, to which Grandy has been commuting from Boston since he took the NMU job.

The Grandys had three children. One son, also a sailor, was killed in a freak boxing accident at sea, which the father witnessed. A daughter is married to a seaman. A second son, Kenneth, 26, has been sailing the last few years as purser's bellboy aboard the liner *United States*. He now is determined to go into the insurance business and never sail again.

"Why should I?" he asks. "Sure, the money's good. But it means I got a house I can't live in, kids I can't enjoy, a car I can't drive, a wife I can't see."

BUT HE KNOWS

Hearing such talk, Kay Grandy smiles tolerantly. He knows he's going back to sea and he knows why.

"The sea offers me solitude, a chance to think I can't seem to find on shore. On a ship, you can always find a private corner. Standing at the forepeak, watching the bow cut the waves. Sitting on a bitt on the fantail, watching a tropical night sky where the stars are so low you wonder if the masts can slide under them.

"Sure, there's escapism involved. Leaving the dock, you know you're leaving worries and details behind you can't do anything about at sea. But there's also a kind of dignity—no crowds, no pushing around, no office politics, no small jealousies. The sea brainwashes you of pettiness.

"I like trusting and being trusted. Once in New York, I went to a bank to borrow $150. The bank wanted the story of my life and after all those questions, they wanted to know what I'd do with the money. On any ship I've ever sailed on, I could borrow $1,000 in 10 minutes and nobody'd give a damn what I wanted it for.

"Coming home is always a big thing, fresh, intense. A father or husband is never taken for granted. He's always Santa Claus to the kids. His family relationships never get stale."

Ray Grandy paused and grinned.

NOT ALL ROSES AT SEA

"I make it sound beautiful, don't I? Well, it isn't. There are any number of lousy things. All the regulations, the constant discipline, always at the beck and call of someone. The loneliness away from your family.

"People are always ready to take a sailor. He goes into a saloon in Newport News or Galveston or Bremen, there are guys waiting to roll him, cops ready to fine him. He goes to buy something and the price goes up—they figure he doesn't have time to shop around."

After 28 years at sea, Grandy has much to remember—the fire in No. 1 hold on the *Brazil*, coming up from Rio, which took 4 days to put out; the war.

But most vividly he remembers the working conditions in his early days, the company hiring boss or waterfront saloonkeeper you bribed for a job (you felt like a slave girl in the market), the $72 a month paid an able seaman, working 4 hours on, 4 off, no overtime for Saturdays and Sundays.

The food, always the food. The weevils in the flour, the maggots, the chicken that "had more sea time than the old man."

And today?

Today an able seaman is paid $353 a month for 40 hours a week and time and a half for anything over. He works 4 hours on and 8 off. (As carpenter, Ray Grandy's base is $444 a month.)

Today, by union contract, the merchant seaman sleeps only 2 or 3 to a cabin, eats well, has his choice of 2 carefully inspected meats at all meals except breakfast. He has fresh-water showers, washing machines, innerspring mattresses, fresh white bedsheets once a week, clean towels twice a week, pension and hospital plans, and paid vacations.

Social-Security Improvements Would Bolster Our Economy at Once

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALVIN E. O'KONSKI

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 4, 1958

Mr. O'KONSKI. Mr. Speaker, much has been said about increasing the purchasing power of the rank and file of the American people to help overcome the present recession. So for it has been all talk and no action. Talk alone won't do the job that needs to be done.

Many fantastic schemes have been proposed but most of them unfortunately would make the rich richer and the poor poorer. Most of these fantastic schemes would also increase the taxes of the rank and file of the people and defeat the very purpose intended—namely, to give the people more purchasing power. Increasing taxes would decrease their purchasing power.

The surest and the most commendable way in which our Government could immediately increase the purchasing power of the rank and file of the people back home without increasing taxes would be to improve the social security program. This would not cost the taxpayers any money because at the present time there is a twenty-six billion dollar surplus in our social security trust.

The changes that should be made in the present social security law are as follows:

First. The minimum payments should be increased to $50 per month and the maximum should be increased to $200 per month and proportionate increases across the board.

Second. All disabled people should be entitled to receive social-security payments regardless of age rather than waiting to age 50 under the present law. The present laws should be liberalized on this point so that one does not have to be half dead to receive social security.

Third. The eligible age for men should be brought down to age 62 and the eligible age for women should be brought down to age 60. This would open up many jobs for younger workers.

Fourth. The limitation that social-security recipients can earn should be raised from the present $1,200 per year to $1,800 per year if single and $2,400 per year if married.

Fifth. Widows receiving social security for minor children should continue to draw social security even after the minor children reach 18 years of age. In fact the widows need this social security more as they get older than they do when they are younger. Under the present law when the children reach 18 years of age the widow goes off of social security until she reaches age 62. This is unfair and a severe hardship.

Sixth. All old-age pensioners should be included automatically under the social security program and receive

monthly benefits rather than the costly supervisory old-age pension system that we have at the present time.

Seventh. Veterans should not be denied social security disability benefits because they are drawing veterans benefits or vice versa. A veteran should be entitled to both social security and veterans benefits.

If these changes are made in the social security law, there will be at least a billion dollars additional annually put into the hands of the rank and file of the people of America. This would increase the purchasing power of more than 2 million of our people who need it most.

If this Congress really wants to do something to help the rank and file of our people who are having a hard time of it at the present time this is the surest and best way to do it and it can be done without increasing the taxes of the American people. If the Congress is sincere and really wants to do something for the people, here is a wonderful chance to do it.

What is more, these benefits can be paid within 30 days of the passage of these improvements and the effect can be immediate to bolster our economy. I know of no better, speedier, effective, or economical way to give an immediate boost to our sagging economy. Why not act now today?

Kalevala and the Finnish People

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN D. DINGELL
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 4, 1958

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, the brave people of Finland have a great and glorious national tradition going back many centuries, and this tradition is preserved in its natural simplicity in their national epic, the great poem known to the world at Kalevala. This epic poem of almost 25,000 lines—of 50 runes or cantos—was probably composed at various times and put in writing by different hands. As an artistic whole it is in sympathy with the great traditions of the Finnish people. Its blend of symbolism and realism reflects the instincts of this brave people. Thus it is characteristically Finnish, both in form and in content. It is the faithful portrayal in beautiful metric verse of the folklore of the primeval Finnish race in their ancestral homes.

The date of the composition of this classic is, of course, unknown. Until the 19th century, Kalevala lived on the lips of the peasants and the simple folk. Then students and specialists of the subject collected parts of the poem bit by bit, arranged, and published them. The great importance of Kalevala was at once recognized in Europe, and by 1852 it was translated into Swedish, French, and German. Later it was also translated into English. It is almost impossible to overemphasize the importance of Kalevala in the spiritual, religious, and national history of the Finns. What the great classic epic Iliad had been to ancient Greeks, Kalevala continues to be for the Finns, as it has from the very beginning of their national history.

The people of this country have always had great admiration and sympathy for the brave, sturdy, industrious, and patriotic Finns. They have always deserved our aid and assistance. They have not only been appreciative of such aid, but have been most conscientious in repaying it, even under the most adverse circumstances. Since the end of World War II, we have extended, in grants and loans, almost a quarter of a billion dollars to them. They have already repaid a substantial amount of the portion advanced as loan.

There has always been friendly and cordial intercourse between the peoples of the two countries, and since 1950 such intercourse is being broadened to the mutual advantage of all concerned. In matters of immigration the Finns have enjoyed considerable advantage over southern Europeans. The present quota system does not permit as many Finns to enter this country as the Finns wish, but there is the hope that this quota will be liberalized and more Finns will come here. The Finns who have migrated here have become loyal and patriotic citizens of this country.

Labor Looks at Economy Today and Tomorrow

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 19, 1958

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, it was my pleasure to accept the invitation of Mr. Roy T. Hurley, president of the Economic Club of New York, to attend the March dinner-meeting held in the ballroom of the Hotel Astor, March 3, 1958.

It was my privilege to participate in the program of the evening and to share the speaking honors with Mr. David J. McDonald, president, United States Steelworkers of America.

I spoke on the subject "The World in the Atomic Age," while Mr. McDonald chose as his subject "Labor Looks at the Economy Today and Tomorrow."

Mr. McDonald's address follows:

A keen awareness of the honor implicit in your gracious invitation to speak here this evening is accompanied by an equally keen awareness of the obligation it imposes upon me to speak frankly and forthrightly on the crucial issues that confront us. In dispatching this obligation, I will review in rather sketchy form the long-range prospects as I see them for America and then move from that broad canvas to a more specific outline of the present year and the present problems.

In my own reading of American history, I have been impressed by the consistent recurrence of three major themes in our national life. They are, if you will, the major premises upon which we Americans build both our views and our conclusions on what constitutes the good life. These three notions are, respectively: a faith in God, a faith in the dignity of every human being and a faith in progress. Generally speaking, we have taken the notion of progress to mean very largely advances in our economic welfare.

I see nothing in the long-range future to shatter my confidence in the belief that greater progress lies ahead for all of us. Like most of my fellow Americans, I am less intrigued by the past imperfect than I am thoroughly confident in the future perfect.

The reasons for my optimism are to be found in our people and in our products. Surely there is agreement that the most important raw material to the future of our Republic is people, and we are now sure of three things regarding the American people:

1. There will be more of them, with the Bureau of the Census projecting a jump from today's 163 million to as high as 192 million by 1965 up to a whopping 208 million by 1970;

2. They will continue to leave the farm for city living and city employment; and

3. They will follow Horace Greeley's injunction by moving westward.

Putting it simply, we now recognize that the possible population increase by 1970 will be up to 38 percent over 1950 or almost 2 percent a year. If the past is prologue, we know that these Americans will demand better education, better standards of living, and better working conditions than ever before. Moreover, they will offer a market potential that literally staggers the imagination. Yet, there are certain facets about this population growth, drift, and distribution that demand intense investigation and vigorous action. Are we giving to it the kind of inquiry and the kind of action that the future requires of us? I think not and I shall give my reasons for this observation in just a moment.

Let me turn to the second aspect of the future which I called productivity. Actually, these people can live better than ever before—which is the simplest way of saying that our gross national product can continue its remarkable upsurge. In 1935 when confidence in ourselves and our future was at a peril point, the gross national production was about $72 billion. Once confidence was restored it rose to over $400 billion. Ten years from now—in 1968—it is possible that our total production of goods and services can grow to over $650 billion.

As with population, this potential for magnificent growth also poses a problem which demands hardheaded consideration.

Let me turn now to the two problems inherent in our long-range future growth. Thus far, the two major elements in my story rest in the assertion that within a decade, more and more Americans will be living better than ever before in our history. More people means greater potential markets and greater markets means greater potential sales and more sales means more production.

Statistics of population trends show increasing birth rates and decreasing death rates.

This suggests to me the need for our using every ounce of energy, imagination and production now in order that future generations will not be handicaped by burdens that we could and should have assumed. I agree with Edmund Burke, the great English conservative statesman, when he said that the political community is a "partnership between those who are living, those who are dead, and those who are to be born." Putting it bluntly, every classroom unconstructed, every highway-mile unlaid, every bridge unbuilt, every hospital need ignored—constitutes a breach of faith with the Amer-

ican people. And I state categorically that there is mounting evidence of these breaches at the present time.

The second problem involves the potential standard of living of our people a decade from now. How can we support a projected $650 billion product economy by 1968? The only way to do it is to increase the level of sales to consumers by approximately $140 billion—roughly a 50-percent increase in total personal consumption by 1968.

If this is true, then we must recognize now both the opportunities and the urgent need for an immediate upward surge in the living standards of the masses of the American people. Again, I do not think that we are moving adequately and effectively in this direction. As a matter of fact, we have experienced, beginning in the latter part of 1955, a slowdown in consumer growth and you can only assure an effective consuming mass population by providing for a stable mass working population enjoying good wages in a consistent fashion. Unemployment and underemployment eat at the very vitals of that which is essential to our future prosperity. And again I must assert solemnly that here some sectors of the American industrial leadership are derelict in their duties.

In brief summary, therefore, I see our long-range prospects as potentially magnificent, potentially the greatest period of growth in world history—provided that we make effective and immediate use now of existing resources and share fairly the fruits of our common productive efforts.

Now let me turn to the immediate present and the immediate problems. It goes without saying that the prevailing climate of business activity in America is cause for concern to our bankers, to our industrialists, and to our political leaders. As president of the one and a quarter million United Steelworkers of America, I share this concern most deeply. The last 6 months have witnessed an interesting debate by economists and financial analysts, by Government and business leaders over whether or not we are trapped in a depression or recession. I do not propose to dabble in the semantic issues of these debates.

The plain fact is—while economists quibble and politicians promise, the pace of America's mighty productive machinery grinds in slow and agonizing tempo. Across the land reports of plant shutdowns and mass layoffs grow daily in number. Already the staggering sum of nearly 5 million unemployed should convince even the most optimistic among us that the time for promises and prophecies is past—that the time for determined action is here and now.

I am highly sensitive to unemployment figures and I cannot hide concern over the fact that unemployment rose by 1,100,000 in January, which is the highest jobless figure for any month since 1950.

Knowing the snowball effect of this kind of unemployment, I cannot sit idly by and agree that this is a reasonable, sensible, or equitable way to pay for so-called rolling adjustments in the economy. Today, over 45 percent of the production capacity of the gigantic and basic steel industry of the United States stands idle. Blast furnaces, open hearths, and rolling mills capable of turning out an additional 60 million tons of steel ingots a year to meet our civilian and defense requirements, are now shut down.

Steel production, at 54 percent of capacity, cries out above the quibbling and the prophecies.

Among steelworkers, men of basic steel, ferrous, and nonferrous metal mining, and metal fabricating—over 160,000 sit unemployed, while more than 200,000 additional members of our union work short time. Those figures are as of the turn of the year. Today they are significantly higher.

The loss of purchasing power suffered by our membership alone, due to unemployment and the reduced workweek, had reached the alarming rate of about $850 million a year.

Steel industry forecasters continue to express only a hope that production may rise sufficiently in the last part of 1958 to achieve an average operating rate of about 75 percent of capacity for the year. But even if this goal is reached, the United States will have lost for the present and for the future about 35 million tons that could have been produced. This is in addition to the loss of 15 million tons that we could have turned out in the last 6 months of 1957, but did not.

During the past 6 months—as in 1949 and in 1954—our constantly rising capacity to produce has once more outrun the ability of 55 million American families to buy the goods our national economy is able to turn out.

For 2 years our soaring investment in new plants and in more efficient equipment sparked the boom which ended last summer. In 1956, capital investment skyrocketed to a record $35 billion, more than $6 billion higher than the year before. In 1957, capital investment rose still higher, to $37 billion. This tremendous expansion of production capacity created the possibility of an unprecedented growth in the output of goods of all sorts.

Unfortunately, demands from all sources are lagging behind our rising ability to produce. In fact, in many important categories, 1957 sales were falling behind the levels of a year or even 2 years before.

For example, in the first 11 months of 1957, the sale of new automobiles totaled 5½ million, a shade less than the year before. During the same period in 1955, however, over 7 million new cars were sold.

Last year new housing starts fell to less than a million for the first time since 1948. In 1956 we started to build over 1.1 million new dwelling units and more than 1.3 million during the year before.

Shipments of major electrical appliances also lagged in 1957—freezers were down, refrigerators down, ranges down.

Furniture sales fell off, and freight carloadings ran about 15 percent below the preceding year.

Retail sales have shown a frightening downward trend in recent months. As more and more families find their incomes falling, and millions more become apprehensive about their jobs and debts.

Meanwhile, manufacturing and trade inventories are near an alltime peak, higher now than at any time since 1940. As could be anticipated under these circumstances, incoming orders and the unfilled backlogs of many manufacturing concerns are now declining.

During the business slump of 1949, rapidly rising Federal, State, and local expenditures and rising automobile sales helped cushion the decline and spark the recovery. During the 1954 recession, booming home construction and rising consumer purchases did the same. But I cannot see comparable upward movements in any major area, on the basis of current production forecasts.

Housing starts now show no sign of rising appreciably above the level of 1957. Automobile production—with over 900,000 new models reported to be in dealers' showrooms and overflowing the lots—looks far from promising in 1958. In fact, industry sources now predict lower sales than a year ago.

Starting in midsummer of 1957 exports fell off to a 20-percent decline by December. Conservative estimates predict that American exports will be off something like 10 percent this year. That is a couple of billion dollars' worth of business.

Furthermore, in view of the fact that idle production capacity is greater now than in the slumps of 1949 and 1954, businessmen are revising their plans for new plant and equipment downward. An over-all drop of at least $2 billion—or about 7 percent—is forecast for 1958. Outlays by manufacturers are already expected to fall 16 percent. If demand fails to rise very quickly, these totals may well be cut still more. At the same time, our capacity to produce with more efficient machines and with fewer employees will still be rising rapidly as expansion programs for this year as well as for previous years are completed.

Although total governmental outlays will go up in 1958, there is no indication that the increase now planned will be sufficient to restore full employment and production in the months immediately ahead.

This is, in truth, a sorry picture. And I have recounted these disturbing and distressing facts—no doubt familiar to all of you—not in the manner of a Jeremiah come to rent the air with lamentation. I speak rather as one who—close to the heart of this serious business slump—looks to Government, business and labor to end this decline and spark a recovery through mutual shouldering of responsibility.

Just as the time is past for promise and prophecy, so also has time run out for words.

Instead of vainly waiting to see if the situation gets worse, in 3 months or in 6—and facing the possibility of having to cope with a much more difficult problem later on—action must be taken now to reverse the downward trend.

What can be done to spark recovery? As I see it, the health of our Nation rests on three mutually related pillars—Government, business, and labor. In mentioning the role of the Government first, I must emphasize the fact that priority in attention should not suggest that the total responsibility rests with the politicians. But it is evident that we cannot discount the role of the Government in our economy. It has great power and great resources and it has learned much from the bitter lessons of the depression and the vexing problems of a wartime economy. The Federal Reserve Board can influence directly the amount of money in circulation and indirectly the availability of that money to certain segments of the economy. Through its tax policies, it can and does significantly affect business decisions regarding expansion and individual decisions regarding purchases. Its tremendous role as a consumer of heavy equipment in a cold-war economy gives it a decisive impact on our production. But more than that, we now realize that no civilized country will revert to the days of heartless governmental "hands off." We recognize clearly the Government's role in actively fostering the common good.

It can and should do more to raise the living standards of our American families, particularly the neediest. Even in prosperous 1956, 29 percent of all families had incomes of under $3,000 before taxes, according to the Federal Reserve Board.

Furthermore, 53 percent of our families had less than $500 in cash reserves to meet emergencies; 23 percent had none at all. Surely there is neither moral nor economic justification for unused capital when so many American families are still in need of so much.

Surely there is no moral or economic reason for denying the protection intended by the fair labor standard laws to countless millions of fellow Americans who still work for less than $1 per hour.

There is no justification for the present social security rates at a time when the aged and the indigent, who constitute a growing percentage of our population, are in greatest need. Can one argue that the

present social-security system which provides only $24.50 weekly for a married couple is adequate in this day and age? Instead of cautiously moving plans out of dusty files for study, the administration might courageously move to implement these plans effectively and imaginatively.

Nor can I remain unconcerned about the housing needs of millions of Americans with modest incomes. Responsible public groups report that a national housing growth of 2 million new units a year is now required if the dream of an adequate home for every American family is to be ultimately fulfilled. This urgent problem awaits effective administrative leadership.

In the December issue of Fortune magazine we read that: "Today some 17 million Americans live in dwellings that are beyond rehabilitation—decayed, dirty, rat infested, without decent heat or light or plumbing. The problem affects all our metropolitan cities, but it is most severe in the biggest, richest, and most industrialized. The number of people crowded into slums is growing faster than the cities as a whole."

Are we going to fasten this blight irrevocably on the present generation and pass on our own dereliction to future Americans? The time for action is the present—particularly when idle plants and manpower are available.

Action is needed in the field of workmen's compensation for injuries and for death. In view of the fact that 3 out of 4 of our families have inadequate cash reserves for emergencies, it is clear that something must be done for help. It is utter nonsense to assert that 3 out of every 4 American families are shiftless, irresponsible, and careless in the handling of its resources. It is a public responsibility that must be met in part at least by public resources.

I have said little about our defenses, little about foreign aid, little about highway and school construction, but these occupy urgent positions in our scale of values and cry out for strong, courageous and immediate action. This administration must not make the mistake of 1930, 1931, and 1932 in delaying too long the forceful action needed to curtail the growing speed and gravity of the current decline.

When I suggest some things that the Government can do I particularly emphasize that nowhere do I propose boondoggling. It is our belief that much can be done by the Government that will concretely add to our Nation's permanent wealth.

The second pillar on which our economy rests is industry. I think that the lesson of the thirties will not be forgotten—that if industry asserts no signs of statesmanship in times of need, then the Government must step into the breach.

But there is much to be done and I would be less than honest not to confess my disappointments. I am disturbed and disheartened by the deliberate attempt to mislead the American people by tying every wage increase with a price increase by industry—price increases that substantially outrun the cost of wages to the industry. I am disturbed and disheartened by the insinuation that labor has demanded and is getting wage increases that have outrun productivity. Please note that in the basic steel industry, productivity—the real output rise per man hour—has actually gone up faster than the real wage gains of the worker. Between 1939 and 1957, real hourly straight-time wages went up 53 percent. On the other hand, steel productivity rose 71 percent.

The steel industry has provided a classic example of the way to make inflation inevitable. Although steel prices had already been raised $13.50 a ton in less than one year, they were hiked $6 more only last July. Actually, prices could have been cut by $6 and profits still would have compared favorably with profits earned by the industry in most prior years.

Is it not strange that in 1957, despite drastically reduced production, steel profits were higher than ever before? What we need from industry today is a consciousness of present and future needs and a realization that these needs can best be met not by raising prices and cutting production but by cutting prices and increasing production.

It can be done and it ought to be done, for we are acutely aware that new and efficient processes in the steelmaking industry, both now and in the future, will cause the production rate per man-hour to soar immeasurably.

Finally, we of labor recognize our responsibility to the worker and to the Nation at large. We ask no preferential treatment. There will be no fighting of technological change; there will be no reversal to pathetic attempts to halt the march of technology. There will be no pressures to frustrate sensible automation. Instead, we pledge a reliable labor force of 67 millions of men and women dedicated to a common effort to produce more in order that we all may live better.

Will Skimmer Work?—No One Knows

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES O. PORTER

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 3, 1958

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, high dams and then fish migrations may or may not be solved by a skimmer device now being installed in the Deschutes River for the Pelton Dam and which may be used on the Brownlee Dam on the Snake River.

In the following article, written by the able editor of the Portland Oregonian, Herbert Lundy, and appearing in that newspaper on February 18, 1958, the skimmer is explained. This should be of wide interest to proponents of high dams.

I, myself, am particularly interested because of the fish migration problem on the Rogue River in southern Oregon and the fact that it is highly likely that the Corps of Engineers will recommend the high dam at Lewis Creek on the Rogue. If this skimmer will work it would be most welcome to preserve the salmon in the beautiful Rogue River. The article follows:

About 15,000 fall Chinook salmon and 1,200 steelhead were trapped and trucked around the Brownlee Dam construction job in the Snake River in September, October, and November. At least as many spring Chinook, probably more, went through uncounted which a coffer dam was washed out by floodwaters in the spring. The progeny of these 35,000 or more Chinook and steelhead will begin their migrations to the ocean next year. The spawn of the previous migrations will be starting out sooner.

The partial year of trucking adult fish around Brownlee disclosed to fishery men that there was an unexpectedly large and valuable spawning run of salmon up the Snake above the Salmon and Imnaha Rivers. The fish management people want to save and enhance this run. Their hopes will be pinned on the operation of a Rube Goldberg device for collecting and transporting fingerling migrants which has come to be known as a "skimmer."

The name "skimmer" is roughly derived from the principle on which it is based. This is that many young salmon and steelhead working downstream for their youth-to-adult life in the sea follow the shore lines in big bodies of water; that most others, through traveling in midstream, do not sound below about 100 feet. Hence the concept of a device to skim the small fish from near-surface areas of an impoundment, before they can be destroyed by blades of turbines or dashed to death over the spillways of a high dam.

The $3,500,000 skimmer layout will be approximately 1 mile above Brownlee Dam. It will be almost 2,000 feet long, extending from shore to shore. The fish barrier will be a steel wire mesh net. The center and major portion will be of heavy material, 120 feet in vertical depth; the wings adjacent to the shorelines will be of lighter material, adjustable so that they will continue to seal the underwater embankment as the reservoir fluctuates with its 101-foot drawdown.

The net barrier will be strung on cables, chief suspension being on the bottom cable anchored near the wings. The top cable will be floated on metal pontoons. The cables and the 120-foot-deep net will go up and down as the surface of the impoundment fluctuates. The theory is that most of the small migrants will not swim down deep enough to go under the net.

Built into the net will be 3 collector boxes, 1 at each side of the river in the wings, on the upstream side; 1 in the middle of the net. Pumps will draw water through these boxes at a volume of 100 second-feet each; the jets of water being directed upstream and to the side along the net, to form an additional attraction to the fingerlings.

In the boxes, the small salmon and steelhead will be automatically sorted for size by a grader system employing chutes and slots, similar to that in use in hatcheries. This system will direct the fish groups into holding boxes—live boxes, in angler's terminology.

At this point, if all goes well, the young fish will have been collected. From the holding compartments they will be directed through valves into an 8-inch pipe in which a current of water will convey them to tank-trucks. The trucks would haul the small fish about 15 miles, for release into the Snake River below the Oxbow Dam site.

The skimmer complex of nets, locks, pumps, valves and pipes designed to gather the small migrants and conduct them around the dam would be protected from drifting logs and ice floes by a trash boom eight feet deep and spanning the river upstream.

Two principal hazards to this mechanical means of collecting small fish would be net failure and possibility that many fish will sound and go under the net.

A simpler skimmer device than that awaiting approval by the Federal Power Commission for Brownlee Dam is the one already approved and being installed in the Deschutes River for Pelton Dam. The penstocks at Pelton will be deeply submerged at about 180 feet, and no net barrier will be tried there. The forebay is to have a maximum fluctuation of only seven feet.

The fish ladder leading from below the reregulating dam to a natural bay above the concrete arch Pelton Dam will provide upstream access to adult salmon and steelhead. On the theory that the small downstream migrants will prefer not to sound below 100 feet, and that those coming down the western shore will make their way across the face of the dam to the artificial outlet on the eastern shore, a collection box there will be stationary.

The fish will be gathered in an outlet which will use 200 second-feet of water—but return 194 feet of it to the forebay—and conveyed in a pipe carrying six second-feet

of water through the dam. This pipe will shoot the little fish into the fish ladder and they will go down that to the river below the re-regulating dam.

The skimmer device at Pelton is to go into service when the forebay is filled this spring, at Brownlee in the fall. These will be the first tests of a system worked out cooperatively by fishery and dam engineers in an effort to solve one of the major conflicts in the Northwest.

But a word of warning: If these skimmers work as well as they look on paper, they will not answer all the problems of dam passage. There is, for example, the time lag involved in salmon reaching their spawning beds. At Nez Perce site, there would be an adult salmon problem, as well. Salmon trucked around the dam would have to be put back in the Snake below the mouth of the Salmon River, since no one would know if they were bound for the upper Salmon, upper Snake, or Imnaha Rivers. But water impounded in the forebay would be a mixture of Salmon, Snake and Imnaha waters. Could the fish find their way to their home streams? No one knows.

Statement of Gov Theodore R. McKeldin of Maryland Before Armed Services Committee, House of Representatives

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES P. S. DEVEREUX
OF MARYLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 4, 1958

Mr. DEVEREUX. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement by Gov. Theodore R. McKeldin, of Maryland, before the Armed Services Committee, House of Representatives, Washington, D. C., March 3, 1958:

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, as we approach the Ides of this March, it is no tyrannical Caesar who is threatened with destruction by the knife.

Instead, the threatened victim is that great body of devoted men, serving their States in time of peace and the Nation in time of war or of impending war—the National Guard.

Why this magnificent military organization of everready fighting men is singled out in the plotting of the Pentagon is hard to understand.

But surely the guard will not be called upon to say to the Congress in new dismay: "Et tu, Brute!"

Surely the House and the Senate will provide the necessary appropriations to maintain the Army National Guard at its presently authorized strength of 400,000 men.

Surely the Congress of the United States will not submit meekly to proposals which could destroy outstanding divisions of militia which are the prides of their respective States and which have, in times of historic peril, contributed magnificently to the security of the United States and the victory of our arms.

Mr. Chairman, the pending proposals for reduction in forces to the extent of six National Guard divisions, could deprive my State of Maryland and the Commonwealth of Virginia the old Twenty-ninth—the Blue and Grey—of D-day fame on the bloody beaches of Normandy.

There is a contract, sir—at least implied—between the Federal Government and each of the several States and commonwealths.

Section 104 of title 32 of the United States Code declares that "no change in the branch organization or allotment of a unit (National Guard), located entirely within a State, may be made without the approval of its Governor."

When the States accepted the present Federal allocations of National Guard units, it was with the understanding that such units would not—and indeed could not—be withdrawn without the consent of the governor of the concerned State.

With this understanding, the States created and organized—at the request of the Federal Government, if you please—a vital force with an interstate strength of approximately 400,000 men.

Bear in mind, if you will, that the present strength of 400,000 is a reduction of 34,000 under the strength of 1 year ago.

The proposal now is to reduce the force further to a strength of only 360,000.

I submit, sir, that this is a violation of agreement.

I submit further that it considers only those needs of the Department of Defense as viewed from the parapets of the Pentagon.

But what about the needs of the States?

What about the agreement to which each of us is a party?

Are we to be ignored in the making of decisions by which we are vitally affected?

What has happened to so suddenly reduce the importance of the Guard in the scheme of defense?

It was only 2 years ago, before this very committee that the Department of Defense insisted the Guard needed more than double its present strength.

It was within the past year that President Eisenhower said "the dual status of the National Guard * * * exemplifies that sound, traditional relationship between the States and the Federal Government, unique in our governmental system."

"This historic concept," said the President, "should be ever strengthened, never weakened."

And it was Secretary Brucker who declared that "if this great Army in which we are all proud to serve is to have the solid lasting strength to carry out its vital mission in the defense of the Nation, the National Guard must continue to play its full part with zeal and dedication."

The National Guard, sir, has been playing that full part. It is, as Secretary Brucker said, "extremely precious to all America."

Despite Secretary Brucker's oft-repeated assurance that the Army will train all young men the Guard can recruit, the Army has failed to carry out its part of the "memorandum of agreement" on the 6-months training program.

We are told that the Federal Budget would provide for only 6,000 such trainees in fiscal 1959.

But the National Guard will need 60,000 such trainees if it is to maintain its strength.

Can it be—as one is almost forced to suspect—that this studied neglect of the guard at the Washington level—this requirement for training without provision of the necessary funds—is a brass-bound effort to immediately discredit and eventually destroy the National Guard.

Let me return in this discussion to Maryland where we have allotted units of the 29th Division to practically every city and town in the State.

The units are so distributed as to be easily accessible to any place where an emergency may occur.

Even as we Governors exchanged notes on this new threat to the guard, units of the Maryland Guard were engaged in the relief of a serious emergency.

Farms and homes were isolated by snow. Roads were impassable. Milk was being dumped by farmers who could not get it to market. Many people were without sufficient food in their homes. Doctors were unable to reach patients.

I called on the heavy-equipment units of the guard to join with road crews in breaking the dangerous impasse.

The guardsmen did a magnificent job in bringing back to normal those sections of the State where they were on active duty.

I know that thousands of Marylanders, rescued from distress by those men and their big machines will view with alarm any move that would take them out of service.

Every one of our Maryland units is housed in a State-owned armory—most of them built at State expense.

Are those fine armories to be abandoned at the whim of someone in Washington?

And why, I ask you, does the Department of the Army propose to diband six National Guard divisions of dual status and keep six Reserve divisions which render no service to the States?

In conclusion, I respectfully urge your committee to support the following program:

1. Provide funds for the maintenance of the Army National Guard at a strength of 400,000.

2. Insist that the present 27 National divisions be maintained.

3. Correct two glaring weaknesses in our present system without delay:

(a) Change the regulation with respect to the 6-month trainees, as indicated above, or provide sufficient funds with which to cover this activity.

(b) Amend the law (Reserve Act of 1952, sec. 209a) to make it possible to transfer men with a Reserve obligation to units of the National Guard when requested and approved by the Governor of the State.

I thank the committee for giving me an opportunity to present my views upon this very important matter, and I urge with all the power at my command that the rights and the responsibilities of the States not be ignored. I respectfully urge again that the Congress insist upon a strength, in the Army National Guard, of not less than 400,000.

I have with me today the adjutant general of Maryland—Maj. Gen. Milton A. Reckord. If there is additional information that you need about Maryland or about the guard in general, there is no one anywhere more capable than he to give it to you.

Influence Peddling at the FCC

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PETER F. MACK, JR.
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 4, 1958

Mr. MACK of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, Commissioner Mack has finally resigned. Unfortunately, the case against the Federal Communications Commission goes much deeper than the headlines about Commissioner Richard A. Mack. I have been among the strongest proponents of a thorough investigation of the charges which have been made against Commissioner Mack and other members of the FCC. And I was first to expose Mr. Mack's interest in the now famous insurance firm. I want that investigation to continue. But we must go further than personalities and ferret out the reasons that influence peddling on the

FCC, and possibly some other regulatory agencies, has been able to flourish.

Millions of dollars worth of valuable television franchises have been parceled out by the Commission within recent years. The most important question for the House Legislative Oversight Subcommittee to decide is whether these franchises were issued, in line with the public interest, to the most meritorious applicants, or whether personal and political favoritism played a major role in the Commission's decisions.

If the channel 10 case in Miami is typical, I am afraid we must conclude that FCC concerns itself very little with the documented evidence so painstakingly—and, I might add, expensively—built up through public hearings before impartial hearing examiners.

These comparative hearings on rival applications for TV channels frequently last for years and years. The cost to the Government and to the private applicants is colossal. To communities waiting for television service, these proceedings before the FCC seem endless. If a channel fight ends with the Commission's decision, it is almost an exception rather than the rule. They usually land in court. Perhaps the frequency of court appeals is itself the best indication of the inconsistent and arbitrary fashion in which the FCC has decided these contests in recent years.

Imports Ruining Industry in Northern Wisconsin

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALVIN E. O'KONSKI
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 4, 1958

Mr. O'KONSKI. Mr. Speaker, it is time that the people of northern Wisconsin and other areas of our Nation which have untapped natural resources take a look at the Washington scene to see what is happening. The present trend of encouraging imports is raising havoc and discouraging the development of natural resources in our area and in other areas similar to ours on the national scene.

For the past 20 years, our national leaders have been encouraging and financing with American money, resources in other parts of the world, which are directly competitive to our own natural resources. If this policy continues for the next 10 years, as it has the past 20 years, areas like northern Wisconsin will become ghost areas with their natural resources untapped.

At the present time we have several thousand miners in our area who are out of work. In spite of that fact, imports of iron ore are growing by leaps and bounds. The following table of imports since 1952 will clearly show why iron-ore mining in our area is in a terrible slump:

United States imports of iron ore

Year:	Long tons
1952	9,760,325
1953	11,084,185
1954	15,768,771
1955	23,443,220
1956	30,412,018
1957	34,000,000

It is interesting to note that the importation of iron ore into our Nation is duty free in every respect, with no protection to the American industry or the American worker. To give a clearer view of the picture, in 1952 foreign imports amounted to only 10 percent of our iron ore consumption. In 1956 our imports amounted to 21 percent of our national consumption. In 1957 our imports amounted to 24 percent of our national consumption. With this trend, it is estimated that foreign imports of iron ore, by the end of this year, will amount to 33 percent or one-third of our national consumption.

The rapid rise of imports has been mainly at the expense of Lake Superior ores from Wisconsin, Minnesota, and Michigan. This mining region, long the raw material backbone of the steel industry, now supplies about 60 percent of United States needs, compared with 75 percent 5 years ago and about 85 percent 10 years ago.

What is more tragic is the fact that in Venezuela, for instance, iron ore production is financed by American capital and the Federal Government gives tremendous tax advantages to these foreign investments which American producers cannot possibly compete with.

It is high time that the people of our area scrutinized very closely what our international do-gooders are doing to our area. For the past 15 years since I have been in Congress I have been trying to awaken the people of our area to these dangers that lie ahead; but unfortunately, there has been little response.

What has, and is, happening to the iron-ore industry is likewise happening to our wood-products industry in our area.

In April 1957, 30 percent of the working people were laid off in our plywood industries because of the cheap imports of plywood from Japan. At the present time, more than 60 percent of the workers in the plywood industry in America are without jobs because of the cheap importation of plywood from Japan.

When you consider that in such areas as Wisconsin, Michigan, and Minnesota, the plywood and veneer industry is the very lifeblood of their economic existence, this problem of imported hardwood plywood and veneer should give us all, including the Congress and other agencies of Government cause for concern.

Communities such as Algoma, Antigo, Ashland, Butternut, Birnamwood, Crandon, Gillette, Marshfield, Mattoon, Mellen, New London, Oconto, Oshkosh, Shawano, Sheboygan, Stevens Point, Two Rivers, Rhinelander, Wausau, and so forth, all in Wisconsin, and Newberry, Munising, Marquette, Gladstone, Grayling just mentioning a few in Michigan and numerous others in Minnesota and other areas of the Nation, all of which depend to a large degree, if not entirely, upon the plywood and veneer industry for their economic life and well being.

Many other related industries such as logging, hardboard, lumber, and so forth, also are affected indirectly by this cheap imported hardwood plywood problem.

When you consider that the American plywood and veneer worker competes each hour with a Japanese worker being paid only 11½ cents per hour, it is reasonable to say that the workers in both countries suffer hardship.

When you consider the American plywood and veneer industry competes with imported plywood from Japan that is sold duty-free for less than the cost of production in the United States, is it any wonder that plant after plant in this area is being shut down with thousands of skilled workers being thrown on the scrap heap, and numerous communities becoming ghost towns.

Examples: Japan's exports to the United States in the January–June, 1957 period totaled a 57-percent increase over the same period in 1956. Imports from Japan of hardwood plywood has increased 4,120 percent since 1951. These imports have eaten up 46.6 percent of the total American market in 1956 alone.

Consumption of hardwood plywood in the United States is up 74 percent since 1951. Low priced imports captured 99.4 percent of this 74 percent increase in consumption.

Japanese plywood industry has increased their production 400 percent since 1951, mostly with the help of American capital—American plywood industry has increased their production in the same period by only six-tenths percent since 1951.

Japanese labor cost per 1,000 square feet of plywood is $4.17 as compared to from $30 to $34 per 1,000 square feet in the United States.

These are but two examples of what is happening to the areas of northern Wisconsin, northern Michigan, and northern Minnesota. For 15 years I have tried vainly to warn the people of our area of these consequences of our foreign policy. Unfortunately, it was not until workers actually got laid off that they are now beginning to stop, look, and listen, and are beginning to pay some attention to the sad results of trying to take care of the rest of the world at the expense of American resources and the American worker.

I have introduced bills to impose a tariff on imports of iron ore and wood products. But with the leaders of both parties plugging for more imports instead of less, such bills receive little consideration. Only the rude awakening of our citizens back home will reverse this trend.

Legislation Introduced To Exempt Wheatgrowers from Overseeding Penalty for 1958

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. J. FLOYD BREEDING

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 4, 1958

Mr. BREEDING. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I desire to call attention to legislation introduced on March 3, 1958, by myself and the distinguished chairman of the House Agriculture Subcommittee on Wheat, Mr. CARL ALBERT, of Oklahoma.

The measure is designed to accomplish one basic purpose; that is, to exempt for 1958 from the base-acreage-loss penalty, enacted last year, the wheat producer who planted in 1957 for harvest in 1958.

The bill, H. R. 11089, represents the technically refined version of H. R. 9814, which I introduced on January 8, 1958, for the same legislative purpose.

Mr. Speaker, it was not until October 3, 1957, that the Kansas State Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation (ASC) Committee, and many other wheat-State committees, received information from the United States Department of Agriculture which spelled out specifically the operation of Public Law 85-203, the so-called feed-wheat law, as it applied to excess-wheat farms, particularly the penalties involved.

I have been a wheat farmer all my life, Mr. Speaker, and for 30 years in the Fifth District of the State of Kansas, the district which I have the privilege of representing. And I know that winter wheat operators in my area begin planting as early as August 15. Under the law governing the production of wheat, as revised in 1957, there simply was not sufficient time for the farmer to be on notice that he could be punished for overseeding through the loss of some of his base acreage.

To correct this retroactive inequity, my bill, H. R. 11089, and Mr. ALBERT'S bill, H. R. 11086, identical measures, would free for 1 year, 1958, from base-acreage-loss penalties the 1957 winter-wheat planter who planted without knowledge of the overseeding penalty. For the year 1959 and all subsequent years, wheatgrowers will be subject to the full slate of penalties for noncompliance with the wheat laws, including the acreage-loss penalty, designed to discourage wheat production in excess of allotment.

The text of the measure follows:

H. R. 11089

A bill to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, with respect to wheat acreage history

Be it enacted, etc., That section 334 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, is amended—

(1) by adding at the end thereof two new sentences reading as follows: "For the purpose of establishing farm acreage allotments (i) the past acreage of wheat on any farm for 1958 shall be the base acreage determined for the farm under the regulations issued by the Secretary for determining 1958 farm wheat acreage allotments; (ii) if subsequent to the determination of such base acreage the 1958 wheat acreage allotment for the farm is increased through administrative review, or court proceedings, the 1958 farm base acreage shall be increased in the same proportion; and (iii) the past acreage of wheat for 1959 and subsequent years shall be the wheat acreage on the farm which is not in excess of the farm wheat acreage allotment, plus, in the case of any farm which is in compliance with its farm wheat acreage allotment, the acreage diverted from the production of wheat: *Provided*, That for 1959 and subsequent years in the case of any farm on which the entire amount of the farm marketing excess is delivered to the Secretary or stored in accordance with applicable regulations to avoid or postpone payment of the penalty, the past acreage of wheat for the year in which such farm marketing excess is so delivered or stored shall be the farm base acreage of wheat determined for the farm under the regulations issued by the Secretary for determining farm wheat acreage allotments for such year, but if any part of the amount of wheat so stored is later depleted and penalty becomes due by reason of such depletion, for the purpose of establishing farm wheat acreage allotments subsequent to such depletion the past acreage of wheat for the farm for the year in which the excess was produced shall be reduced to the farm wheat acreage allotment for such year."; and

(2) by striking out in subsection (h) "the language "future State, county, and farm acreage allotments" and inserting in lieu thereof "future State and county acreage allotments."

As evidence of the gross injustice and widespread protest caused by the retroactive application of the base-acreage-loss penalty, Mr. Speaker, I am including in the RECORD, an article entitled "Southwest Kansas Farmers Protest Overseeding Penalty," which appeared in the Hutchinson (Kans.) News on February 13, 1958:

SOUTHWEST KANSAS FARMERS PROTEST OVERSEEDING PENALTY

(By Don Kendall)

On September 26, 1957, most of Southwest Kansas land not laden with ripening milo was the womb for embryo wheat.

The 1958 crop, which at the present time promises to be a big one, was almost completely seeded.

In past years it had been a practice on the part of many farmers, particularly those on the high plains, to overseed their allotments in good years.

WEATHER FICKLE

The reason was obvious. Weather in fickle Kansas can't be relied upon, so the farmer overproduces in good years and hopes for the best in lean.

Since 1938, when the Agricultural Adjustment Act was revamped, overseeding has tended to increase county and State crop histories.

This, in turn, has resulted in some bigger allotments for farms, counties, and the State.

On September 26 the Department of Agriculture announced by letters to State agricultural stabilization and conservation offices the following:

"The county and State will receive only the allotted acres on excess farms and no credit will be given for acres planted in excess of the farm allotments."

In fact, the letter stated, this policy would tend to reduce farm wheat allotments because of overseeding.

Four years' production are included in computing base acreages for wheat farms. For 1958, for example, years 1953 through 1956 are used.

Beginning with the 1960 crop, as you can see, the 1958 acreage would be included by ASC offices in computing that year's allotments.

If a farm had been overseeded for the 1958 wheat crop, that farm would receive only its allotment as crop history.

The effect would be eventually to reduce base acreages. For example: A farm with a base of 100 acres would have an allotment of about 66 acres of wheat.

If that farmer overseeds his 1958 crop, only 66 acres would be entered for that year's history.

If this is pursued each year by a farmer—overplanting his allotment in 1959, and so on—it would be possible to have a radically reduced allotment by 1963.

ASC offices throughout the State have received form letters from the State to send to wheat producers.

This letter states that producers having overseeded allotments will receive notice to tear up extra acres by a certain date.

The farmer who has stayed within his allotment for 1958 will receive full credit on his farm's crop history.

PROPOSAL MADE

There has been a proposal made in Congress which would suspend this acreage penalty on farmers who overseed.

The proposal was made in bills offered by Representative J. FLOYD BREEDING, Fifth District, and Representatives HILL and CHENOWETH of Colorado.

It has been opposed on several sides by Congressmen who say it might serve to favor a few farmers at the expense of those who complied.

The fallacy in the objections, as far as southwest Kansas is concerned, is that farmers who seeded within their allotments last fall are in the minority in parts of the area.

MOST OVERSEED

Stanton County, for example, had about 145,000 acres seeded in and around its allotment of 128,000 acres.

The policy statement of the Department of Agriculture sifted through channels and landed in the State ASC office about October 1.

Four days later the State office issued the statement to county offices.

Through a maze of interpretations by county office managers, farmers and newspapermen, the policy by which over-seeded wheat would penalize allotments was publicized.

But by that time all wheat for 1958 had been planted.

The Department of Agriculture said, "We have been receiving many reports indicating that the farmer who overplants would lose his allotment in the future an other misstatements of facts.

DISCUSSION LIMITED

"We would prefer that in discussing this matter with producers, you (ASC offices) could confine your discussion to the provisions of the law."

This policy led to the bumbling method in which the new regulation was handed out to the public.

The provisions of the law may have been clear to the lawyers who wrote them in Washington and may have been lucid to State officials.

But in many instances it was not clear on the county level and to the farmers.

The ASC recognized this on January 24 and issued the form letter to be issued by county offices to wheat producers.

Excuses that the policy came after wheat seeding apparently weren't valid.

"Those producers who are protesting," the Department of Agriculture said, "can dispose of their excess acreage by the disposal date, if they desire to be in compliance and receive diversion credit."

Port of Stockton

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN J. McFALL
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 4, 1958

Mr. McFALL. Mr. Speaker, today in Stockton, Calif., the United States Army engineers are holding hearings important to the future of the port of Stockton, fastest growing deep-water port in the west.

The engineers are seeking information about the proposed new false river route for the San Joaquin River and they are checking the need of deepening the existing channel to 35 feet.

These studies were ordered last year by the House Public Works Committee. Members of the committee, of which I am a member, were checking the port of Stockton and its channel in person last October.

I am confident the studies will show the need and the justification for these improvements.

The port has a bright future of service to California and the Nation, but today I want to discuss its past.

I would like to pay tribute to the citizens of Stockton who mortgaged their future to develop this great port.

The port celebrated its 25th anniversary last Friday and there were glowing words about its accomplishments.

Today is it easy to agree that the port is necessary and important; the port has proven itself in time of peace and war. Twenty-five years ago, it was a different story. It required vision and courage in those days to support this fledgling venture.

When the *Daisy Gray* pushed her nose through the Delta fog in 1933, no one knew for sure that this first cargo carrier to dock at the port would not be the last.

Although the entire community is deserving of credit and praise, the larger measure of tribute must go to the small band of leaders who paved the way.

The commissioners who first directed the port were five—Irving Martin, Sr., Pliney E. Holt, Otto E. Sandman, Samuel Frankenheimer, and N. M. Brisbois.

Today, only Sandman and Brisbois are still living to see even their most optimistic dreams surpassed.

In the interim years, six other men served as past commissioners—Paul E. Weston, E. H. Wolf, Newton Rutherford, Martel Wilson, C. C. DeYoung, and Julius Blum.

And of these, only Weston and DeYoung are still here to see the product of their efforts.

Present commissioners: Col. H. E. Sanderson, W. L. Maxwell, John D. Turner, Sr., R. L. Eberhardt, and Norman E. McGurk.

They are carrying on the proud tradition of continued progress laid down by their predecessors.

First director of day-to-day port activity was B. C. Allin. He was succeeded by the late Henry Ohm.

For the past 10 years, the port director has been Elmo Ferrari, a sprinter in his undergraduate days at USF who has not slowed down since.

Today, ships flying the flags of every free nation realize the trade possibilities of the port of Stockton sending agriculture and maufacturing production of the West to the centers of the world and bringing in return needed cargo to our rapidly expanding western United States.

Central California's agricultural and industrial wealth has been economically served by the modern facilities at the port of Stockton. The five commissioners, serving without renumeration, represent the spirit of cooperation and interest that has built the port to its present enminent position.

We in the Nation's Capitol have seen great strides made in close cooperation between the United States Department of Agriculture, the Commodity Credit Corporation, the United States Corps of Engineers, the House Committee on Rivers and Harbors, and the port of Stockton officials.

We anticipate renewed progress in the handling of surplus goods, storage of grain, and providing increased trade with the free nations of the world.

With this continued cooperation of all concerned, I know that the next 25 years will prove even more rewarding to the port of Stockton and the Nation.

National Negro History Week

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN D. DINGELL
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 4, 1958

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to permission granted I am inserting into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an article authored by Charles J. Wartman, the distinguished executive editor of the Michigan Chronicle. The article is entitled "National Negro History Week."

At St. Leo's Parish in my district, a dinner was held honoring National History Week. At this observance, colored citizens, both Catholic and Protestant, joined with white citizens in our community to both reflect on past progress and look forward to the increased mutual understanding that will enrich our community life from our efforts to make one Christian principle of brotherhood not just a perfunctory observance, but a living vital force within our community, to be practised throughout the entire year. In addition, the dinner honored the progress of the Negro Community in our country.

Many outstanding citizens of the State of Michigan attended this stirring occasion. The chairman of the affair, Mr. Luther Keith, is an old and close friend of my family, and under his leadership this affair was once again the success that civic-minded Detroiters have come to look forward to each year.

NATIONAL NEGRO HISTORY WEEK

The observance of National Negro History Week was instituted 33 years ago by the late Carter G. Woodson and the Association for the Study of Negro Life and History.

The first observance came at a time when the American Nation was experiencing the darkest period of social reaction following World War I. Domestic insecurity and the disillusions following World War I had loosened a virtual tidal wave of reactionary thought and ideas which found fertile spawning grounds in the Ku Klux Klan, antilabor, anti-immigrant, and antiprogressive groups whichs prung up like mushrooms throughout the Nation.

The migrations of hundreds of thousands of Negroes from the South to the western, northern and midwestern cities had been met by race riots, duplications of the southern segregation system, and harsh discriminations in employment, housing, and education.

In 1923, as today, one of the standard techniques of those who were spreading hatred and bigotry was to insist that the American Negro had accomplished nothing, was incapable of learning, and was generally inferior, biologically, to whites.

It was in an effort to counteract this propaganda and to give both Negroes and whites a sense of appreciation for the Negro that Carter G. Woodson and his colleagues hit upon the idea of an annual observance of Negro history. The selection of the month of February for the celebration undoubtedly was made to coincide with the traditional historic celebrations of Lincoln's and Washington's birthdays.

It is important to note that 33 years ago a very small number of Negroes were graduating from the colleges and universities of the Nation. More than 90 percent of all these graduates were coming from the segregated Negro schools of the South. Rigid quota systems in the universities of the East, West, and North restricted Negro students to a mere trickle.

Woodson and his colleagues had still another purpose in mind. They were interested in improving the scholarship of students and professors, particularly in the field of Negro history. The Association for the Study of Negro Life and History became a sponsor and compilor of the Journal of Negro History, a scholarly professional publication of hundreds of papers, and other materials on the Negro in America, in the West Indies and in Africa. It is undoubtedly the most complete document of its kind in the world today.

The history of the Negro from 1923 to 1958 is in all probability the world's outstanding story of rapid progress in so short a time. The story of progress is interwoven with the history of the United States and the revolutionary changes in world history of which the Negro, along with all the other Americans, has been an integral part.

The Negro in America today stands on the threshold of the solution to many problems which the most optimistic observers in 1923 felt would never be solved.

As the Nation comes closer to the realization of the dream of integration, the study of the history of the Negro increases in importance. It is important to counteract the anti-integration propaganda of those who would hold back the clock and continue the stranglehold of segregation on American society. It is important because in a melting-pot society, the very strength of the society is found in the fibers of the traditions and differences which the many groups comprising the society bring to it.

The advances and achievements of individual Negroes and the group as a whole take on added significance as American democracy moves forward to a position of leadership in the free world.

Americans of all races, classes, and creeds have more reason for knowing the true story of the rise of the Negro in America. It is important that they know this story free from the cliches and stereotypes which have so tragically crippled and obstructed the efforts of Negroes to gain recognition and acceptance as full first-class citizens in the past.

It means, therefore, that the slavery interlude must be viewed in its proper perspective as an unfortunate era in the growth of the American Nation. It means also that the period of reconstruction in the South must be reappraised so that the facts of the struggle for political power, in the Nation as a whole and the South in particular, can be seen for what it really was and not the blind unthinking usurpation of the political system by ignorant blacks as it has been all too often depicted.

The harmful stories and accepted attitudes about Negroes which are a carryover from the slave period and the fabrication of those who sought to protect and perpetuate the system are still today the underlying causes for the difficulties encountered in trying to end segregation in the schools, in housing and in employment.

An honest study of factual and honest accounts of the lives of Negroes in America can go a long way to create a new climate in which to work for an integrated society.

The study of Negro life and history is important if it does no more than awaken us all to the fact that the status accorded the Negro in America is a century-long lag in public morals. In principle, the Negro problem was solved a long time ago—in practice the solution is not yet effectuated. Only openminded study of the question, even if only during a week's celebration of Negro History Week can bring us closer to the full implimentation of the principle we recognize as part and parcel of our religious heritage.

Taxed Twice

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 4, 1958

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include a straightforward editorial which appeared in the Chelsea (Mass.) Record on February 28, 1958:

TAXED TWICE

The 10 percent Federal excise tax that telephone users pay for their service is double taxation.

Taxes the telephone company pay are, in the last analysis, taxes that every telephone user pays, for, like other costs of doing business, are necessarily reflected in the prices charged for telephone service.

Federal, State, and local taxing authorities levy taxes on the telephone business. They include local property taxes, Federal and State social security taxes, unemployment taxes, franchise taxes, State taxes on revenues and earnings, and the 52 percent Federal corporate income tax.

In addition to these taxes which telephone users indirectly pay as part of the charges for service, is the Federal excise tax imposed directly on users at the rate of 10 percent of the charges for local and long-distance service.

It is this excise tax which you see separately entered on each month's telephone bill, making it 10 percent larger than it would otherwise be.

You pay your excise tax to the telephone company, but the company retains none of it. The company simply acts as collector and turns over the money to the Federal Government. As a matter of fact, collecting the tax is an additional expense to the company, necessarily reflected in charges for service.

With both indirect and direct taxes to pay, telephone users are twice taxed.

This excise tax should be repealed.

Arab Boycott of Americans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EMANUEL CELLER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 4, 1958

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the following letter which I addressed to Secretary of State John Foster Dulles, on February 28, 1958, on the subject of the Arab boycott of Americans. The text of the letter follows:

FEBRUARY 28, 1958.

Hon. JOHN FOSTER DULLES,
Secretary of State,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: Again, I convey to you the protests of a great many citizens in this country against the Arab boycott of American citizens and commercial firms who travel in or do business with Israel. This action on the part of the Arab nations is tantamount to international intimidation and blackmail.

I believe it is incumbent upon the United States, in pursuance of an American foreign policy, to oppose as strongly as possible this Arab boycott. It has already earned the disapproval of the United States Senate in a resolution adopted in July 1956. It is asked that the policy of the United States be no different from that of West Germany which refused to yield to Arab threats to cease business with Israel and no different from the policy of France and Switzerland in the sense that both have resisted the boycott by instructing their representative nationals not to respond to questionnaires circulated by the Arab League, inquiring whether certain companies employ or are controlled by Jews.

Thus far our Government has taken no public stand against this Arab bludgeoning. Indeed, it seems that the silence of our Government lends encouragement to this boycott based on bigotry. Under your guidance, an agreement with Saudi Arabia was renewed whereby United States consents to screen American military, diplomatic and civilian personnel so that no Jews are assigned to the United States airfield at Dhahran.

This is tantamount to saying that American Jews are not equally protected in their citizenship. American vessels that stop at Israeli ports are denied the right to make calls at Arab ports. Ships of American registry have been blacklisted by countries of the Arab League because they sail to Israel. American planes that land in Israel cannot fly over Arab countries. American aircraft is denied flight information or any rescue service from Arab States. Beyond that, Arab diplomats accredited to the United States are directing this boycott on our own territory.

This Arab boycott has interfered with the International Wheat Agreement. The Arab League states refuse to ship their American wheat on blacklisted vessels or buy wheat from exporters who are Jews or who have dealings with Israel. You have thus far failed to take the necessary diplomatic action to the end that this discrimination might be discontinued. In a sense then, we as a nation, are forced to submit to the operation of a boycott, the effect of which is to tax Americans for wheat subsidy although a segment of the American public is barred from any participation.

The dignity of our Nation demands that representations be made to the guilty nations that the United States views with grave concern these outrageous acts.

Respectfully yours,

EMANUEL CELLER.

An Adequate National Guard and an Adequate Reserve

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OVERTON BROOKS
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 3, 1958

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, Subcommittee No. 1 of the House Armed Services Committee, which normally handles Reserve legislation, has been meeting over a period of weeks, holding hearings on the National Guard and Reserve program. These hearings were closed today and at the time of the closing of the hearings two important resolutions were unanimously adopted by the subcommittee. The first resolution concerns the National Guard and urges and gives full support from the subcommittee to a National Guard of not less than 400,000 strength, rather than a guard reduced to 360,000 as proposed.

The second resolution relates to the Reserve program. The subcommittee was unanimous in feeling that the Army Reserve should consist of 300,000 troops and the subcommittee urged that full efforts be made to prevent a reduction in the minimum Army Reserve strength of 300,000.

In other words, this subcommittee approved an Army consisting of National Guard and Federal Reserves of not less than 700,000 persons. The resolutions passed are herein set forth:

RESOLUTIONS OF SUBCOMMITTEE NO. 1, HOUSE ARMED SERVICES COMMITTEE

Whereas Subcommittee No. 1, House Armed Services Committee, has held extensive hearings on the proposal to reduce the size of the Army National Guard in fiscal 1959 from current strength of 400,000 to 360,000; and

Whereas the subcommittee has taken under consideration the proposal of the Army to develop a revised Reserve forces troop basis; and

Whereas the subcommittee has had the benefit of testimony from representatives of the Department of the Army, the National Guard Association, the Adjutant General Association, Members of Congress, the Ameri-

can Legion, governors, the governors' conference, and others: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That, a quorum being present, the subcommittee, by unanimous vote, recommends the following to the full committee, that:

(1) The strength of the Army National Guard for fiscal year 1959 be maintained at 400,000, exclusive of persons engaged in 6 months' active duty for training; and

(2) Adequate spaces in the 6 months' training program be provided in fiscal year 1959 for the Army National Guard, and these be not less than a total of 48,000; and

(3) Recommendations be made to the Appropriations Committee to insure that language concerning Army National Guard and Army Reserve strength be made uniform with respect to the inclusion or exclusion of 6-month trainees; and

(4) The Army be directed to proceed with the development of plans for a revised National Guard troop basis, coordinating same with the States, through the National Guard Bureau, and that prior to its approval and implementation it be submitted to the Armed Services Committees of Congress; and

(5) Sufficient appropriations be provided to maintain the strength of the Army National Guard as set forth above and that these appropriations be in addition to funds now included in the budget and not less than the following:

National Guard	$38,000,000
Active Army (appropriations: Operations and maintenance in order to support the increased strength of Army National Guard)	13,800,000
Total	51,800,000

(6) The chairman, Subcommittee No. 1, be authorized to appear before the Appropriations Committee representing the Armed Services Committee in support of the foregoing recommendations.

Whereas Subcommittee No. 1, House Armed Services Committee, has held extensive hearings on the proposal to reduce the size of the Army Reserve in fiscal 1959 from current authorized strength of 300,000 to 270,000; and

Whereas the subcommittee has taken under consideration the proposal of the Army to develop a revised Reserve Forces troop basis; and

Whereas the subcommittee has had the benefit of testimony from representatives of the Department of the Army, Reserve Officers Association, Members of Congress, and others: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That, a quorum being present, the subcommittee, by unanimous vote, recommends the following to the full committee, that:

(1) The strength of the Army Reserve for fiscal year 1959 be maintained at 300,000, exclusive of persons engaged in 6 months' active duty for training; and

(2) Adequate spaces in the 6 months' training program be provided in fiscal year 1959 for the Army Reserve and these be not less than a total of 34,000; and

(3) Recommendations be made to the Appropriations Committee to insure that language concerning Army National Guard and Army Reserve strength be made uniform with respect to the inclusion or exclusion of 6-month trainees; and

(4) The Army be directed to proceed with the development of plans for a revised Reserve Forces troop basis coordinating same with Reserve Forces Policy Board, and that prior to its approval and implementation it be submitted to the Armed Services Committees of Congress; and

(5) Sufficient appropriations be provided to maintain the strength of the Army Reserve as set forth above and that these appropriations be in addition to funds now included in the Budget and not less than the following:

Army Reserve	$28,000,000
Active Army (appropriations: Operations and maintenance in order to support the increased strength of Army Reserves)	7,600,000
Total	35,600,000

(6) The chairman, Subcommittee No. 1, be authorized to appear before the Appropriations Committee representing the Armed Services Committee in support of the foregoing recommendations.

Nebraska's Birthday

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. A. L. MILLER

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 4, 1958

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, March is the birthday month of the great State of Nebraska. It was on March 1, 1867, 91 years ago, that the proclamation making the Territory of Nebraska one of the United States of America was signed by President Andrew Johnson. Nebraska thus became the 37th State in the Union.

It has been my practice for the past several years to insert into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a statement of facts concerning Nebraska, her past and her future.

In the long span of time the written history of Nebraska goes back for only a comparatively short period. According to the Nebraska Blue Book, the earliest records show that huge fossil beds and glacial deposits give proof that in past geologic ages this region was the bottom of an inland sea which was later elevated above the water.

At one time, a tropical climate prevailed and during a later period glaciers covered the land. Archeological explorations have uncovered considerable evidence indicating the presence of prehistoric man in the State.

It has been estimated about 40,000 Indians lived in Nebraska at the time of the earliest white visitors. Their settlements in the State must have covered a period of several hundred years. It has often been presumed the Spaniards were the first white people to come to Nebraska. That would be about the year 1541. In that far gone day, the Indians dominated the area and bison roamed the prairies by the thousands.

In later years, about 1700, French trappers began to venture up the rivers. By 1739 nearly the entire length of the State had been traveled. In those days Nebraska was an uncharted wilderness. At one time or another the region was claimed by Spain, France, and England. Eventually France established claim to the area and sold it to the United States in 1803. Following the Lewis and Clark expedition in the years 1804–6 came the story of the pioneers who carved a great State out of the prairie wilderness.

The first military post was established at Fort Atkinson on the present site of the village of Fort Calhoun, just a few miles north of Omaha. Then came the first pioneer settlement by the white man in this particular territory. By the year 1832 covered wagons had started to cross the State. The Oregon Trail, which for the next 40 years was the greatest wagon road in the world's history, was established. Other great trails across Nebraska included the Mormon Trail, the Denver Trail and the Nebraska City cutoff. Thousands of covered wagons carrying pioneers westward traveled over these trails each year until the construction of the Union Pacific Railroad made their operation no longer feasible.

Rugged frontier conditions were evidenced in Nebraska during those years when the pioneers carved their homes out of prairie sod. The pioneers faced the heat of summer and cold of winter, the marauding Indians, the droughts and prairie fires with indomitable will. Their bright vision of a new land they could call home was entirely justified.

TERRITORIAL HISTORY

The history books tells us the Nebraska region was made part of the Territory of Indiana in 1804. The following year it was made a part of the Territory of Louisiana. After 1812 it became part of the Territory of Missouri, and in 1821 it became a part of an unorganized region usually called Indian country.

Nebraska was first organized as a Territory in 1854. It included all the present State plus part of North and South Dakota and most of Montana, Wyoming, and Colorado.

STATEHOOD IN 1867

Nebraska had a long, hard fight in the effort to become a State. There was a sharp division of opinion between residents of free and slave territories and as a result many delays were encountered. In fact, many residents of the Territory were opposed to the idea of statehood. The Congress passed an enabling act April 19, 1864, and an election was held on June 2, 1866, on the statehood issue. The tabulation showed 3,938 Nebraskans in favor of statehood and 3,838 against—a margin of only 100 votes. Statehood came finally March 1, 1867.

The Nebraska picture was rapidly changing. In 1865 the Union Pacific started to build a railroad across the State. This revolutionized transportation in the area.

The passing years found more settlements starting in all parts of the State. New railroads were built. The new Homestead Law brought in people from many of the States to the east. They came in a wide variety of nationalities but these individuals blended into the communities and Nebraska was on its way.

IRRIGATION

In the western part of the State, men of vision watched much-needed water

flow down the rivers to be wasted in the sea. They organized irrigation projects in the North Platte Valley. Crops blossomed as they never had before. Irrigation spread to other parts of the State and it is still spreading.

Right now I am seeking approval of funds for other irrigation projects. Ainsworth and Farwell have been authorized but no funds appropriated to start. Mid-State is in the planning stage. They will pay back their costs to the Government. They are an investment in the future of America. In the years ahead we must conserve every possible drop of water. Additional flood-control projects are also needed.

New industries came into Nebraska. The raising of livestock grew by leaps and bounds and Nebraska ranchers now send thousands of head of cattle, hogs, and sheep to the market. Nebraska boasts of having the finest steaks in the world.

Nebraska still seeks new industries. Towns and cities have committees working throughout the year in an effort to bring in such industries.

The State government has a Division of Nebraska Resources which has done much good work in attracting industry to our State.

With the passing of years we see the need for many changes. This has become the air age and right now Nebraska is seeking to improve its airline facilities to provide new service to many parts of the State.

THE STATE FLAG

The State flag, designated by the legislature, consists of a reproduction of the great seal of the State, charged on the center in gold and silver on a field of national blue.

The design for Nebraska's seal was prescribed by the State's first legislature in 1867. The smith in the foreground typifies the mechanical arts. Agriculture is represented by shocks of grain, the growing corn and the settler's cabin. The steamboat on the Missouri River and the train represent the State's appreciation for transportation which hurried its settlement. The State Seal under the signature of the Governor and the Secretary of State must be affixed to all official State documents.

The State bird is the western meadowlark.

The State flower is the goldenrod.

The State tree is the American elm.

THE UNICAMERAL SYSTEM

Since 1937, Nebraska has had the only one-house, or unicameral, legislature in the Nation. This system was adopted by constitutional amendment and has signally successful. The unicameral is made up of 43 members elected on a nonpartisan ballot for 2-year terms. Regular sessions are held in odd-numbered years. The Lieutenant Governor of the State serves as presiding officer. The speaker is elected from the membership.

NEBRASKA'S CAPITOL

Nebraska, commonly called the Cornhusker State, has had 5 capitols—2 territorial capitols in Omaha and 3 State capitols in Lincoln. The present State capitol in Lincoln is considered one of the most beautiful government buildings in the world. Built on a pay-as-you-go basis, the Capitol cost over $10 million. It was free of debt upon completion in 1932.

The length and breadth of the building, which takes the form of a cross within a square is 437 feet. The 400-foot central tower is crowned by a 32-foot statue of "The Sower," symbolic of the State's agriculture.

Each of the building's four corners represents a cornerstone of the law. There are 18 panels in the outer court, depicting the history of the law starting with Moses and the Ten Commandments and ending with the admission of Nebraska to the Union. The series is broken on the south facade by panels representing the Magna Carta, flanked by the signing of the Declaration of Independence and the framing of the Constitution.

Eight great figures, symbolizing the ideals of culture which are protected by the law, make up the lower buttresses of the tower. They are an Egyptian Scribe for History, a Prophet of Israel for Vision, a Greek Philosopher for Reason, an Emperor for Statecraft, an Apostle for Faith, a Saintly King for Chivalry, Sir Isaac Newtoh for the Science of Nature, and Abraham Lincoln for the Liberties of Peoples.

FACTS ABOUT NEBRASKA

Nebraska has a total area of over 77,000 square miles. The largest county, Cherry, is as large as the States of Connecticut and Rhode Island combined.

Nebraska's population on July 1, 1957, was estimated at 1,426,000.

Nebraska's altitude ranges from 835 feet in the southeast to 5,340 in the northwest.

Nebraska has 22 million acres under cultivation, a larger percentage of land in farms than any other State. We have substantial irrigated acreage and over 21,000 irrigation wells.

Nebraska has approximately 1,400 industrial plants employing about 60,000 people. New plants are being added every year. Omaha, the largest city in the State, is the world's largest livestock market.

Nebraska has 17 four-year colleges and universities and 5 junior colleges.

Nebraska has the highest life expectancy rate of any State in the Union.

We have in Nebraska a people of courage, ambition, and commonsense who seek to be good Nebraskans and good Americans. They will help to keep our Nation great.

"Equality before the law," "honesty before men," and "reverence before God," are the precepts upon which Nebraska built and is building. These are the precepts which will keep Nebraska great and enduring through the years to come.

Brig. Gen. David Sarnoff

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. OVERTON BROOKS

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 3, 1958

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I wish to present for the attention of the Congress the address of Brig. Gen. David Sarnoff upon the occasion of his being awarded the highest award of the Reserve Officers Association. This presentation was made at the ROA banquet held in Washington, D. C., on February 8, 1958. General Sarnoff was ably presented by Brig. Gen. Wendell Westover and I am pleased to also include his remarks.

REMARKS OF BRIG. GEN. WENDELL WESTOVER IN MAKING PRESENTATION AND INTRODUCTION OF GENERAL SARNOFF AT ROA BANQUET, WASHINGTON, FEBRUARY 8, 1958

General Sarnoff, I am greatly honored by the assignment to speak for the Reserve Officers Association of the United States, and through its voice express the gratitude of all security-conscious citizens for your clear vision and devoted contributions to national security.

ROA does itself honor in conferring upon you its highest award.

Your acceptance of ROA's recognition brings pride and distinction to the association to which you yourself have given long support.

This citation, listing your historic accomplishments as one of America's geniuses in electronics, speaks for itself. All America knows, and our Government has recognized, your service to the advancement of American standards of communications, and, in wartime and peacetime, what you have done to preserve and protect our heritage. The Radio Corporation of America, in which you have invested your genius and your leadership, is a monument to your lifetime of accomplishment.

ROA salutes you tonight for all these things. But more than for them, ROA pays homage—General Sarnoff—to your record as a citizen-soldier. In World War I, you helped the American Expeditionary Forces to victory by advancing its wireless system. As a reservist who served beyond the call of duty in two great wars, you have exemplified the highest standards of the officers corps of the armed services, and the minute-man tradition. In the postwar years, you served sacrificially in directing the work of the national security training commission.

Of particular meaning today—in this age of sputnik and Explorer—have been your official and persistent efforts to alert the Nation, and the Government, to the dangers, the challenges, and opportunities of the cold war.

As a longtime active member of ROA, you have been an inspiration to our leadership. Your challenge to the Nation, outlined in your famous memorandum of April 5, 1955, has electrified our membership and given a new mission to ROA, and to citizens everywhere who love their country and are jealous for its safety.

General Sarnoff, it is a distinct honor to hand you this citation. Officers of ROA, Members of the Congress, other distinguished guests, ladies and gentlemen; it is my personal pleasure and high privilege to introduce to you Brig. Gen. David Sarnoff.

REMARKS BY DAVID SARNOFF, CHAIRMAN OF THE BOARD, RADIO CORPORATION OF AMERICA, BEFORE NATIONAL COUNCIL OF THE RESERVE OFFICERS ASSOCIATION OF UNITED STATES, MAYFLOWER HOTEL, WASHINGTON, D. C., FEBRUARY 8, 1958

May I express my heartfelt gratitude and appreciation for the high honor which the Reserve Officers Association has conferred upon me tonight. I thank General Westover for his most friendly introduction, and I thank the entire membership of the association for the generous citation which I shall cherish always.

The Minute Men award has a special significance for me because of the organization from which it comes. As a longtime member of the Reserve Officers Association, I have been proud to share in its trials and its triumphs.

As chairman of the National Security Training Commission for 2 years, I had an opportunity to observe, at close range, the effective work done by the association in support of its highest objective—national defense.

While the Nation's mood alternated between fitful confidence and fretful alarm, the association never wavered in its insistence upon a strong military Reserve as an indispensable part of a strong national defense program.

It is largely through the unflagging efforts of this group—and others of like mind—that the Nation now has on the statute books legislation for a comprehensive Reserve program.

Last June, in its final report to Congress, the National Security Training Commission paid a well-deserved tribute to the Reserve Officers Association for its unselfish work in promoting the Reserve program. That report noted that our country was well on the way to having "the most effective Reserve force in our history." At the same time, however, it solemnly warned against permitting any lag in the Reserve program because of lack of funds or any other reason.

In recent months, I am sorry to say, there have been disquieting signs that the Reserve program has been lagging, due to on-and-off methods of recruiting, and restrictive input for training quotas.

These signs are disturbing because in the new space age our military Reserves are more important than ever before. The emergence of the IRBM and the ICBM—far from eliminating our need for manpower—has placed new emphasis on our requirements for trained men.

If an enemy should impose a conflict upon us, we must have trained men to launch the ICBM's, to tend the radar outposts, to operate the atomic submarines, and to handle the thousands of complex tasks that are part of modern warfare.

In his illuminating articles on military power—published this week in the New York Times—Hanson W. Baldwin said: "Man is still the heart of battle. Despite all the recent accent upon new weapons and new machines, man is probably the weakest element in the American formula for security. * * * The turnover is tremendous, reenlistment rates nowhere near high enough, and far too many promising officers are resigning. All of the services are experiencing difficulty in retaining their highly trained technical men."

We need large numbers of trained men if we are to counter the insidious Communist small-war strategy of nibbling and intimidation, and prevent localized brush fires from blowing up into an appalling nuclear holocaust.

In the Communists' grim glossary of warfare, there is no such thing as an absolute weapon, unless it is man himself. Therefore, if our own young men are to meet the challenge effectively, they must be properly trained and conditioned before an emergency arises. That, of course, calls for an adequate Reserve program.

I earnestly commend the Reserve Officers Association for its continuing vigilance in working for a strong Reserve Force—a vital element in our national security. Thank you.

Sonnets and Economics

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 24, 1958

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, the following article, despite its humorous vein, should serve as a warning to all that we are having practiced upon us a new art of deception. Members of Congress, in order to properly discharge their responsibilities vis-a-vis the executive, must become familiar with this new art form. Accordingly, I commend to the attention of our colleagues the following article which appeared in the New Republic of February 3, 1958:

SONNETS AND ECONOMICS

Among poets, the exigencies of the sonnet as a verse form are professionally recognized: the man who can convey his meaning and still meet its requirements of rhyme and cadence is a stout fellow. Equal recognition is accorded by economists of all tendencies and all political affiliations to the exigencies of the annual economic report as a form of expression in their metier.

Both a sonnet and an economic report permit dividing the material into two groups, and the sounds with which the lines end are permitted to vary from one to the other. In an economic report, the opening of every section must be soothingly buoyant; later on, if there is something unpleasant that really must be said, it can be covered. To give the political necessities their primacy and their due, and yet to place the essential economic facts where they can subsequently be quoted, requires a skill and a cynicism which fellow practitioners of the politico-economic arts should appreciate. And for our culture to be broadly sophisticated, an equal understanding of the report as an art form should be encouraged among the public at large. To this end, the following pairs of illustrations are offered from this years' document:

Page 10: "The year 1957 was a prosperous one, despite the decline in the final quarter. Economic expansion continued, though at a lower rate. Production, employment, and income again attained record levels. For the year as a whole, gross national product amounted to $434 billion and personal income to $343 billion, both some 5 percent above 1956."

Page 11: "The rise of expenditures and incomes in the latter part of 1956 and most of 1957 was largely matched by an increase in prices. The physical output of goods and services rose only slightly, and throughout 1957 industrial output remained below the peak registered in December, 1956." (Industrial production, shown as the last item of the table on p. 10, shows a percentage change from 1956 to 1957 of zero, while that from 1955 to 1956 was 2.9.)

Page 4: "At the turn of the year, the economy was beginning to feel the effects of an acceleration of the placement of defense contract awards, prompted by the need to move forward quickly with programs essential to the strengthening of the Nation's defenses."

Page 12: "The sharp advance in national security outlays ended in the second quarter. * * *"

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board, or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D. C., at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer plus 50 percent: *Provided*, That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized bookdealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by bookdealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

PRICE OF THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

The Public Printer is authorized to furnish to subscribers the daily RECORD at $1.50 per month, payable in advance.

Remit by money order payable to Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D. C.

PRINTING OF CONGRESSIONAL RECORD EXTRACTS

It shall be lawful for the Public Printer to print and deliver upon the order of any Senator, Representative, or Delegate, extracts from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the person ordering the same paying the cost thereof (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 185, p. 1942).

CHANGE OF RESIDENCE

Senators, Representatives, and Delegates who have changed their residences will please give information thereof to the Government Printing Office, that their addresses may be correctly given in the RECORD.

RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD is located in Statuary Hall, House wing, where Mr. Raymond F. Noyes is in attendance during the sessions of Congress to receive orders for subscriptions to the RECORD at $1.50 per month, and where single copies may also be purchased. Orders are also accepted for the printing of speeches in pamphlet form.

Appendix

A Story of Ruthless Import Practices, of Growing Unemployment in the Coal and Railroad Industry, and of Hungry and Dejected People in Affected Communities

SPEECH
OF

HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 5, 1958

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, hearings on the bill to extend the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act are now in their third week. Because of the long list of witnesses scheduled to testify before the Ways and Means Committee, I have decided against imposing upon the committee's time. Instead, I am taking my case directly to the floor of the House.

In past years, despite the inclination of so many Members of Congress for more liberal trade policies, the case against excessive imports of residual oil won the sympathy of many representatives of States not affected. Members of Congress from coal-producing States have, except for isolated breaks in the ranks, stood shoulder to shoulder in demanding sensible restrictions on the residual oil which—year after year for the past decade—moved from foreign refineries into the east coast markets that are traditional coal users. Through this alliance, there have been times when legislation to correct the situation came exceedingly close to passage.

I should like to present for publication in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD what I feel is the evidence that may enable us finally to realize our objectives during the current Congress. This material is a story of ruthless import practices, of growing unemployment in the coal and railroad industries, of hungry and dejected people in communities of Pennsylvania and other coal-producing States.

Mr. Speaker, before filing these tables of comparison, I should like to recall for your information some of the warnings issued at hearings of congressional committees in 1950 after a deluge of 74,719,000 barrels of residual oil had entered our shores in the preceding year.

I testified on this matter in 1950. Here is one sentence from my statement:

> Without doubt the flooding of the United States with this cheap foreign oil that displaces coal in the industrial power and heating market is rendering a death blow to the coal and railroad industries.

While at the time such allegations may have seemed to be exaggerated, during the interim period, thousands of coal miners and railroad employees have in actuality seen job opportunities killed by import competition. They have not been able to return to their chosen professions because residual oil imports have never let up in all those intervening years.

I invite you to ask some of my colleagues from the anthracite area whether or not residual oil imports have been fatal to many mines in their region. Mr. Frank Earnest, Jr., president of Anthracite Institute, Wilkes-Barre, was a witness in 1950. So were Thomas Kennedy, vice president of the United Mine Workers of America, and Harry See, Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen. I ask that you compare their testimony that year with current records of foreign residual oil's destructive aspects.

When the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Works issued a report on the hearings held by its subcommittee, this paragraph was included:

> The committee, on the basis of all the evidence before it, is convinced that the importation of foreign oil has had a substantially injurious effect on the coal, oil, and railroad industries of the Nation.

Yes; the domestic oil industry was also being damaged by excessive imports in those days—just as it is suffering today. The president of the Independent Petroleum Association of America testified at the hearings in 1950. The president of the National Stripper Well Association, from my State, testified. So did a host of other independent businessmen in the petroleum industry. From them and other witnesses, the subcommittees learned that, besides bringing unemployment, imports, first, imperil our national security; second, reduce the Nation's buying power; and, third, disrupt our entire fuel economy.

Here is an estimated rundown on residual oil imports into the east coast markets since the 74,719,000 barrels arrived during the year 1949:

[Thousands of barrels]

1950	120,025
1951	118,608
1952	128,070
1953	131,206
1954	128,953
1955	151,938
1956	161,124
1957	171,275

There you have it, Mr. Speaker. What about the death blow to the coal industry that I mentioned 8 years ago? Here is what a coal operator from western Pennsylvania recently told me:

> At the present time I am selling enough coal locally to keep about a dozen of my men employed. When the winter is over I will not be able to continue operations. Until residual oil from Venezuela took my business on the east coast, there was always a hopper car getting loaded under my tipple. About half of the other 30 men who used to work for me are now on relief, and the rest have migrated into other parts of the country looking for work.

Anyone who is old enough to remember conditions along the Atlantic Seaboard in the early part of World War II will recognize the danger of permitting sources of fuel to go by the boards when the world is in the state of turbulence which prevails today. Nazi submarines entered the Gulf of Mexico and sank ships within sight of New Orleans. Residents of Atlantic City and other coastal communities could stand on the beach and see the flames of torpedoed tankers leaping from the horizon into the skies. If it was so difficult to haul oil from Texas to Florida 15 years ago, how in heaven's name can we place reliance on shipments from South America in an era of snorkel submarines and jet aircraft?

Mr. Speaker, I am talking about a very important security matter. The Presidential Advisory Committee on Energy Supplies and Resources Policy recognized the serious implications of too much foreign oil. It was in the interest of national security that the Committee recommended a specific ratio of imports to domestic production—a recommendation which was included in the national defense amendment to the last extension of the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act.

During the past week, I have discussed the coal situation with Tom Pickett, executive vice president of the National Coal Association. He reminded me that in 1954 it was agreed that a minimum level of production of 500 million tons in the bituminous-coal industry was essential to assure the capacity required for the acceleration that would be needed in an emergency period. The coal industry was below that level last year, and at the current rate of output will be off by at least 15 percent when 1958 has run its course.

American railroads today are beset with a number of problems. I do not contend that the coal-carrying lines would automatically find themselves back on a vigorous footing if residual-oil imports were reduced. I want to point out, however, that in coal equivalent the residual-oil imports last year amounted to more than 39 million tons. The resulting estimated loss to the railroad industry is $109,235,000. Given their logical share of this service charge, the Pennsylvania, B. & O., and other coal haulers would most certainly be in much better condition than they are at the present time. Here is an appraisal of current conditions on the railroads by James M. Symes, president of the Pennsylvania:

> If my appraisals of rail-transport requirements in the event of another war are approximately correct, and I believe they are, then certainly we are not now prepared to do the kind of job we would be called upon to perform—and we will not be prepared to do so if present policies with respect to transportation are continued. The same line of reasoning that caused me to indicate, 17 years ago, that the railroads could handle the expected load of World War II, causes

me to say now that they are not prepared to do what will be expected of them in the event of another war.

Under the circumstances, it would appear that Congress has a very definite obligation to enact legislation restricting the volume of residual oil that may enter the markets of the United States from foreign sources. So long as this alien product is permitted to deprive American workers of their means of livelihood, and so long as the national security is threatened, Congress is remiss in its duty if restrictions of residual oil are not incorporated into the laws of our land.

While I am hopeful that the Ways and Means Committee will insert into the trade-agreements law the provisions essential to reduce the inflow of residual oil, I place the House on notice that the necessary amendment may have to come from the floor. I request that my friends in the House be prepared to assist in accumulating the necessary votes if and when that time comes.

Atomic Energy Commission

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CARL T. DURHAM
OF NORTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 5, 1958

Mr. DURHAM. Mr. Speaker, section 164 of the Atomic Energy Act authorizes the Atomic Energy Commission to enter into contracts or modify or conform existing contracts to provide for electric-utility services for a period not exceeding 25 years for the installations at Oak Ridge, Tenn., Paducah, Ky., and Portsmouth, Ohio, but further requires that such contracts shall be submitted to the Joint Committee and a period of 30 days shall elapse while Congress is in session before the contracts shall become effective.

I would like to insert in the RECORD a copy of a letter dated February 27, 1958, from Mr. Lewis Strauss, Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission, to me, and a copy of modification No. 2 to a contract of the Atomic Energy Commission with Ohio Valley Electric Corp. for electric service to the Portsmouth, Ohio, area. This modification would extend the term of the existing contract to include an additional term of 12 months commencing on April 1, 1960, and terminating on March 31, 1961. Under unanimous consent, I insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a copy of the letter and contract modification as described above:

UNITED STATES
ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION,
Washington, D. C., February 27, 1958.

Hon. CARL T. DURHAM,
Chairman, Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, Congress of the United States.

DEAR MR. DURHAM: On February 28, 1957, modification 1 to the additional power agreement, identified as contract No. AT-(40-1)-2030, with the Ohio Valley Electric Corp. for electric service to the Portsmouth area was submitted to the Joint Committee. This modification 1 became effective 30 days after submission, on March 30, 1957, and unless extended terminates on March 31, 1960.

AEC and OVEC have agreed that the term of the additional power agreement shall be extended without any other change in the provisions and conditions, to include an additional term of 12 months commencing on April 1, 1960, and terminating on March 31, 1961. Accordingly, modification 2 to the additional power agreement has been executed.

In accordance with the provisions of section 164 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, there is submitted to the Joint Committee herewith, a signed counterpart of modification 2.

By its letter of February 26, 1958, OVEC has advised AEC that such of the regulatory approvals specified in section 7.06 as were necessary at that date to permit the transactions specified in this modification 2 have been secured and that such regulatory approvals were, at that date, in form and substance satisfactory to the company and sponsoring companies.

Sincerely yours,

LEWIS STRAUSS,
Chairman.

JANUARY 13, 1958.

Re: Extension of term for an additional year.
UNITED STATES ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION,
Oak Ridge Operations,
Oak Ridge, Tenn.
(Attention of Mr. S. R. Sapirie, Manager.)

DEAR SIRS: You have notified Ohio Valley Electric Corp. (OVEC), pursuant to section 6.03 of contract No. AT-(40-1)-2030, dated February 14, 1956, between OVEC and the United States of America, acting by and through the United States Atomic Energy Commission (AEC), (said contract, as amended by modification No. 1 thereto, being herein called the additional power agreement) that you desire to extend the term of the additional power agreement for an additional year after the date on which the additional power agreement would otherwise terminate. AEC and OVEC have negotiated the terms and conditions of such extension, and the sponsoring companies referred to in the intercompany power agreement, dated July 10, 1953, among OVEC and said sponsoring companies have consented to the execution and delivery of this agreement by OVEC.

1. AEC and OVEC have agreed, subject to the provisions of this agreement, that the term of the additional power agreement shall be extended, without any other change in the provisions and conditions thereof, to include the additional term of 12 months commencing on April 1, 1960, and terminating on March 31, 1961, unless the additional power agreement shall be terminated prior to March 31, 1961, in accordance with the provisions thereof.

2. This agreement shall become effective as a contract for electric service to AEC on the effective date of this agreement. The effective date of this agreement shall be the date on which the time shall have elapsed during which this agreement must remain on file with the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy pursuant to section 164 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954. Until such effective date shall occur, this agreement shall constitute an agreement between us to use our respective best efforts to cause such effective date to occur as soon as practicable after the execution and delivery of this agreement.

3. AEC and OVEC recognize that, since this agreement provides for the extension of the term of the additional power agreement without any other change in the provisions and conditions thereof, (a) the provisions and conditions of the additional power agreement shall be applicable to the additional term of the additional power agreement in the same manner as if the initial term included the additional term, and (b) the conditions of performance specified in section 7.06 of the additional power agreement shall be applicable to this agreement and to the extension of the term of the additional power agreement provided for in this agreement.

4. OVEC shall be entitled to terminate this agreement by delivering to AEC, within 60 days after the effective date of this agreement, a notice in writing of its election to terminate this agreement if OVEC shall have failed to receive, within 30 days after the effective date hereof, an opinion of general counsel of AEC, in form and substance satisfactory to OVEC, to the effect that AEC had full power and authority to execute this agreement and the undertakings herein described and to obligate the United States of America, subject to the terms and conditions hereof, for all payments which may be required to be made, by reason hereof, by AEC to OVEC pursuant to any of the provisions of the additional power agreement, that the persons executing and delivering this agreement on behalf of AEC had full power and authority to do so, that all action necessary under section 164 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954 to permit this agreement to become effective has been taken, that the provisions of this agreement do not contravene any of the provisions of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, and that this agreement does not affect the AEC power agreement (as defined in the additional power agreement) in such manner as to cause the AEC power agreement to contravene any of the provisions of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954. In the event that OVEC shall terminate this agreement pursuant to this paragraph 4, the term of the additional power agreement shall, after the termination of this agreement, be the term which would be in effect without regard to this agreement.

5. If any of the provisions of this agreement, or any part of any provision hereof, shall be held by a court of competent jurisdiction to be invalid for any reason, this agreement shall terminate forthwith upon such determination. In such event the term of the additional power agreement shall, after the termination of this agreement, be the term which would be in effect without regard to this agreement.

If the foregoing correctly sets forth your understanding, please so indicate by executing a copy of this letter at the place designated for your signature and return the same to us.

Very truly yours,
OHIO VALLEY ELECTRIC CORP.,
———— ————, *President.*

Accepted:
UNITED STATES ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION.
By S. R. SAPIRIE.
January 17, 1958.

Approved:
G. L. QUINN,
Acting Director of Production, Atomic Energy Commission.
January 30, 1958.

Retirement of President Judge W. A. Valentine, of Wilkes-Barre, Pa.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 5, 1958

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD,

I include the following editorial from the Wilkes-Barre Record of March 1, 1958, upon the retirement of Judge W. A. Valentine, president judge of the court of Luzerne County:

JUDGE VALENTINE RETIRES

Retirement of President Judge W. A. Valentine after 29 years of service on the Luzerne County bench and 56 years as an active member of the bar came quietly and without ceremony as he would wish it.

His distinguished career has spoken eloquently for itself. His retirement has occasioned many expressions of regret, as well as kindly appraisals of his worth as a jurist and as one who needed no title for recognition as an expert in the law.

Veteran courthouse employees recalled Judge Valentine in the years he was on the bench was not one to seek sumptuous surroundings. He seldom, if ever, requisitioned new office furnishings, equipment, or redecorating. One employee some years ago suggested he should have a new desk. Judge Valentine in typical style responded by suggesting the old desk be revarnished. It was recalled his chambers were painted only once in the years he occupied them and that was done after ceiling cornices dropped and the offices had to be refurbished.

Judge Valentine's chambers were simply furnished. They were looked upon as a place of toil. There were no ornaments. The chambers reflected the jurist's tastes and his capacity for hard work. Though his budget allowed for employment of a law clerk, Judge Valentine contented himself without such service.

His yen for usefulness continued to the last hour of his service at the courthouse. Willingly and sagely he expressed his views in answer to questions on the causes of juvenile delinquency and the possible remedies.

He expressed himself on many subjects, and not the least interesting of his convictions is the one to the effect that judges should be voted for on a nonpartisan ballot entirely apart from political parties. Like many a desirable goal, it may not be easily attained but certainly would be worth the effort.

Eyes Right

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 5, 1958

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include an address by Mr. William Yinson Lee, director, Eyes Right, Inc., at Overseas Rotary Fellowship of New York.

Eyes Right, Inc., is an organization which has sought to help the blind to see. It has done much valuable work in this direction.

I am pleased to include the following address of Mr. Lee entitled "The Visually Handicapped":

THE VISUALLY HANDICAPPED

(Address by William Yinson Lee, director of Eyes Right, Inc., at Overseas Rotary Fellowship of New York)

Mr. William Yinson Lee, past acting chairman of the Overseas Rotary Fellowship of New York, told his fellow members at their meeting at the New York Advertising Club on February 18 of the dramatic correction and improvement of sight which was given to a number of visually handicapped people, including some with as little as 2 percent vision (98 percent blind). He referred to the efforts of Eyes Right, Inc., a voluntary nonprofit charitable organization incorporated in New York in 1951, of which he is cofounder with Mrs. Muriel Brayman Dexter, president. Both are members of the board of directors.

In the United States there are 1,700,000 visually handicapped people. Of these, 334,000 are legally blind. It is estimated that at least 40 percent, or over 133,000 of the legally blind have enough "vision" to be rehabilitated to lives of usefulness through the use of special optical aids.

There are agencies helping the "legally blind" but Eyes Right is the only organization dedicated exclusively to aiding in the correction and improvement of vision of the "visually handicapped," which term also includes the legally blind and persons with major impairment of sight—the "blind" with residual vision—through the use of special optical aids, principally the improved telemicroscopic lenses.

The activities of Eyes Right, Inc., are opening new and expanding horizons in the home, the community and the Nation, to these visually handicapped persons, through the use of the special optical aids referred to and, equally important, making available to them the necessary personal adjustment for their fullest use. Eyes Right has the distinction of thus rehabilitating to lives of usefulness many visually handicapped persons who were previously more or less helpless and hopeless, as they had no place to which to turn for guidance or assistance.

The following are typical of scores of cases helped by Eyes Right, Inc.:

1. Two legally blind persons, N. B. and J. K., have had their sight corrected and improved with the aid of special subnormal vision lenses that they have been able to make a 400-foot 8-millimeter documentary film of some of the activities of Eyes Right, Inc. This 25-minute film is intended for showing to service clubs, fraternal organizations, and interested groups, upon request.

2. A legally blind girl, M. S., who had never read anything but Braille, can with the use of special optical aids and the new projection magnifier now read visually the smallest print and study music.

3. Retrolental fibroplasia legally blind child, A. Z., with the aid of telescopic lens and slip-on microscopic cap, can now read his schoolbooks and the writing on the class blackboard, which he could not do before. He is now living the life of a normal child.

4. Visually handicapped cerebral palsy boy, A. A., 14, had attended a State blind school for a year but was dismissed because he was not blind enough to qualify for continued training. He was not allowed to attend regular school because of his visual handicap. There was no school which he could attend. Eyes Right gave him a set of subnormal vision lenses. He can now enjoy television across the room, look out the windows of his home, distinguish people, and can see the writing on the board at school, which he could not do before. With a reading cap on his spectacles, he can now read newsprint. Parents say, "The boy has been helped toward a self-reliant and useful life." Doctor says, "You have done a great service to this deserving boy." The change in his attitude is remarkable and certainly heartwarming. To see this is a reward, indeed." He is now attending regular school.

In spite of the $150 million spent by the United States Government and the untold millions contributed by the public to private agencies for aid to the blind and the legally blind, very little is being done for the visually handicapped, whose blindness does not qualify them to receive benefits or assistance from agencies for the blind. Because of their visual handicap, a million or more of these people are unable to earn a livelihood but hundreds of thousands of them could do so, if provided with subnormal vision aids, after appropriate examination, coupled with the necessary personal adjustment for their fullest use. In addition, arrangements should be made for special reading instruction and for a psychological reorientation from the blind to the seeing world, which Eyes Right, Inc., is endeavoring to include in its program.

William T. Roy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GORDON CANFIELD
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 5, 1958

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Speaker, when I came to work on Capitol Hill in January 1924, as a congressional secretary, I met William T. Roy, then a senatorial aide. I liked the cut of his jib, as the sailors say, and we soon became close friends.

No one was more pleased than I when 27 years ago Bill was named assistant to Lewis Deschler, distinguished Parliamentarian of the House, and every Member of our body will say "amen" to the tributes that have been accorded Bill by Speaker RAYBURN and former Speaker MARTIN and so many others as he and his beloved wife Donna leave for what all of us want to be many happy years in retirement in the Southland.

Washington newspapers today describe Bill as "the Parliamentarian with the photographic memory." He has just that and he knows every Member of both House and Senate, his background, and his record. When the Speaker or a Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, wanted to refer to a precedent or a bill or an enactment of yesteryear it took Bill only minutes to pinpoint the subject matter. It is understandable why the distinguished chairman of the House Appropriations Committe and the author of Cannon's Precedents, Mr. CANNON, of Missouri, who once was House Parliamentarian, now rates Bill alongside of Asher C. Hines and Lewis Deschler, as among the most famous of all House Parliamentarians.

Men and women, serving in the parliaments of the NATO nations, Germany, Japan, Korea, and Vietnam have called on Bill Roy in recent years for assistance in working out practical parliamentary procedures and Bill has many dear personal friends among them.

Bill has an outstanding war record, his service in the military beginning back in 1919, when he was a buck private in the army of occupation in Germany. When he returned home he became intensely interested in helping to build up a strong National Guard organization in the District of Columbia. He rose in the ranks to a lieutenant colonency and the 29th Division, which he commanded, will never forget him.

What is the secret of Colonel Bill's success? A very simple one. He loves

people. The Congress was his second home and how he exalted our national legislature, its histsory, traditions, and prerogatives. He will long be remembered for his courtesies, his patience, his understanding, his thoroughness. He stands very high in my book of unforgettable characters.

Extension of the Reciprocal Trade Agreements

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 4, 1958

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the statement of Seymour E. Harris, on behalf of the New England governors before the House Ways and Means Committee on February 28, 1958.

The statement follows:

THE EXTENSION OF THE RECIPROCAL TRADE AGREEMENTS—STATEMENT OF SEYMOUR E. HARRIS ON BEHALF OF THE NEW ENGLAND GOVERNORS BEFORE THE HOUSE WAYS AND MEANS COMMITTEE, FEBRUARY 28, 1958

SUMMARY

I am representing the New England governors. We favor an extension of the Reciprocal Trade Agreeements (RTA), which make possible negotiations for increasing trade. The international crisis strengthens the case for RTA. Emphasis in the debates over the RTA has shifted from a program for more trade (1938) to one for solving the dollar shortage (first postwar decade) and now to one for keeping our friends.

We support the President's program with some reservations. We do not believe, as he does, that the RTA brings more jobs. In fact, by helping to destroy our vulnerable industries, it has tended to reduce the number of jobs, for the import competing industries require relatively much labor per unit of output—or dollar of output.

We insist on an escape clause (a device for revoking trade concessions if results for industry are injurious), which protects industries and regions against unwise or unpredictable results of tariff negotiations; and one which provides more rapid correctives than we have had in the past. (It took 8 years and a loss of 50 percent of the jobs in woolens and worsteds before the mistake of the reduction of tariffs in woolens and worsteds of 50 percent was partly rectified.)

We do not believe that the case for protection is nearly so great for growing as for declining industries. Hence, insofar as national policy requires tariff cuts, the growing industries should absorb the burden of increased competition out of rising markets. An overall average reduction may even be accompanied by rises when vulnerable industries are experiencing substantial losses.

Mr. Harris also stressed the point that when substantial cuts in tariffs may be followed by large imports and serious threats to a domestic industry, the tariff quota might be supported. That is to say, the Government establishes a ceiling on imports as a protection against excessive imports associated with tariff cuts.

Trade policy is one approach to the problem of balance in international economic relations. But there are serious problems to be solved, and they relate to the distribution of the burden.

By importing more, we tend to concentrate the responsibility of foreign policy on the vulnerable industries.

By providing dollars to foreigners through foreign aid or private investment programs, we tend to distribute the burden more widely among taxpayers and investors. In each instance the foreigner gets dollars.

By yielding export markets to other countries, we tend to impose more burdens on the strong export industries and less on the weaker industries that compete with foreign exporters. And we favor putting more burdens on the strong and less on the weak.

We tend to stress increased imports too much. Indeed, an inadequate aid and investment program tends to bring larger tariff concessions and more imports.

In determining the distribution of the burdens, we also have to allocate them between foreign and domestic interests. Foreigners also have to contribute towards stability by producing efficiently and containing inflation. Their balance of payments difficulties stem in part from their weak domestic policies. Inflation brings reduced exports and more imports. In addition, they often refuse to accept their share of world imports. Their restrictions are generally much greater than ours. Under the common market, Europeans may require this country to absorb an even greater share of Asiatic exports.

The most effective and most equitable approach to more imports is rising incomes, not tariff cuts. Here the rise of imports is spread widely and hence adverse effects on any one industry greatly reduced. Prosperity brought vast gains of imports since 1946, and tariff cuts failed to do so in the thirties. Hence, the need of aggressive policies to deal with the recession.

In determining trade policy the Government must integrate it with all Federal policies. Where injury is done through tax and spending policies, through farm policies (e. g., higher prices of cotton or wool and hence less sales of textiles), through merger policy, through resource policy, etc., then the Government must be especially careful not to introduce trade policies that injure an industry or region more. In fact, the case is strong for some help from trade policy.

The continued loss of textiles and the injury to New England of Federal policies are relevant issues here.

Identification: I am chairman of the New England Governor's Textile Committee and also chairman of the economics department at Harvard University. I am, however, speaking for the New England Governors and not for Harvard University. I am the author of some 30 books, several of which deal with issues of international economics, the last being International-Interregional Trade (1957).

I should say at the outset that we are not opposed to an extension of the reciprocal trade agreements. We say this even though in some instances the administrator of these agreements have been injurious to the New England economy, and particularly to the textile industry. We are impressed by the arguments used by President Eisenhower and also by Senator DOUGLAS in a brilliant speech. The emphasis here is put upon the international crisis and the increased need, therefore, for more trade with our allies and friends. The President said, and I quote, "We will fail if closed markets and foreign exchange shortages force free world countries into economic dependence upon the Communist bloc."

THE THEORY OF RECIPROCAL TRADE AGREEMENTS

In 1933 the major argument was that we needed more trade and the RTA was the way to achieve more trade. In more recent years the agreements have been tied to dollar shortage. In other words, if there is a genuine shortage of dollars, the easiest way to cure the shortage is for the United States to import more goods. Now again, the emphasis has been shifted, and this time to the international crisis and the need of tying our trade more to our friends and allies and the uncommitted neutral countries.

RESERVATIONS

Though we accept the President's general position, we do not, however, accept all the arguments. For example, and I quote, the President says, "The development of a healthy export trade has created a significant number of jobs for our working men and women." This is not a tenable position, nor was it tenable when taken by the Randall Commission. Actually, export trade does not create jobs. As a matter of fact, a higher degree of protectionism would probably give us more jobs. Indeed, an excess of exports is a stimulant to the economy and does create jobs. But this excess of exports is to be tied to the foreign aid, foreign investments and the like, not to the growth of export trade. In fact, it has been generally held that the export industries are those which provide the largest amount of output per manhour. Therefore, if we export more and import more and to this extent destroy our less competitive industries, to this extent we lose jobs rather than gain them.

Another reservation should be made, namely that so far at least the trade of the U. S. S. R. with Western countries, or nonbloc countries, has been very small. The major gains have been in trade within the bloc, though indeed there has begun to be some penetration into the neutral areas.

THE PHILOSOPHY OF THE RTA

In the past, some attention has been paid to the stake of industries protected. There has been some reluctance to reduce tariffs when the net effect would be a serious dislocation in some particular industry or area. It is true nevertheless that serious mistakes have been made, perhaps one of the most serious has been the Geneva Protocol of 1948 under which the tariff on woolens and worsteds was reduced from 45 to 25 percent. This reduction was followed by a decline of output of more than 50 percent and an even larger decline in New England. It took almost 8 years before this error was rectified to some extent.

ESCAPE CLAUSE

Many free-traders hold the position that there should be no escape clause, that is to say that if a particular tariff cut or trade concession results in large dislocations and increases of unemployment the industry or the region should have no redress. This seems to me to be an untenable position. It cannot be expected that government servants should be allowed in their negotiations to destroy an industry or greatly weaken it. Even if the negotiators have no such intention, they often do not know what the effects of a particular concession will be. Obviously, if there is not such a reservation available, the net effect is likely to be that no negotiations will take place.

Undoubtedly there is a case for the President having final authority in these matters because he alone can take a broad view. But the President should not be unconcerned over the condition of weak industries and particularly those that are losing employment steadily. On the other hand, the President should have the authority to consider the industry as a whole; and if the facts show that losses in some part which may to some extent be associated with tariff concessions are more than offset by gains in other parts of the industry, then to that extent the President might interpret the escape clause quite broadly. Above all, there is hope that it will not be necessary, as it has been in the past, to appeal for years to

get concessions and then obtain them at politically appropriate times.

THE DISTRIBUTION OF THE BURDEN

Our current international policy tends to stress the point that the United States has certain obligations to its allies and also to neutral nations. Among these responsibilities is the one to help these countries continue to improve their standard of living and their trade with this country. They must have reasonable access to our markets. Above all, we must be sure that they are not starved for dollars, given our own economic position and capacity to make dollars available and also the state of our industries.

THE WEAK VERSUS THE STRONG

In relation to the issue of the distribution of burden, I discuss first the problem of the weak versus the strong industries. In classical economics the general thesis held has been that we destroy the weak on behalf of the strong. We do not succor the weak. But there have been changes in viewpoint since those days, and the general view now seems to be that we help the weak rather than the strong. In other words, if the United States has to have more imports consistent with its foreign objectives, then the burden of absorbing increased imports should be put upon the growing industries, not upon those that are especially vulnerable to foreign competition and are already losing ground under current trade policies. It is especially wrong-headed policy to put an additional strain on any industry that is substantially losing jobs. In this connection we would argue that the gage should not be the fluctuations or the trends in output, but those in jobs. In other words, when an industry is losing, say, 5 percent of its jobs on an average year after year, there is no case for a reduction in trade barriers and there might even be a case for increased protection. In this manner the losses can be spread over a longer period and the adjustments may be made more easily.

MOBILITY VERSUS IMMOBILITY

A second issue here is related to the problem of whether or not industries and workers losing jobs can make adjustments. Where there are plenty of jobs available in the neighboring territory and economic conditions are very favorable, some movement, of course, can take place without great hardships. But in many industries this is not so. The explanation may be a heavy concentration of one industry or it may simply be the type of worker who is unwilling to move or would be very unhappy to be forced to move. The theorist often does not allow adequately for the costs involved in moving people and moving industry. At any rate, we have had many studies of which the Miernyk is the most interesting, which shows the difficulties of moving even in the midst of great prosperity. This study also shows the long periods of unemployment following losses of an industry, to some extent associated with trade policy.

THE STATE OF THE ECONOMY

A relevant problem in determining the distribution of the burden is the state of the economy. Obviously, it is easier to reduce tariffs in periods of great prosperity than in periods of recession. The reason for this is that in recessions unemployment already prevails, and any attempts to liberalize trade will increase the amount of unemployment.

Obviously, in a period, say, like 1958 it would be very difficult to put across any reductions in tariffs and there would be persistent efforts to increase the degree of protection. Obviously, also this is the time when appropriate measures should be taken to deal with a recession. This might include, for example, a drastic reversal of monetary policy, an increase in spending for defense and its related field, education, and also to some extent for welfare as well as, if the situation does not improve, a cut in taxes.

GOVERNMENT AID

Another issue relates to the contribution of Government in solving the problems of industries and people affected adversely by the economic situation. For many years there has been much talk of the possibility of governmental aid as a solution to the tariff problem. In other words, cut tariffs and help those who are injured. After several years of study after the war the State Department gave this up as a tenable policy. The point is, of course, that once an industry suffers from unemployment or loss of profits that industry will almost inevitably blame the tariff even though there may be other factors that are more important. Hence, such a program would probably be unworkable. On the other hand, we should stress the point that a program like the area redevelopment program suported both by the administration and the Democrats last year might be very helpful. Undoubtedly some losses of jobs result from trade policy and related policies or changing fashions or what not, and something should be done to help the industries and the regions that are affected adversely.

THE BURDEN ON THE FOREIGNER OR THE AMERICAN?

Those who favor more liberal trade policies tend to stress the contribution that the United States should make as against that to be made by the foreigner. But it is well to stress the point that the major restraints on trade are abroad, not in this country. We have had very large reductions in the average levels of our tariffs in the last generation, whereas most countries abroad still impose quotas, exchange control and the like. On the average, the United States is a relatively free-trade country, much more so than most other countries. In part, the shortage of dollars and the trade difficulties of foreign countries are related to unwise policies abroad which include, for example, cartels, uneconomic production, and generally a greater degree of inflation and excessive expansion than in the United States. This tends to cut exports and increase imports and bring disequilibrium in the balance of payments.

TARIFFS OR INCOME GROWTH?

One approach to the increase of trade and the increased availability of dollars is to reduce tariffs. Another approach is to raise incomes. There is no doubt in my mind but that the latter is the healthier and the most effective approach. This is so in the first place because the rise of income and the resultant increase of imports tend to allocate the burden of our international responsibilities over the population and industries widely. A reduction of the tariff, however, tends to put the burden on the vulnerable industries which are generally the weak industries. Furthermore, it is quite clear from our economic history that in the 1930's, when we had both tariffs cuts and relatively small amount of income growth, the increase in trade was small; but in the 1950's, with the great increase of income and continued tariff reduction, the rise of imports was phenomenal. Therefore, above all what we need are sane domestic policies and continued income growth. This, much more than tariffs, will bring about the expansion of trade.

THE COMMON MARKET AND EUROPEAN RESPONSIBILITIES

In determining our trade policy, one problem we have to watch is to what extent should the United States make the adjustmetns and to what extent should foreigners make them. In the present discussion of the common market this becomes a matter of first-rate importance. There is a considerable fear that a result of the common market would be that, for example, Japanese exports would be largely excluded. One of the problems confronting the United States has stemmed from the fact that the Japanese have lost their major markets in Asia and therefore increased pressure has been put upon this country to absorb the Japanese exports. In the discussions under GATT when the United States made substantial concessions, European countries did not follow suit. Now with the common market there is a great danger that the pressure on the United States would increase even more to assume a disproportionate share of the adjustments. This particular problem should be closely watched.

THE RELATION OF TRADE POLICY AND OTHER GOVERNMENTAL POLICIES

Still another aspect of the distribution of burden revolves around the relationship of tariffs and other governmental policies. The whole theory of free trade was based on the general assumption that the Government does not interfere except to a minimum degree. Of course we all know now that the Government operates on almost every facet of our economic life. Therefore, it is important to consider tariff policy in relation to all the other interferences and to assume that each industry and region will have fair treatment from the Government, given all the policies.

In this connection we have to consider, for example, the flow of Treasury cash from one region to another, not on the assumption that each region will get back just exactly what it puts in. But we do need to know what the net effect of these flows is. We also want to know what the effect of farm policy is, for example, on the price of raw materials and foods and, therefore, on the demand for products that are produced from the raw materials. We also want to know what the effect of Federal policy is on mergers which tend to have an adverse effect on some regions and some industries. Where the net effect of Federal policies is adverse, as it is, for example, on the New England economy and on the textile industry, then to that extent the case for a more liberal treatment on tariff policy becomes greater. In other words, given the need of any trade policy whether it is a decline or an increase, and generally it would be a decline, the industry or region that suffers excessively from Federal intervention should be given special consideration.

THE TARIFF QUOTA

In the textile industry we have now had a tariff quota on woolens and worsteds, that is to say, beyond imports of more than 5 percent of domestic products the tariff is moved up from 25 to 45 percent. This is a technique that can be improved by establishing quotas over shorter periods and for particular types of fabrics in order to avoid excessive disruption of the industry. The case for the tariff quota rests on the assumption that if the industry or region is guaranteed against a flood of imports, by establishing a safeguard that if the tariff is reduced imports will not be increased beyond a certain amount, then the concessions in trade are more likely to be forthcoming. The quota is particularly effective where there are very large differences in wage rates that are not offset by substantial advantages in techniques and productivity in the United States. Where the wage differential is 10 or 12 to 1, this may be an important consideration. Here there is great fear of floods of imports. This does not mean that we believe that wages should be equalized. Obviously, if wages were equalized, you would have very little case for international trade at all. Where the wage differentials are very large and particularly where the pressure of exports to a particular segment of the American economy may be very serious, there is a case for dealing with the problem through

the tariff quota. Certainly the case is not a tenable one when the industry maintains its jobs. The case is, however, strong when the industry is losing jobs at a fairly substantial rate, and where these threats still prevail. We are not trying to suggest that tariffs should be increased because the foreigner is penetrating our market. So long as the domestic producers maintain their employment, I see no case for an increase in tariffs. It is when they are losing their jobs and imports contribute to this loss that special measures of this kind are required.

A WORD ABOUT NEW ENGLAND AND THE TEXTILE INDUSTRY

Of course textiles continue to lose ground. New England has lost more than one-half her jobs since the end of the war. In woolens and worsteds the losses have even been larger. Hence the special claim of the textile industry on those who administer our reciprocal-trade agreements.

New England in the last 10 years has enjoyed a suitable share of our flourishing national prosperity. Yet despite the growth of new industries and the rise of nonmanufacturing jobs, scattered pockets of unemployment stubbornly persist. The explanation for this inconsistency lies in New England's relatively large stake in slowly growing industries, or declining industries such as textiles.

Seven rapidly growing industries accounted for 50 percent of New England's manufacturing jobs, as opposed to 61 percent for the same industries nationwide. New England had 29 percent of her manufacturing jobs in 4 slowly growing industries; the Nation, 15 percent.

Textiles are still losing ground. On the basis of wages, prices, employment, output, or profits, textiles have consistently lost ground over the last decade, both absolutely and relatively. In view of the outstanding technological advances, the shrinkage in jobs is far more striking than the shrinkage in output.

In 1957 (November 1956 to November 1957), textile employment for the country declined by 6.2 percent and all manufacturing employment by 3.6 percent, as compared to 15.0 and 5.2 percent, respectively, in New England. And if the present recession becomes any sharper than those of 1948–49 and 1953–54, further textile losses may prove to be more disconcerting than in the past.

We therefore urge Congress, the administration, and our governors to act promptly and forcefully to preserve the textile industry from further misfortune. We commend the Federal Reserve for abandoning its tight money policy, which is especially costly to a struggling, small-unit industry like textiles. And, since textiles are affected by the health of the whole economy, we hope that the Federal Government will take all possible measures to halt the current recession.

A Deputy Par Excellence

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 5, 1958

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Wilkes-Barre Record of March 1, 1958, commenting on the retirement of Attorney G. Reuling Davis as deputy prothonotary of Luzerne County, Pa.:

A DEPUTY PAR EXCELLENCE

Retirement of G. Reuling Davis as deputy prothonotary after more than 7 years of service in that post calls for recognition of his contributions to the efficiency of that office. His ability was recognized during the tenure of Olin W. Evans, who retired in January and also by Allan W. Holman, who succeeded Mr. Evans as prothonotary.

Retention of Mr. Davis beyond retirement age was a natural consequence as was the statement by Mr. Holman, as he accepted the resignation of Mr. Davis, that "you could have continued here for the next 4 years if it had been your pleasure." No compliment more eloquent could have been paid an able and dependable aide who has all the qualifications of a principal in public office.

As well as could be expected of one who has shown that he is intent on remaining active, Mr. Davis is not retiring to a complete rest but will resume the practice of law.

He is primarily devoted to his profession, which he entered in 1918. Before he entered the prothonotary's office as deputy, he had served as a United States Commisisoner, and during World War I he was a member of a Wilkes-Barre city selective service board. He served for 7 years as a member, from 1942 to 1949, of the executive committee of the Wilkes-Barre Law and Library Association.

He has resided in Wilkes-Barre since the age of 1, or for a total of 69 years. He was born in Wilmore, Cambria County, which, incidentally, is the birthplace of former Chief Justice John Kephart of the Pennsylvania Supreme Court.

His father and uncle under the firm name of Davis Bros. conducted a chain of grocery stores in Wyoming Valley from Nanticoke to Wilkes-Barre. His father, Edward W. Davis, was vice president of the former Wyoming Valley Trust Co., and later a director of the Miners National Bank.

Time To Face Dairy Problems

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JACK WESTLAND
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 5, 1958

Mr. WESTLAND. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an editorial from the February 13, 1958, issue of the Snohomish County Tribune, a weekly newspaper published at Snohomish, Wash.

This editorial is another example of the deep concern being expressed, not only in Snohomish County, but also in the other counties of my district about proposed price support cuts and the need for a dairy self-help plan. In fact, the problems of the dairyman is of concern throughout the Nation.

I am sure that the Members of Congress also feel deep concern, and that they will soon come to grips with these problems.

Therefore, I once again urge early hearings on H. R. 9741, the self-help plan I introduced January 7.

The editorial follows:

TIME TO TAKE DAIRYING OUT OF POLITICS

With the approach of April 1, the date the United States Department of Agriculture proposes to cut dairy supports to 75 percent of parity, increasing talk about the so-called "self-help" plan for the dairy industry is being heard. More and more dairymen seem fed up with Government-established price supports, a situation in which a bureaucrat can deprive producers of $250 million in income with the scratch of a pen.

No matter which way the pen scratches, the huge dairy surplus remains. When support prices were high, the surplus was tremendous. With supports low, surpluses are still huge. There is no guarantee that cutting the supports even farther will solve the surplus problem.

In the January issue of Darigold, official magazine of the Snohomish County Dairymen's Association, Manager W. F. Penney has this to say:

"Should this (cut in supports) take place, the effect on the Puget Sound producer base price could be tragic. The lowering of supports itself could affect the Federal order formula price by 20 to 25 cents. * * * The base price could drop as much as 70 cents per hundred-weight."

Even Congressman JACK WESTLAND, who has backed Eisenhower administration policies for the past 5 years, balked at Ezra Benson's latest caper. In a recent communique, WESTLAND tells of appearing before the dairy subcommittee of the House Committee on Agriculture in favor of a bill to maintain milk supports at $3.50 per hundredweight.

"Based on visits to dairy farms in my district of Washington State and on the many letters I have received on this subject," WESTLAND writes, "it is clear to me these dairymen are waging a losing battle. These farmers work harder, but earn less than almost any other segment of agriculture. This has been the case while the Federal Government has attempted to regulate the dairy industry.

"However, until the time comes when a permanent producer-financed and operated (self-help) dairy stabilization and production-controlled program is established, interim price supports such as proposed by this and other bills are necessary," the Congressman testified.

WESTLAND has asked Agriculture Secretary Benson to withdraw or postpone his order to cut price supports until Congress can study and act on a self-help program. He adds he is confident the Secretary will carefully consider this suggestion. We hope he does, too.

Perhaps the threatened price cuts will serve a good end. Maybe the dairymen and their representatives will come to grips with the problem of surpluses and make an all-out move to take controls away from the Federal Government. If self-help legislation is passed this year, perhaps dairy farmers will actually owe Ezra a vote of thanks for bringing the situation to a head.

Who Is Subsidizing Whom?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALVIN M. BENTLEY
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 5, 1958

Mr. BENTLEY. Mr. Speaker, at the request of certain constituents of mine, and under leave to extend and revise my remarks, I wish to include the text of an editorial from the October 1957 issue of Capper's Farmer entitled "Who Is Subsidizing Whom?" The article in question indicates that the stability in the cost-of-living index between 1953 and 1956 was due to the drop in farm

prices over the same period while manufactured prices were rising.

The editorial follows:

WHO IS SUBSIDIZING WHOM?

Since the Korean war, farmers have been taking it on the chin nobly in order to make inflation easier to live with for American consumers.

The income cut that farmers have taken since 1951 has been, in effect, a subsidy to the consumer.

While farm prices have gone down, cost of living has been going up. But consumers got their food and clothing at about the same price from 1951 through 1956.

These two essentials—food and clothing—have offset other cost-of-living items. They have served to hold the whole inflation spiral in check.

Taking into account some improvement in the last 18 months, farm prices have declined 22 percent since the Korean conflict. But had farm commodity prices gone up instead—and at the same rate as other cost-of-living items—food and clothing now would be 15 percent higher, USDA economists figure.

That's not all. If farm prices had gone up, labor, transportation, and other marketing costs would have followed suit.

Net result over the 1951–56 period would have been a really whopping burden for American consumers. Some $70 billion at least, say USDA economists.

Thus, your sacrifices have meant a fantastic saving in America's food and clothing budget since 1951. This isn't necessarily news, but publicity for the big role you have played in checking inflation needs headlining.

Many critics of agriculture have spent much time and money denouncing farm price supports. You have been lashed repeatedly for accepting subsidies.

But let's compare figures. Since 1951, price support programs have cost American taxpayers $3.5 billion. That is the difference between what commodities cost the Government and what they sold for.

But you have saved those same taxpayers some $70 billion.

Put these same figures on a per capita basis and they become even more startling.

While our whole population of 170 million has been absorbing a $3.5 billion farm-price subsidy, the farm population of only 22 million has been saving American consumers $70 billion.

That's why Capper's Farmer asks: Who is subsidizing whom?

Not only has the farmer helped hold down the cost of food with his cut in income; he also has absorbed a part of the increase in the Nation's food-marketing bill.

This food-marketing bill—the costs between the farm and the consumer—went up $6 billion from 1951 to 1956. (The bill would have increased more had farm prices gone up.) But those costs were not all passed on to the consumer. The farmer picked up a chunk of it with a $2.6 billion cut in his net income.

Farmers haven't enjoyed the beating their pocketbooks have taken while other income has followed the inflation spiral upward. But by belt tightening they have eased the Nation's financial headache.

The Nation's economy has maintained strength because farm prices haven't followed the general trend upward, economists say.

Congressman WRIGHT PATMAN, chairman of the Joint Congressional Economic Committee, during this session, asked William McChesney Martin, Jr., chairman of the Federal Reserve Board, whether it would be "ruinous" if farm prices went up as much as other prices. Martin replied: "It's certainly something we don't want to contemplate."

Before the same committee, this question was put to Oris Wells, top USDA economist: "The stable prices (between 1951 and 1956) in other words were at the cost of the farmer?"

Wells replied: "Certainly. If we had not had falling farm prices, the price level would not have been stable."

Again, before the House Banking and Currency Committee, Chairman Martin of the Federal Reserve Board said: "The great shame to me * * * was that we kept stability in the dollar from 1953 to the early part of 1956 by a decline in farm prices, which was being offset by a rise in manufactured prices.

"In other words, the stability was not balanced. It was farm products going down, manufactured products going up, and the net result being stability."

And now, rising food prices—what the Nation's economists have been dreading—have begun.

Ewan Clague, Chief of the Bureau of Labor Statistics, which puts out the cost-of-living index, says:

"In 1956 the major change in the cost-of-living index, and the reason we moved away from stability, was that food prices no longer helped us. For 4 years food prices declined, and that offset rises in rents and services and other factors on the industrial side. Then in 1956, food prices turned around and joined the others, so our index went up."

Labor is set for another round of wage increases. Many union contracts call for wage increases as the cost of living goes up. Industrial prices definitely are going higher. Interest rates are rising.

But what about farm prices? Is it fair that agriculture, because it is unorganized and without bargaining power, should bear all the sacrifice of combating inflation? Why is the Government asking for permission to drop farm price supports still lower? Is that the only way to halt the inflation spiral? Your Congressman and Senator are now home. Ask them these questions.

The Christmas I Remember

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 5, 1958

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, the moving story, told by Msgr. John Patrick Carroll-Abbing, of his dream of a home for boys which finally became a reality when he founded the Boys' Towns of Italy, is one worth reading.

Having had the privilege of knowing Monsignor Carrol-Abbing, one does not wonder that today many of the once homeless youth of Italy are safely sheltered in the Boys' Towns of Italy.

On a recent trip through Italy, I had the pleasure of meeting some of these boys. They expressed in simple but beautiful language the gratitude they feel for the people of the United States who did so much in helping to make Monsignor Carroll-Abbing's dream of Boys' Towns of Italy a reality. Under leave to extend my remarks, I include herein The Christmas I Remember:

THE CHRISTMAS I REMEMBER

(By Msgr. John Patrick Carroll-Abbing)

(NOTE.—It was Christmas Eve, 1944, in Naples and the "patter of little feet" in the dark was a sound to dread. In today's installment of The Christmas I Remember, Msgr. John Patrick Carroll-Abbing tells how he took the dread out of that sound and brought realization to the dreams of thousands then huddled under rags.)

It was Christmas Eve, 1944. Naples was shrouded in fast-approaching darkness. On the docks activity had ceased. The long lean liberty ships could be seen only as dark masses etched against the sky.

As I walked through the deserted streets I heard a clatter of feet behind me. A boy ran past, a typical scugnizzo, his rags flapping about him; then another panting child, then two more and finally a smaller boy, his eyes starting from his head, blood trickling down his cheek. The boys melted into the shadows, the pattering of their feet died away. Silence once more.

Who were they? What had they done? Where had they come from?

They were the children of the war. Did it matter whether only a year before one of them had lived with his mother in the sheltered protection of his little cottage home in the mountains; that another one had followed the allied armies from Sicily; that another had lived in a little country town near Salerno?

These were things of the past; now their homes were destroyed, their mothers dead, their fathers prisoners of war. They were an insignificant part of the vast army of homeless children, marching the roads of Italy, infesting the port cities, seeking but one thing: to ward off starvation.

The day before, I had been in the little town of Fondi; the dismayed villagers had told us of the gangs of youngsters who passed by. "Every day they come through on their way to Rome, whole groups of them." Cynical, tough—even the smallest of them—they were a social menace.

I walked up the hill, stepping off the sidewalk every now and then to avoid treading on the youngsters huddled together in sleep with a sack and old rags pulled over them.

After supper I sat beside the blazing fire with the United States Army colonel attached to the AMG and the captain of the port police whose guest I was and we talked of the events of the day.

The captain spoke of the gasoline drums that had been found floating in the bay. "We discovered that the kids were riding them down the sewers into the port. Until then we hadn't been able to understand how they were getting past the sentries at the gates."

The colonel was opening a package from home: a box of candy, a woolen sweater and a letter. He pointed to the kisses scribbled at the end. "My kids," he said.

We looked into the fire. It was Christmas: the feast of a child who was born in a stable. The angels were singing: "glory to God in the highest and peace on earth to men of good will." All over the world men were killing each other and children with no mother's love to warm them were sleeping out in the cold.

"What is a little Irishman doing in Italy if he can't solve a tiny problem like this?" It was the colonel, gruff and polemic as he usually was when he was deeply moved.

As I lay in bed and looked up at the painted canvas ceiling which billowed and flapped in the darkness, I thought that the colonel was right: What were any of us doing in the world if we could not try, each one in his own little way, to do something for the children who had no one to love them?

Did I dream that night? If I did I certainly did not dream that out of the little organization, that I started soon after to feed and clothe the street boys, would grow the nine beautiful Boys' Towns of Italy. I did not dream that it would be the men and women of the United States without distinction of national origin or creed who would make this possible and so give to thousands of children across the seas love, care, hope and a new chance in life.

Eugene L. Preston

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. W. R. HULL, JR.
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 5, 1958

Mr. HULL. Mr. Speaker, a great newspaperman—one of the old aggressive school of American journalism—passed away February 22. He was Eugene L. Preston of the Liberty Advance and the Liberty Tribune in Clay County, Mo.

Gene Preston was a grand person. I am proud to have been numbered among his legion of friends across Missouri and the Nation.

The Liberty Tribune on February 27 carried an article on the funeral rites of Gene Preston and under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include parts of this article:

Eugene Lyman Preston, 66 years of age, and for the past 15 years, news editor of the Liberty Tribune, and the Liberty Advance, died Saturday afternoon at the Kansas City Osteopathic Hospital. His condition had become critical 2 weeks before his death.

The many persons who came to pay their respects filled the auditorium of the Liberty Methodist Church for the final funeral rites on Monday afternoon. And many accompanied the body to Fairview Cemetery for the burial.

The Reverend Gregory Poole, pastor of the Methodist Church, read first the 23d Psalm and closed with the words of Jesus as He speaks to all who follow after Him, as well as the words of St. Paul.

Following the Scripture, Mrs. J. F. McGuire sang Take My Hand, Precious Lord, accompanied on the organ by Russell Aubrey.

The Reverend Poole's message follows:

"We come this afternoon to a time when we remember endings and beginnings. We stand at the close of a very useful earthly life. One whom we love and one who served his community well has passed from our midst. When we look back over his life, we can see that it is one of service to the communities in which we lived.

"The newspaper editor plays a unique role in the life of his community. The community looks to him to be its historian, it looks to him to be its chief scribe; it looks to him to be the defender of that which is right; and it also looks to him to be the prophet of the community's future. This is an exacting task. It requires both determination and discrimination. The one whom we commemorate today possessed both of those virtues.

"Thus, we come to the close of the lifetime of this loved one, and yet as we come to this time, we some way realize that there are some things over which death has no power. We think of all this man did for the community of which he was a part, the pleasant memories, the friends he made. These are things which death cannot destroy. Mainly, when we come to consider it, these things are Gene's greatest memorial and we can be thankful for them. But let us not forget that this is also a time of beginnings. Our loved one has passed on into a new era of life. The problems, the difficulties, the sorrows, and the suffering are over. A new life has begun.

"I would have us remember this, and perhaps it shall be a ministry to our hearts in this hour: Jesus said, 'I will not leave you comfortless; I will come to you; I will send you a comforter.' Perhaps in meditating on this fact, that what we call a closing of a life is also a beginning of a life, God will be that comforter for our hearts. Jesus also said, 'In my Father's house are many mansions.' These are literally the wonderful words of life. There is power in these words.

"We are mourning here today. Why are we mourning? We are mourning not so much for one that has gone from us. We are mourning our own loss, are we not? We are mourning because we are being separated for a while from one we love, and yet in all our sorrow there is no bitterness, there is no doubt that we shall see him again. This is the sense of new beginnings that each of us posseases this afternoon. True, an earthly life has come to a close, but a new life has begun.

"Beyond our sorrow there is the comfort of eternity. Beyond both life and death there is God. Beyond this earthly ending there is a new beginning. Perhaps in meditating upon these things we shall find strength needful for the facing of this and every hour of sorrow."

Floating in the Gloating

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SIDNEY R. YATES
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 5, 1958

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article entitled "Floating in the Gloating," by Leo A. Lerner:

I was sitting around the house reading the Fuller Brush magazine, which is a patriotic thing to do because it is an unembellished catalog of our superior standard of living, when gloating began to float in.

We had launched our own sputnik, modestly named Explorer, though perhaps it should have at least been called Explorelei, or Explorecutie, or something, with a nik equivalent to suggest the affectionate diminutive. And having launched our own sputnik, the sky was the limit for headline braggadocio and radio announcers out of breath with the wonder of it.

I was pleased, too, because a start is a start, but I wondered if all that crowing was wise. In a way, the fact that both sides have thrust power capable of sending earth satellites into the orbit merely meant that in case of war we could destroy each other, and the outcome might merely depend on which one did the biggest job of destruction first.

In all the floating and gloating that was done, nobody mentioned that the end of sober thought might mean the resumption of brag and bluster that could lead to war.

Most of the gloating had the strong tinge of politics to it and was mostly bunk. TRB, writing a week ago in the New Republic (on weekdays he is a respected reporter for the Christian Science Monitor) said that the Republican politicians were waiting for the launching of the first United States satellite like kids waiting for Christmas.

"They can hardly think, dream or talk about anything else. Radio and TV scripts for Congressmen are already canned and waiting to be released locally simultaneously with the American sputnik. Glowing interviews are ready for S-day. Republicans are grimly determined to give it the biggest celebration Madison Avenue ever prepared."

"Get the satellite up there and the heat will be off" was the motto; so that our Army pencil, 6 inches in diameter and 80 inches long, is writing in the sky, "No more urgency. No more worry about education and defense. The eggheads, now that they have produced a sputnik, had better be scrambled. We've stood them for 114 days too long."

Although Ike and the Congressmen came through with all the quotes as planned, it was the newspapers themselves that did the oddest gloating job. The stories didn't match the headlines. You had to dig into the 8-point type to find out that Dr. Wernher von Braun, the former Nazi missile expert who now heads our Army program, said that the Explorer is a rival in spirit only to sputnik, and that if we should develop a rate of progress, in speed to accomplishment, to that of the Russians, it would take at least 5 years to overtake them.

Von Braun called that fact a frightening thing, and yet no headline said: "Our Moon Up, but We're Still 5 Years Behind." That was too much to expect, perhaps, from a hopped-up newspaper community more anxious to play domestic politics than to tell the truth.

Politicians believe in running scared in a political campaign, but they are cheerful about deceiving the people into not running scared where our national safety is involved.

In this situation, politics is the Achilles heel of American power, but it always has been under all administrations.

Things are getting too serious for local politics to control foreign policy, but that's the way the sputnik bounces.

On Sunday I searched the newspapers for one fact that established the headline "United States Moon Signals Data on Mysteries of Space," but there were no facts to back up that headline, although there was much body matter to the news stories.

Whatever we find out about meteoric dust from our sputnik, there remains a need for serious housekeeping. The educational system must be rethought and revised, the military budget must be big and bold enough, the people should be made more aware of the situation (as an instrument of intelligent foreign policy) and the dangers of our weakening economy should be openly discussed as a secret weapon of the enemy.

We need what George Kennan calls social health.

The new satellite entitles us to a small hurrah, but there is work to do.

I was amused at the statement of Harlow Curtice, president of General Motors, that a tax cut would be the most help to the American economy. This is bringing forth a mouse. What he needs (and we need) is more people buying Chevrolets and Oldsmobiles and Fords, and the way to do that is not to cut taxes, but to find ways to restore our productive capacity and get people jobs.

Under the circumstances we should be willing to spend more, not less, to save our way of life. As welcome as the launching of the Explorer may be, it complicates the fight against complacency and national smugness.

Tribute to the Organized Labor Movement in St. Joseph, Mo.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. W. R. HULL, JR.
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 5, 1958

Mr. HULL. Mr. Speaker, the St. Joseph News-Press recently paid a wonderful tribute to the organized labor movement in St. Joseph, Mo., which I believe is richly merited.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include in its entirety an editorial from the News-Press of February 24:

LABOR FOR THE BONDS

St. Joseph is proud of its organized labor. It is proud of its No. 1 man in organized labor. That man is Warren Welsh, president of St. Joseph Labor Council. It is proud of labor's newspaper organ, the St. Joseph Union Observer.

With that preamble let us ask that you who maybe are not in union labor and do not see the Union Observer, read this page here today. For on this page of the News-Press is reprinted an editorial that appeared in the last issue of the Union Observer. It carries this caption: "The Bonds Are a Must."

The Union Observer is presided over by two men whose own contributions to civic progress are not unknown. The publisher is Warren Adams, a former police commissioner. The editor is Carl Castel, also a former police commissioner. This is only one of their many public contributions.

The editors of the News-Press and Gazette have watched organized labor down the years. And remember this, this man Warren Welsh has been the dominant factor in organized labor for considerably more than a quarter of a century. No body of men and women ever had a more loyal, hard-hitting, strictly honest champion.

It may be taken for granted that the editorial views of Publisher Adams and Editor Castel reflect the views of president and coordinator Warren Welsh. We know they do. We suggest that whether you subscribe to the Union Observer (and already have read that editorial) or whether you are not familiar with the paper, please read or reread The Bonds Are a Must.

This Union Observer expression, we editors up on the hill on Edmond think, is organized labor speaking at its very best. We are proud of you Warren and Carl, of the fourth estate and you Warren W. But the line you have taken fits the pattern of what we have known of you these long years. That is one of the reasons union labor is so respected in this city of St. Joseph today.

Eligibility for Social-Security Benefits

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL A. FINO
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 5, 1958

Mr. FINO. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing a bill today to allow a widow who is under disability to receive social-security benefits at age 50. The present law requires that, for a widow to be eligible for benefits, she must either be age 62 or the mother of a child who is entitled to benefits under the act. This means that the widow of an insured individual receives payments during the time her children are growing up, which stop when the youngest child reaches age 18, except in the case of a disabled child. She must then wait until she reaches age 62 before being eligible for further benefits.

I think that an excellent argument can be made against this policy, based upon recent studies which have disclosed the many difficulties a person over 40 encounters when he seeks employment. A widow who has spent her youth in raising children, who attempts to enter the labor market must find added difficulties over and above those encountered by the average worker of middle or advanced age with a record of past employment. For in the great majority of cases, she lacks the experience and background necessary to qualify her for a decent job.

If this is so in the case of a widow in good health, who given the opportunity, is able to support herself, what is the plight of a widow who is physically unable to undertake gainful employment? My bill is limited to the latter class, that is widows who are disabled as that term is defined in the act and administered by the Social Security Administration—which, by the way, is a strict definition, rather stringently applied.

Mr. Speaker, as I see it, one of three fates must befall such a person. First she may be fortunate enough to have an independent source of income, sufficient to supply her needs. If she is not so fortunate, however, as most widows are not, she had the unenviable choice of becoming either a burden upon her children or whatever other family she may have, or she will become a public charge. I see no reason why a widow in such circumstances must be forced to wait until she is 62 years old before she is eligible for social-security benefits. The interim between the time when her mother's benefits close, or if she was not entitled to a mother's benefits the time at which she became a widow, and the time she reaches age 62, has been aptly described as the "valley of despair."

The 1956 amendments to the Social Security Act provided for the granting of benefits to disabled workers at age 50 and for disabled children over age 18. I suggest that it is high time we took similar action in the interest of disabled widows, who find themselves in equally distressing circumstances.

Community Action in the West

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES O. PORTER
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 5, 1958

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the March 1958 issue of Sunset magazine, a publication devoted to western living. It tells how alert citizens of Springfield, Oreg., a city in my district, enthusiastically took up a tree planting proposal from Mr. Clayton Anderson, superintendent of the Willamalane Park and Recreation District—which includes Springfield within its area.

Last year, 731 street trees were planted. The project is now planned as an annual event in which resident and businessman join hands.

The article follows:

NEW TREES WILL BE BLOOMING IN SPRINGFIELD

When spring comes to Oregon this year, the streets of Springfield will be brightened by the blossoms of hundreds of young trees that never bloomed there before. To the many Springfield citizens that have joined hands to beautify their city, the display will be a special reward. Spring will also bring a renewal of the community planting project that was responsible for the new trees, a project so successful last year that it is now planned as an annual event.

Since World War II Springfield has experienced the increasingly rapid growth typical of many western towns. Her population has more than tripled in less than 10 years, to a present total of more than 10,000. To meet the demand for houses, entire neighborhoods mushroomed on open farmland, or on land skinned of its native growth by mass-production building methods. Lawns and flowers helped to soften the raw look of these subdivisions. But the new areas sorely needed trees—for the landscape value to each home, for summer shade, most of all for the appearance of permanence and the blending with established residential districts that only trees can give. Although Springfield's tree-planting plans were aimed at the whole town, the response was greatest in the newer areas.

The tree-planting proposal came from Clayton Anderson, superintendent of the Willamalane Park and Recreation District which includes Springfield within its area. (For a report on how to organize a public park and recreation district, see the April 1957 Sunset). He suggested to the Willamalane Recretation Council that they appoint a five-member, permanent "More Beautiful Springfield" committee, and that its first objective be street tree planting. Thus a volunteer committee became the sparkplug that activated the project.

To enlist and encourage neighborhood participation, the committee decided it should recommend desirable trees for street planting, and then help obtain them at the lowest possible price through quantity purchase, underwriting a part of the cost. The committee also offered to assist in planting the trees, and to furnish guidance in their later care.

Participating homeowners were asked to pay $1.50 for each tree (average height, 6 feet), and to plant and care for their trees under the supervision of the committee.

The project was launched by a brief fund-raising campaign, not only to provide the committee with money for operating expenses, but also to acquaint the public with the plan. A garden club volunteered to sell 50-cent buttons to individuals, $5 stickers to business firms; and in a 2-hour period in downtown Springfield the members raised nearly $200, a substantial part of the fund.

Newspaper stories helped enlist the cooperation of neighborhoods. Wherever people indicated an interest, committee members spoke at block meetings. They had obtained lists of street trees recommended by the University of Oregon and approved by the Springfield and Lane County planning commissions. The speakers showed color slides of street trees (both good and bad examples), and demonstrated that such things as setback laws and utility lines are factors in selecting types of trees. The goal was one-half block to 1 block uniformity in species of trees planting along the streetsides.

After a general discussion, a neighborhood leader was chosen to contact everyone in his block, take orders for trees, and collect the money. By offering trees at a below-retail price, as well as through its official recommendations, the committee exercised considerable control over the kinds of trees planted. Not every family in every block bought a tree, but the planting was completed wherever a majority of the block's residents wanted it.

A Springfield nurseryman furnished the trees at special rates and acted as planting consultant.

March 23, a Saturday, was citywide tree-planting day. The day before, 650 holes were dug by machine at designated spots; 3 stout stakes for guying each tree were de-

posited by each hole; and the trees were delivered. Stakes were donated by a lumber company.

With each tree came a mimeographed sheet of planting instructions in simple step-by-step form. In addition, committee members, garden club members, and participating nurserymen roamed the blocks, helping wherever needed.

Most of the trees planted were the flowering ornamental types: cherries, plums, crabapples, and hawthornes. Others were sweet gum, European white birch, pin oak, scarlet oak, and London plane.

Altogether, 731 trees went into the ground that day. And this year, the enthusiastic committee promises, there'll be lots more.

U. S. S. "Enterprise"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BOB WILSON
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 5, 1958

Mr. WILSON of California. Mr. Speaker, those of us who have followed the career of the famous World War II aircraft carrier, the U. S. S. *Enterprise*, were thrilled recently by the announcement that the new nuclear powered carrier will be named the Enterprise in honor of the Big E which at one time was the main protective shield against the Japanese in the war in the Pacific. She was Adm. Bull Halsey's flagship and has recently been relegated to the boneyard, despite the effort of the Enterprise Association headed by Bill Rubin which attempted to raise funds to keep her afloat.

A recent tribute to the *Enterprise* appeared in the San Diego Evening Tribune in a column by Neil Morgan who won the Ernie Pyle award in 1957. Under unanimous consent, I include this column as a portion of my remarks:

CROSSTOWN WITH NEIL MORGAN

NEW YORK.—There is a kinship between death and sentiment, one which I do not care to examine too closely. But it was in the room with us all day yesterday, and it was dressed in pride.

The morning began when a tired, pale man in a tweed suit walked into the big 15th floor office at Third Naval District Headquarters, near the downtown tip of Manhattan.

We came to our feet naturally—a pair of admirals, a commander with the shoulder braid of a naval aide, two civilians who had been enlisted men when the man in the tweeds was the top man on their ocean and a newspaperman. The newspaperman was just there for the funeral.

The tired man shook hands all around and sat behind the big desk and read a statement. The carrier *Enterprise* had been his flagship, not quite two decades ago.

For a while, the *Enterprise* was the only carrier between America and the Japanese. Its pilots had shot down almost a thousand enemy planes, sunk 71 ships, and probably sunk or severely damaged another 192 ships.

His statement admitted that he was old, and sick, and that he loved the ship, but that younger men with more steam in their boilers would have to do the work now.

So Fleet Adm. William F. Halsey assigned to others in the room the goal he had sought—to save the ship he loved from the scrap dealer's torch. It was a battle Halsey and the other *Enterprise* sailors had fought since the Navy announced plans to junk the gallant ship.

But sentiment like this costs money of the seven-figure kind. If the *Enterprise* was to become a naval shrine, with schoolchildren tramping curiously over its flight deck, Halsey and these other men had to raise the money.

And the admiral in the tweeds had tried for months, and now he admitted he was surprised that the country had not understood. The money had not come in. His ship, he knew, could not be saved. But he said that if the younger boys would keep trying, he would help all he could.

That was the start of the funeral.

The other men are not, men you would accure of sentiment, if you did not know. One is a New York City insurance adjuster. Another, Bill Rubin, of San Diego, the president of the Enterprise Association, sells newspapers and operates a string of stores. A third is director of athletics at the University of Pittsburgh.

The funeral was not an easy one. The day wore on into darkness as the men who loved their ship sought a way to save her. They called the Pentagon. Another admiral said there was a good chance the Navy would call a nuclear-powered carrier by the name of *Enterprise*, if these men and the other thousands of *Enterprise* veterans thought well of the idea.

Reporters came and went, stenographers typed and retyped drafts of hopeful statements; porters brought sandwiches and coffee, because no one left the room for lunch.

Finally, the old man in the tweeds shook hands all around, his eyes lingering fondly on each face.

"I'm sorry, boys," he said.

The others talked for a while. On their way uptown, they took an impetuous detour by the naval shipyard in Brooklyn to see their ship again. It was battered and scarred, still, and the scars brought memories.

And the memories brought the sentiment that bring tears to the eyes of men.

Prevailing Wages for Federal Highways

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 6, 1958

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include a very interesting letter written to the United States Department of Labor by the president and business manager, James R. J. MacDonald, of the Hoisting and Portable, Power Shovel and Dredge Engineers, Local 4 and Its Branches, I. U. of O. E., Boston, Mass.:

HOISTING AND PORTABLE,
POWER SHOVEL AND DREDGE ENGINEERS,
LOCAL 4 AND ITS BRANCHES, I. U. OF O. E.,
February 3, 1958.

Mr. STUART ROTHMAN,
United States Department of Labor,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: In the January 23, 1958, issue of the Engineering News-Record, on page 114, is an article captioned "Prevailing Wages for Federal Highways."

In commenting on the prevailing wage feature of the Davis-Bacon Act being extended to the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1956, the article quotes you as saying the Davis-Bacon Act has been "a stabilizing influence in the construction industry" and a "bulwark of protection for the working man against substandard wages."

This is a ringing endorsement of the Davis-Bacon Act and was in truth the purpose of its enactment. But, as sometimes happens, the purpose and intent of a law is nullified or distorted by the administration of the law.

Let us take a case in point. I refer to the rates of wages predetermined for Federal-aid highway construction in Washington County in the State of Maine. Underway at the Dow Airfield in Washington County for the past couple of years has been a job of considerable magnitude. The rate predetermined for the job for crane and shovel operators is $3.40 per hour. J. R. Cianchette Co., of Pittsfield, Maine, is the general contractor. Recently, adjoining the Dow Airfield, a contract for the construction of 2¾ miles of divided, limited-access highway under the Federal-aid highway program was awarded to the J. R. Cianchette Co., for approximately $2,750,000. The rate of wages for crane and shovel operators on this job, as predetermined by your Department, is $1.75 and $2.25 an hour, depending upon the size of the machine.

This means that the same man operating the same machine for the same contractor takes a cut in wages of as much as $1.65 an hour when the machine is moved from Dow Airfield to the road job. If the rate of $3.40 per hour represented a "bulwark of protection for the working man against substandard wages," then the United States Government, through its Department of Labor, has by a stroke of the pen condemned the man to a substandard wage and substandard living.

The article, in describing how rates are established, contains several quotes that I assume are taken from the Federal-Aid Highway Act. The article says, "'similar construction' is taken to mean highways or 'construction most similar to interstate highway construction' and is not regarded as having effected any substantial change in previously existing wage-determination procedure." It further states: "'Immediate locality' is considered a flexible term. Mr. Rothman has said the area is not necessarily a political subdivision." And again, "the rule of reason has been used in interpretation."

In view of the above, it is interesting to note how the Department of Labor was persuaded to establish the rates it has established in Washington County for highway construction. With the advent of the Federal-Aid Highway Act, nonunion contractors in the State of Maine set about to devise a way to break down the rate of wages the Department of Labor had previously recognized. It took some skilled maneuvering, but they were able to do it.

The Department of Labor had previously set up wages for three classifications of construction, marine construction, building construction, and heavy and highway construction. First, of course, it was necessary to divorce highway from heavy construction, since obviously your Department could hardly ignore rates it had already predetermined under heavy and highway construction. Thus, by establishing a fourth classification, highway construction, the way was open to stabilizing this segment of construction for the nonunion contractors.

But even then it was necessary to convince the Department of Labor that the rates it had recognized previously were not proper rates for the new classification. Now, quite obviously, if Maine was considered as a whole, and the yardstick used for determining rates for the Federal aid highway program was that paid on similar construction and construction most similar to interstate highway construction, then the rule of reason would prevail, and very probably the rates established by the Department of Labor would be the rates paid by union contractors who had done by far the great bulk of such work, and the hoped-for stabilizing influence would not come about. So by convincing the

Department of Labor that rates should be set up by counties, it was possible to segmentize the State and ignore the practicalities of major highway construction.

Let us get back to Washington County, where I started. I would like very much to know where and when in the immediate locality any construction most similar to interstate highway construction has taken place; that is, that compares to the contract recently awarded the J. R. Cianchette Co. Yet to determine the rates for this job, the Department of Labor accepted as valid those rates being paid by small contractors in the county. This type of contractor generally owns 1, 2, or 3 small pieces of excavating equipment, which not unusually, he and his family operate. I say it is grossly unfair to set a standard of wages by this type of contractor. There is about as much relationship between this small-type of contractor and a major highway contractor as there is between a border skirmish and a full-scale war.

But a mere handful of nonunion contractors have succeeded in establishing their much-desired stabilizing influence. The little contractor, who was used to establish the rates and the union contractor who was ignored, are both out of the picture; the first through the simple lack of earth-moving muscle and money, and the latter because he is committed to paying wages he has always paid in Maine, and recognizing a bulwark of protection for the workingman against substandard wages.

As the president of a union which represents more than 500 men in the State of Maine, I protest against this discrimination. I ask you to apply the "rule of reason." I ask the Department of Labor to check the rates paid on the construction of the Maine Turnpike. I ask for a flexible interpretation of "immediate locality," so that "construction most similar to interstate highway construction" will be taken in its true meaning and will thus not result in any substantial change in previously existing wage determination procedure.

Very truly yours,

JAMES R. J. MACDONALD,
President and Business Manager.

The "Little" Businessman

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN H. DENT
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 3, 1958

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix to the RECORD, I include the following editorial from Alan G. Nichols, publisher, Pittsburgh Sun-Telegraph, in answer to an open letter of inquiry from a businessman.

I agree with the editorial in all its concepts. The feeling of confidence and faith is only one of the ingredients we need to whip the enemy, or the recession, depression or whatever name hard and sordid times may be called.

With this display of courage and optimism I suggest a little realism in the form of substantive amendments to the social security law, lowering the age limits, increasing the payments and a greater coverage under unemployment compensation with longer pay periods. Coupled with this, I would push some of the already federally approved public-works programs, schools, roads, and public buildings, post offices, hospitals, and so forth.

Thus a good dose of courage backed with confidence in both ourselves and our institutions and away we will go together.

Congress can and will help. The newspapers can and will help; the people can and will help. There is no good sound reason for a depression, all that can cause one is narrow, selfish, partisan thinking. The time has passed for self-seekers. Let us do it as a team.

Public works, public press, and public spirit can keep the ball rolling in the right direction:

A "LITTLE" BUSINESSMAN WRITES THE EDITOR

Mr. ALAN G. NICHOLAS,
Publisher, the Pittsburgh Sun-Telegraph, Pittsburgh, Pa.

DEAR MR. NICHOLAS: I am a "little" businessman. I have been in business for 17 years, in the same Squirrel Hill location on Hobart Street near Wightman Street. For a year my wife and I, who work long and hard hours in our store, planned to move next door into a larger location and open a "superette" market, the first of its kind in Squirrel Hill. A few weeks ago, I finally took the first steps and started ordering new show cases and fixtures, etc. I put an ad in your paper for another clerk or two and have the people I want to hire. Since I have started this expansion plan, I have read in the papers and heard on radio and TV so much about a recession and unemployment. I am wondering, Mr. Nicholas, whether I am doing the right thing in going ahead with my plans? I'd like the advice of a man in your position, if I may impose upon you?

HARRY A. LIPTZ.

THE EDITOR ANSWERS

The letter you sent, Mr. Liptz, made me ponder long. While I feel honored and pleased that you should ask my advice, the answer to your question includes a grave responsibility. And yet, there is only one way I can answer your question.

Your position as a small-business man is very similar to those of us in business of larger scope, employing hundreds or thousands of people.

To ignore the fact that there has been a deflection in business in various fields or sections of the country would be like the ostrich hiding in the sand.

To say that the effect created by this deflection is an alarming one would not be the truth either. Fortunately, the deflections have been comparatively slight and spasmodic and there are many signs in the making which paint a much brighter picture. What the future holds, none of us know.

However, here are the truths and standards by which I will try to answer your question.

This great country of ours has faced far, far greater crises. We have never overcome these crises with fear and hesitation. Rather, our country has been built by fearless men—men who staked their lives, their reputations, their futures on faith in America and that it would grow and prosper.

The present situation calls for a renewal of such faith and confidence that this country will continue to grow and prosper.

Men in businesses of all kinds, regardless of their size, must carry on this richly endowed heritage. Specific action on the part of management and labor, Government and civic leadership can bring about the prosperity which is possible and rightly ours.

Such action calls for the dusting of shelved plans for the expansion of plants and factories; cooperation on the part of labor and Government; encouragement of building by the easing of financing; development and promotion of new products; encouragement of research and scientific discoveries.

These and many more developments will create the activity and employment necessary to put the country on the upward swing again.

Most of all, the feeling of pessimism must be erased.

In its place, there must permeate a feeling of confidence throughout the land. And this feeling will come much quicker when businesses everywhere look up. For if we are to go up in sales and employment and building and expansion, we have to think and work in that direction.

That goes for you, Mr. Liptz, and for all of us.

Go on with your new venture, and the best of luck to you. We know you will make a success of it.

We urge others—in large and small businesses everywhere to move forward with faith and with confidence.

And as for the Pittsburgh Sun-Telegraph which is going forward in its own field, we make this pledge:

The pages of this great newspaper will be devoted to encouraging all businesses in moving into this upward swing of expansion and fuller employment. Let Pittsburgh start it for the whole country for we know the people here have the faith and confidence necessary to carry on successfully.

ALAN G. NICHOLAS,
Publisher, Pittsburgh Sun-Telegraph.

The Regulatory Agencies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE S. McGOVERN
OF SOUTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 4, 1958

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, the attention of the entire Nation has been focused currently on the important regulatory agencies of the Federal Government. Such attention is in itself valuable insofar as it awakens the American people to the vital role which these agencies play in our governing process. The current investigation and publicity centered on the agencies will be of much greater valued, however, if permanent corrective measures are taken to make the regulatory agencies better able to do their work in the public interest.

Our able colleague from Arizona, Representative STEWART L. UDALL, has stated the basic problem of the agencies so clearly in his newsletter of March 6, that I have asked for permission to include his statement in the RECORD as follows:

REGULATORY AGENCIES: COURTS OR FORUMS OF "INFLUENCE"?

If the current investigation of the important Federal regulatory boards and commissions serves only to attract wide public attention to the vast power held by these agencies a worthwhile purpose will have been served.

And if it results in adoption of new procedures which preclude the use of influence by either high administration figures, Members of Congress, or the industries which are supposed to be regulated we might be well on the way toward correcting a situation in which abuses are practically inevitable.

Millions of dollars hang on many of the decisions of such regulatory bodies as the Federal Communications Commission (which has authority over licensing of television stations), the Civil Aeronautics Board (which decides matters affecting airlines) and the Federal Power Commission which, for example, will decide who—if anyone—will build Bridge Canyon Dam in northern Arizona.

These agencies, which have the power of life and death over the industries they regulate, exercise enormous powers. One historian has suggested that, in terms of decisions which count most in the day-to-day life of Americans, these exert more power than either Congress, the President, or the Supreme Court.

Yet, though they are quasi-judicial bodies, in many ways they are not run like courts. Whoever heard, for example, of the judge in an Arizona Superior Court being loaned money by one of the parties in a major civil suit being tried before him? Or, for that matter, of being wined and dined at the expense of a litigant in an undecided matter?

Pursuing it further, whoever heard of a legislator interceding with a judge on a case involving a vital public policy?

And yet, not only are the Federal agencies operated in such a way as to encourage these questionable activities, but constituents frequently call on Members of Congress to intervene for them simply because that is the way things are done under present laws and practices.

The Service to Phoenix case last year provides a good example. The question before the CAB was which airline or airlines would best provide the service needed by Phoenix—and the rest of the State. In keeping with the practice of the CAB I appeared, along with other members of the Arizona delegation, to urge that the best possible service be granted.

However, 13 Senators and half a dozen Representatives from other States—some from as far away as Minnesota and Nebraska—dropped their work and went before the CAB to plead, not the need for better service to Arizona, but for consideration to airlines predominant in their areas which sought the profitable Arizona business. If Phoenix today still lacks adequate service, this intervention may partly explain that fact.

While rules of the CAB permit such congressional appearances, as far as I am concerned these cases should be considered solely on the merits, and even Congressmen from the States affected should not participate in the hearings.

The right to an impartial hearing is deeply imbedded in the thinking of our people, and the decisions arrived at by unjudicial methods are suspect even when they are just.

Under our system of justice there are no friends at court, only advocates of law and fact in open court. And understandably those who hold court after hours, or in the market place, should not expect that the decisions they hand down from the bench will stand upright in the public eye.

I believe all of these regulatory agencies have the power to adopt rules and customs which will eliminate the influence factor when decisions are made. I once heard a wise Arizona judge put it this way: "If you want your court to have respect and dignity, you must always maintain a judicial demeanor and conduct your proceedings like a court."

It is my sincere belief that if these agencies adopted rules which completely stopped intervention in matters before them except for requests to expedite action or for status reports, thus creating a true judicial atmosphere, most Members of Congress would applaud to the echo.

Today our citizens have a right to expect that even quasi-judicial public bodies will adhere to the best judicial practices. Nothing less will win and keep public esteem.

Stop—Stop This Madness Before It Is Too Late—For God's Sake, Turn Back

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES O. PORTER
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 5, 1958

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, the words of Albert Smith Bigelow, 51-year-old architect and painter from Cos Cob, Conn., have certainly occurred to many people with regard to the nuclear weapons race: "Stop. Stop this madness before it is too late. For God's sake turn back."

Mr. Bigelow was a lieutenant commander in the Navy during World War II, commanded three ships and saw considerable action in the Atlantic and South Pacific. He is now the skipper of the ketch the *Golden Rule* which is on its way to Eniwetok waters where the United States Government intends to make further tests of nuclear weapons in April.

Are Mr. Bigelow and his crew "crackpots"? Or are they seeing the future more plainly than the rest of us are willing to admit?

I have filed a bill for the cessation of the nuclear weapons tests. Perhaps the gesture being made by these men will help the world realize the great danger confronting us all.

Under unanimous consent, I include the following news story from Labor's Daily for Tuesday, February 18, 1958:

SHIP SETS SAIL FOR A-TEST AREA—MISSION OF PROTEST

SAN PEDRO, CALIF.—Somewhere between the California mainland and Hawaii a 30-foot ketch, the *Golden Rule*, is plying the Pacific on a mission with a message. The blue and white sailing vessel has as its destination the Eniwetok waters, where the United States Government intends to continue nuclear tests in April.

The purpose of the volunteer four-man crew is to protest the tests, and to arouse the attention of the world toward the grave potential dangers involved in nuclear testing.

Sponsoring the $30,000 voyage, including cost of the boat—only $10,000 has been raised so far, the remainder is a loan—is the Non-Violent Action Against Nuclear Weapons Committee, headquartered in Philadelphia. But hundreds of persons not affiliated with the committee in any formal manner have sent small contributions.

Skipper of the ketch is Albert Smith Bigelow, 51-year-old architect and painter from Cos Cob, Conn. During World War II, Bigelow was a lieutenant commander in the Navy, commanded 3 ships, and saw considerable action in the Atlantic and South Pacific. Later, he was housing commissioner of Massachusetts, and in 1952 was a Republican precinct captain. Last August, he and 10 others were arrested at Camp Mercury, Nev., AEC test site headquarters, for protesting the summer-long nuclear bomb tests.

Two Hiroshima maidens disfigured by the A-bomb blast, who came to this country for plastic surgery, spent 19 months at the Bigelow home.

Why is Bigelow undertaking the perilous trip? "Because it is the way I can say to my Government, to the British Government, and to the Kremlin: 'Stop.' Stop this madness before it is too late. For God's sake, turn back.'

"I am going because it is time to do something about peace, not just talk about peace. I am going because, like all men, in my heart I know that all nuclear explosions are monstrous, evil, unworthy of human beings.

"I am going," he continued, "because it is now the little children, and most of all, the as yet unborn who are the frontline troops. It is my duty to stand between them and the horrible danger.

"I am going in the hope of helping change the hearts and minds of men in government. If necessary, I am willing to give my life to help change a policy of fear, force and destruction to one of trust, kindness, and help.

"I am going because I have to—if I am to call myself a human being."

Second in command is William R. Huntington, 50-year-old architect from St. James, Long Island, N. Y. A World War II conscientious objector, he later served as commissioner in Europe for the American Friends Service Committee. Like Bigelow, he has had extensive experience sailing small craft off the east coast.

SEAWORTHY SHIP

The other 2 members of the crew, chosen from a volunteer list of more than 50, are George Willoughby and David Gale. Willoughby, 43, comes from New Jersey. He is secretary of the Central Committee of Conscientious Objectors and has four children. He and his wife, Lilian, were arrested at Camp Mercury last August and, like Bigelow and the eight others, given a suspended sentence of a year.

Gale, 25, a pacifist organizer from Carver, Minn., is unmarried. He is a Presbyterian, the other three are Friends (Quakers).

The ketch in which they are sailing is a smaller model of the famous *Sea Witch*, winner of the San Francisco-Honolulu race several years ago. Boatmen who have worked on or examined the *Golden Rule* place their stamp of approval upon it. It is seaworthy in every respect.

No precautions for safety in bomb-test waters have been taken. The crew has no idea what will happen to it. Most observers around Berth 44 in San Pedro, where the vessel was made seaready, felt that the Navy would take it under tow and pull it out of the bomb-test area.

The voyage has caught the attention of the European press, which was represented in San Pedro by photographers for several prominent agencies. By the time the ketch reaches its destination the eyes of the world may well be upon it.

Outlook for Recovery

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALVIN M. BENTLEY
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 5, 1958

Mr. BENTLEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend and revise my remarks, I wish to include the text of an exclusive interview with Secretary of the Treasury, Robert B. Anderson, which ap-

peared in the March issue of Nation's Business. I feel sure that all members would be interested to read the remarks of Mr. Anderson and to learn of his estimates for our recovery from our present unsatisfactory economic situation.

The text of the interview follows:

OUTLOOK FOR RECOVERY—AN EXCLUSIVE INTERVIEW WITH THE SECRETARY OF THE TREASURY, ROBERT B. ANDERSON

Question. Mr. Secretary, do you consider it likely that the American economy will begin to bounce back around the middle of this year?

Answer. I have not tried to make any judgment as to a precise timing of the movement of the American economy, but rather have expressed a confidence, which I still maintain, that we are going through a period of readjustment or recession, however you want to describe it, of a character that will not be protracted.

Without attempting to pick a precise time in the year in which the economy may be expected to shift into a resurgent mood and begin a sustainable rate of expansion, I am confident it will occur within a reasonable period.

Question. There has been a great deal of talk about weak spots and danger signals in the economy. Do you see strong points and hopeful signs as well?

Answer. Well, in an economy of the size and magnitude of ours undoubtedly there will always be fluctuations. It seems to me that most importantly we ought to try to analyze our situation on the basis of long-term and short-term factors which weight importantly on the total economy.

Looking first at the short-term situation, I think you find that readjustments already have been made in a number of areas.

Question. What are some of these areas?

Answer. Inventory reductions have brought about a better balance in some industries. There already has been adjustment in outputs of a substantial number of industries. There has been adjustment in prices, which reflect some of the industry adjustments that have taken place. Personal income has held up very well. Total income and total retail sales in December were about 2 percent over a year ago. There has been a very prompt readjustment in the stock and bond yields and in the interest-rate relationships. The stock market has shown some elements of strength in recent months. There are indications of a revival of residential construction, which is turning up.

About $5.5 billion more in defense contracts will be let to private industry for the first 6 months of 1958 than in the last 6 months of 1957. There will be an increase in defense spending as well as increase in defense contracts. There will be speedups in other projects, such as highway construction, which will add significantly to the economy. As there has been some turnover or lessening of demand for credit in the areas of private construction, there has been increasing demand on the part of State and local governments. For example, the 30-day visible supply of municipal bonds in the wek ending January 31 was $549 million, compared with $260 million a year before.

The business plans for fixed investment in calendar year 1958 are higher than in any years, except for 1956 and 1957. The most important factor of all is the maintenance of a relatively high level of confidence in the basic strength of the economy of this country.

Question. You feel that this confidence is thoroughly justified?

Answer. Yes, I do. I think that boards of directors who make their decisions on the basis of a belief that the restrictive influences in the country will not be protracted, and we will be able to maintain a sustainable rate of growth, will be on the right side.

Question. What about long-term considerations?

Answer. Our population in this country is growing at the rate of about 3 million a year, and this is the equivalent of adding a State the size of Kentucky to our consumer population every 12 months. We have an increasing demand for new products and new materials. We have a very competent scientific and technological community in the business world, and they are constantly making new products and finding new ways to make things. Both because of the demands of our people and the factors of competition, these new technological advances indicate a growth and a rate of progress. We have a constant desire on the part of all of our people to improve their standard of living and to expand their opportunities. This is one of the intangible but very important forces in an economy such as ours.

We have, from 1946 through 1957, put more than $300 billion into capital investments—a total outlay equal to the United States military expenditures during World War II, between 1941 and 1945.

Question. Some economists suggest we had too rapid a rate of capital expansion and we now need a period for population growth to catch up. Do you feel this is true?

Answer. Without trying to make a judgment as to the rate at which capital investment ought to take place, I do think that the movements of our economy at present reflect in part the natural aftermath of such a large expenditure program.

I think that there will be continued capital expansion, perhaps not on the scale that has characterized the past 2 or 3 years, but rather a more sustainable rate of growth that is again consistent with the demands of both our domestic economy and export demands.

Question. How much Government spending can our economy stand for defense and other purposes?

Answer. This, of course, is one of the really basic problems of our country. We must, and I am sure we can, maintain a relatively high level of defense expenditures so as to insure an adequacy of protection for our country. I am quite certain that everyone would give this a top priority. On the other hand, it seems to me that we must regard our effort not as something which we must do for a year or so, but an effort which we are at least willing and competent to make over a long and unknowable period, if that is necessary.

In the past when we have been engaged in wars we have taken a large proportion of the gross national product, and after the conflicts were over have taken a time within which to recover. We could again take a sizable slice out of our gross national product for national protection, but if you get up into an exaggerated possibility of such great proportions as, say, a half or more, then you get to the point where most of us would work for the Government, where people are told what and how to do things, when price controls and wage controls would come into effect, and there you would have a degree of regimentation that is the very thing we seek to avoid in maintaining the freedom and the liberties which we cherish.

The precise point where you get more regimentation and less liberty can be difficult to judge.

It seems to me we need to determine a rate of expenditures for those things which are most essential, and to postpone, where necessary, things not as essential.

Question. Is that the philosophy behind the new Federal budget?

Answer. Certainly this thinking is always in our mind. We believe the budget is one which the country can maintain without the kind of regimentation which we are seeking to avoid.

Question. Do you feel that in this period of readjustment we will be able to produce the $74.4 billion in revenue estimated in the Federal budget for fiscal 1959?

Answer. We believe that it is a reasonable estimate of receipts during the period. The judgment is one which has to be made months in advance, and, of course, it is difficult to be entirely precise 17 or 18 months in advance.

The calculations which we have made are based upon a level rate of receipts from corporations, with some increase in receipts from individual income tax at current rates, but which takes into consideration not a rate of growth equal to that for the past 2 or 3 years, but something less than half that rate. Even giving weight to the current economic condition we believe that it will not be of a sufficiently protracted period to mitigate against the kind of estimates of revenue which we have made for that fiscal year.

All assumptions of receipts are hazardous. The very process of budget making requires a degree of preciseness which is difficult within itself. It would be much easier if we could make our assumptions on a range of revenue and a range of expenditures, but this would be like writing a budget in which you followed each calculation with the word "maybe." We finally come to the point in the budget process where even with the realization of the difficulties involved we nevertheless have to arrive at a judgment. The most that we can say is that our judgments, we believe, are reasonable.

Question. They are based upon the best evidence that you can get?

Answer. They are based upon the best evidence we can get in the Treasury, the best information which we can get from the staff experts of the Federal Reserve System, the council of economic advisers, and those other sources of information which are available to all business people.

Question. Can you explain just why the administration considered a $5 billion increase in the Federal debt limit of $275 billion necessary rather than some smaller increase?

Answer. The request for a $5 billion increase was based, first, upon the belief that the orderly management of our Government affairs would indicate that we should have balances on hand equivalent to at least 12 working days of normally anticipated expenditures. This requires about $3.5 billion of funds available. Our expenditures for all purposes are currently running at a rate of about $1.5 billion every 5 working days.

We then believe that there should be a margin for contingencies because in a Government the size of ours, with the problems that our Government has, there are certain things which we could not reasonably be expected to anticipate. For example, we might move more rapidly than anticipated in some of the scientific fields—for example, in missile development—and it might become important that the Department of Defense spend money in that area more rapidly than it now judges it will spend it. We believe under those circumstances we in the Treasury should have the ability to meet what acceleration if required. We believe, also, that in view of the fact that we are managing a debt of $275 billion we ought to have some flexibility in handling our debt management problems.

For example, when we go to the market, as we have recently done, with a large offering involving both intermediate and long-term bonds, we believe that there should be a reasonable period during which the market is allowed to absorb and to distribute by secondary operations this kind of a debt offer. If, after making such an offer, we should have a large attrition—that is, people who have held earlier securities, and who for business reasons would want to be paid—then we may find it necessary to go back to the market in a short time to ask for cash.

So that in effect we are competing with the offering that we have just put out on a longer term basis.

Therefore, in making our calculations under a tight debt ceiling we have to make an offering that minimizes attrition, or we have to take into consideration the fact that if the market should better itself between the time that we make the offering and the time that the securities are actually marketed so that the attrition is less than we expect, then by accident we may have some of the debt overlapping, and we would be beyond the debt ceiling.

Question. Do you anticipate returning to the present debt limit if a temporary increase is granted?

Answer. We have asked that the $5 billion increase be granted through fiscal 1959. At that time we would have to take a look at our fiscal position and at our debt-management problems. I believe that it is in the best interest of the country for the Congress from time to time to examine the way in which we are handling our operations in the Treasury in the management of the debt. This is the sort of examination that will occur when we review our debt-limit problems.

Question. What are your plans for lengthening the maturity of the debt?

Answer. I would not want to be too detailed with reference to debt-management plans, because during this year we are going to have to refinance about $50 billion of debt. This includes the amount that we recently went to the market for—$16.8 billion. In addition, we will have to refinance about $22 billion in short-term bills and arrange for redemption of about $3 billion in tax-anticipation bills.

I believe, however, that it ought to be, and it is our objective to get the best balance that we can in the debt under conditions as they exist and to minimize the number of times that we have to go into the market either for cash or for refinancing. We realize that when we do go into the market, we may create problems for people who are financing private businesses, either corporate or individual; we may create problems for States, municipalities, and political subdivisions and other institutions that are going to the same market for their financing. So the extent to which we can improve the balance in our debt structure and minimize our trips to the market, I think, will serve the best interest of the public.

Question. Is there any realistic basis at this time for businessmen to anticipate substantial tax cuts soon?

Answer: Fiscal policy, I believe, should always be judged in the context of the impact which it has on the total economy at any given period. One should not try to make dogmatic judgments on hypothetical situations. It seems to me that in periods of relatively high levels of production we should make every effort possible to pay our current expenditures with current revenues and not to add to an already burdensome debt.

On the other hand, I have expressed to the Congress the feeling that I can conceive of situations where the downward movements in an economy might be sufficiently deep and sufficiently protracted that some tax reduction should be considered in order to revitalize the economy. I do not believe that we are now at that point. I have confidence that the economy will reassert itself without that kind of action.

Question: Are you satisfied with the effect of the actions that have been taken to stimulate the economy?

Answer. If one examines the adjustment that has occurred in interest rates and in the yields between stocks and bonds since November 14, which was the date of the first reduction of the rediscount rate, I think he will find that it has been about as sharp a drop in interest rates as has occurred in recent times. This, I think, is indicative of a very rapid market adjustment to conditions.

There will always be some variation of opinions as to the kinds of things and the timing of things that ought to be done in an economic climate such as ours. There are even differences which exist in various geographical parts of our country, but by and large the most important things, it seems to me, are the basic confidence of our people and the demonstration of a willingness on the part of the agencies of the Government to take whatever actions they in their best judgment believe are needed to help maintain an economy expanding and growing at a sustainable rate.

I am sure that this Government would never sit idly by and watch either inflation or deflation run a ruinous course.

Question. How do you feel about the practice of Government lending money at a lower interest rate than Government must pay to borrow?

Answer. As a general proposition it seems to me that the rate at which the Government lends money ought to be at about what it costs the Government, because Government costs are borne by all of the taxpayers. I think, however, that one has to take into consideration whether there are other values that arise from the money which the Government spends or provides, which outweigh the disadvantage of providing money at lower than the normal cost.

Question. Can you tell us the present status of the activities of the joint Federal-State committee?

Answer. The committee is still functioning. Before any program really becomes final, both the Congress and various State legislatures will have to take action with reference to those functions which will be assumed by the States. This will take some time, because all of the legislatures do not meet each year, and each of the various governors will make his own decision about the program and the manner in which he wishes to present his program to his own legislature.

Question. Is the administration's interest in the objective of that committee still as strong as it was?

Answer. Yes, it continues strong because we believe in a vigorous Federal-State system. We have a high regard for the duality between the States and the Federal Government.

Question. What is the biggest obstacle to the achievement of the objective of the committee?

Answer. Perhaps the most difficult problem grows from the fact that certain of the Federal-State functions have grown up piecemeal over a long time. To take a specific example, the States are exceedingly interested in sharing to a more substantial degree in inheritance taxes. They feel that this is important not only from the standpoint of the revenues involved, but also because of the differences in laws relating to inheritance and property ownership between the various States. Yet the fact that we have had a system of Federal estate taxation for a long period of time makes it exceedingly difficult now so to readjust the Federal system that the combined Federal and State taxes will be fair and not too complicated.

Question. Do you feel there is an overdependence by States and communities upon Federal money?

Answer. It seems to me that in years past there has been a readiness on the part of States to be dependent more and more upon the Federal Government. It seems to me that one of the important functions of the present Federal-State Action Committee is not only to take a look at what has been done, with the idea of restoring some functions to the States where they could be more economically and better administered by local authorities, but also to consider new programs in which there is involved a new Federal-State relationship so as to avoid overdependence or overconcentration in the Federal Government.

Question. Do you feel that the communities and the States could undertake much of the work that has been done by the Federal Government?

Answer. I think that the States and local communities have the capability and the potentiality. It is a question of ability to realine the responsibilities of the Federal and State Governments. There is also the question of the redistribution of sources of revenue so as to enable the States to resume functions heretofore performed by the Federal Government. Most importantly, there must be willingness and a desire on the part of the people of the State and local governments to have the responsibility for these programs under a conviction that they would be better and perhaps more economically administered at local levels, rather than at the levels of the Federal Government.

Statement by R. W. Freeman, President of International House, New Orleans, on Reciprocal Trade Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HALE BOGGS
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 24, 1958

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement by R. W. Freeman, president of International House, New Orleans, to the House Ways and Means Committee in connection with extension of the Reciprocal Trade program:

STATEMENT BY R. W. FREEMAN, PRESIDENT OF INTERNATIONAL HOUSE, NEW ORLEANS, TO THE HOUSE WAYS AND MEANS COMMITTEE IN CONNECTION WITH EXTENSION OF THE RECIPROCAL TRADE PROGRAM

International House at New Orleans is a nonprofit civic institution founded in 1949 to promote and facilitate world trade through the Port of New Orleans and other ports of the Gulf of Mexico by the liberalization of trade, bettering international economic relations and education of the peoples of our own and other countries to the benefits of healthy, two-way world trade.

International House is not an advocate of free trade in any sense of the word, but it does believe strongly in freer trade, in reduction of trade barriers and restrictions, in greater movement of the commerce of the world between our own and other countries, in elimination of quotas, currency restrictions and tariffs insofar as is possible and consistent with our own national good.

We have always strongly supported the Reciprocal Trade Agreements program which we have seen steadily increase the volume of United States foreign trade, provide millions of jobs for our citizens, cargo for our developing merchant marine, goods for our citizens, and in general operate to the benefit of all of our people.

We believe, furthermore, that this program and the trade increases it has brought about through liberalization has been of enormous benefit to the United States in world political matters because it has helped to convince other nations that we favor trade growth and not trade restrictions.

Some years ago Dwight D. Eisenhower, then a candidate for the Presidency, said in New Orleans that "if there is a city in the United States which has grasped the significance of world trade, that city is New Orleans where International House is a majestic and tangible symbol of your understanding. It has become known all over the country as a successful clearinghouse for healthy two-way international trade. To me it has even greater symbolism. It represents community action without Government money—community action arising out of private thinking and local planning."

Here it is necessary to emphasize that International House is a private institution, supported by about 2,500 dues-paying members in New Orleans, in Louisiana, and scattered throughout the United States and abroad. It is in nowise a Government-supported institution, its support comes solely from businessmen who believe that they should develop, encourage and promote international trade.

International House has always believed that private initiative, investment and work was the solution to holding the economic leadership of the United States in the world, and that our country could not possibly depend or wait upon Government leadership and aid for this solution, but should do the job by private means. Thus, we are energetically opposing the efforts of the protectionists to erect new or to strengthen old barriers to the advance of private enterprise in foreign trade.

We have, therefore, watched the gathering attacks upon the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act with great alarm and misgiving, because we regard the attacks as unfair, unwarranted, unjustified and in many senses of the word an actual hoax upon the American people, many of whom are not well informed about the complexities and intricacies of foreign trade, or its great significance to our own economy.

We have seen with great concern that while there has been a sharp increase in our volume of trade, protectionist attacks have mounted upon our tariff policies; we have seen the protectionist attacks and sniping of our program cause suspicion, doubt and unrest among the friendly nations of the world who find it difficult to understand or adjust themselves to the vacillations of our trade policies.

We believe that stability and liberalization in our trade policies is essential to our position as world leaders, and that it is impossible to achieve either of these goals with constantly changing tariff schedules and political influences upon the basic laws.

Because of these beliefs and factors International House last September 10 adopted the following resolution requesting Congress for a 10-year extension of the reciprocal-trade program without emasculating amendments. Copies of this resolution were sent to every Member of Congress and were distributed widely throughout the United States at the grassroots level.

The resolution follows:

"RESOLUTION ADOPTED BY THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE OF INTERNATIONAL HOUSE ON TUESDAY, SEPTEMBER 10, 1957

"Whereas the reciprocal trade agreements program, inaugurated in 1934, has been successful in promoting international trade throughout the world, and resulted in progress and prosperity in our own and all friendly foreign nations; and

"Whereas working within the framework of the reciprocal trade agreements program, the United States has in the past quarter century greatly expanded the worldwide exchange of goods and increased its own markets abroad by reciprocally lowering tariff and trade barriers and liberalizing trade regulations; and

"Whereas world trade is a necessary factor for world peace; and

"Whereas it is recognized that nations and peoples buying from the United States must also sell to the United States and this necessarily makes for mutually beneficial two-way international trade; and

"Whereas the total United States volume of exports and imports surpassed $30 billion annually in 1956 and is a keystone to our own peace, prosperity, and the welfare of our citizens; and

"Whereas the reciprocal trade agreements program has been renewed 10 times since its original passage in 1934 but these renewals have been for short periods and gradually the law has been emasculated and weakened by restrictive provisions in recent years; and

"Whereas to assure continuance of this beneficial and productive program it is necessary to rally all citizens to join in an effort to preserve this law when it comes up for renewal next year in Congress; and

"Whereas New Orleans, a great port and trading center, recognizing the paramount importance to the Nation and the world of a continuance of the reciprocal-trade program, expresses serious concern with the move to turn the clock back to a tariff program that would restrict trade, and undermine our economic and political situation in world trade: Be it therefore

"*Resolved*, That International House of New Orleans, an organization dedicated to world peace, trade, and understanding, hereby requests Congress to authorize a 10-year renewal of the reciprocal trade agreements program beyond June 30, 1958, and endorses a nationwide program to educate and inform the people of the United States and particularly those in the Mississippi Valley of the grave threat to this highly successful program; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That all trade, commercial, civic, economic and cultural groups everywhere be invited to join in this crusade to save and extend the reciprocal trade agreements program, and thus preserve the keystone of our foreign trade policy which has had the support of both great political parties over two and a half decades, and which has made a material contribution to world peace and prosperity."

Naturally enough within a few weeks this action began to claim national attention, and within the next few months a large number of local, regional, and national organizations adopted similar or like resolutions, some asking for 5, 10, 11 years' extension and some seeking permanent trade legislation.

The effect of this crusade was to stir up an early interest in the trade-agreements program, which was aided materially when Vice President RICHARD M. NIXON announced that the Eisenhower administration would seek a minimum of a 5-year renewal, and later it was announced in Washington that this was the administration's goal.

International House is fully aware that during the historic tariff debates of the past quarter century every fact or opinion has been published and expressed, and that it is difficult, if not impossible, to bring new light to bear upon the economic phases of the tariff problem.

We do believe, however, that far too little attention has been paid to the political implications of the present controversy, and the devastating effect the death of the reciprocal trade agreements program would have upon our position in world affairs.

Furthermore, we believe that the clamoring of the protectionist adversaries of the reciprocal program has drowned out and destroyed the voices of reason which have by comparison been mild and unheard in the squabble. We do not believe that the American people, generally speaking, have a true concept of how many jobs depend upon foreign trade, and how few are affected or have been lost by badly needed imports which we have brought into our country.

These facts will, of course, be laid before you by experts, but there will be many widely different constructions placed upon them by your witnesses. We know that it is your duty to sift the truth from the untruths, and we believe that when you do the logic of trade liberalization and stabilization will be apparent.

We very much fear that the United States is about to deliver to our arch enemy Nikita Khrushchev his cheapest and easiest victory through the demise of the reciprocal trade program in Congress.

It would also be Khrushchev's greatest victory, won without firing a shot and at no cost or loss whatever to the Soviet Union.

We are sure that Nikita Khrushchev's recent remarks on trade did not escape any of you, but I want to repeat what he said, which was:

"We declare war on you—excuse me for using such an expression—in the peaceful field of trade. We declare war. We will win over the United States."

No warning from the free world could be as precise, as direct and as factual as this warning from the Soviet leader. Yet important segments of our business community here seem to have ignored it entirely. Let us be sure that Congress does not make this basic error.

The need for higher tariffs or continued high tariffs is the biggest hoax that has ever been perpetrated upon our Congress. Only a relatively small percent of our population derive any benefit whatever from high tariffs, while 99 percent or more of our people suffer and pay for such policies.

People generally do not know all the facts, they have not been aroused to the dangers, to the realities, and to the tragic costs of protectionism; most of all they do not realize the disastrous political effects of high or higher tariffs, of slamming the trade door shut.

People do not realize that exports are an extremely vital part of our economy and prosperity, and that exports are geared precisely to imports since others must sell to us in order to buy from us. Our foreign business friends must be able to earn the dollars they want to spend for our products, and they can do so only as we provide them fair and reasonable access to our markets.

The thing that we must bear in mind, of course, is that foreign trade is of vital importance to all of the United States and that undue solicitude for the protectionists is at the expense of our farmers, our labor, our industry, and our whole economy which depends in greater or less degree on exports. Our export producers, on the farm and in the factory, are hurt by a restrictive import policy because it induces trade restrictions by foreign countries and reduces their supply of dollars with which to buy our goods.

We tend to overlook another important factor and that is that there is American labor content in every dollar of our exports, whether of minerals, of agricultural products, or of manufactured items, while on the other hand a large percentage of our imports are of raw materials and other products which are not produced here, and which are not in competition actually with our own economy.

Great and important, however, as our foreign trade is to our own economy, this is of far more importance to other friendly nations of the world.

It is our earnest belief that 95 percent of the American people would be unreservedly and enthusiastically for a liberal and reciprocal foreign economic policy if they knew what it means to the future of the United States.

Every time we move to impede instead of to liberalize world trade we not only directly hurt ourselves, but we alienate more friends abroad. The Soviets, with their full and immediate control over trade policies, fill every vacuum we create, and win every battle we lose.

There are much more intelligent and far less dangerous ways of coping with the problem of lost jobs through imports, and adjusting hardship cases. The cost of this would be minor, and would be direct, and would be understood whereas the indirect cost of higher tariffs is major, very high, and very dangerous to our whole political position in today's explosive world.

International House strongly believes that the United States position in the world and as a leader for peace is determined as much by our ability to promote liberal and productive trade policies as it is by our ability to produce military pacts and nuclear weapons.

We are firmly convinced that world trade is important to every American and that a liberal trade policy and lowered tariffs help American economy. We also believe that it would promote many jobs for every job affected or lost, that it would stimulate business conditions, lower prices, and would prove that trade, international as well as national, is the backbone of all business and prosperity.

It is impossible to construct a Chinese Wall around this Nation in the 20th century, and it would be wrong even if possible. We think high tariffs are unrealistic and dangerous to the economy of the United States, the welfare of other nations, and the peace of the world.

In this era of geopolitics the leaders of International House are convinced that as a nation we can no longer live in the splendid isolation of the past, either economically, militarily, or politically. Our motives are judged by other nations of the world as much by what we do in economic matters as by what we do in military matters and diplomatic affairs.

International House believes that at a time when we are seeing history making changes in the field of international trade, science, and culture, with the Soviets challenging United States supremacy throughout the world in the cold and silent war, it would be a national tragedy to return again to the narrow view and to try again to erect friendship destroying trade barriers. We believe that our friendly neighbors must trade to exist and that we must assist them to trade and live.

International trade, travel, and transportation have linked the world so closely together that now it would not be possible to turn back the clock to the high tariff policies of the great American depression era.

We are today watching the development of the common market in Europe which bids fair to be the most important economic development there in a century; it creates overnight one big market where there has been numerous small markets, and puts much of Western Europe into an economic union that will enable them better to compete with the United States. These facts behoove forward instead of backward thinking on our part in our trade policies, and for this reason also we should renew the reciprocal trade program for a long period.

Therefore, we recommend that Congress, in recognition of its obvious responsibility to the majority of the people of the United States, renew the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act for 10 years; that it avoid new emasculating amendments that have crept into the legislation in years past.

We hereby officially record our support of the Congress in extending this great piece of history-making legislation.

Address by Hon. Frances P. Bolton Before the "Salute to Women" Luncheon, Chicago, Ill., February 15, 1958

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. MARGUERITE STITT CHURCH

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 5, 1958

Mrs. CHURCH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am inserting herewith the outstanding and significant address delivered by my colleague, Mrs. FRANCES BOLTON of Ohio, before the crowded "Salute to Women" luncheon in Chicago, Ill., on February 15, 1958:

Madam Chairman, fellow Americans, to be here with you today at this wonderful luncheon is both a pleasure and a privilege. To be given such an opportunity to speak frankly with so many responsible women is opportunity indeed. Thank you for it.

Especially do I want to thank you, Mrs. Higgins, for your part in bringing me here.

You are indeed fortunate to have such an outstanding Republican woman in your midst. Mame Mason Higgins is known up and down the land not only for her work as dean of women and professor of education at Bethune-Cookwan College and instructor in Cincinnati and St. Louis public schools, but also as a family caseworker in the Chicago Public Welfare Department, as the executive director of the South Parkway Branch of the YWCA and as the Director of Negro affairs in the Chicago area under the National Youth Administration. Few women have given more of themselves to worthwhile, far-reaching good works than has Mrs. Higgins.

It is especially delightful to me to have been introduced by my colleague MARGUERITE STITT CHURCH who serves with me in the Congress on the Committee on Foreign Affairs. You are fortunate to have such a representative in Washington. We on the Hill are proud of her—we women especially. I do not need to tell you of her dignity when she goes down into the well of the House and addresses the Congress. Nor do I need to mention the fine quality of mind that organizes her thoughts and expresses them in clear, trenchant English. The sincerity of her remarks, whenever she speaks, is one of her strengths, as is her heartfulness.

Yes, this is another election year, friends, don't fail to send back to Washington this fine Member of Congress, one whose womanhood assures you, whether you are in her district or not, that something extra which means much to you and to the Congress itself.

When I sat down in my quiet room to consider the many matters we might discuss today I found myself in a quandary. There was so much that I as a woman wanted to talk over with you who are women. Bit by bit I ran my pencil through one subject after another. What I have left are a few matters that to me are basic—fundamental to our future as a Nation and as free people, important to us as women into whose hands God has given the children, and so the future of mankind.

It used to be that women were not supposed to trouble themselves about matters outside their homes. How long ago that seems. For now we must carry responsibilities that reach out across the world. One of the poignant areas of experience that was mine on my long trek in Africa in 1955 was the immediate bond that seemed to forge itself in country after country as I met the women. They want our women's help. They feel we will understand, as men never can, the special needs of the child, for better education, for health and medical care, and so forth, and so the needs of mothers.

As I relive these experiences I find myself wondering if we over here, we women, realize half clearly enough the responsibilities that are ours across the world. So, as I speak with you today I hope you will recognize the great current that flows under and around and through whatever I may say: that we, as women of responsibility, of opportunity and of understanding, must not only carry our share of the load here at home, but must raise our sights until our horizons encompass all the world. For to us the Infinite has given responsibility for His children, wherever and in whatever circumstances they may be.

As one looks around, isn't it amazing how much women really are doing? Think of the many civic groups which you who are here today, represent. Look at the first-hand knowledge of other lands that flows to us all as the international exchange projects bring foreigners to our shores and take our young people out across the seas.

Women are playing an ever greater part in all the international organizations of the U. N. The International Labor Organization—the Inter-American Commission. And our own women's organizations—among them the National Council of Negro Women, the National Council of Women of the United States and the International Council of Women of the World.

I have been greatly tempted to tell you what women are doing all over the world, how they are finding that basically there is a unity of desire and of purpose that will inevitably draw us all together. But I do want to talk with you about our own country's need of us—under God. And I want to emphasize a few matters that are more in your hands than in mine.

This is another election year—one of great portent and of far-reaching significance both here and abroad.

As you well know, I am a Republican—as was my husband before me. Until I was elected to succeed him, I had no need to examine my reasons, nor to define what the GOP stands for. In recent years, however, one has heard on all sides: "There is really no choice between the two parties, they want just about the same things." Then suddenly one fine day I was pulled up short, faced with some rather cold facts that painted a different picture altogether.

World War II necessary and legitimate emergency legislation and the Korean conflict gave Washington unbelievable control of our economy, threatening to change our traditional way of life unless rescinded. Granted the needs for emergency action were unprecedented, they were supposed to be temporary. However, it was not until President Eisenhower came to the White House in 1953 that wartimes controls were relaxed, taxes reduced, and steps taken to eliminate certain governmental functions which could best be handled by private enterprise.

Basically, the Republican philosophy of Government was best expressed by our first Republican President, Abraham Lincoln, when he said:

"The legitimate object of Government is to do for a community of people whatever they need to have done, but cannot do at all or cannot do so well for themselves in their separate and individual capacities. In all that the people can individually do as well for themselves, the Government ought not to interfere."

So, suddenly, I saw that there was a great difference between the two parties, rather than a similarity which was being so constantly pictured to the people. This dif-

ference was magnified a thousandfold when racial problems were brought out into the open.

Then Dwight D. Eisenhower accepted the nomination. Among other fundamental points of his political creed he made it unquestionably clear that he believed in the equal dignity of all our people, whatever their racial origin or background may be; in their equal right to freedom and opportunity and the benefits of our common citizenship.

During his first campaign he acknowledged the fact of discrimination and said: "This crusade is pledged to use every single item of leadership and influence it has to eliminate it. It intends to enforce the full constitution, not part of it."

In his inaugural address on January 20, 1953, he said further, "We reject any insinuation that one race or another, one people or another, is in any sense inferior or expendable."

He assured us all that he would see to it that wherever the Federal Government had jurisdiction, this principle would be activated and segregation would cease.

I need not remind you that it was but a matter of months before these principles were being put into effect.

With other Republicans, I have worked for and secured the passage of various bills which had to do with the rights of minorities; anti-poll-tax legislation, antilynch bills, and an FEPC measure, only to see these bills buried in the Democrat-controlled Senate.

I must say to you with utter frankness that I cannot understand how any American Negro, who knows the history of these bills, or who is informed about the empty words of the Democrats and their determined actions against all civil rights measures, can possibly vote for a Democrat. How can such a vote be justified.

Granted that during the depression years and the New Deal era, F. D. R. used the power of Government to give both food and jobs to the unemployed, yet none of the civil rights measures which President Eisenhower put into effect so promptly, but could have been instituted by the flick of a cigarette holder any time during the 20 years of Democrat rule. Yet Negroes have continued to vote for Democrats. I simply cannot understand it.

Now we Republicans on the Hill and on Pennsylvania Avenue have no wish or intention of taking from others the credit for every civil-rights advance of these last years. Neither Democrats nor Republicans can claim credit for the magnificient work done by Mrs. Mary Church Terrell and Rev. William Jernigan in the Thompson Restaurant case in Washington. Such courage and faith as theirs cannot be praised adequately. Nor can either political party claim credit for the results of the years of arduous work of the NAACP that won the long court fight which resulted in the school decision of May 17, 1954.

But, ladies, we Republicans do want full credit for measures taken to eliminate discrimination in our Capital City: Opening up the theaters, hotels, and other places of amusement, integrating the fire department, desegregation of the public schools.

We do want credit for the elimination of segregation in the Air Force, Army, Marines, and Navy, and in veterans' hospitals. We do want credit for ending segregation in all schools on military installations in the United States. We do want credit for the improved operation of the Committee on Government Employment Policy, resulting in the upgrading of thousands of Federal employees (300 Negroes were early made supervisors in the Post Office alone).

We do want credit for setting up a new Government Contract Committee, resulting in higher type jobs for Negroes in such industries as packing houses, public utilities, and the chemical industry.

When I first came to Congress, Chicago had a Republican Congressman whose name was Oscar DePriest—a fighter if there ever was one—and the first Negro to be elected to Congress since the days of the Reconstruction. While campaigning for Wendell Willkie he said:

"When a civil-rights bill is passed, a Republican President will do it. It will not be easy. When accomplished it will have to be done over strong opposition of Democrats, North, South, East, and West. They are a smart bunch who know how to make effective deals both above and below the table. I know because I served with them in Congress. You may laugh this off as politics but as long as Democrats control the White House we can forget civil rights. It just won't happen. The second phase of your emancipation, your quest for first-class citizenship, will come with the election of the next Republican President, whether it be Wendell Willkie or some other Republican later."

Mr. Willkie didn't make it, but President Eisenhower did and this is one of the first things he said:

"People are made in the image of God. They are divinely endowed with aspirations and talents. Their destiny reflects their divine origin. Therefore, the Republican Party must be inspired by a concern that comprehends every American; that sets up no walls of birth or creed or party; that ranks all men and women of decency and good will equal in their dignity."

Nineteen hundred and fifty-seven brought the determined all-out effort by President Eisenhower to give Negroes their first-class citizenship. In spite of heavy opposition we passed the civil-rights bill in the House. In the Senate the potent Eisenhower bill was weakened by including the trial-by-jury amendment. In the final test vote in the Senate, only 9 out of 49 Democrats voted against this amendment. How can Negroes everywhere fail to register that this was a 4½-to-1 ratio against Negro civil rights?

The day following this vote President Eisenhower said:

"The result cannot fail to be bitterly disappointing to those many millions of Americans who realized that without the minimum protection that was projected in section 4 of the bill as it passed the House of Representatives, many fellow Americans will continue, in effect, to be disenfranchised."

How can Negroes fail to have registered the battle which our Republican President and Vice President, the minority leaders of Senate and House and the rest of us fought and won?

After the legislation was passed in the Senate, it went to a House-Senate conference where the trial-by-jury amendment was partially eliminated. So today, a Federal judge, without a jury can fine a defendant up to $300 and give a jail sentence of 45 days without interference.

Oscar DePriest's prediction was all too accurate: "When a civil-rights bill is passed a Republican President will do it * * * when accomplished it will have to be done over strong opposition of Democrats, North, South, East, and West."

Praise be that there have been and are some Democrats who fight for universal civil rights; the fact remains, however, that in this last battle in the Senate, Republicans voted 34 to 5 against sending the civil-rights bill to its traditional burying ground in Senator EASTLAND'S judiciary committee. Eleven Democrats also opposed such action while 34 voted to bury it.

If you examine the record you will find that during the years of Roosevelt and Truman there were 33 test votes in the Senate and House on civil rights, antidiscrimination, antipoll tax, and antilynching measures. Eighty-one percent of the Republicans voted for these measures, as compared to only 41 percent of the Democrats.

What can we Republicans—men and women—do about all this? Why has this misunderstanding persisted down the years?

Politically, the trouble is that precinct captains and ward leaders are not reappraising the actual happenings, and getting the facts to the people. Only a few earnest men and women, if certain of their facts, can transform the thinking of whole areas.

Such has been the case in a Negro ward in my own city of Cleveland, where John Kellogg, a young energetic ward leader who is also on the city council, when to work some years ago.

That 18 ward votes Republican with an enthusiasm that is good to see. Oh, yes; it means work and lots of it. But John Kellogg has proved that informed, determined people are not going to vote for any candidate whose party has fought against their right to vote.

It is natural, I suppose, that because I am in active politics, which is the machinery by which we preserve our freedoms, my mind goes first to the responsibility of precinct workers, etc. But because I am a woman, deeply aware of the great responsibilities that are ours as women (and you have given me this opportunity to talk freely with you), I cannot refrain from saying that it isn't just politicians who have responsibility.

Every man and woman in a free land holds his freedom in his own hands. If he fails to do his part in upholding the Constitution and the laws of the land originally created to protect his freedom, he has no cause to complain should they fail him.

So many voters fail to vote in the primaries—the one time when they can select their party's candidates.

So tragically many don't even go to the polls on election day. Failure to vote gives the other side an extra vote. In many communities, your vote, or the lack of it, decides the outcome.

Now I am asking you as voters, as women who should be building for your children the kind of freedom under God that should be theirs, are you willing to accept the record of the 25 years of Democrat rule? Do you want to keep the control of Congress in the hands of the party that is going to use all its strength to refuse full citizenship to any group such as yours?

Or do you see how truly the vote you do have here in the north can build the party that has fought your battles for nearly a hundred years. If so you will take your responsibilities seriously and do everything in your power to see that the facts be known and constructive action be taken.

High on my list of matters I wanted to discuss with you was, of course, our children and our responsibility for them. Every mother knows in her heart that her children learn most from her in those early formative years. Each of us makes mistakes, alas! But when the chips are down we know that home should be a place where love is, where a child is welcomed, and where the first lessons of respect, integrity, honor, and love are part of the very atmosphere of that home. Today I have emphasized other matters.

Yet, I cannot refrain from leaving with you the thought that our responsibility for our homes, our children, and for their education is perhaps our greatest responsibility. They are the future and we know that as the twig is bent so does the tree grow. Because our homes are of paramount importance we must be concerned about the national economy which means the ability of our people to earn a living for themselves and their families.

We must be certain that the administration is facing up to the unpleasant fact that today there is more unemployment than is usual at this time of year. To assure you that the administration is not only deeply concerned about the situation but has a firm policy to foster recovery in a very sound way, the President stated this week that definite steps have been taken to stimulate home building, step up the national highway building program, increase activity under the urban renewal program, and increase the rate at which defense procurement contracts will be placed with private industry. He assured us further that if other measures are needed, they will be proposed—and in time!

Let me again quote from the President:

"I have confidence in the recovery of our economy * * * this year. * * *

"It is my conviction that the underlying forces of growth remain strong and undiminished. * * * The future will belong not to the fainthearted, but to those who believe in it and prepare for it.

"The firm policy of the Government is to foster this recovery in every sound way. I am making sure that we will go forward on every practical avenue of action. * * *

"If other measures are needed, I assure you they will be proposed—and in time. For example * * * expansion and modernization of public works and buildings, all of these useful public projects to be taken off the shelf when they could most appropriately be undertaken.

"In all these matters of Government policy, it is well to remember * * * it is necessary not only to avoid taking the wrong steps, but confidently to take the right ones. This we propose to do."

Again let me thank you for the privilege that has been mine to discuss with you some of these vital matters in which we women have not only a deep concern, but also the numbers and the capacity to make possible an ever-increasing freedom under law which is so necessary to the happiness of all of our people.

Not a woman here but knows that home is the center of constructive community and national living.

In closing I would ask the Infinite Father of all mankind to help us so to live that this great country of ours becomes more and more a land where freedom under God is in every breath we draw, and every thought and every deed. For only then can we hope to build a better world.

I should like to leave with you this quotation by Abraham Lincoln:

"We will speak for freedom and against slavery as long as the Constitution of our country guarantees free speech, until everywhere on this wide land the sun shall shine, the rain shall fall, and the wind shall blow on no man who goes forth to unrequited toil."

Daffodil Days in Oregon's Umpqua River Valley

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES O. PORTER
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 5, 1958

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, Friday afternoon, February 28, a large package of daffodils grown in the Scottsburg-Green Acres area of the Umpqua River Valley arrived in my office. I regret that it was impossible to share this bit of beautiful Oregon with each of you. I do invite you to come by and see the vase of colorful daffodils in my outer office.

Saturday I sent the following telegram to Mr. and Mrs. Norman Workman, of Scottsburg. Mr. Workman is president of the Umpqua River Daffodil Growers Association:

Your beautiful daffodils brought Oregon spring to Washington. They were shared with other appreciative people. Thank you so much for your thoughtfulness. Best regards.

On behalf of the daffodil growers in my district, I should like to extend an open invitation for any Member to visit the area whenever he or she is in the West. More than 3 million blooms from the Umpqua are marketed to all parts of the United States and Canada and the golden fields of daffodils are a lovely sight when in bloom.

Rather than read the following articles, I have requested permission that they be included in the RECORD. One is an editorial from the Reedsport Port Umpqua Courier by Editor William Tugman. The other is an article which appeared in the same newspaper and which details the work put in on Daffodil Days. Both appeared in the February 27, 1958, edition of the newspaper:

DAFFODIL DAYS IN REEDSPORT

Merchants in Reedsport this weekend are holding "Daffodil Days" in recognition of the important flower and bulb growing industry in the Scottsburg-Green Acres areas of the Umpqua River valley. This a very praiseworthy "promotion" stunt. How many people in this community realize these facts:

In a 3-weeks period every spring, the daffodil growers of this area ship more than 3 million blooms to all parts of the United States.

Even at rock-bottom prices this "spurt" injects more than $30,000 of "new money" into the community.

Most of this money goes to the 60 to 100 people who find employment during the bloom season.

On the Pacific slope, the seasonal daffodil industry markets more than 50 million blooms.

New methods are prolonging seasons and extending markets.

Every year, in the season, hundreds of tourists from valley points come down the beautiful Umpqua to see and obtain blooms.

To our way of thinking, the real significance of the daffodil industry is that it points the way to a diversified and intensive agriculture in our narrow but fertile valley. The soils are rich and the farms are sheltered from the winds and blasts that create problems in other areas. We know that these valleys are ideal for many cannery crops which will come inevitably with better access to markets and to processing plants.

Highway 38—the only real watergrade route to the coast in Oregon—offers the ultimate answers to many of these problems of agricultural development. Let's ride out this coming weekend and see the golden fields of daffodils and get acquainted with our neighbors to the east.

MAKE YOUR WEEKEND TRIP A SUNDAY DRIVE UP THE UMPQUA TO SEE FIELDS IN GOLDEN BLOOM

Merchants of Reedsport this weekend—Friday, February 28 and Saturday, March 1—are holding Daffodil Days in honor of the bulb and blossom growers of the Umpqua valley between Scottsburg and Elkton whose industry makes an important addition to the area's economy.

Nearly all merchants are using daffodils for decorations and many will be giving them away to their customers on Friday and Saturday. The event is a gesture of good will toward the growers who have been hard hit by the Midwest blizzards which closed many markets after an unusually early season which promised a fine crop and good prices.

Norman Workman, president of the Umpqua River Daffodil Growers Association says the spring crop brings some $30,000 into the area each year in a 3-week season, even with minimum prices, and it provides jobs to more than 60 pickers.

Present members of the local association are Harry Burton, Alden Paull, E. L. and Anne Baker, W. C. Lowe, T. S. Andrews, Don Posekany, Norman Workman, Norman Jackson, Don Abrams, Andy Monson, Benny Knypstra. Growers not members of the association are Roy Lewis and Warren Billick.

Citizens of the Reedsport-Gardiner area are invited to ride up the Umpqua Sunday afternoon when the fields are expected to be at the peak of their beauty in golden bloom. Each year hundreds of sightseers are attracted from Eugene, Roseburg, and other points in the inner valleys.

"We've hit hard luck this year," said Mr. Workman, "but we have faith in the future of this and other agricultural specialties for these sheltered valleys. We have the soil, the climate; we need only better transportation and wider outlets to make the Umpqua area come into its own."

More than 3 million blooms from the Umpqua are marketed to all parts of the United States and Canada, mainly through four jobbers: Hugh Campbell, Portland; Pacific Fruit and Produce, Seattle; L. & L. Evergree, Puyallup, Wash.; G. R. Kirk, Tacoma.

On the Pacific slope more than 50 million blooms are ripened in similar sheltered valleys from California to Washington in late winter. Shipments are made by air and by refrigerated trucks to far distant cities to compete with hothouse production for weddings and spring events of all kinds.

Mr. Workman says growers of this area now have limited storage facilities where buds can be preserved for several weeks beyond the normal blooming periods.

William T. Roy, Assistant Parliamentarian of the House of Representatives

SPEECH
OF
HON. CECIL R. KING
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 4, 1958

Mr. KING. Mr. Speaker, I rise to extend my sincerest best wishes and commendation to a valued public servant upon his retirement from an important office in the legislative branch of the Government. William T. Roy, the assistant parliamentarian of the House of Representatives is retiring from many years of highly efficient, able, and dedicated service to the legislative branch of the Government and to the people of the United States. Colonel Roy is one of those rare individuals who we encounter as we go through life. He has applied all of his energy to his work, and Members of this House will attest to the dedicated nature of his service and the pro-

fessional skill and competence which he has brought to bear on the important problems which have fallen within his sphere of responsibility. I have valued him over a period of many years as a close and trusted friend. He has always been ready to assist Members of this House and others with a multitude of problems arising out of the intricacies of legislative procedure. The positions of Parliamentarian and Assistant Parliamentarian are among the most important positions on Capital Hill. Decisions made by persons in these positions in rendering advice to the elected representatives of the people have an important and far-reaching impact upon the lives of all Americans.

I join with my colleagues in commending Colonel Roy for his dedicated public service and extending to him my very best wishes for a period of well deserved rest and relaxation.

Truman Garbage

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EMMET F. BYRNE
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 5, 1958

Mr. BYRNE of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I would like permission to insert an editorial appearing in the Chicago Daily News, Tuesday, February 25, 1958. The Daily News of Chicago is known for its forthrightness, accuracy and fairness in disseminating the news.

As a Republican, I take issue with former President Truman's presentation of the ills of today and the causes and effects involved. We have his analysis on one hand to compare with the remarks of another past President, Herbert Hoover. For my part, I choose to believe in the future of America and to bear in mind that our country has gone through many passing trials. History records augur well for our future, since the past reflects that when we have a job to do, we do it, in spite of distrust and lack of faith on the part of some. The editorial follows:

TRUMAN GARBAGE

Nobody has ever contrived a really effective retort to an opponent who had just dumped a bucket of slop over him.

In a flurry of statements, Republican Senators called former President Truman's remarks at a campaign kickoff dinner cynical, irresponsible, bombastic, demagogic, insincere, wild, reckless, and false. All this proved was that Mr. Truman is the more effective mobmaster.

It is no more possible to debate reasonably the points in Mr. Truman's speech than it would be to discuss the teeth of a circular saw. It was designed to cut, and it did.

Even on civil rights, where a more sober-minded partisan might not have attributed a monopoly of virtue to the Democrats, considering Governor Faubus, and all, Mr. Truman attacked relentlessly. "Unless a President works at it day and night," he said, "* * * you can expect the demagogs to move in and make trouble."

Since it has been a Democrat-controlled Congress that was, and is, the chief obstacle to President Eisenhower's pleas for more foreign aid, one might have expected the former President to soften his blows on this theme. But no: "The present administration has acted like an overbearing banker with a glass eye."

Nobody gets madder than Mr. Truman at the cause-and-effect accusation implied in noting that the last three Democratic Presidents have each had a war. Yet he joyously points out that most of the business recessions in the last half century have occurred in Republican administrations.

Another former President, Herbert Hoover, was also making a Washington's Birthday address. His was an appeal for faith in the future of America, despite concern over a passing trial. In his conclusion, he revealed that his words were almost exactly those of a speech he had given 27 years ago.

We expect that Mr. Truman's message will get a more frequent workout.

Opinion Poll Results

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT J. CORBETT
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 5, 1958

Mr. CORBETT. Mr. Speaker, I have just completed another of my regular polls of public opinion in my congressional district on 10 vital issues. The tabulated percentage results are reported below without editorial comment. I hope my colleagues in the Congress find them interesting and informative.

I began taking these polls when I first came to Congress in 1939. They are in the form of a printed questionnaire, requiring simple yes-and-no answers to questions on vital issues of current interest. They are mailed to registered voters in my district, regardless of political affiliation.

My congressional district is probably as representative and contains as many varied interest groups as any in the Nation. It has a high concentration of labor, white-collar workers, small business, large industries, and some of the finest farmlands found anywhere. The district includes a thickly populated section of Pittsburgh, extends to the rural areas, and takes in many large and small residential towns in northern Allegheny County.

Total response to this latest questionnaire was particularly large and because of the manner in which it was conducted, the percentage results virtually constitute a referendum of the district.

The poll follows:

1. The President is asking for $1.3 billion at once for the missile program and an increase over last year of $4 billion for defense efforts. Should this amount be appropriated? Yes, 88 percent; no, 12 percent.

2. Do you agree with the President that foreign military aid is essential to our own defense? Yes, 83 percent; no, 17 percent.

3. Do you believe that economic penetration of neutral countries by the Communists must be matched or bettered by ourselves? Yes, 76 percent; no, 24 percent.

4. Would you vote for a Federal expenditure of $1 billion over the next 4 years to improve teaching skills and encourage scientific and technological training? Yes, 78 percent; no, 22 percent.

5. Are you satisfied to forgo a possible tax cut in order to keep the budget balanced? Yes, 87 percent; no, 13 percent.

6. Do you believe that the Federal Government should reduce its efforts in the fields of health, education, and welfare to save money? Yes, 24 percent; no, 76 percent.

7. Do you believe that the farm subsidy program should be sharply cut back? Yes, 80 percent; no, 20 percent.

8. Would you grant the President's request for power to negotiate reciprocal trade agreements over a 5-year period? Yes, 72 percent; no, 28 percent.

9. Do you believe the people of the free world are unduly alarmed by the evidence of Russian progress in the missile field? Yes, 51 percent; no, 49 percent.

10. Are you satisfied that President Eisenhower is doing a good job as our Chief Executive? Yes, 82 percent; no, 18 percent.

We Can't Hear the Echo Unless We Make a Sound

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN F. SHELLEY
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 4, 1958

Mr. SHELLEY. Mr. Speaker, the established poets and masters of prose are often surpassed in the expression of an idea by those whose sincerity and belief in what they have to say acquires eloquence far beyond formal training or even natural bent as writers.

Such a man is Mark F. Bell, whose Christmas message to his family and friends has just recently come to my attention.

Mark F. Bell is an American workingman.

He makes his living as a waiter in a restaurant called Dominic & Johnny's in San Francisco.

Each year he manages to find the time to set down for his family and friends a report which manages to express, with an effectiveness which I feel is quite wonderful, the important feeling that comes with belonging to a family, as well as a formula for peace which all of us could profit by, not only in the reading, but in the emulation:

CHRISTMAS MESSAGE TO OUR SON AND DAUGHTERS AND THEIR FAMILIES

This year, as every year, I want to express my opinion in this plain but simple message.

Christmas is not only the most celebrated day of the year for the Christians but also for many other people. At this time, we see decorations everywhere which revives the holiday spirit in our hearts and brings back memories from our younger days.

At this time, more than any other time, we want to greet and to hear from all of our friends as this brings a warmer and closer friendship. We must be heard if we want to hear from others. It is just like being in the mountains. "We can't hear the echo unless we make a sound."

Parents do not only want to exchange greetings and presents with their loved ones, but also wish they could be near them on that great day, especially with those sons and daughters and their families who are far

away whom they don't see as often as they would like to. It is natural for parents to miss their children when they are away from home but some parents whose children are with them or near them don't fully understand that, but I am sure if and when their children go away from their home, they will not only miss them but also many times worry about them. That's why a letter, especially one with good news from sons and daughters who are away, is the best tonic for the parents' morale and their happiness.

Peace has tremendous meaning. Jesus recommended. Today more than ever, all the world is crying and praying for peace.

We need the peace not only in the world but also in our homes and in our hearts as none of us can be happy without peace because peace and happiness go together hand in hand.

So many people are doing their utmost to have peace but those impossible ones want peace at a prohibitive price which cannot be met, and by doing that they are holding back badly needed peace, not only from the others, but also from themselves. If we want genuine peace, we will not only have to pray for it but also practice these noble rules of life which help to bring peace to us. One of the main rules is to treat others as you would like others to treat you. This applies to all men and women as well as all the leaders of the world.

Now, dear children, grandchildren, and all the in-laws. Mother and I are glad to know that all of you have peace and happiness in your homes and we are going to say again, as always, that special prayer in the hope that the good God will keep you on the right path as he has done up to now. We send you our blessing and our love and also wish you a very merry Christmas and many more happy New Years.

Amen, and God bless all of you.

FATHER.

(Mark F. Bell.)

The Oregon Journal Finds an Encouraging Sign in Guatemala

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES O. PORTER

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 5, 1958

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include the following perceptive editorial from the Oregon Journal for February 20, 1958, relating to the recent Guatemalan elections and stating very well the implications for the orderly and reasonable processes which lead to a peaceful result. This is another indication that the citizens of the United States are not only interested in Latin American countries, but concerned about their slow and painful progress along the road of social and economic betterment and, particularly, democracy and freedom:

ENCOURAGING SIGN IN GUATEMALA

The manner in which Guatemala has received its political leadership is an encouraging sign that this key Central American country has a strong core of citizens dedicated to the fundamentals of democracy. And there can be no real democracy unless the fundamentals are practiced.

After the assassination of President Castillo Armas, who overthrew the Communist-dominated government, there was a real test. Smart money would have bet that an ambitious politician supported by the strongest element in the military would have taken over. That has usually been the case in Central America.

But this did not happen, and full credit must be given to the Guatemalan military, which has a power that we have never known in this country. The Vice President took over. An election was held according to the constitution. Fraud was charged in that election, and the man elected resigned. A civilian again took over as a caretaker. Elections were held in January. They were inconclusive. According to the Guatemalan constitution a candidate to be elected President must get the majority of the votes.

Gen. Miguel Ydigoras received the highest vote but not the majority. Crux Salazar received the next highest. Under the law it is provided the choice must then be made by the Congress, which was heavily of the Salazar party. But Salazar withdrew, and the Congress elected Ydigoras.

This is orderly government. There were opportunities and incentive for ambitious men to take over during the circumstances. But Guatemala worked it out.

There has been some talk that Ydigoras is a dictatorial type. But he did not take over as a dictator. He was elected in a free election, and a hotly contested one. That is important, and a credit to the people of Guatemala.

The Nutritive Value of Eggs in the Human Diet

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES C. AUCHINCLOSS

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 5, 1958

Mr. AUCHINCLOSS. Mr. Speaker, on February 26, 1958, the gentleman from California [Mr. SCUDDER], made a most informative speech entitled "The Nutritive Value of Eggs in the Human Diet"—page 2549, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD—in which he submitted some interesting statistics about the human consumption of eggs. He pointed out that the poultry industry in the United States is the third most important source of cash income on our farms, being exceeded only by the cattle and dairy industries. He also stated that poultry production today in a number of States surpasses all other farm commodities, citing as an example cotton in Georgia where at one time cotton was known as the king of the farm commodities. No wonder it is appropriate to designate March as "Egg Month," not only to draw attention to the importance this industry has achieved in our farm life, but also to aid in the promotion of egg consumption.

Although the poultry industry has grown mightily in size, the returns on the investment involved have suffered severely in the past few years and the poultry farmers have been learning the economic facts of life in a hard way. Fortunately, however, things have been better for them lately and they are doing what they can to prevent another depression similar to what they have experienced. I have been close to this picture because in New Jersey poultry farming is the largest industry in the State and a great part of it is located in the Third Congressional District which I have the honor to represent in the Congress.

The depression in poultry farming has resulted mainly from four causes: First, inexperience; second, overproduction; third, rigid crop controls; fourth, inadequate marketing; and I would like to make some observations on these causes and state briefly what is being done by the poultrymen themselves under the guidance of the State of New Jersey to build up and stabilize the industry.

First. Inexperience: Many people in our State went into the poultry industry without adequate knowledge of what it involved. They thought that by buying a few chickens and feeding them, the birds would produce eggs in abundance, since eggs are consumed by individuals of all ages, there would always be a demand for them, and therefore such an investment could not lose. They soon learned the falsity of such a dream. They learned of the problems connected with adequate and appropriate feed, and the ravages of disease; they learned of the difficulties of marketing and the curse of over-production; they learned of the severity of competition and the buying selectiveness of the consumer; they learned lots of things they had never dreamed of and were not prepared to meet. They wrung their hands, cried for help of one kind and another from the Government which was not forthcoming, and if it were it would have been temporary and inadequate. They went into debt, were unable to meet the mortgages on their farms, many failed in business and in a few instances I know of, died of broken hearts. It was altogether tragic.

Second. Overproduction: Many poultrymen reasoned that if they were making money with a flock of 2,000 birds, they would make twice as much with a flock of 4,000 birds, but they soon learned the fallacy of this reasoning. They failed to take into account the steady advance of science which increases the egg production of each individual fowl. They failed to recognize that with a greatly enlarged supply of eggs and poultry products, the demand therefor became more than saturated and the market became one in which the buyer controls the price. They failed to recognize the fact that by their own expansion they affected the whole industry and, as a result, everyone suffered.

Third. Rigid crop controls: This was perhaps the greatest underlying cause of the egg depression in the poultry industry. The grains that make up chicken feed are supported under the law by the United States Government at a more or less rigid price and when the overproduction of eggs caused a decrease in the market price, the high cost of egg manufacture—feed—made impossible a profit in the flooded market of the finished product—eggs. Some poultry farmers wanted the Government to place rigid support prices on eggs and poultry products, but the Government wisely refused to adopt such a policy and, more important, the great majority of the poultrymen desired none of it. They wanted

no interference in their business by Government and advocated instead that Government leave other phases of the farming industry alone and remove rigid controls from the feed grains. This policy of rigid grain controls caused much distress in the poultry industry and I do not believe proper consideration of this serious effect has been given the attention it deserves. The Government has no business to favor one part of an industry at the expense of another part and the poultrymen should enter their serious protest and demand that such a policy be changed.

Fourth. Inadequate marketing: This is a phase of the poultry business in which there is room for great improvement and I am proud to say that the State of New Jersey, under the leadership of the Honorable Philip Alampi, State secretary of agriculture, is doing something about it. Generally speaking, the poultry farmer has marketed his product in the past few years in a haphazard sort of way. He has sold his eggs direct to his own customers; he has joined up with others in cooperatives; or he has just sent his eggs to market and accepted the current price no matter how it was arrived at. The underlying weakness of these procedures lay in the fact that no real standards of quality were set and maintained for eggs as handled from the hen to the market place. The purchasing public under the marketing system had no assurance as to the quality of the product. Of course a cabal of poultrymen to control and maintain a price would be wrong and contrary to law, but there is no reason why poultrymen should not combine to adopt uniform high standards for their products and insist that the members of the combine live up to such standards. That has been overlooked in the past and I am delighted that the poultrymen of New Jersey are uniting under the leadership of the State government to guarantee a high standard for New Jersey eggs; I feel sure that will set an example for other States to follow. I would like to describe briefly what is being done in New Jersey along these lines.

A Poultry Products Promotion Council composed of growers, poultry-feed distributors, representatives of the State department of agriculture and the State college of agriculture has been organized under the authority of the State legislature, and its activities are financed by a State tax on poultry feeds of 1 cent per hundred pounds, paid by all poultrymen and collected by the feed distributors. The aim of this organization is to develop a long-range program for the advertising and merchandising of New Jersey poultry products, and, what is of the greatest importance, the program is coordinated with the quality control and grading activities of the division of markets of the State department of agriculture.

I quote from a letter I received recently from the Honorable Philip Alampi, the secretary of agriculture of the State of New Jersey, and to whom most of the credit of this entire plan is due:

The program is designed to expand market outlets and to strengthen the economic position of New Jersey's $130-million annual crop of quality poultry products by creating consumer preference through advertising and promotion. Domestically produced eggs and poultry meat will be identified and marketed under the department's official State seal of quality denoting conformity to grade and New Jersey source. The confidence-inspiring symbol will be used only on consumer packages meeting strict quality standards of the department of agriculture.

An egg-quality-improvement plan has been developed. Field representatives are presently working in conjunction with the department's inspection and regulatory personnel and with the State agricultural extension service, cooperative marketing agencies, receivers, and producers. Egg-quality surveys are being made and technical assistance given to improve on-farm marketing functions to produce better quality eggs. Improvement of quality-conservation practices in distribution channels will also be sought in cooperation with the regulatory staff of the department.

Interviews were conducted with 5,500 consumers in the New York City, New Jersey, and Philadelphia market areas to ascertain preferences, buying habits, consumption and use of fresh eggs and poultry meat. The findings will aid in guiding the farmers to produce in accordance with market preferences and will help the council and its advertising agency in designing their programs of advertising and publicity.

Surveys have been completed and summarized, analyzing the various ways in which New Jersey eggs, poultry, and turkeys are marketed. Information relative to distribution points, estimated volume of products to be merchandised under the official seal, and marketing outlets was made available to the council's advertising agency.

Preliminary steps have been taken toward developing a marketing program for the poultry meat growers through the combined efforts of the council and the newly created New Jersey Poultry Meat Growers Association, in cooperation with the Bureau of Poultry Service.

To further the efforts of the poultry council, the department obtained $25,000 from the Agricultural Marketing Service of the United States Department of Agriculture. Under a work agreement with the Federal agency this money is used to employ personnel to work with poultry producers, dealers, and distributors for improvement of quality and uniformity of products. Under Federal regulations, none of this grant may be used for advertising.

This surely is a comprehensive and ambitious program and judging from the enthusiastic reception it has received, its success seems assured. It will be worthless, however, if the poultrymen fail to live up to the standards that have been set, and I predict that if they do not cooperate, New Jersey poultry products will deservedly acquire such an unsavory reputation that their market will go into a slump from which they will take a long time to recover.

Permit me to speak of the preliminary work of this program which is now underway.

Advertising: The advertising campaign for New Jersey State seal of quality grade A fresh eggs was launched in the flush egg-production month of January. using key newspapers in New Jersey and New York City having a total circulation of over 1½ million readers, and, with radio advertising, the message is carried to over 2 million persons each week.

Trade publications for wholesalers and retailers carry advertising to over 18,000 interested egg receivers, distributors, brokers, and grocers.

Each of the advertisements appearing in consumer newspapers carry this exhortation next to a picture of the official seal:

When you buy eggs, look for this New Jersey State seal of quality on the carton. It means a dozen genuine New Jersey fresh eggs.

Merchandising services: All 19 newspapers which carried the New Jersey egg advertising schedule assisted in merchandising the campaign by contacting over 4,500 retail grocers in the egg-marketing areas of New Jersey and metropolitan New York City and Philadelphia.

Fifteen papers chose to send a letter and reprint of the first advertisement to the retail grocery outlets in their areas. Jumbo cards featuring a blowup of the New Jersey State seal of quality for genuine New Jersey fresh eggs were mailed by the other newspapers. Copy for these trade mailings was furnished by the advertising agency.

Additional merchandising to the grocery trade included personal calls on key retailers, feature notices in advertising bulletins sent to grocers, tie-in advertising solicitation, window and in-store point of sale displays.

A chain of 285 Associated Food Stores has distributed circulars carrying the first egg advertisement into the homes of 100,000 consumers.

Public relations: Because the poultry industry is the top ranking agricultural interest in New Jersey, news and food editors have given generous publicity to each development of the promotional campaign.

The Lenten season and the fact that March is Egg Month in New Jersey, as well as nationally, stimulate the use of releases on New Jersey eggs.

A continuous campaign of feature and news stories and pictures will be directed to the consumer, trade, and agricultural publications. Radio and TV broadcasters, home economists, and restaurateurs will be kept informed of important developments which they can implement.

Displays will be set up in public places, calling attention to this first for New Jersey egg promotion campaign.

In additon to these activities, the program is thoroughly and constantly promoted by radio broadcasts, describing the State seal of quality which identifies the high nutritive quality found in fresh eggs from the State of New Jersey.

It is indeed a great privilege for me to report on this constructive work being done by my State for its poultry industry. New Jersey poultrymen are helping themselves in the solution of their problems without running to Uncle Sam for assistance. They are acting the way American citizens should in working out their own salvation. I venture to state that others in our great country may well profit by their example and conduct their businesses and professions without the interference of Government in their affairs. Government controls, Government supports, Government dictation have no place in the ordinary business affairs of our people. America never

grew great and powerful, the envy of the world, under such a policy. Our American heritage of freedom with justice should be promoted and preserved if we as a nation are to maintain our standards and provide leadership to a bewildered world.

Another Peril: Creeping Economic Isolation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES O. PORTER
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 5, 1958

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, Oregon has many distinguished citizens, but among them there is no more distinguished economist than Prof. Raymond F. Mikesell, Miner professor of economics at the University of Oregon, and no more distinguished journalist than William M. Tugman, for many years at the editorial helm of the Eugene Register-Guard and now editor and publisher of the Port Umpqua Courier in Reedsport, Oreg.

Mr. Tugman, who has been a friend and mentor of mine for more than 22 years, comments on a recent talk by Dr. Mikesell in the following editorial which was published in the issue for Thursday, February 20, 1958. I commend his views to every one of my colleagues, particularly to those who may be wavering in their support of the mutual-security program and of the renewal of free trade legislation. The editorial is as follows:

ANOTHER PERIL: CREEPING ECONOMIC ISOLATION

One of the most interesting of the many talks which were made to the 39th annual Oregon press conference in Eugene last weekend was the warning of creeping economic isolation which was delivered by Prof. Raymond F. Mikesell, Miner professor of economics at the University of Oregon, and an economic adviser to Presidents of the United States, our State Department, and an active participant in economic missions in many parts of the world. This is a revised version of the trade, not aid, slogan which was so popular with politicians a few years ago, and so soon neglected and forgotten.

Quite as great as the dangers of space weapons are the dangers of losing the trade and the friendship of the world's great resource nations. Annihilation in space warfare might even be more merciful. Economic isolation could bring death by slow, agonizing strangulation. Dr. Mikesell reduces the problem to very simple terms:

"Like ourselves, other nations must sell what they can produce or make in order to live.

"When we shut them out of American markets by raising or restoring tariff barriers we drive them inevitably into the Communist orbit.

"When we shut out Swedish clothespins, German safety pins, Japanese textiles, Bolivian tin, competing products of many kinds, we are inviting long-range reprisals."

Within both political parties there are tremendous pressures to raise tariff walls around favored industries and to reduce all forms of American economic and military aid to our allies and to the so-called backward countries. As we withdraw from the field, the Russians move in. The time could come when we would find ourselves cut off from the great storehouses of Asia, Africa, and South America.

The professor makes all this quite clear to an audience of fairly well-educated and history-conscious editors, but he leaves unanswered (and in the laps of the editors) the $64,000 superquestion:

"How are you going to translate this into language which will appeal to the unemployed guy who is subsisting on rocking-chair money, or to the small-business man who sees his trade dwindling? How are you going to answer the argument that charity begins at home?"

Nobody in his right mind would want to return to the Smoot-Hawley high tariffs and the political and economic follies of the late twenties which had so much to do with bringing on the great depression and Hitler and World War II. The United States needs a policy which moves steadily in the direction of unrestricted free trade, but the question is how fast can we move without upsetting real or fancied American standards of high living?

The present session of Congress will put to a severe test the sincerity of many politicos who do lipservice to the broad ideals of world peace but take for cover under the first barrage of letters from home.

Actually the present recession, to use the honeyed word (and no community is harder hit than ours) may be traced in part to the shrinking of our overseas markets, for the very simple reason that if we do not buy what our friends have to sell, they cannot very well buy from us. Behind the so-called dollar shortage in most of our customer countries lies our increasing unwillingness to let them earn a few dollars from us.

Resolution

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT W. HEMPHILL
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 5, 1958

Mr. HEMPHILL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Gaffney Ledge of March 5, 1958:

RESOLUTION

This is the resolution offered by State Senator George W. McKown and adopted unanimously Monday by the Cherokee County Democratic Convention:

"Whereas employment in the United States is at a dangerous low and take-home pay for the employed is being continuously lowered, while the cost of living continues to increase; and

"Whereas farm prices have been systematically lowered since the inauguration of the Eisenhower administration; and

"Whereas small-business failures continue to increase; and

"Whereas the Republican foreign policy or lack of policy has dragged our international prestige to an all-time low; and

"Whereas the policy of the Eisenhower administration is directly responsible for these ever increasing deplorable conditions: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Cherokee County Democratic Convention, That we respectfully recommend to our ill-advised, ever-vacationing, golf-playing President that he devote at least a measure of energy to the correction of some of these irresponsible policies brought on by his administration that concern the Federal Government, and less energy to those things that are purely State functions; be it further

"Resolved, That Mr. Benson be replaced by someone who is sincere in his interest in the economic welfare of the American farmer and the American people.

"The many policies of the Eisenhower administration show clearly that the farmer, the workingman, or the small-business man have not been able to gain a sympathetic ear, therefore, in an effort to reach his advisors, let a copy of this resolution be given Radio Station WFGN, Spartanburg Herald, the AP, the IP, and the UP."

Food Stamp Plan for America's Needy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. VICTOR L. ANFUSO
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 5, 1958

Mr. ANFUSO. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing a bill which provides for the distribution of surplus food commodities through the use of a food stamp plan.

Let me emphasize at the very outset that this program is intended to aid the needy and the undernourished in our country. The purpose of this bill is twofold: to help raise the levels of health and nourishment of needy persons, and the disposal of some of our huge food surpluses in a beneficial manner.

My bill would authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to put into operation by January 1, 1959, a food stamp system for the distribution of food to the needy from the surplus commodities acquired by the United States Government through its price-support or other programs. Such distribution is to take place through the States. For this purpose, food stamps or certificates shall be issued to eligible persons which would be redeemable for certain types and quantities of food as determined by the Secretary of Agriculture.

The total of such surplus food to be distributed under this program shall not exceed more than $1 billion worth of food annually, based on the cost to the Government for purchasing, storing and handling these commodities.

It should also be noted that the food distributed under the food stamp plan shall not supersede any welfare assistance to such needy people, but should be in addition to such aid given them by the respective States.

Enactment of this bill would serve many useful purposes at this time. Aside from the fact that it would be of great help to the needy in our own country, who are having a most difficult time to cope with the present high cost of living, it would be beneficial also in the following ways:

First. It would help cut down our tremendous inventory of surplus food commodities, reported to be valued at approximately $7 billion and costing hun-

dreds of millions of dollars annually for storage, handling, and spoilage.

Second. It would be of immeasurable help to our farmers by disposal of these surpluses and the increased income for their farm products.

Third. Bolstering the farm economy would also be a much-needed shot in the arm for the entire economy of the Nation at a time of recession and growing unemployment.

Fourth. The needy, the elderly persons, the people in charitable institutions and those who are dependent on welfare assistance would be given extra nourishment and the opportunity to improve their level of health.

Fifth. Disposal of large quantities of such surpluses would have the Government and the taxpayers considerable expenditures for the cost of storage.

Mr. Speaker, since this bill will undoubtedly be referred to the Committee on Agriculture and turned over to the Subcommittee on Consumers Study, of which I have the honor to be chairman, I shall arrange for my subcommittee to undertake early hearings on the bill and the proposals contained therein. I am planning to invite the governors of various States or their representatives to testify before our committee and to present their views and a picture of the situation in their State as regards the needy who would benefit under this plan.

It is my opinion that every State will benefit by the launching of a food stamp plan, particularly the economically distressed areas where unemployment has reached alarming proportions in recent months.

Mr. Speaker, in conclusion I wish to take this opportunity of expressing my gratitude to our colleagues, the Honorable MARTHA W. GRIFFITHS of Michigan and the Honorable LEONOR K. SULLIVAN of Missouri, for their contribution in helping to develop this method of food disposal. They, too, will be invited to share their views and opinions regarding the food stamp plan with our committee.

Lastly, I should like to express my gratitude also to the distinguished chairman of the House Agriculture Committee, the Honorable HAROLD D. COOLEY, who has recognized the wisdom of this legislation and has given me the "green light," so to speak, to proceed with it.

The American Merchant Marine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEONOR K. SULLIVAN
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 5, 1958

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, recently a deep water shipping leader—Mr. Harry X. Kelly, president of the Mississippi Shipping Co., Inc., of New Orleans—came inland to bring a most important shipping and world trade message to members of the Mississippi Valley Association who met in St. Louis, Mo., my home city.

There is a direct trade connection between St. Louis and New Orleans, as goods move down the Mississippi River and overland to that great gulf port and then are shipped to overseas' markets by Mr. Kelly's company and other steamship lines. Thereby, transportation joins to link the Mississippi Valley region to the world, through a coordinated domestic transportation system.

And this man who has spent a lifetime dealing in world commerce emphasizes the need for two-way trade between nations, which further speaks for an extension of the Trade Agreements Act.

I ask unanimous consent to have entered into the Appendix of the RECORD his remarks on the vital role our Merchant Marine plays in commerce and national defense.

The remarks follow:

THE AMERICAN MERCHANT MARINE—ADDRESS BY HARRY X. KELLY, PRESIDENT, MISSISSIPPI SHIPPING CO., INC. (DELTA LINE), AT MISSISSIPPI VALLEY ASSOCIATION, ST. LOUIS, MO., FEBRUARY 11, 1958

You will recall a book published a few years ago, the title "30 Seconds Over Tokyo." It described the heroic exploits of General Doolittle's bomber crews in the first American raid on the Japanese mainland. One of the crewmen had only two words to say, "bombs away." That was a difficult mission. I also have a difficult mission: to bring you up to date on the American merchant marine in 12 minutes.

There is one thing for which I must take time; that is to express the appreciation of our industry for the continuing support which this great organization gives to American shipping.

Your resolutions committee annually demonstrates an awareness of our problems and a firm resolve to aid in solving them. We know that your membership believes that a strong merchant fleet under our own flag—like the Mississippi River itself—is an essential element of the expanding economy of the midcontinent.

First, national defense. For a while, there were rumors floating around that the American merchant marine might be less necessary in the missile age than before. Such rumors have been proved without foundation. General Twining said recently—and I quote, "If the catastrophe of a general war should be forced upon us by the necessity of retaliation against surprise attack, the merchant marine, after the initial period of devastating nuclear exchange, would play a most vital role. Indeed, it might very well be the one source of strength of the free world which would pluck victory from chaos."

Then—to fix the present administration's attitude—Mr. Gordon Gray, head of the Office of Defense Mobilization, said recently, "The conclusion of the Defense Mobilization Board that an adequate merchant marine is essential for defense purposes and that there is a continuing need for a modern, adequate, and well-balanced United States merchant marine fleet has been affirmed as the policy of the administration."

These authoritative statements take care of the rumors and reaffirm the necessity for an American merchant fleet adequate to our defense needs. Ships under the American flag are especially necessary for national defense, for in emergencies, every government needs its own ships to carry goods and men to places vitally necessary for themselves. So many tons of cargo are necessary to support one fighting man at the front. In our lifetime, airlines will not have the capacity to supply this demand.

Second—international trade. Our total annual stake in foreign trade is about $32 billion. That means jobs for 4½ million people with $13½ billion annual earnings. Exports are almost 6 percent of the national output of goods and services—and imports supply about 10 percent of the raw materials we use. The maintenance of American shipping on our essential trade routes is a form of insurance protecting that investment in international trade.

The subject of our foreign trade policy is very much in the limelight today. Actually, our maritime policy has been founded on the principle of reciprocity. For example—our basic goal is to have a fleet adequate to carry a substantial portion of our commerce. Now, while the policies of the Federal Maritime Board and the establishment of essential trade routes have been a very important factor in the development of our huge international trade and the goal set by our Congress is 50 percent, the fact is that the percentage carried in ships of our own flag has been decreasing annually since 1945 and is now about 20 percent. American flag lines have opened up trade areas over the entire world; have instituted trade promotion departments; have placed thousands of shippers in communication with buyers abroad; have placed other thousands of American importers in communication with shippers from other countries. But once the trade is developed, vessels of other nations come in until now they are carrying nearly 80 percent.

It seems to me we have been more generous in allowing other shipping nations to carry our goods than they have been in permitting us to carry a reasonable portion of theirs.

It is possible to carry reciprocity too far; but, I think there is no doubt that in the economic struggle which is now taking place between the free nations and the Soviet Union, aggressive steps must be taken to encourage the development of two-way trade among the free nations. Obstacles to that development must be removed.

Third—the future. The United States Government supports the maritime industry through construction and operating subsidies. This year, the budget request is for $120 million for operating differentials, and $160 million for the ship-construction program. I am sure you are familiar with the justification for this support and the fact that the ship-construction subsidy is not paid to the shipowner—but rather to the shipyard. A ship, which can be built in Italy today for $5 million will cost more than $10 million in any American yard. Italy pays 48 cents an hour for shipyard labor; United States pays $2.40. Our yards are in competition with Japan which pays 32 cents per hour.

On American ships, we pay $19,000 in wages per month. On a German ship, the wages are $4,100 per month.

The Government bookkeeping system fails to reveal all of the offsets which, in effect, reduce the cost of maintaining a merchant marine. I refer to the taxes paid by the owner; Federal income taxes paid by personnel on board and on shore; taxes paid by ship repair yards and suppliers. Maritime Administrator Morse recently estimated that the net cost is about $29 million per annum.

I also point out that in addition to the other substantial contributions the shipping industry makes to the American economy, our ships are substantial customers. In 1 year, for example, we buy about $07 million worth of food in this country. As we move into our ship replacement program, most of it private investment, our economic contribution will be increased and communities throughout the land will be producing parts and machinery which will eventually be installed in our new ships. I think this will be a substantial contribution to production and employment. My company has already contracted to undertake a long-range

replacement program as has Lykes Bros. Steamship Co. Only last week, Lykes awarded a contract for the building of five freighters to the Ingalls yard in Pascagoula. I am glad to state that 9 out of 18 steamers whose keels will be laid in 1958, will operate from gulf ports.

The shipping business has contributed substantially to the growth of the gulf and through the gulf ports, to the development of the Mississippi Valley area. We believe that in the future, your need for shipping will increase and we can assure you of our efforts to promote the most regular, the safest and the fastest service, and with the cooperation of the shipping industry, our manufacturers, our exporters and our importers, the welfare of the entire Nation will increase.

The Soil-Bank Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RALPH HARVEY
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 5, 1958

Mr. HARVEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following newsletter by the gentlewoman from Indiana [Mrs. HARDEN]:

WASHINGTON, D. C.—Any Indiana farmer who is denied participation in the soil bank this year should place the blame right where it belongs—on the Democrat-controlled Congress, not Mr. Eisenhower or Mr. Benson.

Last year, Secretary of Agriculture Benson asked Congress for $750 million with which to carry out the 1958 soil-bank program. The House Appropriations Committee reduced it to $500 million. The committee is, as are all committees in the Congress, controlled by the Democrat Party. So there is no question as to where the blame lies.

When the bill reached the House floor for action, a Democrat Congressman from the South proposed that the entire appropriation for the soil bank be cut out. By a party-line vote of 192 to 187, this was done. The soil-bank program was killed. Even the insufficient appropriation approved by the Appropriations Committee was wiped out. Needless to say, I opposed this action and voted to keep the soil bank in operation. So did most Republicans.

Fortunately, the Senate restored the $500 million. Remember, though, that this was just two-thirds of what the Secretary of Agriculture had requested in soil-bank funds.

It turned out that Mr. Benson had not exaggerated the need. Indiana farmers, for example, oversubscribed our $15 million soil-bank quota by 197 percent. Nationally, the interest was equally as great and by late January the funds were exhausted.

Mr. Benson promptly asked Congress for additional funds. The House Appropriations Committee voted to approve another $175 million and Republican House Members were successful in getting the figure increased on the floor to $250 million in voting last week. It is hoped the Senate will follow suit, and that the funds will be made available.

Congressman CHARLES HALLECK, of Indiana, had this to say during the House debate:

HALLECK told the Democrats that concerning the soil-bank acreage reserve, "the administration asked for $750 million to carry on this program * * * and apparently in great glee, you sabotaged the program, even as you sabotaged the program we wanted for the corn farmers of the Middle West."

He added that "as far as I am concerned, you are not going to get away with it. You cannot blame the administration, you cannot blame Benson, you cannot blame me for the very failings in which you have indulged on your side as you have run the Congress of the United States. * * * You are the people who joined up against most of us on the Republican side to cut out the money, thereby bringing this confusion throughout all of the farm areas today."

HALLECK continued, "I have been trying to find out when you are going to come up with a farm program. You are awfully free and long on criticism, but I have not seen you come up with anything. You will not take what the administration offers. * * * The crop season will soon be here, so apparently after you have had complete control of the Government so far as legislation is concerned, you yet are unwilling to do anything.

"We can have no farm program except as the Congress votes it and appropriates the money for it * * * so I think the time has come when the shoe ought to be put on the right foot, and that is on the foot of the Democrat Congress that has failed to meet its responsibility."

I subscribe to Mr. HALLECK's statement 100 percent.

United States Advisory Commission on Information

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BROOKS HAYS
OF ARKANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 5, 1958

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. Mr. Speaker, the United States Advisory Commission on Information has prepared a report making some very interesting recommendations about the operations of the United States Information Agency. Since our information program abroad is so crucial to the success of our efforts to keep the free world strong and the captive world informed of the truth, I think every citizen of the United States should take a real interest in the suggestions made by the Advisory Commission. Under leave to extend my remarks, I include a summation of the recommendations made, as follows:

Ten years of experience in counseling the United States foreign information program has led the United States Advisory Commission on Information to highlight in its 13th report to Congress the urgent need for long-range planning in foreign information work. "This is essential," affirms the Commission, "if we are to wrest the initiative from the well planned, long-range, lavishly financed Communist propaganda effort."

The Commission said that recent Communist propaganda successes following the launching of their earth satellites coupled with the call for ideological competition that was enunciated by Khrushchev in 1957, represented a double-barrelled challenge and threat to the free world.

The report points out that the Soviet propaganda challenge which has existed for 40 years, has been intensified in the past 15 years and reached a peak with the launching of sputnik and other Soviet advances. But, the report emphasizes, matching this challenge are "some very real opportunities for United States information activity."

It believes that there is a chance to turn sputnik to the free world's advantage. The Soviet sputniks and the challenge they represent can serve to reunite and rearm the free world, just as the Soviet attack on Korea helped to this end.

The report also saw in Khrushchev's challenge of "let us compete" a slight lifting of the Iron Curtain and a chance for increased communications between the Soviets and the free world.

Another opportunity is seen in the increased demand for news from and about the United States. The Commission pointed out in its report that the Soviet's scientific advances have been news around the world and have whetted the appetite of the world for more news about what this country is doing and for more information about the United States and its people. This demand, it believes, can be met only partly by private news services and offers an opportunity for the USIA to help clear up misunderstanding and ignorance of the United States. Reports from the field indicate an aroused receptivity for books, pamphlets, exhibits, and motion pictures and has disclosed a greater curiosity about the scientific and economic strength of the United States than in the past.

A further opportunity mentioned in this report is the need for information activity in Africa, much of which it says remains a wide-open field. It believes there is today a real opportunity, especially in the central areas, to reach the people with long-range information programs that will be of real help to the people of that continent.

Cautioning that it would be a costly error to assume that the Communist threat is only a scientific one, the Commission's report states that "science to dominate the world * * * and ideology to win the minds of men are both essential elements in the Soviet plan of conquest * * * both are the products of carefully developed long-range plans. The Soviet activities in both fields have been persistent, continuous, aimed at specific long-range targets."

To successfully meet the Soviet Communist long-range ideological propaganda challenge, the Commission calls upon the United States Government to close further the 30-year competitive gap between the level of Communist propaganda and that of the United States foreign information effort.

Based on the lessons of the past 10 years, the Commission recommends 8 principles which the United States information program should adopt:

1. The foreign information program and organization must be nonpartisan in the hope that this will encourage continuity in leadership and more efficient planning and operations.

2. Relations with Congress must be closer and continuous, including frequent consultations and discussions.

3. The international information organization should continue to be an independent agency. After observing the operations of the United States foreign information program, both in the Department of State and as an independent agency, the Commission concludes that an information program operates more effectively when it is independent.

4. A permanent career system is urgently needed in order to attract and retain competent personnel.

5. These personnel must be supplied with adequate representation funds which have been denied to them year after year.

6. The program should continually clarify its objectives.

7. It should make available its specialized knowledge at the policymaking levels of governmnet.

8. Finally, the USIA should assist the United States Government in taking the leadership in worldwide information programs.

The Commission's 13th report to Congress also examines the present strengths and weaknesses of USIA and concludes by making specific suggestions for prompt action in order that the Agency may be equipped to meet the long-range challenge of Communist propaganda and ideology. These include:

(a) An appraisal of the Agency's major themes and programs. The Commission recommends the vigorous programing of people's capitalism, family of man, free elections, atoms for peace, and a projection of United States cultural attainments. It urges the Agency to grant the teaching of English a high priority.

The Commission also calls the Agency's attention to two possible new themes. One would be based on the free world's use of science to improve health, welfare, and living standards of all people.

The second, the Commission points out, would stem from the fact that "the Soviets have borrowed heavily from the free world's ides of competition, rewards for excellence, and spirit of free inquiry in developing their physical sciences. They could now be challenged publicly as to why they have not carried the same free world ideas into the social sciences, * * * human relations, economics, government * * * where they would be of benefit to the Soviet peoples."

(b) Step up personnel improvement by obtaining a career service, giving foreign language training high priority, improve and speed up the reassignment of personnel returning from the field, and give greater weight to the role of the cultural-affairs officers in the Agency's total program.

(c) Plan for increased East–West exchanges and cooperate with other Government agencies to promote and develop a program of tourism to the United States.

(d) Improve cooperation and continue to avoid competition with private enterprise.

This 13th report to Congress marks the 10th year of the Commission's existence. Three of the original members of the Commission, Chairman Mark A. May, director, Institute of Human Relations, Yale University; Mr. Erwin D. Canham, editor, Christian Science Monitor; and Mr. Philip D. Reed, chairman of the board, General Electric Co., have served continuously during the past decade. Mr. Sigurd S. Larmon, president, Young & Rubicam, has served on the Commission since January 1954, and Mr. Lewis W. Douglas since January 1956. Because of a recent illness, Mr. Douglas was unable to participate in the preparation of this report and for this reason has not signed it. He has, however, expressed agreement with most of the major points made by the Commission.

Democracy in Costa Rica

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DONALD L. JACKSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 5, 1958

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial:

DEMOCRACY IN COSTA RICA

It is always heartening to see the democratic process flower in the governments of our Latin American neighbors. The recent elections in Costa Rica were models of free and honest voting, such as we have come to expect of that enlightened country.

A conservative lawyer, Mario Echandi, defeated by a narrow margin the incumbent president, Jose Figueres. Figueres had been president since 1953, and had been instrumental, both before and since his presidency, in putting into effect social-welfare measures and advanced industrial codes. Under attack by extreme conservatives in his own country, he was bitterly opposed by Dictator Somoza in neighboring Nicaragua. Somoza provoked a border fight which was bitterly waged. Figueres emerged from this struggle with the admiration of even those fellow countrymen who had felt that he was too far left of center.

To preserve the democratic process that he saw so badly abused in other Latin countries, Figueres maintained an electoral system where registration of voters, secret balloting, and counting of votes were handled by genuine political neutrals. It was this system which produced the people's quiet rejection of Figueres the other day, and his supplanting by Echandi. The latter had campaigned on a platform of less Government interference in business, and the voters were ready to accept him.

There are more people of white than of Indian extraction in Costa Rica, and in economic life fewer extremes of poverty.

Doing Business in Puerto Rico

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WAYNE N. ASPINALL

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 13, 1958

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, and may I say, too, the Congress of the United States, is very fortunate indeed to have the Honorable A. FERNÓS-ISERN as Resident Commissioner from Puerto Rico. He has spent almost 12 years discharging the obligations of this important office, and of course with each succeeding year his services become more valuable to all of us.

Dr. FERNÓS is possessed with unlimited knowledge about his people and with his recognized ability and industry, together with the confidence which his people place in him, he has been able to render to them outstanding service.

Just recently there was held in New York City a briefing conference on the subject of doing business in Puerto Rico. The Resident Commissioner was honored to give the address of welcome to those attending this conference. His address is a fine, up-to-date statement of the history of this part of our Nation and the important part that it and its people are playing in our national life today. I take great pleasure, Mr. Speaker, in placing Dr. FERNÓS' address in the Appendix of the RECORD so that all of us may read it and have profit therefrom.

ADDRESS BY HON. A. FERNÓS-ISERN, RESIDENT COMMISSIONER OF THE COMMONWEALTH OF PUERTO RICO IN WASHINGTON, D. C., AT THE DOING BUSINESS IN PUERTO RICO CONFERENCES HELD ON FEBRUARY 6 AND 7 AT THE HOTEL COMMODORE IN NEW YORK CITY

Gentlemen, allow me to thank you for having accepted the invitation of the Bureau of National Affairs Inc., and the Puerto Rico Economic Development Administration, to attend this conference. I thank you in the name of the people of Puerto Rico, whom I represent in the Federal Government. As I am sure you know, the Resident Commissioner of Puerto Rico is the elected representative of the people and serves for a term of 4 years. He is the spokesman for the people of Puerto Rico in Federal matters. The position exists since 1900 and was created by the first organic act which organized civil government in Puerto Rico under American sovereignty. The fact that you are here, and that you are giving so much of your precious time to become acquainted with the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico and its opportunities, attests to your interests in the islands and its people. (The Commonwealth of Puerto Rico comprises the island of Puerto Rico and a number of small adjacent islands, two of which are inhabited and organized as municipalities within the Commonwealth.)

I believe I owe you a short résumé of the background of the islands comprised within the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico and of its people. As you may remember, the first area of the New World which came in contact with Western civilization was the Caribbean. The first settlement in the New World, and for that matter the first capital of the New World, was established before the end of the 15th century in the island then known as Hispaniola and now occupied jointly by the Dominican Republic and the Republic of Haiti. From what is now the Dominican Republic discovery and conquest branched out. Puerto Rico was the second island to be conquered and settled; therefore, its capital city, San Juan de Puerto Rico, is the second oldest city in the New World. It was founded by the first settler of Puerto Rico, Juan Ponce de Leon, in 1508. Cuba, Mexico, Costa Firme, Peru, followed. Exactly 99 years after San Juan was founded the English king awakened to the fact that there was a New World and there was plenty of room in it, not only for Spaniards, but also for Englishmen. Jamestown was founded.

Therefore, by the time Jamestown was founded, western civilization was 99 years old in Puerto Rico. During the succeeding centuries, up to the end of the 19th century, a continuous stream of settlers moved over from Spain to the New World, and consequently, into Puerto Rico. And in those four centuries Puerto Rico grew into a people a million strong, with no less than 66 cities and towns, or municipalities, and with no more free land for settlement. Until the middle of the 19th century, when various separate kingdoms merged to give rise to the unified Spanish State, Puerto Rico was a part of the Kingdom of Castile, one of the component parts of Spain, and lived under the Laws of Indies, which means the laws of Castile in a modified form, in order to adjust to New World conditions. After Spain became a united kingdom with a constitution and a common code of laws, Puerto Rico was declared to be a component part of that Kingdom. Since 1868 Puerto Rico was duly represented in the Spanish Cortes, the national parliament.

The ethnic composition of the people of Puerto Rico is, therefore, fundamentally Spanish. The Indians very early disappeared as a race. There were about 16,000 Indians at the time of the discovery and conquest and they were soon absorbed both by the white race and by the colored race which was brought into the island from the early days of settlement. Slavery existed in Puerto Rico until 1873 when the 33,000 slaves were declared free citizens. Their masters were paid the proper indemnity.

To say that Puerto Rico was a part of the Kingdom of Spain is to express a political fact, but the political fact did not quite conform with social realities. Thousands of miles of water between the island and the peninsula made for such differences of interest and outlook, that even with a common origin, a common culture, and a common language, there were profound differences which subjected the existing political rela-

tionship to strains and tensions which found expression in the claim for self-government by the island people.

This came to fruition in the year 1897 when the Spanish crown granted a self-governing constitution to the people of Puerto Rico, with the participation of Puerto Rico in the decisions which concerned their external affairs as well as representation in the national parliament. National matters were still in charge of the central government. What the outcome of this arrangement might have been, had it lasted, is anybody's guess. Mine is that separation from Spain was inevitable and that the Spanish-American War, as a result of which Puerto Rico was separated from Spain and its sovereignty transferred to the United States, must be interpreted as a short-cut in history. By virtue of this separation Puerto Rico ceased to be a part of a European kingdom and became, in the political sense, what it had always been and is in the geographic and social sense, a people of the New World.

The determination of the political status of the Puerto Rican people after separation was not made by the Treaty of Cession. The Treaty of Cession, the Treaty of Paris of 1899, left the determination of the political status of the Puerto Rican people to the Congress of the United States. Following the termination of the Spanish regime, Puerto Rico was placed under a military government for two years. In 1900 the Congress enacted the First Organic Act for Puerto Rico and civil government was restored. The Organic Act of 1900 provided for the people of Puerto Rico raising their own taxes and paying for their own internal government, while the Federal Government would have direct charge of external matters and what we all know as federal functions and services. It provided for the extension of the United States tariff to Puerto Rico, as imposed to foreign imports, and for the accession of Puerto Rico to the common market of the United States. The basic relationship still exists at present, except for the limitation on the amount of refined sugar Puerto Rico may ship to the mainland.

The Organic Act of 1900 also provided for American currency to be the currency of Puerto Rico, and for the extension to Puerto Rico of the United States postal system. No federal taxes would be collected in Puerto Rico. (This situation still exists except for the limited application of the Federal income-tax law. Residents of Puerto Rico are now subject to the Federal income-tax law on income derived form sources outside Puerto Rico. This includes Federal salaries earned in the island.)

Practically the whole tax field was left to the island's government and, since 1917, its income from revenues collected includes that tax on goods produced or manufactured in Puerto Rico and transported to the United States market. The tax is equal in amount to that imposed in the United States on United States domestic products. Puerto Rico was to be represented in the Federal Government by a Resident Commissioner who was also granted all the privileges of the House of Representatives, except a vote. The Government of Puerto Rico was organized with a Governor appointed by the President of the United States, a bicarmeral legislative assembly, and a supreme court. The upper house, of the legislative assembly, the executive council, was composed of eleven members appointed by the President. The house of delegates was elected by the people. Out of the 11 members of the executive council, 6 were at the same time respectively the heads of the six departments of the executive branch of Government.

Puerto Rico lived under the Organic Act of 1900, known as the Foraker Act, for 17 years. In 1917 Congress enacted a new organic act known as the Jones Act. The executive council was replaced by an elected senate. Four of the heads of the six executive departments were to be appointed by the Governor by and with the advice of the Senate of Puerto Rico. The Governor, the auditor, and the two remaining heads of departments, namely the attorney general and the commissioner of education, were still appointed by the President. The justices of the Supreme Court of Puerto Rico were appointed by the President, while the judges for the inferior courts were appointed by the Governor with the advice and consent of the Senate of Puerto Rico. Appeals from the Supreme Court of Puerto Rico were to be made to the First Federal Circuit Court of Appeals at Boston and thence to the Supreme Court of the United States. A Federal district court, which had been previously created for the District of Puerto Rico, was continued.

The Jones Act, the Organic Act of 1917, was not substantially amended for 30 years. In 1947 it was amended to provide for an elective governor and for the appointment by the Governor of all the heads of departments. The auditor and the supreme court continued to be appointed by the President of the United States.

A fundamental change in the government of Puerto Rico took place in 1950. Public Law 600, of the 81st Congress, was signed by the President on July 3, 1950. I had the honor of having introduced the bill in the House, while it was introduced in the Senate by Senators O'MAHONEY and BUTLER of Nebraska. The act, which was adopted in the nature of a compact and was to become effective if accepted in a referendum by the people of Puerto Rico, was in fact an enabling act to allow the people of Puerto Rico to organize their own government under a constitution of their own adoption, within the framework of relationships as Public Law 600 offered the people of Puerto Rico. They approved, 4 to 1, the terms of compact. Accordingly, they elected delegates to a constitutional convention to frame a constitution for the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico. I had the honor of presiding over that convention. The constitution framed by the constitutional convention was submitted to the people of Puerto Rico for approval or rejection, and they approved it by popular vote on March 3, 1952. Under act 447 of July 3, 1952, 82d Congress, the Congress of the United States declared the constitution adopted by the people of Puerto Rico to be in conformity with the compact, and approved it, subject to some conditions subsequently approved by the people of Puerto Rico. Thereupon the Commonwealth was inaugurated on July 25, 1952, on the 54th anniversary of the landing of American troops in Puerto Rico under General Miles on July 25, 1898.

In accordance with the compact, the Constitution of Puerto Rico creates the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico. The constitution contains a bill of rights and provides for a republican form of government, with three branches of government, namely, the executive, the legislative, and the judicial. The Governor is elected by the people every 4 years. The Governor appoints the council of secretaries, with the advice and consent of the senate. There is a unified judicial system and a legislative assembly consisting of a senate and a house of representatives elected by popular vote every 4 years together with the Governor and the Resident Commissioner. The bill of rights is patterned after the Bill of Rights in the United States Constitution. A unique feature of the Constitution of Puerto Rico is that it provides for representation of the minority parties, roughly proportionate to their voting strength, regardless of the number of districts they may have carried.

Under the compact the United States Government operates in Puerto Rico within a sphere of authority comparable to that within which it operates in the United States, except the exercise of the taxing power. The Government of the Commonwealth operates in Puerto Rico within a comparable sphere of authority as a State government, although the field in which it exercises its taxing power is broader than in a State. The other main difference between the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico and a member State of the Union is to be found in the fact that Puerto Rico has no participation in the election of the President of the United States, has no representation in the Senate of the United States and is represented in the House by a voteless Resident Commissioner. Federal laws apply in Puerto Rico, with a few exceptions, with the same force and effect as in the United States. Appeals of decisions of the Supreme Court of Puerto Rico are still made to the first circuit court. A United States district court continues to function in Puerto Rico.

Since 1917, under the Jones Act, the citizens of Puerto Rico were declared to be citizens of the United States. Common citizenship has been now for 41 years the fundamental bond of Union between the people of Puerto Rico and the people of the United States and, although those living in 1917 became citizens under collective naturalization, the fact is that more than half of the present population of Puerto Rico, the younger generations, are United States citizens by birth.

Within this framework of political and economic relationship to the United States, Puerto Rico is at present rapidly developing as a free community, permanently associated to the United States. While maintaining its historical and cultural heritage, it has assimilated and incorporated into its life the ideals, the outlook, the ways of American life. Puerto Rico is rapidly becoming bilingual. It is a hubbub of industrial activity. It is inevitably destined to become the outpost of American industry and commerce in the Caribbean, the frontier of American business, vis-a-vis the chain of countries that border the Caribbean Sea; countries that are now undergoing an upsurge of commercial activity and for whom I venture to predict Puerto Rico shall become the workshop. Millions of prospective consumers of the product of American enterprise, ingenuity and know-how live on the Caribbean basin and beyond, into the vastness of the Spanish-American Main.

With the weapon of a common language, both with the people of the United States and the people of the Caribbean, and with the stability derived from our American institutions, I venture to say that Puerto Rico will become the industrial leader of that area; again I say, the outpost and spearhead of American business and the American business and the American spirit in that part of the world.

Nixon's Cordiality Demonstration

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DONALD L. JACKSON
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 5, 1958

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Hollywood Valley Times of Thursday, February 20, 1958:

NIXON'S CORDIALITY DEMONSTRATION

(By George Todt)

"They love him most for the enemies he has made."—Gen. E. S. Bragg—nominating speech for Grover Cleveland, 1884.

Regardless of the opinions of Republican Harold Stassen or Democrat Harry Truman about him in the past, I consider RICHARD NIXON one of the most admirable and amazing personalities in modern American political history.

Few men before him have shown so much progress and improvement over the years of his still-young political life as has Mr. NIXON. And he is on the upgrade, too.

A very fine columnist, whose work I read and admire, recently pointed out that DICK NIXON had always been the same, great guy he is today—but people are just finding it out for themselves as they get to know him better. With this outlook I must respectfully, but firmly, disagree. Here's why.

Although the Vice President was an exemplary young fellow when he first entered into politics a decade ago, not far removed from a tour of duty in the United States Navy as a lieutenant commander, he would probably be the first one to admit that he was green as grass at the time he made the fateful plunge. It ultimately took him from the position of Mr. Doakes to the second-highest slot in the administration of the most powerful Nation on the face of the globe today. All in the incredibly short span of 10 years. Isn't this amazing?

Now it isn't this tremendous success in politics which has filled me with admiration for DICK NIXON—I have been acquainted with quite a few other successful men and women in my time and this doesn't send me any more—but rather the way the young man from Whittier, Calif., has handled the success which has come his way.

In the first place, it hasn't gone to his head. As a matter of fact, he is about as down-to-earth and modest as any political personality of his magnitude could possibly be. As I have watched him become more polished with the passing of the years, I have also noted something else which is occurring simultaneously in his development—the common touch. Let me tell you something I saw him do recently which illustrates my point.

Last Monday evening, Dick and Pat Nixon received more than 4,000 GOP party precinct workers and their friends at the Hollywood Palladium from 6:30 until 10:30—and they shook hands and talked with every single one of the huge throng which jammed the hall. You can imagine how tired they both must have been when the last well-wisher had gone through the line. Frankly, the Nixons were pooped out. So what did they do next?

Well, there were just a small group of us left in the Palladium—some few scores of people on the way out when we all stopped to see what Pat and Dick Nixon were doing. It was so warm and human, the little gesture they made together, that I want all my readers to know about it. All the service personnel and volunteers who served the coffee and punch throughout the evening—another tiresome but important job—were lined up in double rows. And the Nixons went down the lines speaking to every one and thanking them for helping to make their reception the tremendous success that it was.

After people had been coming up to Dick and Pat all night to shake hands with them, this down-to-earth young American couple were thoughtful enough to reverse their roles upon leaving, tired as they were, and simply wouldn't leave until they had the opportunity to thank each and every one of the uniformed service personnel and the volunteers who served the crowd. I will leave it to you to imagine how proud and pleased they all were.

Actually, this warm and human action of DICK NIXON and his Pat are only illustrative of the spontaneous affection for others which constantly emanates from them both. They are humanitarian in the best sense of the term, because it comes from the heart. It is quite obvious to an observer that they truly like people and wish to be of service to them where and when they can. People like them because they like people.

The fundamental reason why I admire the Vice President so much may be summed up in these two words: eternal progression. I don't know of any figure in modern United States political history who keeps on improving himself so assiduously with every passing day—whose ability continues to expand so remarkably as he applies himself more and more to his job.

I have a hunch that DICK NIXON will keep on improving himself constantly as long as he is in public life. And this I like. Don't you? What is a more necessary ingredient to real progress than a consistent rate of improvement? And what is more hopeful in these trying times than the right kind of progress demonstrated by our leaders?

Interests of Family Farmer, Factory Worker, and Consumer Are All the Same Interests When Fighting Depression

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. COYA KNUTSON

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 25, 1958

Mrs. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks, I insert letters from two different segments of our economy, the farmer and the factory worker, both of whom recognize our common problems and common interests in licking this farm depression that affects the national economy:

UNITED AUTOMOBILE, AIRCRAFT, AND AGRICULTURAL IMPLEMENT WORKERS OF AMERICA,

Minneapolis, Minn., February 27, 1958.

Hon. COYA KNUTSON,
Ninth Minnesota District,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSWOMAN KNUTSON: Recently you received a copy of a resolution passed by the Minneapolis City Council concerning unemployment problems as related to the farm problem.

For your information I am enclosing a copy of a resolution adopted at a conference on unemployment problems held on January 15 in Minneapolis.

You will note that the Minneapolis City Council's action was initiated by our unemployment resolution.

Our local union representing workers in a hard hit farm equipment industry cannot urge you too strongly to initiate and actively support measures designed to relieve the economic situation now, not some time in the vague future.

Respectfully yours,

GEORGE W. MACDONALD,
Business Representative, Local 1146.

Resolution on reduced farm income and its effect on full employment

Whereas the American people, through Congress, passed the Employment Act of 1946 with instructions to any and every administration to use all its powers to maintain maximum production, maximum purchasing power, and maximum employment; and

Whereas numerous national policies, including farm policies have been put into effect that are not designed to achieve those stated principles but are actually designed to accomplish the opposite results; and

Whereas it is common knowledge that full employment has not been maintained and that presently in Minneapolis, as in the Nation as a whole, less than maximum production has resulted in much less than maximum employment and maximum purchasing power; and

Whereas there are over 18,000 admitted unemployed in Minneapolis and some 4 million in the Nation with the prediction that these figures will be greatly increased; and

Whereas a great portion of the responsibility for this growing number of unemployed workers can be directly traced to farm policies that have resulted in reduced farm income and eventual elimination of the family-type farmer; and

Whereas such reductions in farm income and family-type farmers serve to reduce, not only the purchasing power of the family farmer who is an important customer for products produced by the city workers, but of the unemployed city worker who in turn cannot buy the farmers' products; and

Whereas Minneapolis, which is located in the heart of an agricultural area and whose well-being through income derived from agricultural products is greatly dependent upon sufficient farm income to buy the products which we, the citizens of Minneapolis, produce; and

Whereas the great depression taught us the lesson that farm depression drags down the living standards of all of us and that American democracy thrives on the independence and self-reliance of its family farmers and organized workers; and

Whereas if present farm policies continue, including the most recent announced reductions in dairy product support prices, driving out small family farmers, and turning the farm economy over to corporation farms while more and more of the business economy is falling into the hands of the huge monopoly corporations, our democratic way of life will have received a serious blow: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That this conference on growing problems of unemployment sponsored by the Hennepin County CIO council, meeting in Minneapolis at 501½ East Hennepin Avenue on Wednesday, January 15, 1958, goes on record calling upon the city council of Minneapolis to pass a resolution memorializing the national administration and Congress to adopt a farm policy that will embody the following:

1. A farm price-support program that will maintain at least 90-percent parity on all crops and dairy products, up to a reasonable level of farm family income.

2. Such support program should include production payments, a bona fide soil-bank program, as well as loans and other devices.

3. Encourage farm prosperity by expanding food consumption at home and abroad under terms and conditions that will neither penalize our own farmers for producing abundance nor antagonize farmers in other countries by dumping so-called surplus foods as a part of capital grants and loans in international economic development, but so as to supplement inadequate diets as proposed by the United Nations Food and Agriculture Organization.

4. Develop school-lunch programs that will reach every child and for food stamps or allotment programs that will supplement inadequate diets of persons with low incomes without being used as an excuse for reducing or holding down wages, pensions, or public assistance payments in cash.

5. Allow real family farmers a greater measure of democratic participation in developing of farm programs through their own organizations; and be it finally

Resolved, That the Minneapolis City Council go on record calling either for the resignation or removal of the present Secretary of

Agriculture who has proven that he is either incapable or unwilling to administer such farm policy programs that will encourage maximum production, maximum purchasing power, and maximum employment.

BONNIE VIEW FARM,
Java Village, N. Y., March 1, 1958.

Hon. COYA KNUTSON,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MADAM: I take this opportunity to express, in part at least, the real appreciation I have for the noble fight you are waging for the American family farmer.

We hear much oratory and concern expressed about the American way of life and the fear that Russia will in some mysterious manner deprive us of this privilege. How stupid. If we would only pause for a brief moment, in this rat race to the moon, and do a little basic research on our American heritage we might discover a very definite pattern and be able to identify and evaluate some of the ingredients which have made us great, as well as some of the negative factors.

Not the least of these assets is the contribution to our economy and our culture of family farming. Through the years it has stood as the symbol of the frontier, of solid thrifty citizenry, and good wholesome American living, as it should be. It comes much closer to an expression of American democracy and independent thought and action than is to be found in more metropolitan groups. The good rural communities made up of independent farm families living under prosperous conditions constitute the greatest defense we have against communism. While they are today in a minority they still contribute a staggering amount to productivity and consumption of American trade. Without them the American way of life would be a mockery.

Today our problem is one of survival. The efforts of Benson to liquidate the American family farmer is as ruthless and reprehensible as anything ever practiced in Russia. Today we are operating without choice in one of the following ways. Through a subsidy of a part-time job, inheritance, depreciation or debt. Any way it's a losing game. The current depression is aggravating a bad situation, and the outlook is more of the same.

It is certain we cannot expect anything good from the quail shooters, nor the diplomats who fly around like a misguided missile, with a bo-bo in one hand and a blank check (ours) in the other. Many of our statesmen and leaders (so called) appear in a lunar daze, with what Elbert Hubbard once diagnosed as "chronic constipation of the intellect and acute diarrhea of the vocal chords." No help here. It seems to me that our only road to survival is to make ourselves heard, above the whistle of the missile, the moans and groans of the sacred cows, and the bellowing of Benson, and call for a showdown.

I therefore humbly suggest the following as grass sentiment from a real family farmer.

FARM PROBLEM

A definition of terms and a bill of particulars. Define family farmers as those who farm for a living and are bona fide operators. Also define and catalog tax-dodging farmers, hobby farmers, corporate farming, and what else have you.

Show plainly who has contributed and how much to the so-called surplus, and how they have absorbed farm subsidies.

Demand that the President (whoever he is) declare a moratorium on all family farm debt, including taxes, in excess of $100, until the farm dollar is a dollar in the market place.

Enact legislation to curb and control corporate farming, penalize or discourage tax dodging and hobby farming.

Use supports and controls if necessary until a practical farm program is devised. Favor direct payments over Government purchase of processed goods. Turn the spotlight on more efficient distribution of farm products and encourage true cooperatives into this field.

Consider the advantage of land use rather than soil bank.

Use present surpluses to help needy people wherever they are.

Work for the appointment of a commission on country life.

I trust that this will be received as intended, an honest expression of opinion from one sincere American to another.

Gratefully yours,

H. G. ABBOTT.

Tax Evasion

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES A. VANIK
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 4, 1958

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, the sale and purchase of corporations for the advantage of profitable tax-evasion gimmicks is developing into a profitable new business on the American scene. This new business is costing the United States Treasury untold millions in income-tax losses. The gimmick is very simple, a company with a lusty income record acquires or is acquired by a corporation with a tax-loss carryforward. The corporation with taxable income offsets this income with the tax loss carryforward and the Federal Treasury loses millions of dollars in income taxes otherwise due and payable. The use of this gimmick is big business, and its use shifts an increasing burden on the rest of the tax-paying public.

In order to take advantage of this gimmick and develop a tax-loss carryforward some businesses have shut down operations and displaced thousands of workers throughout the Nation. This was never the legislative intent of the internal-revenue laws which make possible the privilege of loss carryforward. This privilege should be available only to a corporation continuing in business, and it should not be assignable to another corporation or business for tax-avoidance purposes. It is my hope that the other body will correct this tax-saving gimmick as it currently considers the technical revisions to the Internal Revenue Act.

As a specific example of the operation of this tax-avoiding gimmick, I want to call attention to the following article entitled "Servel Says It Seeks To Acquire Firm With History of Earnings," which appeared in the Wall Street Journal of March 3, 1958:

SERVEL SAYS IT SEEKS TO ACQUIRE FIRM WITH HISTORY OF EARNINGS

DOVER, DEL.—Servel, Inc., which disposed of most of its manufacturing business during 1957 for about $14 million, has a $18 million tax loss carry-forward and is looking for ways to spend its money, an official said at the annual meeting here.

Duncan C. Menzies, president, said, "We want an established business with a history of earnings * * * a bread-and-butter business, not one with a lot of glamor and no record of earnings."

It's hard to tell, Mr. Menzies said, but it is possible that such a firm will be purchased within the next 6 months.

Servel last year sold its air conditioning business and some buildings from its defense division to Arkansas Louisiana Gas Co. for about $3,675,000. Other property, including the firm's general offices and home appliances division, with more than 1 million square feet of space, was sold early in January to Whirlpool Corp.

William Caldwell, counsel for Servel, said the firm has enough cash to redeem the preferred stock at $107.50 a share, and still pay off a short-term loan of $3,760,000. But, said Mr. Caldwell, "I think the common stockholders would cry bloody murder." He said that the sale of the firm's assets last year was authorized on the condition that the firm look for new businesses.

"I could not encourage directors to pay dividends except out of earnings," Mr. Menzies commented. He said he thinks the management has a duty to resume dividend payments as soon as new businesses are purchased and earnings begin coming in.

Convictions That Guide Benson

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DONALD L. JACKSON
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 5, 1958

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Valley Times, Hollywood, Calif., of Monday, February 3, 1958:

CONVICTIONS THAT GUIDE BENSON
(By George Todt)

"Whatever makes men good Christians, makes them good citizens."—Daniel Webster.

President Eisenhower, at his first Cabinet meeting, asked 1 of the 12 Apostles of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter Day Saints to offer a prayer. He did, and since then every Cabinet meeting has opened with a prayer, either vocal or silently.

The Mormon Apostle commenced this commendable cycle was the Secretary of Agriculture, Ezra Taft Benson. All of his staff meetings are opened with a vocal prayer, as are also the National Agricultural Advisory Commission meetings. As a matter of fact, all members of the staff of varying religious denominations take their turn in offering prayer.

What kind of a man is Secretary Benson anyway? Shall we look beneath the surface, and see for ourselves the character and philosophy which motivates this great but much-maligned public servant? Is his the kind of Americanism we can buy for ourselves?

For answer to this question, let's take a few personal glimpses of the man:

He is a kindly and compassionate person who neither smokes nor drinks, nor do any members of his family; while he conscientiously adheres to his own standards, he is careful not to impose them on others holding different views.

His family life is an exemplary and inspiring one. His devoted wife, the former Flora Ammussen, was a beautiful girl from a wealthy home who fell in love with a young farmer of modest means in the early twenties back in Cache Valley, Utah and Idaho. She waited for him to graduate with honors from Brigham Young University, going on a 2-year mission for the Mormon Church to eat up some of her waiting time

in the meanwhile, and then married her childhood sweetheart without further ado. The Bensons have 6 talented children ranging from 14 to 30, all active in church and civic affairs today.

The deep religious faith and humility of Ezra Taft Benson—and the faith and loyalty of his lovely wife and family which comprise 2 sons and 4 daughters—give him a serenity, a confidence, a sense of security which is not likely to be shaken by the Washington tumult now or in the future.

Now what about Mr. Benson's inner philosophical convictions—what motivates him in the performance of his important duties? How can we judge the effect until we know what caused it in the first place? Shall we hear from the Secretary directly about this?

"I love this Nation. It is my firm belief that the God of heaven raised up the Founding Fathers and inspired them to establish the Constitution of this land. This was engrained in me as a youngster by my father and mother and by my church. It is part of my religious faith.

"To me, this is not just another nation. It is a great and glorious society with a divine mission to perform for liberty-loving people everywhere.

"We here in this privileged land hold in our hands the best hope of mankind—and it will be our shame and disgrace before God and man if we allow that hope to wither and die.

"The supreme test of any Government policy, agricultural or other, should be: 'How will it affect the character, morale and well-being of our people?'

"We need—the world needs—a strong America in the critical years ahead.

"Freedom is a God-given eternal principle vouchsafed to us under the Constitution. It must be continually guarded as something as precious as life itself.

"It is doubtful if any man can be politically free who depends upon the state for sustenance.

"A completely planned and subsidized economy weakens initiative, discourages industry, destorys character and demoralizes the people."

This, then, may provide us with a quick insight into the philosophical and moral thinking by our hard-pressed Secretary of Agriculture today. We can readily observe that he is much more interested in American principles than running a popularity contest for the sake of expediency. We could do well, in this instance, to recall the immortal words of the great southern statesman, Henry Clay, who said in an address some 108 years ago.

"I would rather be right than President."

Former President Hoover Turns Clock Back to 1931

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. COYA KNUTSON
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 25, 1958

Mrs. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, under permission heretofore granted, I make the following observations: On Washington's Birthday, 1958, the American people were treated to a bit of magic. The magician was former President Herbert Hoover. The place was Valley Forge, Pa. When Mr. Hoover concluded his speech, he revealed a "surprise." He said:

The address I have just made to you is, with slight elimination of less pertinent paragraphs, the identical address which I delivered on this spot * * * 27 years ago in the depths of that period of anxiety and discouragement. But we rallied to a period of greatness as we will again today.

Mr. Hoover had a purpose in selecting an old speech delivered on May 31, 1931, for delivery on February 22, 1958. From his own words, Mr. Hoover admits that 1931 was a period of depression, "of anxiety and discouragement." He indicates 1958 represents a very similar time of history. He indicates that his words will rally us from our depression to another "period of greatness."

It seems to me that it was not the Republican Party's "words without deeds" that brought us out of the depression Mr. Hoover speaks of a quarter of a century ago. It seems to me that the only prosperity that was "around the corner" back then was the prosperity that Franklin D. Roosevelt and the American people—with the greatest teamwork this country ever saw—constructed with hard work, courage, and imagination.

Mr. Hoover does sense that an economic depression today is a reality not merely the hallucination of prophets of gloom. Let us not be afraid of words. Words cannot hurt us. But inaction can spell disaster.

Mr. Hoover said that the difference between the two speeches was the elimination of "less pertinent paragraphs." I asked the Legislative Reference Service of the Library of Congress to obtain for me a copy of his 1931 address and was immediately struck by one, so-called slight elimination. In 1931, but not in 1958, Mr. Hoover said:

No one who reviews the past and realizes the vast strength of our people can doubt that this, like a score of similar experiences in our history, is a passing trial. From it will come a greater knowledge of the weakness of our system, and from this knowledge must come the courage and wisdom to improve and strengthen us for the future.

In 1958, Mr. Hoover reworded the paragraph to read:

But no one who reviews the past and realizes the vast strength of our people can doubt that this, like a score of similar experiences in our history, is a passing trial. From this knowledge must come the courage and wisdom to improve and strengthen us for the future.

Mr. Hoover's elimination of the phrase "a greater knowledge of the weakness of our system" is a confession of the number one shortcoming of Republican leadership: a failure to learn from the past. The weakness of the GOP system which we discovered after the Hoover depression was the "trickle-down system of big-business favoritism." The Republican Party is a great believer in "rugged individualism." Yet we rarely hear of the GOP calling for rugged individualism from "big business."

I wonder whether it is not "profits that zoom" instead of "prophets of gloom" which have brought into being this 1958-style Hoover "recession." I wonder whether the American farmers, small-business men, the factory workers, the schoolchildren do not deserve more than words. Mr. Eisenhower said on Monday, "Now is the time for courage and commonsense." He should have added: "Now is the time for action."

Brooklyn: A Frontier

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 5, 1958

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, though frequently the butt of jocular remarks, Brooklyn is, I believe, one of the most culturally advanced and forward-looking communities in the Nation.

Dr. Otto Klitgord, president of the Community College, and one of Brooklyn's most distinguished citizens, demonstrates in the following address why Brooklyn today is a pioneering community. The address was delivered at the annual meeting of the Downtown Brooklyn Association on January 27, 1958:

BROOKLYN: A FRONTIER

(Remarks by Dr. Otto Klitgord at the annual meeting of the Downtown Brooklyn Association, January 27, 1958, at the Towers Hotel, Brooklyn, N. Y.)

Recently, two men, 1 a professor of science, visited a local amusement park. Both were intrigued by a new target range where the object was to shoot down pingpong balls suspended on a jet air stream. The first man proceeded to take careful aim and fired 20 rounds without hitting a single ball. The scientist picked up his rifle, took careful aim, fired 1 shot, and immediately all 10 pingpong balls fell. An observer remarked "What a perfect shot. You are a superior marksman." The scientist replied, "It is not a matter of marksmanship—it is simply a matter of knowing what to do—I shot a hole in the pump."

Four weeks ago I was approached by your committee and asked to speak at this meeting and be prepared to say something that would reveal Brooklyn and the Downtown Association as they will be 10 years from now. This I cannot do. I am not a visionary, and I find crystal-ball gazing very unreliable. However, I can examine the facts as they exist, and from the facts make some determinations as to what we should do, and probably will do, in order to give us the Brooklyn 10 years hence as we would like it.

In gathering the facts and information necessary to make practical recommendations, I enlisted the aid of several of my colleagues. To test the practicability of the ideas brought forth, I have further been guided by the solid and constructive thinking of several of your members.

Project No. 1 for our team of scholars was to search the record to find facts concerning the future of Brooklyn. In searching for predictions of failure concerning Brooklyn as a city and as a borough, our researchers concerned themselves with events at the turn of the century, preceding and following World War I; the recession of the early twenties; the great depression; the period just before and after World War II, and, finally, our era of greatest prosperity, the fifties to date. The search was futile and we came away with empty hands. With the exception of occasional political speeches predicting horrible things that would happen to Brooklyn if the opponents were elected, we found a recurrent pattern of confidence in Brooklyn reflected in predictions of improvement in our economic, social, educa-

tional, and political life. Almost without exception, these predictions of growth and related prosperity have come to pass. From the facts at hand, and using as one of our resources the trends of the past, it is safe to predict, 10 years hence, a Brooklyn just as strong economically, socially, culturally, and politically, as we are willing to make it.

Downtown Brooklyn will be exactly as strong as the 2,800,000 Brooklynites which the downtown area will serve. The many individual businesses and organizations that make up this wonderful center must continually seek one another out to plan together, work together, and stick together—so as to better serve the entire borough and thus contribute to its strength.

HOUSING

No one will dispute the fact that Brooklyn needs new housing and lots of it. There are areas that are badly blighted and should be redeveloped. We have a fair share of overcrowding and some slums are in evidence. Through proper redevelopment the ilhoused can rise and live in surroundings that will dignify man. Ways must be found to spur the building construction that is essential to Brooklyn's future. It is time that everyone take a fresh new look and make a new attempt at finding better ways of establishing the good housing that Brooklyn needs.

The need is there and when the solution of meeting this need can be found, the resultant effect on jobs, business, industry, and family income should be phenomenal and should have a salutory effect on all the people of Brooklyn.

TRANSPORTATION

Transportation is now, and will for years to come, be a continuous plaguing headache, strangling the free movement of people and goods. Fantastic transportation costs, pressuring the economy, make us all cry out for some form of traffic relief. The need within the city for highways, throughways, parkways, bridges, tunnels, parking space, is endless and fantastic. Every step taken toward the solution of the traffic problem takes valuable real estate off the tax rolls, diminishes the space in which our people can live, work, and play, and otherwise plagues our existence at every turn.

Modern science, engineering, metallurgy, and design, can take us far beyond the present-day subway, bus, and arterial parkway forms of transportation.

I would like to see the city sponsor and actively support an experiment that could well, at one fell swoop, prove to be the master solution of the problem.

There is within our grasp a way of whisking through traffic from the Jersey shores, across Brooklyn, and into Nassau County without bothering anyone. Why is it concluded that only a bridge or a tunnel can link Staten Island with Brooklyn?

Developmental engineers and scientists, we find, have for years been working on a system of transportation which could carry passengers and goods ranging from a baby carriage to a 60-ton double trailer, in lightweight capsules moving almost noiselessly at high speeds from one point to another.

We should build for purposes of study and experimentation, and design for the future a monorail system of transportation. During the past few months, I have collected from every corner of the earth, books, manuscripts, designs and plans, which show clearly the tremendous possibilities of this form of transportation. I believe that an actual experiment would clearly show the desirability of moving persons and goods quietly, rapidly, and economically, across the city in a quiet, dignified, speedy monorail system which would be so designed that it would enhance the appearance of the city.

I have no reference whatsoever to an elevated. The modern monorail for New York would have no more similarity to the old elevated than our modern missiles have to Benjamin Franklin's kite.

If the city is to make further progress, better and less costly transportation will have to be found. I believe that this experiment should be launched. It could well be our undoing not to try.

The possibilities are so great that for purposes of the experiment and to work out engineering problems and designs, private industry might well contribute equipment, materials, and technical assistance. The Downtown Brooklyn Association and the chamber of commerce could well join hands in soliciting the aid of industry.

INDUSTRIAL PARKS

I am cognizant of the many reports that have appeared in the daily press about the mothballing of our giants of the sea and note the drastic curtailment in war shipbuilding activities. Concern has been expressed by many about the future of the New York Naval Shipyard, the scene of employment of tens of thousands of Brooklynites. Missiles, projectiles, atomic warheads, nuclear-powered submarines, are, of necessity, going to force a drastic change in the industrial activities carried on there. Few of us can see the yard as a missiles factory, or a place for the assembly of superpowered missile-bearing explosives.

Our defenses of the future will have little need for the products of the Navy yard as it exists today. Unless the yard can be used in a realistic way for future defense purposes by building or servicing units that require its vast area, prize water frontage, and huge industrial buildings and equipment, plans should be made for its use as a modern industrial park used for the manufacture by private industry of the tools of peace, defense, and the products needed to increase our standards of living.

It is ironical to think of one of Brooklyn's No. 1 industries, the Mergenthaler Linotype Co., moving away from its home, when space that is needed is just across the street. The Navy yard, a pillar of our naval defense strength in the past, can now become a pillar of economic strength to help support our program of peace and contribute to defense by the manufacture of items needed for our general security.

When it is clearly shown that the Navy yard could be better used for industrial purposes, then it would be advisable that an authority be established to develop and expand it for industrial purposes.

I am confident that the space and facilities in the yard could be enlarged and improved to provide permanent employment for the yard's current work force, and in addition, create new jobs for many thousands more.

Other industrial parks can and should be developed in Brooklyn. There are probably over 1,000 acres that could be used for this purpose. I understand that the city is seeking legislation that would permit it to assemble odd parcels in undeveloped and blighted areas for industrial park purposes. This is certainly the right thing to do. Let's all spur the city on to greater activity. Give it our full support. After the sites are available, then will come the task of relocating present factories and helping new ones to move in.

More industry, more efficient plants, more jobs, and a resultant higher standard of living, will contribute materially to a prosperous brooklyn 10 years hence.

BROOKLYN AND THE PORT OF NEW YORK

Brooklyn's waterfront comprises the greatest and most important part of the Port of New York. This great port, the very heart of our business and industry, is the principal reason the city came into being and emerged as the greatest city in the world.

Since so much of Brooklyn is devoted to the port and dependent on it, our future is closely interwoven with the destiny of the port. We are all aware of the great work and the many plans that are underway by the port authority, and the city of New York. It is imperative, however, that deeds follow words and plans.

By our own admission, the many piers, wharves, and modern cargo-handling facilities needed for the efficient, rapid, economic handling of goods are sadly wanting. We must also realize that to have a modern port we need, not only modern facilities, but well-trained workmen and technicians to expedite the work of the port.

To the north of us, almost completed, is one of man's greatest modern developments—the St. Lawrence seaway. Like it or not, we must face the fact that this huge new system of waterways is going to divert a tremendous tonnage from this port, as well as from other ports along the east coast. Because we are at present the busiest port, we may suffer the greatest tonnage loss. To say that this seaway will hurt us economically, or result in the loss of jobs and shipping, and perhaps stimulate the exodus of industries to other places, could place me in the position of being labeled a "prophet of doom." At this I rebel and am thus compelled with every ounce of my energy to help turn a potential loss into a worthwhile asset.

As it stands, we have our old Port of New York, for better or worse, while near us to the north there is being created an entire new, modern, competitive system of ports and waterways. About this development we can do nothing, but we can be in a position to strengthen our port, attract more business to it and bring more business into New York directly from the Great Lakes and Canada. Instead of being separate from the St. Lawrence seaway, we should become a part of it. I believe that this could be done at a cost no greater than that of the Brooklyn Civic Center.

Let us take a careful look at the map and proceed in a freighter by inland waterway in a northerly direction. Without difficulty, we proceed to Albany via the Hudson River. With a little dredging, we can proceed up the Hudson to Fort Edward near Glens Falls. Continuing north, there is an old but usable canal at Whitehall which, with dredging, would permit the passage of our ship into Lake Champlain. In this lake, we have a system of small inland ports on both the New York and the Vermont sides of the lake. Our vessel will pass with no difficulty through Lake Champlain into the Richelieu River near the Canadian border, and thence into the St. Lawrence River. Dredging and other improvements would also be required in the Richelieu River.

Surely, this would require some doing. Funds would have to be provided, engineering work started, and some kind of a treaty with Canada negotiated. But just think of what this would do for the Port of New York, the State of New York, the State of Vermont, parts of Canada, and all of the minor ports throughout the Great Lakes region that could benefit from the facilities available here.

Our port handles foreign commerce valued at nearly $10 billion per year; 490,000 persons earn $2,100,000,000 each year from jobs that would not exist if it were not for the port. The opening of an inland waterway directly from New York to the St. Lawrence might cost as high as $150,000,000. It would be well worth that expenditure to strengthen our great port and support people and industries dependent upon it. I presume that the Federal Government and the States of New York, New Jersey, and Vermon would aid in financing the necessary work to improve and strengthen the economy of this region.

On August 1, 1957, there was introduced in the House of Representatives and the

United States Senate, a joint resolution authorizing the Secretary of the Army to make a survey of a water route from New York into Lake Champlain and to connect with the St. Lawrence River. We, in Brooklyn and the Metropolitan New York area, should spur this survey on to completion so that the St. Lawrence seaway may actually become a great asset to the port of New York, and also contribute still further to the national defense and security of the United States.

EDUCATION

Throughout the world, people have been so busy laughing at corny jokes about Brooklyn that few have taken the trouble to find out about Brooklyn's important place in world affairs as a center of learning, culture, and research in the arts and sciences.

Few people realize that each day over 50,000 men and women attend our institutions of higher learning: Brooklyn College; Brooklyn Law School; Cathedral College of the Immaculate Conception; Packer Collegiate Institute; Long Island University; State University's Downstate Medical College; Pratt Institute, in the midst of its new development; Brooklyn Polytechnic Institute, the second largest engineering college in the country and one of the first in research; St. Francis College; St. Johns University; St. Joseph's College for Women; New York Institute of Technology; Institute of Design and Construction. Add to these the New York City Community College of Applied Arts and Sciences, and you have an extraordinary concentration of facilities for higher education, exceeding that found in many States and foreign countries.

In Brooklyn, our youth has educational opportunities in all of the professions, from architecture through zoology, and in all of the technologies from automation through X-ray.

The needs of business, commerce, labor, and education are all serviced by our great colleges and universities. Add to them, one of the world's best museums; a top-flight public library system; the Academy of Music; the Aquarium, and Marine Park; historical sites—and we find educational and cultural facilities equal to the resources found in any community in the entire world.

Our public school system has been criticized as being wanting in science, mathematics, and related subjects. Yet, at the same time, we are praised from far and near for having right here in Brooklyn one of the best science high schools to be found anywhere. I refer to the Brooklyn Technical High School with nearly 5,600 science-minded students and a top-notch faculty.

We have in our schools and colleges brainpower and knowledge that, properly applied, can think through and find a good solution to most of the problems with which we are faced today. However, it is up to organizations such as the Downtown Brooklyn Association to make the advances to our academic people which will produce a satisfactory wedding of town and gown. Working together—business, the community, and education—can produce wonders.

We hope that through our cultural leadership in the arts and sciences, and by our participation in college and university programs, we can make the people of the world laugh with Brooklyn as the problems of the present yield to the achievement of the future.

The Chamber of Commerce of the United States, aided by the Brooklyn Chamber, have conducted a great study and have labeled it "Education: An Investment in People." The report points out that there is a direct relationship between education, earning power, and the standard of living. The report shows that as a result of more education, there is greater productivity, greater political activity, and a higher standard of living. The report eloquently says:

"An active interest in providing ever better educational opportunity in a community is the essence of good citizenship; good government; and good business."

Our programs of higher education must be strengthened, enlarged, and improved, if higher education for the people of Brooklyn is to remain equal to, or superior to that found elsewhere. Part of your investment has to be in education; every one of our local private colleges is in need of funds to establish scholarships, to expand their buildings, and raise faculty salaries.

At this time we are all aware of the great advances that the Soviets have made in science, but few realize the tremendous research program being carried on right here in Brooklyn by Brooklyn Polytechnic Institute. Research in space problems, electronics, chemistry, communications, nuclear physics, may shortly bring forth the answers to many of our science problems. Few realize that this college, like all other colleges, is struggling against great financial odds in trying to expand their offering, equip the reconverted buildings on Jay Street, keep pace with the increasing interest in education.

Every one of us will benefit directly and indirectly from the work of our great colleges. Before this week is out, I would encourage each one of you to think seriously about making a contribution to any of our local colleges. First find out for yourselves just what the needs are; then write a check; a substantial one.

I want to remind you that public colleges have financil problems that are just as pressing as those faced by private colleges. The publicly supported colleges, like Brooklyn College, with an enrollment of about 19,000, and our New York City Community College with an enrollment of 6,100, constantly need your dedicated support, and the assurance that you will be active in helping the city succeed in giving our schools the wherewithal to accommodate increased enrollment, raising faculty salaries and providing adequate buildings.

For example, the board of trustees of the New York City Community College was greatly aided in its efforts to acquire a site and additional buildings in which to accommodate more students when Mr. Andrew S. Roscoe, speaking for the Downtown Brooklyn Association, and representatives of the Brooklyn Chamber of Commerce, appeared before the board of estimate. They pointed out that an expanded community college was necessary to provide technicians needed in our modern industry. In this connection, it might be pointed out that although the amounts appear in the city budget, steps have yet to be taken to acquire the site and assign an architect to design the additional buildings. Perhaps the association can be of help again and thus help provide the education that our young people require and the technicians needed to operate our industries.

AN ARENA

The increase in leisure time, resulting in general from the progressive decrease in work time is creating vast local markets for all leisure-time pursuits. As a result, there is a greater demand for adult education facilities. Libraries are being pressed to provide more books and library services; our museums and art centers are finding their facilities taxed to the limit, and plans will be advanced for their expansion.

Public amusement is bound to come in for a vast increase, so let us take a moment to examine this one carefully. As much as we loved the Dodgers, it must be admitted that interest in them had waned to the point that only a relatively few found it worth their while to attend any but the most important games. I have a distinct feeling that this had nothing to do with Ebbets Field or its location. If people are really interested and want to see or participate, they will find the means of getting there.

At the very time the crowds were dwindling in the ball parks, thousands and thousands of sports-minded people were jam-packing Roosevelt Raceway and other outlying tracks and sports centers; difficult transportation was no obstacle.

I am sure we can agree that a large scale commercially operated sports area or arena would pay—a center where people by the thousands could participate in their favorite sports, or witness the best exhibitions by professionals.

I am not at all sure we need another ball club; I am sorry we lost the one we had, but to get another would just be inviting a repeat performance of the California story.

Space suitable for a sports arena in Brooklyn is at a premium, because we also need acreage for industrial parks and modern housing. Much as we would like an arena near the Atlantic Avenue railroad station, the problem involved are immense and no solution is in evidence. There is some opinion that the downtown section would be best enhanced if the station area were redeveloped for income-producing private housing.

In seeking other possible locations for the needed sports arena, another possibility comes into view. The day is here when large land areas in the midst of a teeming metropolis are no longer essential or practical for big military installations.

Is not the day foreseable when the large area of Fort Hamilton could contribute to the economic, cultural, and leisure time pursuits of the people of Brooklyn. It should be a good location for an arena and would not take property off the tax rolls. In fact, it would result in some being added, because it would be utilized for sports activities that are commercial in nature. If it can be clearly shown that an arena should be located elsewhere, then the fort could become available for housing.

OUR GREATEST ASSET

Outside of the natural advantage given to us by the port of New York, our greatest single asset is the people of Brooklyn—2,800,000 strong—more than you will find in most cities or States.

The people of Brooklyn generally are of the working class; many have come here from all over the world and have chosen Brooklyn as the frontier on which they will establish their homes and families; improve their lot; work their way from the lower income to the middle and upper income class; educate their children, and contribute, to the best of their ability, to the religious and civic life of our borough.

The facts and figures released by the city planning commission, the board of education, and the bureau of the census, as reported in our local newspapers, point again to an influx in the ever-changing make-up of our Brooklyn population. We now have in our midst large numbers of Puerto Ricans and Negroes, all of whom are here for exactly the same reason that we formerly received waves of Dutch, English, German, Irish, Italian, Poles, Swedes, Russians, and others from the four corners of the earth. Our newcomers have ambitions and hopes that the opportunities that exist here will enable them to become more self-sufficient and economically secure, and will enable them to provide education for their children; have good homes; enjoy modern health standards, and the other things that come with the good living that is possible throughout all America.

In the main, our new people want to do the right thing; they seek honest employment and welcome guidance; are willing to be educated in order that they reach their goals and objectives. Few come here for a "hand-out" or relief; they are just as ashamed to accept public alms as you or I would be.

The Negro and the Puerto Rican will contribute to the greatest economy that Brooklyn has ever known, if we will be careful and diligent in our planning and activity so that this may come about.

In the past, industries by the hundreds left New England, New York State, and even Brooklyn; they have established new plants in the west, south, Puerto Rico, and elsewhere. Many were attracted by offers of tax-free operation; free plant sites; loans without strings attached; low-cost labor; freedom from unions, and similar inducements. Industries that went south found the Negro to be a top-notch industrial worker, equal in most respects to anyone available in the north. Of the 500 plants that have been established in Puerto Rico, all, without exception, acclaim the Puerto Ricans as an asset to industrial production.

However, there are many factors in these distant places not entirely to the liking of the industries which moved away from here hoping to improve their lot. They soon found that existence in some of those tax-free towns was almost intolerable because, after all, what kind of a school system, water supply, fire department, police department, public health program, and sewage system, can be furnished by a tax-free economy? In fact, we can sum it up by saying that those tax-free offers have about as much substance as Los Angeles' gift to the Dodgers.

On this point, I think it about time that this association, the Brooklyn Chamber of Commerce, and similar organizations, label the tax-free giveaway programs as the baloney—blarney—that they really are. Our erstwhile industries having moved away, soon found that their modern plants using automation, new inventions, scientific materials, required a high degree of education—technical education in particular—to produce the technicians needed to sustain high operational efficiency. Technicians could not, or cannot, be educated in the tax-free communities, so industry was forced to import technicians, or, at great cost, to train the workers themselves.

Now, we are about to experience a change. New industries, profiting by the example of those that have moved away, will prefer to become established here where our public schools, colleges, and universities, offer the education that the workers need; education that has produced a continuous supply of competent technicians, engineers, and scientists.

Our greatest resources are people, educated to earn a good living, and to live the good life. They are here; it is up to you to stimulate the expansion of industry and the growth of new enterprises so that in sharing the frontier that is Brooklyn, all may prosper.

SUMMARY

A country village decided to have a festival at which there would be food, dancing, games, and free wine from a huge cask would keep the spirits high. To fill the cask, each villager was to pour in a jug of his own wine made from local grapes. One villager thought "my supply is low and it is too late to make more—and anyway, one jug of water in that huge cask will never be noticed." During the festival the cask was tapped when all were tired and thirsty. As the spigot was turned, out flowed a steady stream of clear water.

So that our cask will be filled with the right ingredients for the constant celebration that accompanies prosperity, each one of you should adopt the following program of action:

Keep your association strong and a force in the affairs of the city and Brooklyn.

Bring government and private enterprise together in a new attempt at establishing the good and abundant housing that Brooklyn needs.

Try the monorail.

Make good and full use of the navy yard.

Join the St. Lawrence seaway.

Help our colleges and schools.

Build an arena.

Make Brooklyn a prosperous home for all our people—all 2,800,000 of them.

The story of the two men engaged in a game of golf is appropriate at this time. Neither one being very good at the game, they were soon in a trap. One took a good swing, missed the ball, but plowed into an anthill scattering sand and ants all over the place. The second swing was worse; again he missed the ball, plowing up more ants and sand and scattering them all over his friend. As he raised his club for the third stroke, an ant was heard to shout: "If we are going to survive, we had all better get on the ball."

Presidential Indifference

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT C. BYRD
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 5, 1958

Mr. BYRD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include an editorial from the March 3 Charleston, W. Va., Gazette. I recommend it to the attention of my colleagues.

The editorial follows:

IKE INDIFFERENT, CONFUSED IN TIME OF NATION'S NEED

There was upon a time a French king who during his lifetime lived it up good and hard, spending the public funds, pinching the rosy cheeks of his bosomy attendants, taking scant notice of affairs of state and heeding advice to let them eat cake. In a more philosophical vein near the end of his roisterous career he coined a famous phrase: "apres moi le deluge"—after me the deluge—and he was right, for his successor and family suffered a bloody end at the base of the guillotine.

To date President Eisenhower hasn't coined any famous phrases, but some of his recent actions are reminiscent of the callous behavior of an irresponsible and unthinking monarch.

While the rest of the Nation worries daily with a spreading recession in the form of increasing unemployment and a continuing inflation—two phenomena never before seen at the same time in our economy—the leader of the team plunks himself in Georgia at the estate of one of his former baronial team members and in effect cleanses his hands of the whole mess.

Ten days and some 20 grouse kills later he heads back to Washington in the official Presidential plane after first detouring 1,500 miles to deposit the First Lady and two of her social confidantes at a "make milady's face beautiful" resort near Tucson, Ariz., said resort absorbing the costs for the treatment and the taxpayers providing the transportation.

Is this the sort of dedication to government, to the American people, and to the problems of our Nation that Candidate Eisenhower spoke of so glowingly in his campaign bids for office?

Certainly, we do not want to be in the position of begrudging any President, even an indifferent one, the rights and perquisites to which his office entitles him. But these same rights and perquisites also demand obligations and responsibilities. The obligations and responsibilities of a President in times of duress are to lead and to set an example for his people.

For the last year or so President Eisenhower has led us nowhere, and of late his sole idea of setting an example seems to be to get away from it all either on the golf course or in a grousing shoot with others who can afford to get away from it all.

As his days in office dwindle, it is sad but true to note that President Eisenhower is confirming the critics of yesteryear. Incapable of decisive command, he is captive of a group of incomparable mediocrities so divided in their opinions of what should or should not be done that in fact nothing will be done.

As a general Eisenhower under orders performed well. As a President without orders he's a lost ball amid the rocks and weeds of doubt and indecision.

Twenty-fifth Anniversary of the Inauguration of Franklin Delano Roosevelt

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HERMAN P. EBERHARTER
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 5, 1958

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, today marks the anniversary of the day in 1789 when the first Congress convened under the Constitution. It marked a time of crisis and of challenge—a crisis which was met and a challenge which was surmounted. Today also marks the anniversary of the inauguration in 1861 of Abraham Lincoln, at a time when our Nation also faced one of the gravest crises in its history.

These dates perhaps sound like ancient history. We know of those crises from having read about them. It is hard to reconstruct in our minds the atmosphere of that day in 1789 or of Lincoln's inauguration.

But millions upon millions of Americans remember at first hand another great occasion, another historic occasion, which happened on March 4—the first inauguration of Franklin D. Roosevelt as President of the United States.

We can remember the atmosphere of the day. We can remember the mixture of fear and of hopefulness as Roosevelt took the oath of office. And we can look back over these 25 years, remembering step by step the actions taken by Franklin Roosevelt to rescue America from one of the lowest points in our Nation's history.

The night skies over Pittsburgh had been dark—not for a few days but for months. Hunger stalked all of our cities. Despair was in the eyes of men in every walk of life. Our country, some feared, was a dying society. Would we turn to communism or to fascism?

Of course we did neither. The challenge of the depression was met in such fashion that today our economists tell us we can never again have that kind of depression in the United States.

Today our national administration would do well to join with us in recalling the first inauguration of Franklin D. Roosevelt 25 years ago. We are not in a depression. But we are deeply mired in economic troubles.

In Pittsburgh and in all of our major cities, in the rural areas and everywhere in this country, jobless men walk the streets looking for work. There is no excuse—no legitimate economic excuse—for this distress. True it is not of the magnitude of the great depression. But for every man out of work who has no immediate prospect of returning to work, this recession is, in effect, a personal depression.

Franklin D. Roosevelt led us brilliantly into the paths of economic reform which we are now told makes a future depression unlikely, if not impossible. He did it not by sitting and waiting for next month's economic statistics to be compiled to tell us how serious the situation was. He did it by moving vigorously against those factors which clearly existed leading to unemployment and distress.

The current occupant of the White House, if he were to look out upon the land and if he were to see and to recognize the conditions now existing, would also find in them sufficient reason to move now—promptly, vigorously, effectively—to restore our economy and to end joblessness in this country.

He could learn much from the history of the Roosevelt years. The lessons are there. They involve primarily a willingness to use the machinery of government to serve all the people in a time of crisis and challenge.

How To Give Aid

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BROOKS HAYS
OF ARKANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 5, 1958

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. Mr. Speaker, we are now giving close attention to the mutual-assistance program of the United States Government and examining the President's request for funds to continue operations for the next fiscal year. While we concentrate on the public aspects of economic aid, we should not forget there is also a role for private philanthropy in this area. The New York Times of Thursday, January 30, 1958, had a thought-provoking editorial on how to make the most of local effort. Under leave to extend my remarks, I present that editorial as follows:

HOW TO GIVE AID

A simple story from a village in South Korea can teach us some things about how aid to nations in need can be effectively given.

Five years ago a fieldworker for the United Nations turned over to a village of 800 some $37.50 that had been taken in as payment for grain that the villagers did not want to accept as charity. This money, in turn, was invested in improvement of irrigation of the local ricefields so as to increase yield. The money investment was small, but the investment of the villagers in time and labor was large. In the end it paid off. The rice yield in the village was raised from about $6,000 to $36,000, a return of 800 to 1 on the original money investment.

Now the Save the Children Federation is adopting this technique, both to give further assistance in this area and to afford pilot projects for both the Korean and the United States Governments. In every case local effort is the key to the grants that are made. And in each case a percentage is earmarked for specific help to the children.

What is significant here is that the investment of money is trifling. But there is an investment of some other things. There is an understanding of the people who are to be helped. There is an ability to enlist their support and cooperation. There is an appeal to loyalty and initiative. And there is the continuing factor of warm human interest.

Not many investments pay off at 800 to 1. Perhaps if the spiritual investment kept pace with the economic the rate of return would go up.

This case seems to demonstrate that fact.

Theodore Roosevelt Centennial

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALBERT H. BOSCH
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 4, 1958

Mr. BOSCH. Mr. Speaker, I am honored to join with my colleagues in paying tribute to Theodore Roosevelt who was inauguarted President of the United States 53 years ago today. We are all proud of Teddy Roosevelt's record which stands as a monument to leadership. I wish to include a recent column by George E. Sokolsky entitled "Theodore Roosevelt Centennial."

The article follows:

THEODORE ROOSEVELT CENTENNIAL
(By George E. Sokolsky)

Not enough is being made of the fact that next October the 100th anniversary of the birth of Theodore Roosevelt will be celebrated. The particular era in which we live historically starts with Theodore Roosevelt and while a younger generation may feel closer to another Roosevelt, it was Teddy who stirred the Nation with his overpowering personality, his physical dynamism, his intellectual forensics, and his intense nationalism.

Theodore Roosevelt was a nationalist, one who believed in America first and practiced it all the time. He was President when this country was still in its upbuilding stage and he was unapologetic in his assertions of its strength. He talked like a warrior but kept the peace. He moved through his Presidency with pride, dignity, and courage, and accepted no second place for his country.

Like all Roosevelts, both the Oyster Bay and the Hudson River varieties, Theodore came of a middle class, old Dutch family, of not too great means but enormous respectability. His father had been a bond broker and collector of the Port of New York; his mother was the daughter of Maj. James S. Bullock, a Confederate officer in the Civil War. Teddy went to Harvard from which he was graduated and immediately entered Republican politics on the grassroots level. He was elected to the Assembly but his health was poor and he went West to the little Missouri to be a cowboy on a ranch, thus establishing his love for the great outdoors.

His major interest, however, continued to be politics. He ran for mayor of New York City but was defeated (1886). He was appointed to the Civil Service Commission where he served 6 years, thus getting a valuable experience which served him later when he became President.

What brought him into direct line for high office was his very dramatic career as president of the New York City police board.

The top Republican politicians in New York wanted to get Roosevelt out of their hair. They had the President appoint him Assistant Secretary of the Navy. He directed naval operations during the Spanish-American War for a while but finally organized the Rough Riders, and served as its lieutenant Colonel.

At any rate, it was the colorful Roosevelt of the Rough Riders who was elected Governor of New York to the chagrin of the boss, Tom Platt. Platt immediately set about getting rid of him by having him nominated to the vice presidency in 1900. Mark Hanna did not want Roosevelt but Teddy had by now become the most popular figure in the Republican Party. The politicians thought they were rid of him forever, as vice presidents do not usually have much of a role in American life.

However, President William McKinley was assassinated and Theodore Roosevelt became President on September 14, 1901. His administration was a lively, exciting one. Roosevelt read everything, knew everything, knew everybody. He made the White House a center of American culture. He freed the Republican Party from the bossism which held it tightly in the control of monopolistic businesses. He stimulated a public interest in government. He sent his son, Quentin, to public school in Washington and shocked the fancy people of Washington. He entertained Booker T. Washington, a Negro educator, in the White House. He is the author of the Panama Canal.

Teddy Roosevelt—nobody called him Theodore—was President until 1909 when his friend, William Howard Taft, succeeded him. Roosevelt went hunting in Africa, returned to edit The Outlook and, quarreling with Taft over basic principles, he organized the Progressive Party, better known as the Bull Moose and ran against Taft in 1912, thus paving the way for Woodrow Wilson to be elected President of the United States.

His career was so full of action, of effervescent living that it is not always remembered that Theodore Roosevelt was one of the most constructive President in American history.

Low Tariffs Hurt the Potteries

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WAYNE L. HAYS
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 5, 1958

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial which appeared in the Salem News of Saturday, March 1, 1958:

LOW TARIFFS HURT THE POTTERIES

Labor and management of Salem and other district potteries expect to be well represented in Washington next Friday to argue against an administration proposal for a 5-year extension of the Reciprocal Trade Agreement Act, along with a liberalization that would permit further tariff reductions of up to 25 percent.

Previously concerned over mounting imports which, because of low tariffs, permit the foreign-made ware to be sold cheaper

than domestic products, the pottery people now are alarmed, and rightly so.

Already foreign competition has forced some potteries to close. The Salem China Co. has fared better than most of the dinnerware plants but only by the dint of hard work and an almost nonexistent profit. A further lowering of United States tariffs would jeopardize the livelihood of some 400 people here.

The Limoges China Co. at Sebring is going up for a sheriff's sale shortly. The Spalding China, an art plant, is liquidating. At Minerva the Cronin China Co. had to be liquidated. The W. S. George Pottery of East Palestine is gasping for its breath. Foreign competition closed two once-promising potteries in Carrollton.

All these are within the immediate district. Employment is off in the potteries at East Liverpool. At Paden City, down the Ohio River apiece, the Paden City Pottery threw in the towel last fall as did the Carr China Co. at Grafton.

There are others, including California's second largest pottery, the Vernon Kilns, which has started liquidation.

The pottery industry isn't the only group that is being hurt by foreign competition. Even the auto manufacturers are wrestling with the growing foreign-car imports.

Congress, the Tariff Commission and the President need to take a new appraisal of the basic tariff structure and overhaul our foreign-trade regulations.

Uncle Sam has a big heart but he cannot afford to let down the folks at home and expect to spread his bounty abroad.

The Sweatshop Is Still With Us

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JOHN F. SHELLEY

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 4, 1958

Mr. SHELLEY. Mr. Speaker, I offer the following account of the experiences of a lady who has had the courage to find out for herself, through actual experience, that despite the advances of the unions of this country, the sweatshop still exists.

I regret that I must report that this condition does indeed exist today in my San Francisco Bay region, but I know that it is not limited to this area.

Mrs. Sonia Baltrum is a skilled professional in the textile industry. She could well have been content to make a living in the quiet pursuit of her craft, but her thoughts extend beyond the mere day-to-day quest for a weekly paycheck. Her interests are with the people who manipulate the sewing machines, cutting equipment, and other machinery associated with the textile industry.

The sweatshop is by its very name despicable. It exploits not only the skills but the integrity of its employees. It accepts and directs the talents of its inmates, then adds to the insult by offering substandard wages.

It operates, as Mrs. Baltrum relates, in private homes and even garages which from the outside give no indication of the industry being carried on within.

I offer the following remarks which should make it clear that despite the many advantages already promulgated by the unions, additional legislation which would insist on a decent living wage is still needed:

STATEMENT OF BAY AREA JOINT BOARD OF TEXTILE WORKERS UNION OF AMERICA, AFL-CIO, TO SUBCOMMITTEE OF HOUSE COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR, IN HEARING OF EXTENSION OF COVERAGE OF FAIR LABOR STANDARDS ACT, SAN FRANCISCO, CALIF., NOVEMBER 7, 1957

My name is Sonia Baltrun. I am the business manager of the San Francisco Bay Area Joint Board of the Textile Workers Union of America, AFL-CIO, and I have been an official of this union for about 20 years.

The bay area joint board represents about 1,200 textile workers, mostly women, in 23 plants. The major products of those plants are bags, yarns, rope, padding, carpeting, curtains, and drapes.

My first purpose in testifying here today is to endorse the comprehensive and thorough testimony presented this spring in Washington by President Meany and his staff and the subsequent presentation made by industrial union department President Walter Reuther and the officials and staff of my own union. The coverage of the FLSA should be broadly extended, particularly in agriculture and retailing, which are of primary importance in the State of California.

My second purpose is to bring before you some of the local conditions in the textile industry, which make it imperative that the FLSA be extended and raised to $1.25 as soon as possible.

Our primary problems here in northern California are substandard nonunion sweatshops that are growing and spreading, resulting in substantial unemployment among the workers in our union.

Most of these sweatshops pay $1 an hour for experienced operators. Under our contracts the minimum is $1.40 to $1.60 an hour, plus fringe benefits such as vacations, holidays and health and welfare benefits which cost at least 12 cents more per hour.

It is obvious that employers under contract with the union find it difficult or, in more cases, impossible to compete.

Let us give more examples of what is going on in this locality and in northern California. I will withhold names and addresses, but I will be glad to supply the subcommittee with specific details if you desire them.

Right here in residential areas of San Francisco, I know of small knitting mills that pay $1 an hour and less to workers—$1 an hour for experienced operators. The outside of the knitting mill is just like another residence. You would not know there was a factory inside, or in the garage in the back.

I myself worked for 3 days recently in a factory located over a produce market knitting baby garments in Oakland. I received $1 an hour as experienced operator on knit baby garments. Inexperienced workers were paid 85 cents an hour.

We have the entire bay industry organized, that is textile plants. But we are now suffering large scale, chronic unemployment because bag plants, yarn mills, carpeting plants have sprung up in the Salinas, Fresno, Hanford and other towns in the San Joaquin Valley. Our minimum here is $1.40 an hour plus fringe benefits. The prevailing wage for experienced operators in the out-of-town sweatshops is $1 an hour.

In Armona, Calif., one of the plants which pays a minimum of $1 an hour competes directly with one of our Oakland yarn plants which pays $1.40 minimum and all the fringe benefits besides.

I personally know of at least eight textile plants in the valley and a shirt plant in Salinas area which pays a maximum of $1 an hour.

I would like to submit for the record this chart of series of articles which appeared in the San Francisco Chronicle on October 3, 4, and 11, 1957. The first is headlined "Illegal Garment Factories Thrive in Chinatown."

The pictures of the overcrowded, poorly ventilated, and unsanitary factories, with children playing on the floor, speak for themselves. The articles indicate there are about 120 such shops employing more than 2,000 women. The article quotes the president of the Pacific Coast Garment Association, Fred Prater, as saying:

"If you kill the Chinese contractors, you kill a major portion of the garment industry in San Francisco.

"One of the biggest dress manufacturers in the United States has 15 or 20 little factories working for him.

"Our downtown manufacturers do their own cutting, but the Chinese shops do the making and trimming for them."

These articles are concerned that these factories are illegal because they are in the areas zoned for commercial and not industrial use.

We are concerned because they have been paying 75 cents an hour and will be paying only $1 an hour when the State minimum wage goes up to $1 effective November 15, 1957. We are concerned because of the hours of work they are putting in. We are concerned because of health hazards to these women employed there. We are concerned because it means pulling down labor conditions for organized workers and because organized plants are suffering unemployment, while these sweatshops are making a nice profit on this exploitation. We are concerned because the FLSA cannot catch up with them.

While most of these Chinatown sweatshops are in the garment industry, some are in textiles as well. How many we do not know.

I have also prepared another chart which I would like to submit for the record. The chart sums up the major facts which are important in the Bay area from the standpoint of judging the need for $1.25 FLSA minimum wage.

The need for such a minimum is down in the two piles of coins on the left.

The first pile is $2.79, the hourly rate needed by a steadily employed wage earner in the San Francisco Bay area, to support herself, spouse, and two children, according to the standards of the Heller committee of the University of California. The figures are based on September 1956 data, adjusted upward to September 1957, by change in the San Francisco consumers index.

Most of the workers in our industry are women. Many of them are single women who have to support themselves. The second pile of coins is $1.54, which we estimate is the Heller budget for single women, working steadily, in San Francisco area, as of September 1957 prices. This is estimated since the last actual study of budgets for single working women was made by the Heller committee in September 1949.

Thus the need is somewhere above the $1.50 an hour at present prices in this area.

Our union minimums are from $1.40 to $1.60 an hour as shown in the third pile of coins. If fringes are included, it comes to about 12 cents an hour above this. This is somewhat above the national minimum average for textile and is substantially above the level in the Southern States. On the other hand, the general wage levels are higher in the bay area than in the United States as a whole.

The proposed FLSA minimums shown in the next pile of coins is $1.25. This will not directly affect any of our organized plants—but will affect the substandard sweatshops and in turn help our situation.

The last pile of coins is $1 an hour which is both California State minimum effective November 15, 1957, as well as the prevailing wage for experienced, but not solely such, for many are at 75 cents per hour, for ex-

perienced operators in the substandard shops.

The work in our industry will be done wherever the lowest wages are paid. If left to natural forces, this will become an industry of small runaway sweatshops. The purpose of the Fair Labor Standards Act was to stabilize industry at decent levels. Such a decent level today is not less than $1.25 an hour. (This should be extended to all categories of workers, thus catching up with all the sweatshops.)

Red Powerplant Superiority

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN LESINSKI
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 24, 1958

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Speaker, the Russians put the first satellite into space, are reported to have produced superior missiles and rockets, and are supposed to be making tremendous strides in technology, science, and industrial production.

The following article by Peter Edson, which appeared in the Washington Daily News on February 24, 1958, tells of the latest Soviet achievements in the field of hydroelectric power production, another area in which the United States is falling behind because of the machinations of the present administration which favor big business.

Mr. Edson's article is as follows:

RED POWERPLANT SUPERIORITY
(By Peter Edson)

Soviet Russia's hydroelectric power production now approaches and will soon surpass that of the United States.

Individual powerplants in Russia and Siberia are far bigger than the largest installations in America.

Grand Coulee Dam on the Columbia, largest United States installation, has a capacity of 1.9 million kilowatts.

The new United States-Canadian Niagara powerplant on the St. Lawrence will have a total capacity of 2.2 million kilowatts.

But the U. S. S. R. has 10 plants ranging from 2.0 to 6.0 million kilowatts. One is almost complete, 3 more are under construction, 6 more are in advanced planning stage.

The 6.0 million kilowatts of the Yenesei River plant will be larger than the 5.25 million kilowatts capacity of all powerplants at all dams built by the United States Army Corps of Engineers in its history.

Five Siberian plants will have a combined capacity 50 percent greater than all United States dams built by the Army, Bureau of Reclamation, and Tennessee River Valley Authority put together.

This amazing picture of Russian power development comes from no less an authority than Maj. Gen. E. C. Itschner, Chief of United States Army Corps of Engineers. It is based on Russian reports put together by Army intelligence. It is fully supported by Senator ALLEN J. ELLENDER, Democrat, of Louisiana, who visited Russia last year and was allowed to make movies of many installations.

Testimony by Senator ELLENDER and General Itschner before Senate Interior and Public Works Committees has given officials here in Washington a rude awakening on what was going on in Communist boss Khrushchev's declared war to pass the United States in peaceful production.

Only two new United States multiple-purpose water resources projects have been authorized during the Eisenhower administration. One is Bureau of Reclamation's Colorado River development. The other is the St. Lawrence seaway being built with Canada.

Since building materials are scarce, particularly concrete, the Russians go in for earth and rock-filled dams.

Most Russian rivers flow through flat country, so they have few canyon or high dams. But they have four notable dams from 7 to 12 miles long. Fort Pack, longest in United States, is 4 miles. Only one Russian dam failure has been reported.

Total Russian hydroelectric power capacity is put at 25.9 million kilowatts, but this does not include 44 powerplants whose size is unknown. Total United States hydroelectric capacity is 27.6 million kilowatts. This is about 16 percent of all United States electric power. Russian coal is so inferior that more emphasis is put on hydroelectric power development than in this country.

Russia is dispersing its powerplants, developing whole new economic areas, says General Itschner. This breaks up big industrial concentrations like those in the United States northeast and so reduces and scatters strategic bombing targets.

Mr. Speaker, in the face of that reported progress, does the administration still plan to continue its policy of private power development? Will they continue to advocate that the Idaho Power Co., for example, be authorized to construct three low dams in Hells Canyon which would provide a power output in prime kilowatts of 505,000, or will they see the wisdom of public power development with one high dam which would provide a power output of at least 1,122,000 kilowatts?

I think it is time for the leaders in the administration to wake up, take a good look at facts, and act for the welfare of our Nation instead of catering to special interests and allowing our country to degenerate to the status of a second-rate power.

Can Congress Meet the Challenge of Gold?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. E. Y. BERRY
OF SOUTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 5, 1958

Mr. BERRY. Mr. Speaker, I have asked consent to insert in the RECORD the address of the Honorable Lewis L. Huelsdonk, chairman of the gold and silver committee of the Western Governors Mining Advisory Council, which was delivered at the national western mining conference in Denver, Colo., February 7, 1958. It is entitled "Can Congress Meet the Challenge of Gold?" It is one of the best things I have seen in connection with the gold and monetary problem. I hope all Members will read it studiously:

I was very happy when I was again invited to appear before this group of down-to-earth mining men. This is particularly true because the Colorado Mining Association has built the national western mining conference into one of the most noteworthy conventions of this type in all of the world. Great credit must be given to the men responsible—for without their courage and foresight, the voice of western mining would, indeed, be difficult to hear.

Last year I was here pleading for a congressional investigation into the gold problem. I was deeply concerned, not only because I was serving as cochairman of the gold committee of the Western Governors Mining Advisory Council and as a member of the California State Mining Board where over, 1,700 gold mines had been forced out of existence, but also, because I had just returned from a very extensive gold survey tour through Europe and North Africa where I had conferred with many of the central bankers and world experts on the question. I felt sure that Congress should and would want to find out something about the strange role that gold was playing in a confused inflation-bent economy.

I was pleading not alone for the salvation of a great American industry whose product contributes immensely to economic stability throughout the civilized world, but also for the survival of a way of life which had raised this country, in a relatively short period of time, to a level of greatness.

With very little exception this plea fell upon the deaf ears of what might be termed an afternoon Congress. However, since that time the world has been shaken with some terrifying events and the very roots of complacency have been jarred. There is a wild horse loose—mainly because this afternoon Congress had failed to watch the keeper of the barn door. Up until last Friday at 10:40 p. m., Cape Canaveral time, this mad mustang was free to do its own bidding because we simply did not have a roundup horse or a buckaroo to send in pursuit. At that time, we finally succeeded in mounting a small boy for this man-sized job. Our hero is now on the way, with his lasso rope, and he will no doubt soon be fortified with other American riders—but even so—it will be a long, hard chase for American ingenuity to recapture this galloping nightmare which has been kicking down our defense fences in every land on the globe. It will be equally hard to place a share of the blame upon the shoulders of those men, who, for the sake of convenience, had sidetracked responsibilities to a den of experts—for neglected obligations have unfashionable ways of reappearing when the big finger of the kettle points to the pot and the pot calls the kettle black. Such coverup talk is for the ease of guilt. It is always political, confused, too late, and of little consequence. Its accomplishments are nothing but a waste of time. The job on hand is not to first accuse, to forfend accusation, but to safeguard the future with as much energy and as few mistakes as possible.

Today, with sputniks and the Explorer vying for glory in the skies, there appears to be a battle developing for the possession of the moon and control of outer space. This may sound like comic-book nonsense now, but there is no doubt in the scheme of things to come, that whoever controls these areas will be in a strategic position to conquer the entire world. In a short time ahead this may become another first for someone—for no man or nation has ever accomplished this objective, although the aspiration has been ever present throughout history. I need not remind you that this aspiration is dangerously present today and from all indications we are far behind in a race to ward off its threat—in spite of our successful January 31 launching.

We are behind because Congress preferred to do little other than listen to the experts who had told them that we were far ahead. The colossal scientific achievements of Russia have proven that these experts are not infallible as our Congressmen had supposed, but, on the contrary, that they are quite capable of making mistakes—and that on

many occasions their ouija boards were wrong.

We are now told that our trouble lies in not glorifying the American scientist—that we have made heroes of our ballplayers and athletes and therefore have failed in developing our scientists. To this we need only a quick glance at the 1956 Olympic records to come up with another version. We were told by the experts that we would win, but experts were wrong again. We were second to Russia in the final count by 5 gold medals and 129 points. This must prove that athletic accomplishment can be contemporaneous with scientific achievement.

I am merely pointing out these facts to illustrate that experts exist for every pebble on the beach and that their judgment and predictions are not always right. In all of the categories—the experts on economic problems are the most numerous and the most confused. They cannot agree among themselves or with anybody else. They have become frustrated because—from the beginning of time—they have been trying to create money from nothing and have it maintain value. Today these experts are buried in such a maze of complications that they are unable to recognize the simple facts that the wherewithal from nothing is equal to nothing and that the net product from the dilution of milk by water is water. Many of these experts are the creatures of Congress and, as such, they are also keepers of the barn door. We know that they have made mistakes—even some seemingly self-seeking ones. We have had depressions, recessions, and creeping inflation—all under their guidance, advice, and assurance that these things could not happen. In all of their wisdom and with the full backing of the Government, they have been unable to check the steady, consistent depreciation of the dollar. In the long run economies lean on the strength and stability of currencies and military power crumbles by their failures. Therefore, it is incumbent upon Congress to keep constantly alert to make certain that no more horses escape; lest we wake up some morning to find that we have also been challenged by the wisdom of Russia on economic and monetary horizons.

We have recently heard much about the unidentified dangers that are hovering about us, but we have heard little about the identified dangers that are boring within.

Congress yielded its power to coin and set the value of money some 45 years ago, and today we are losing the tangible backing of our currency because the experts—who usurped this power and have since been given command with a rod of iron—prefer the noncompetitive creation of fiat money.

In the hearings last August before the United States Senate Committee on Finance (pp. 1444 to 1447 of their report) there was evidence documented by Senator MALONE'S testimony that the legal 25-percent gold-reserve requirement on $26.5 billion in circulating Federal Reserve notes and on $20 billion of Federal Reserve deposits would amount to $11.76 billion. His testimony also brought out the fact that of the $22 billion of gold that we hold, $16,273,000,000 is mortgaged for payment against foreign-held American dollars, and that this leaves a net gold reserve for the United States of only $5¾ billion, and—need I remind you?—that this is supposed to fill the shoes of our legal reserve requirement of $11.76 billion. Russia is currently carrying an unmortgaged gold-reserve requirement of $7.3 billion. It must also be remembered that our dollars are issued on a 25-percent gold basis, then credit expanded to about 6 times into money supply, and that direct foreign conversion costs us 100 percent in gold, or a net loss of about 130 percent in gold for each dollar that comes home by this route. These are identified dangers that could, with a little effort, be measured by Congress in terms of our Nation's vanishing liquidity.

We also find that during the first half of 1957 that over $600 million[1] worth of gold was purchased by the United States from the International Monetary Fund. An analysis of this transaction indicates that it was not only for the purpose of building up United States dollar balances for the fund's use in its lending activities, but also for the additional purpose of digging out an extra home supply of Federal Reserve notes from an empty barrel. Simply described, the maneuver is an inflationary guided missle wilder than a Russian dream. Six hundred million Federal Reserve dollars, backed with gold by only 25 percent—or $150 million worth—will purchase $600 million worth of gold—which can then be used on our 25 percent legal gold reserve basis—to issue $2.4 billion worth of Federal Reserve notes. Thus, there is created a net gain of 1 billion, 800 million in Federal Reserve dollars from nothing except manipulation. From these same balloon dollars the money supply can be expanded by at least 6.6 times through our present debt-management and bank credit policies. So, the possession of only $150 million worth of gold can swing the door open to the use of over $11 billion in easy money supply. This is an inflationary ratio of over 75 to 1 and perhaps the fondest dream of our monetary acrobats. It is a vicious way to allow money to be created. It is a puppet performance which invites the laws of economics to catch up by the boomerang method. It is an identified danger that demands a double check on the keepers of the barn door.

Last year I read paragraph (a) of section I of article IV of the final act of the Bretton Woods Agreement in order to forestall any misunderstandings in regard to the attachment of currencies to gold. It is short; so I would like to read it again; this time, however, for the more definite purpose of spelling it out as the main cause for our present embarrassment of having more foreign held dollars demand against our gold reserve than we can legally accommodate.

"(a) The par value of the currency of each member shall be expressed in terms of gold as a common denominator or in terms of the United States dollar of the weight and fineness in effect on July 1, 1944."

No one needs to be an expert to understand that this international agreement categorically ties all of the major currencies of the world to gold with the exception of the Russian ruble. And Russia, though not currently a party to this agreement, maintains a base of 222.168 milligrams of fine gold per ruble and holds a 25 percent gold reserve requirement against her issue of currency. This places gold as the base to all of the most important currencies, and in addition the Bretton Woods Agreement provides for the United States dollar to act as an internationally usable money by placing an obligation upon her for the redemption of all of her foreign-held dollars in gold at $35 per fine ounce.

Now—in facing these facts—it must be conceded, even by our Congressmen and monetary experts, that our dollar is not only based upon gold, but that it is now being used as a medium to set the price of gold. Therefore, the American dollar and gold, though distinctive from each other in this country by undiminishing fiat ratios, is without a difference in international monetary consideration. This is the only reason that our dollar maintains its prestige as an internationally usable money. No matter how much we inflate our dollar at home—and although we cannot own gold as American citizens, the foreigner can always receive 100 percent in gold for an American dollar upon demand. This is true of individual foreign-held dollars as well as foreign central bank holdings, because the foreigners have ways and means of transferring their individual dollar balances into national dollar balances. This fact was also brought out by Senator Malone and documented in the testimony before the United States Senate Committee on Finance, August 1957, page 1444. Through this dollar standard arrangement we have been placed in a dangerous position. We are being forced, at our expense, to furnish the rest of the world with a gold standard which automatically revalues itself upward in direct proportion to the depreciation of our dollar. In other words, our depreciated dollar of today is worth about one-half of its 1948 value, yet when it is held by the foreigner it will purchase for him as much gold from the United States Treasury as it did in 1948—and there is nothing being done about it.

This is a frightening predicament into which we have allowed ourselves to be led. Our inflated dollars have been piled into such huge heaps that they are spilling over into the laps of our foreign friends for the inevitable use as a straight flush against our ace in the hole at Fort Knox.

However, it has been said that these foreign-held dollars are not necessarily demand against United States gold because they are also free for the purchase of American goods. And this is true, except that in the terms of these inflated dollars, the price of American goods is considerably higher than the price of foreign goods—and certainly very much higher than the bargain price of gold which has not been allowed, under law, to change for 24 years.

So, consequently, in a search for bargains, the foreigner will not use his internationally usable dollar at the American counter when foreign goods are available at cut rates—nor, if, when he needs no goods, he can exchange his pile of precarious paper for the undisputed security of solid gold.

In the meantime, either by the occurrence of rising foreign prices through the force of inflationary pressures abroad or by the constant buildup of foreign-held short-term dollars beyond the critical point of convertibility, gold, at its 1934 price, will definitely become an exclusive bargain. This will cause an epidemic of gold fever, and provide the stimulus for a foreign stampede in a race for the touch of King Fort Knox before his power to turn paper into gold runs out.

By then, another ignored identified danger will be recognized, but the time will be late. Another horse will be loose—a fast one, of a different color and more difficult to corner.

This horse's head is jammed through a paper barn door now, and if the keepers are not awakened in time to secure its halter to the hitching post of gold, we are doomed to the greatest dollar crisis the world has ever known. Because, if we should stop such a raid on our gold by refusing to honor the redemption of our foreign-held dollars, our dollar would no longer be an internationally usable money by virtue of no longer being able to command gold; and the net result would be its loss of foreign prestige and world influence. On the other hand, if we did not stop such a raid (with foreign-held dollar-demand in excess of our gold supply) our gold would be wiped out and leave our dollars without backing. And hence, in this manner, our dollar would also fail in a bid for prestige and world influence. It is a dilemma. But why are we being caught in the middle of such a squeeze play without our citizens having at least an equal chance to purchase their own gold with their own dollars? And why should foreigners be privileged to claim 100 percent in gold for their return of our dollars which are only 25 percent backed with the metal and then expanded by over 6 times through money supply methods? These are the kinds of questions that puzzle a sane man; but, I

[1] International Financial News Survey vol, X No. 15.

am sure that they do not puzzle the monetary marksmen from Moscow—who are, without a doubt, aiming their ruble guns at dollar prestige as a contribution toward ultimate victory in the cold war. This is an identified danger with difficult realization, but, nevertheless, one not to belittle.

Of all these identified dangers that lurk in the background for an opportunity to strike, the shortage of gold, with its warning rattles muffled under monetary policy, lies coiled with deadly fangs as the least apparent.

This gold shortage is dangerous because gold is the foundation that holds up our money tree—and our money tree, now top-heavy with monetized public debt, stands upright with unapparent weakness, only because the foreigners have not yet chosen to pull the mortgaged gold props from under its overloaded branches.

The premise of a gold shortage has been challenged through some strange facets of modern economic philosophy. To this we need only to remind these challengers that estimated at $35 per ounce, the total world production of gold in the last 2,000 years of recorded history has been less than $62 billion. Such a challenge is fantastic, in view of the fact that our Nation, with only 6 percent of the world's population and claiming nearly 60 percent of its official gold stock, has been forced from the proper money of gold to a national monetized debt that has grown in just the last 25 years to well over $200 billion more than the total value of all of the gold that the world has been able to yield in the last 2,000 years.

There should now be very little doubt as to the short supply of gold and in terms of economic law—be it modern or otherwise—short supply lends wings to value with telling effect. Therefore, it is reasonable that the value of gold cannot be held indefinitely in a price jail when its supply is neither keeping pace with the increase in population nor with the economic expansion.

This poses the serious question as to why our monetary wardens should confine gold in the solitary confinement cell of a price prison when its release could determine the full degree of its value in monetary honesty.

We can stop wondering about this question. Gold is behind price bars because political courage has continually failed in matching the powerful challenge of easy money methods. Anslem Rothschild once said, "Give me the power to issue a nation's money; then I do not care who makes the laws." This is what we face today. Congress gave this coercive power to the Federal Reserve bank—and as (elected) lawmakers, they have never been able to muster enough courage to legislate against its evils. To the contrary—they have always conceded to the fiat demands of money for the mere asking. Our monetary managers know that such tactics create inflation and that the discipline of gold is the prime safeguard. But, the production of gold is direct competition to Federal Reserve bank credit. It increases the member bank reserves and deposits without resort to Federal Reserve bank discount. It increases the supply of proper money without bending its knees to Federal Reserve consent. In fact, it is the only big bump left along the Federal Reserve road of tender mercies. For this reason, we have a monetary policy dedicated to the destruction of gold production as a means of eliminating this competition. Thus, for the convenience of easy bank profits, the stabilizing effect of gold has been smothered under a wet blanket of watered money. This does not mean to say that the Federal Reserve System is all wrong—or that private bankers should not direct the central banking of this country—it does say, however, that political courage does not exist with sufficient strength to legislate against the unrestrained credit-money forces that are building the private Federal Reserve bank without competition into a power greater than that of our Nation.

The gold mining industry of the United States has been the first to be sacrificed upon this altar of political cowardice, but it will probably not be the last—because Congress, still yawning from its recently disturbed sleep, will only throw stones at the disturbers. This does not mean to say that individual legislators are sleepy or political cowards. There are many Senator Malones in Washington who are being heard now and there are many others, buried deep in red tape problems, who are alert, intelligent and quite capable of coming to the rescue when the shoe begins to pinch the feet of their constituents. This is the American way and the way we will probably take. However, when the danger is identified before the pinch begins to hurt, the proverbial pound of cure can be saved by an ounce of congressional prevention. And that is a part of their job.

I was told in Europe, a year ago last fall, by over a dozen different banking authorities that a return to the gold standard was the only honest basis for international exchange, but that then was not the time—because gold would have to be revalued with inflationary effect. I was told by one expert, who was a monetary policy adviser to the Italian government, that confidence in the money managers of the world would soon push gold entirely from the monetary picture. He backed up his statement with figures to prove that gold, because of its short supply, was then only a token in monetary considerations, and therefore that confidence was, in fact, at that time the only means of money. In discussing this theory later, I began to feel that perhaps he was right—except that his timing was off by at least a million years. Because—first—it would be necessary for the peoples of the entire world to gain such complete confidence, trust and honesty among themselves and between each other, that cessation of all police action would follow as a natural consequence.

Even if all of our geese were swans, the world of today could not comprehend such a dream, nor is international trust a sign of the times—even between the most friendly nations. So when the modern money managers begin to prescribe themselves as the only source of money, we had better begin to wonder why. Or when a consensus of opinion of international bankers places gold as the only honest basis for international exchange—and with no genuine moves being made in that direction, we had better begin to wonder why again. We are being told that this honest move will take place as soon as things become stabilized—but we are not being told that it takes the move to do the stabilizing. So we go recklessly on, with the cart ahead of the horse, hoping that we can stay on the grade until a wider place is found to swap ends.

The restoration of monetary order through the convertibility of currencies, with unquestionable exchange rates, is the only key that will unlock the door to world stability. This key cannot be made of promissory notes, because scraps of paper have always been burned by the ambitions of man. On the other hand, gold will always stand firm because of its indestructibility and tangible bond between nations; it is by all reason, therefore, the most desirable substance for the keymaker's die. However, there is not enough gold in existence to make a key of sufficient size to fit the present lock. So if the door to stability is going to be opened, either gold must be revalued to the necessary price level for parity requirements, or the lock must be shrunken by a devastating depressionary effort. From the American viewpoint the profits from gold revaluation could be sterilized for the purpose of establishing a stabilization fund. This fund could be used, under the jurisdiction of the United States Treasurer, for the purpose of adapting flexibility to the supply of proper money until such time that gold production and related problems could be adjusted. Such a fund could also act as a backlog for the redemption of our foreign-held short-term dollars.

Insuring our security with gold, revalued to a new standard along such lines would not be inflationary because the increased difference in reserve gold, being frozen, would not reflect in money supply; unless called upon as needed for that purpose. Instead, it would relieve our obligation of furnishing a "dollar standard" for the rest of the world; it would place gold production in limited competition with reserve bank rediscount profits, which would be a healthy step; it would increase the production of proper money (ie-gold) as insurance against runaway "credit money" ratios; it would allow the supply of gold to keep pace with the growing economic and population needs; it would restore the rights of the individual as free men to own and store gold as wealth; it would stop the sale of monetary gold for industrial uses; it would develop a free market that would eventually establish the true value of gold; it would rebuild ghost towns and mend heartbreaks; it would reestablish badly needed community payrolls; but above all it would till the soil for international peace and plant confidence, honesty and trust between all nations and their peoples.

In order to accomplish these things and avoid monetary insaneness, it must be recognized that new money must be born in proportion to the increase in population, if unbearable debts are not to be forced upon the laps of our children. Because for each child born above the death rate, either additional money or monetized debt is needed for cradle to grave care. Now, since the increase-ratio of the world's population has overshadowed the increase-ratio of the world's gold production by approximately 20 to 1 in the last 15 years, Congress should be aware of the fact that we need more gold production—not less—and that our monetary policy is now being used only as a tool for the willful devaluation of our dollar. This expands money supply with improper debts and seriously confuses inflation with prosperity.

Advancing the price of gold to a realistic level in conformity with the present inflated production costs is the only way to effectively increase the supply of gold—and Congress is the only commission in the world with the power to do this job! So let's hope—with all of our might—that Congress does not fail to recognize the dangers—because, if they do not—it does not mean that the dangers will cease to exist.

The House Committee Report on Reds

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DONALD L. JACKSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 5, 1958

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Santa Monica Evening Outlook of Tuesday, February 18, 1958:

THE HOUSE COMMITTEE REPORT ON REDS

The House Committee on Un-American Activities has just released its annual report for 1957. The report contains some sobering

facts. Once given to posing openly as a genuine political party, the Communist Party is now a deeply secret underground apparatus for subversive infiltration and propaganda.

The committee states that the Commies have penetrated key Government agencies and have obtained scientific information which has helped Russia to develop its nuclear weapons and outer space devices; and that they are continuing to do this, as well as stepping up their recruitment of new converts to the cause. It seems that the party is making up in dedicated strategy and action for its apparent loss of funds and card-carrying members.

The release of this report should do much to stop the relaxing of our vigilance. There has of late been far too much evidence of indifference by our citizens, much of it induced by a false feeling that the danger of internal subversion is now slight, if indeed not over. Congress and its hard-working committee have not contributed to this relaxing. But the United States Supreme Court has done just that.

Its recent interpretation of the Smith Act in the appeal of the California Communist leaders did two things that discourage efforts to combat the Reds. It tied the hands of the FBI and the United States attorneys throughout the land. And it gave a tremendous boost to the morale of the party leaders, which helps to account for the renewed vigor of the party that the House committee now deplores.

As pointed out by bar members and responsible men in Government service, the decision was weak as a matter of constitutional law, for it reversed the original decision that approved the Smith Act. So flimsy were the distinctions that the judges gave for reaching a different conclusion in 1957, 6 years later, that most thinking people felt the judges just didn't like the Smith Act, didn't like the idea of Congress curbing political free speech except in times of obvious violent overthrow.

This judicial discouragement has resulted in United States attorneys throwing up their hands and refusing to prosecute further a hopeless cause. Now the House committee sounds a call to action. Now Congress should repass the Smith Act in words unmistakably conforming to the Supreme Court's views.

Let them write in the statute that advocating forcible overthrow means advocating actual violent action as soon as the time seems right, and that this constitutes an immediate threat and not just as abstract philosophical discussion. Then the Supreme Court would have a hard time discharging convicted Communists. Then Federal prosecutors could bring defendants into court with renewed vigor. Convictions and jail sentences would follow, as they did before the Court turned soft. And that would be good.

A Highly Intelligent Letter From a GI

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EMANUEL CELLER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 4, 1958

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to insert in the RECORD a letter I have recently received from a GI stationed overseas on the subject of Army morale. I am withholding the signature:

SIR: I read an article which you wrote for a magazine a few months ago on the draft. In the most recent issue of Newsweek magazine, there is a similar piece, the difference being, that Newsweek goes into detail on the problem of low morale in the Armed Forces.

It is about time that the current attitude of the American fighting man be noticed by someone other than his superior officers, who seem to be too busy with inspections and "scratching each other's back" with favorable efficiency reports.

I am a member of the United States Army, stationed in France, and if you are familiar with the details of the Newsweek article, then you may apply them to my situation and my unit.

Morale is not merely low. It is nonexistent. It's grounded. This can be traced to the refusal of the military to adjust to the 20th century—and its refusal to admit that the enlisted man is primarily a man, not a serf.

The reference to "spit and polish" is well put. Excessive GI-ing (cleaning, scrubbing, etc.) is standard in my outfit. We have been on a sand-the-floor binge since December. Along with this stress upon "standing tall," have followed restrictions and frequent work details after the regular duty hours.

This emphasis upon work details has reached the point where it takes 10 minutes a day to screen the bulletin board, glancing at the numerous rosters to see if one's name has been tapped for some grubby toil.

Naturally, the men resent this constant spit and polish push. The Army, naturally, increases the harassing necessary (it feels) to get work done.

And so it goes—day after day after day after day.

In the light of the (complaining) I've done, it will sound strange to say that I like my Army job.

I do. I don't like the forced role of a domestic. But my work during duty hours is directly applicable to my plans for civilian life.

Unfortunately, the majority of draftees and many enlistees, are not so blessed. They are square pegs in round holes, thus increasing their discontentment.

Low morale, in my opinion, is related to these questions: Must conscription equal servitude? Should a military tour of duty be the same as the working day of a scrubwoman? Should a soldier be a janitor?

There is your low morale. This is why a GI feels more like a member of the department of sanitation than a member of the Department of the Army. Treat a man as if he were a child, and he'll either be a rebel or a child, neither of which is an asset to a military machine.

Perennial GI parties aren't the only factors killing morale.

Such examples of cinemascopic ignorance as training (utterly useless) are others.

The week's training for me consists of the following: A whole day in the post theater, listening to lectures on military justice. The following morning (4 hours) I shall spend listening to similar speeches given by sergeants who leave much to be desired as speakers, and especially as thinkers. On Saturday, the following day, I shall have 4 hours of training which will be devoted to inspections, marching, etc. What amounts to 2 full days (working days) is being taken up with activities which in no way increase interest in the service, nor do they contribute to the job production.

I have less than 9 months remaining on my overseas tour, which I intend to finish with honorable service and as good a job as I can.

But I'll be darned if I call it a privilege to watch myself, and others like me, turned from a man into a low-paid maid. While officers' clubs flourish, enlisted men sleep in substandard billets (mine was condemned by the Air Force as being unfit to live in). While officers scan documents for personal r. i. f. notices, enlisted men read work rosters, wondering how many hours of menial tasks will be put in this week.

What incentive an American fighting man may have is thus smothered. He doesn't give a darn. And that is low morale. The Army doesn't care, why should I, he says.

If a dedicated, highly professional soldier as Lieutenant General Gavin had to quit—what other state can morale be in but low?

I want to do my best. But I want to do it as a man. If military service is necessary, at least let me do it on my feet, not on my hands and knees.

Respectfully,

———, ———.

Soviet Bloc Raises Its Bid for Latin American Trade

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HALE BOGGS
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 24, 1958

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article appearing in the New York Times of March 2, 1958:

SOVIET BLOC RAISES ITS BID FOR LATIN AMERICAN TRADE

(By Herbert L. Matthews)

The threat of the Soviet bloc's economic penetration of Latin American is like the little black cloud on the horizon. The barometer is falling, the wind is blowing toward us, the storm is going to hit.

President Eisenhower, in his state of the Union message on January 9, issued the warning that we should not be misled into thinking that Russia would only use military aggression to achieve her aim of world conquest. Testifying before the House Ways and Means Committee on the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act last Monday, Secretary of State Dulles said that the Soviet aid-and-trade offensive was a greater danger to the United States than open armed attack. On January 3 the State Department had issued a summary of The Soviet Bloc Economic Offensive in Less-Developed Areas.

All this means that we are forewarned. The Soviet bloc offensive (one must think in terms of the whole bloc, because about half the activity comes from the European satellites) is as yet largely confined to Asia and the Middle East. The program in Africa is just getting under way. That in Latin America is more advanced, but is also obviously only beginning.

TOTAL NOT YET LARGE

The actual figures are deceptive. In fact, Soviet-bloc trade with Latin America in 1957 totaled only about $210 million, compared to $244 million in 1956 and a record $335 million in 1955. Of this trade, 90 percent was carried on with Argentina, Brazil, and Uruguay. Cuban sugar sales amounted for most of the remainder. Offers of credit have so far been confined largely to Argentina, Brazil, and Uruguay. To take an overall figure, United States grants and credits given in foreign aid have amounted to more than $60 billion. Soviet-bloc aid has not quite reached the $2-billion mark.

On the basis of these figures an unwary observer might well ask: What is all the fuss about? The answer is easy and disturbing. It lies in the intentions and capabilities of the Soviet bloc in 1958 and its potentialities in the coming years.

Until 1953 the Soviet Union relied on political activities in countries and regions beyond the boundaries of the solid bloc of Communist nations. There were the Communist parties everywhere, through which Moscow worked, and no less than 13 major international front organizations each with dozens of subsidiary organizations all over the world. They cover such subjects as youth, labor, international trade, women and journalism. They emphasize national liberation and, particularly in Latin America, economic independence.

Nominally the Communist party is legal in only five Latin American republics—Argentina, Bolivia, Ecuador, Mexico, and Uruguay. However, there are a number of countries where the technical illegality is not enforced. Communism, for instance, has been against the law in Brazil since 1947, yet our State Department estimates Brazilian membership in the Communist Party today at 50,000. Argentina now has the largest party, with about 80,000. For this the country has the former dictator, Gen. Juan Perón, to thank, since he created a climate for them and surreptitiously encouraged important elements among them.

However, taking the picture as a whole, political communism is not a threat anywhere in Latin America. What might be called economic communism is another matter, and with totalitarian states economics and politics are inseparable.

SOVIET CREDIT AVAILABLE

The Soviet Union plus its satellites have now reached a point where they are in a position to grant credits, buy raw materials and export manufactured goods. The greater part of the trade now going on with Latin America is, in fact, the purchase of raw materials and the shipment of machinery. This is a genuine, economic base for trade and is the one which dominates United States trade with Latin America. The Russians are moving in at a time of inflation and falling commodity prices in which primary producers are finding it increasingly difficult to sell their commodities in normal cash markets.

Hence, when the Russian or other Communist-bloc trade missions come along with tempting offers, the Latin Americans must be expected to sell. Official trade missions are going from Argentina and Brazil to the Soviet bloc. The Soviet bloc is beginning to take part in Latin American trade fairs, like the Czech exhibition at the Jalisco Fair in Mexico in February and the Golden Anniversary Fair in Buenos Aires now underway. Technical assistance, a field we have almost monopolized since the war, is now being offered from the Soviet bloc. As is well known, the Russians are currently graduating more engineers and scientists than the United States, and they will be increasingly available.

The handicaps that we, as a free enterprise, capitalistic trader, face in competition with a Socialist trader are giving American leaders cause for worry. The Soviet bloc aid is always in the form of easy credits, generally 2.5 percent stretching over 12 years, which is much better than the Export-Import Bank, World Bank, or American private investors can offer. The Soviets, for instance, can lose in a deal with Argentina and pick up the loss in a deal with Peru. Or they can deliberately make an unprofitable economic deal for political gains. They do not need to pay any regard to ordinary commercial considerations. We do. They do not need any economic justification for their transactions. We cannot do business that way, except for our occasional grants-in-aid to a country like Bolivia to prevent absolute hunger.

The Russians can make their own people do without certain commodities or capital goods and export them. We cannot do that. For us trade naturally has important political corollaries but the main thing is the commercial transaction. Nikita Khrushchev has said quite frankly that the U. S. S. R. values trade more for political than economic reasons.

KHRUSHCHEV'S INTERVIEW

He gave an interview to Brazilian newspapermen in Moscow in November 1957, for instance, in which he, on the one hand, expressed the desire to resume diplomatic relations between Moscow and Rio de Janeiro and on the other hand held out the lure of big trade offers and technical assistance. Following that interview, Soviet credit offers of up to $750 million were reported and there was talk of large purchases of Brazilian coffee in exchange for industrial equipment. There were also rumors of Polish credit offers of $250 million to be invested in the steel- and iron-mining industries.

In both Brazil and Argentina the Soviet bloc is taking advantage of the "oil nationalism." Both these countries make heavy and very costly purchases abroad of oil; both are potentially big producers of oil but they want to develop their own industries. They will not let American or British firms in to develop the resources as has been done in Venezuela.

TEMPTING OFFERS

So the Russian bloc steps in with offers of material and equipment on very easy terms of payment and of technical assistance. Such offers are tempting. Meanwhile, Communist agents seek to discredit American business everywhere in Latin America, to disparage American products, to criticize American financial measures and to stir up labor troubles.

They are beginning to get results and they must be expected to get more and more results as time passes. As the State Department document said last January, most signs point to a continued increase in the trade of the less developed countries with the Soviet bloc. Latin America is definitely a less developed and in most cases an underdeveloped area.

The Soviet challenge is clear. How to meet it is a controversial problem. Some Americans feel the answer lies in greater Government assistance and this is what the Latin countries would prefer. Most American exporters would prefer to see Washington help the free-enterprise system. In any event, the challenge has to be met to avoid political dangers which would be far greater than any possible economic losses.

Coosa-Alabama River Story

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KENNETH A. ROBERTS
OF ALABAMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 5, 1958

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include for the RECORD the fifth in a series of articles which I have prepared on the great Coosa-Alabama River system in Alabama:

THE COOSA-ALABAMA RIVER STORY—PART V: NAVIGATION THE GOAL

(By KENNETH A. ROBERTS, Member of Congress)

New dam construction will not appease those who dream of a new Coosa-Alabama River.

The potential of the basin will, in their estimation, remain unfulfilled until the riverway is navigable from the hills of Rome, Ga., to Mobile Harbor.

That is why Congressmen, civic and business leaders are watching closely a Corps of Engineers study of shipping—both available and possible—on the river.

Half of the study is complete. It shows navigation feasible from Montgomery southward.

The remainder of the report, it is expected, will show a similar feasibility for the Coosa River so provisions for locks can be made simultaneously with the building of the Alabama Power Co. dams.

The situation on the Alabama River appears more firm than that of its sister, the Coosa. The Federal Government now is planning for a $110 million project which would provide a navigation channel 9 feet deep from the mouth of the Alabama to Montgomery by means of low-lift lock and dam at Claiborne, two higher dams with locks and power installations at Millers Ferry and Jones Bluff, and supplemental channel work on the river below Claiborne.

But this project, too, has been the victim of the kinds of delays and setbacks which have plagued the upper stretches of the waterway.

General planning only has been done on the individual structures and when Alabama Congressmen joined basin officials in trying to get $150,000 for the Millers Ferry Dam during the past session of Congress, they were unsuccessful. The effort will be renewed during the present session.

What are the chances that the Government will be convinced the river should be navigable from one end to the other? Alabamians think they are good.

In the first part of their survey, Army engineers estimated about 2 million tons of freight a year will pass through the Montgomery to the gulf section, making development worthwhile from an economic standpoint.

Officials estimate that freight tonnage possible from Rome to Montgomery would perhaps double that of the lower waterway. Heavy industry at Rome, Gadsden, Anniston, Talladega, Sylacauga, and Childersburg would account for the heavy tonnage.

If the benefit-cost ratio is favorable, the way would be cleared for the Government to add locks to the power dams. The full potential of the riverway could be nearer utilization. Next: Basis for hopes.

Coosa-Alabama River Story

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KENNETH A. ROBERTS
OF ALABAMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 5, 1958

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include for the RECORD the sixth in a series of articles which I have prepared on the great Coosa-Alabama River system in Alabama:

THE COOSA-ALABAMA RIVER STORY—PART VI: BASIS FOR HOPES

(By KENNETH A. ROBERTS, Member of Congress)

The assets of the Coosa-Alabama River give credence to the great expectations which have spanned the years with unwavering vigor.

The persistence of predictions involving the river makes the most objective observer believe that there must be some truth in these speculations.

More than 70 years ago, Rev. B. F. Riley voiced one of the prophesies. This historian said the waterway from Rome, Ga., to Mobile

will be opened to "spread all around * * * industry, prosperity and wealth."

Last fall, Robert F. Henry, president of Coosa-Alabama River Improvement Association, updated the situation. He said:

"The way is now open for the Federal Government, in partnership with private industry, to finish the job along the Coosa-Alabama system. If the Government will put locks on the power company dams on the Coosa and will build three proposed dams on the Alabama, the entire system will be open for navigation. It will make this valley blossom like a rose."

In the face of this optimism, let us examine the assets of the waterway.

Considered one of the 10 great river systems in the country, the Coosa-Alabama covers an area of 23,000 square miles. It flows from its headwaters—the Etowah and Oostanaula Rivers at Rome, 3,000 feet above sea level—down the Blue Ridge Mountains southwesterly across the Piedmont plateau, picking up the Tallapoosa River to form the Alabama River, then down to the lowlands of the gulf coastal plain to join the Tombigbee River in forming Mobile River just north of Mobile Bay.

The course runs through a basin blessed with mild, equable climate. There is abundant, well-distributed rainfall; large areas of fertile soil; flourishing timberland; rich and varied mineral resources; and a diversity of industry.

Minerals include bauxite, Selma chalk, clays, coal, iron ores, Fuller's earth, gold, graphite, granite, marble, slate, mica, ochre, lime, manganese, gravel, sand, silica, asbestos—the list goes on and on. Some are mined; others lie waiting.

At its Rome origins, the waterway is in a country of textiles, paper and metal products. Passing the Weiss Dam site at Centre, Ala., the Coosa enters Gadsden, home of heavy industry. Among its products are steel, rubber, textiles, pipe and metal goods.

At the tri-county junction of Etowah, Calhoun and St. Clair, the river enters Alabama's Fourth Congressional District. In its course to the gulf, the waterway will touch 7 of the district's 8 counties. Next: Tracing the river.

Coosa-Alabama River Story

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KENNETH A. ROBERTS
OF ALABAMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 5, 1958

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include for the RECORD the seventh in a series of articles which I have prepared on the great Coosa-Alabama River system in Alabama:

THE COOSA-ALABAMA RIVER STORY—PART VII: TRACING THE RIVER

(By KENNETH A. ROBERTS, Member of Congress)

In its wandering course to the gulf, the Coosa-Alabama waterway unfolds a representative look at Alabama—particularly the Fourth Congressional District—and hints at the growth navigation would bring to this basin.

Leaving the industrial centers at Rome, Ga., and Gadsden, the river passes along Calhoun County, another site of industrial dominance over agriculture.

Anniston, east of the river by a few miles, is center of the industry—textiles, pipe, metal products, chemicals, and electronic tubes are important—and is the largest city in the Fourth District, but third to Montgomery and Gadsden in size of cities passed by the river. Here are two large military installations, Fort McClellan and Anniston Ordnance Depot.

To the west lies St. Clair County. Less industrialized than her neighbor, St. Clair has textiles, manufacturers of brick, cast iron pipe and cement. This stretch of the Coosa is rich in soils—the red limestone soils are among Alabama's best—and forests abound.

Now forming part of the Talladega-St. Clair Counties boundary, the river goes deeper into timber country, bordering the great Talladega National Forest. Talladega County is one of Alabama's most industrialized. Industry varies from textiles at Talladega, to newsprint at Childersburg, to marble mining at Sylacauga. The large Alabama Ordnance Works powder plant is at Childersburg.

Clay, east of Talladega, is the only Fourth District county not touched by the river, but the waterway could tremendously affect this county. Clay is the "graphite center" of the United States, and there is lumbering and the mining of mica.

The Coosa widens as it enters Coosa County, after passing Wilsonville in Shelby, site of a huge new powerplant. Lay and Mitchell Dams span the river between Coosa and Chilton Counties. Only slightly industrialized, Coosa has an abundance of timber and minerals—including tin—and is ripe for river development.

Entering Elmore County, the river flows into Lake Jordan. Elmore has moderate industry—lumbering and textiles are here—and minerals, including gravel, quartz, and limestone. The river bends westward after passing Wetumpka and combines with the Tallapoosa River to form the Alabama River.

The river dips down to Montgomery, site of greatest industry, before flowing west to form the southern border of Autauga County. Prattville, to the north, claims a majority of the industry—meat processing, textiles, lumbering—in the high-agricultural county.

Dallas is the last of Fourth District counties in the river's course. Tenth largest in the State, Dallas county contains Selma, the District's second biggest city. The land is rich in agricultural products. Lumber and wood products are among the 100 industries in the county. Here too is Craig Air Force Base.

Near Millers Ferry, the river leaves the Fourth District. Ahead lie Wilcox, Monroe, Clark, Baldwin, and Mobile Counties—and Mobile Bay. Next: Time for Culmination.

Coosa-Alabama River Story

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KENNETH A. ROBERTS
OF ALABAMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 5, 1958

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include for the RECORD the final installment in a series of articles which I have prepared on the great Coosa-Alabama River system. As will be obvious from reading this and the other articles, I am very much interested in complete development of this waterway and I believe it behooves the Members of Congress to assay the tremendous potential that could be unleashed to benefit the entire Nation, if this development were brought about.

Following is the last in my series:

THE COOSA-ALABAMA RIVER STORY—PART VIII: TIME FOR CULMINATION

(By KENNETH A. ROBERTS, Member of Congress)

Here, in the Coosa-Alabama Valley, we have everything necessary for the building of a second Ruhr Valley. Now is the time to culminate the dreams we have had for this area.

We have approximately one-third of the people of Alabama in our valley and this includes an adequate labor supply for new industries.

We have more mineral resources than any other section of Alabama, including many vital to the defense of our Nation, and heavy timber forests.

We have power enough for the long range development of the industrial empire in the Coosa Valley. When the Coosa dams are complete, some 360,000 kilowatts will be added and the Wilsonville steam plant will supply another million kilowatts to the capacity of the Alabama and Georgia Power Cos.

In short, we have all that it takes to make our area take on new life, all except the actual doing of it. Though the efforts to secure our dream have bridged a century, these efforts often have been insufficient, even complacent. And, as the Bible states, "hope deferred maketh the heart sick."

Believing that first things come first, we must insist that other river developments which are of less consequence to the benefit of Alabama and the Nation now take a back seat while full support is thrown behind the Coosa-Alabama.

Consider what full development of the Coosa-Alabama would bring: additional power for industrial development, full employment for the valley's people, freedom from disastrous floods, development of valuable mineral resources, adequate facilities for recreation for the young and the old, and the development of an industrial fairyland which would strengthen our national defense and security.

Industries are leaving the other parts of the country every day and finding new locations in the South. They prefer sites along waterways.

If Alabama is to move with the South, she must utilize her greatest undeveloped asset. The bounty of the Coosa-Alabama River system must be recognized.

We must not rest until our dream—closer to reality now than at any other previous time—is realized.

Support for H. R. 8002

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 5, 1958

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, in view of the debate on the floor with respect to H. R. 8002, I feel it appropriate to place in the RECORD, for the thoughtful consideration of my colleagues the following editorials, the first of which appeared in the March 3, 1958, edition of the St. Louis Globe Democrat and the second appeared in the March 3, 1958, edition of the St. Louis Post Dispatch:

[From the St. Louis Globe-Democrat of March 3, 1958]

SHOWDOWN ON MOSSBACK UNITED STATES BUDGETING

At long last the House of Congress will get a chance this week to debate and vote on one of the most vital Hoover Commission reforms—H. R. 8002, which would junk horse-and-buggy Federal financing methods for recognized modern procedure.

This is among the most important issues before this Congress, if not the least understood. It is especially significant now in a period of rising Washington costs. It can save taxpayers millions, perhaps billions of dollars.

The measure, twice passed unanimously in the Senate, has been clogged by obstructionist tactics in the House. Standpat battlers for a status quo have used every device to block its consideration from the floor. Now it will be forced to open consideration, but opponents have dug in for a last-ditch fight.

The legislation would require annual accrued expenditure budgeting by the Government. In plain language, that means it would give back to Congress its right to check and control long-term approapriations on a year-to-year basis. It would return to Congress power over the Federal purse strings, as the Constitution clearly intended that Congress have.

The legislation has been shorn of this authority, in large measure, by the system of appropriating lump sums for programs that run years. When Congress once votes money for such projects, it has no further control over the funds no matter how long the spending takes.

The result has been to pile heavy money backlogs in the pipelines of Federal departments or agencies. Last summer, authoritative estimate was that $70 billion of such carryover funds existed. Under present methods, Congress is powerless to do anything about this money. Obviously pile-up of tax billions in this manner encourages inefficiency and waste. It sabotages effective budgeting.

Congress should have annual review of all such moneys. It would obtain such power under H. R. 8002. Congress should have full authority to curtail, change, or end such spending from year to year. Government should be allowed to pay in a fiscal year only for goods and services obtained in that year. Under the proposed law, such powers would be afforded.

A classic example quoted to show need for this budgeting reform was the $12,500,000,000 appropriated during the Korean war for tanks, guns, and other military hardware. A month after the fiscal year began, the conflict in Korea ended. But expenditures of the billions allotted to supplies for this war did not. Four years later the Army was still spending the funds, free from congressional review or bar.

No business head, or housewife for that matter, would dream of managing money that way. It would be preposterous that Government continue such sloppy fiscal habits, especially when Washington is digging so hard for missile and space needs.

President Eisenhower, the Secretary of the Treasury, the Budget Director, the Comptroller General, accounting and other finance experts of the Nation support this bill.

The showdown finally impends. Aggravated, stubborn, and frustrating delays must be dissipated. This measure should be passed by the House and established a law of the Nation. It is irrefutably in the national interest.

[From the St. Louis Post-Dispatch of March 3, 1958]

ROADBLOCK IN THE HOUSE

A much-needed Federal budget reform is scheduled for debate and vote in the House of Representatives Wednesday. We hope that this time the House, which has twice frustrated unanimous Senate votes on the measure, will act with more responsibility. The reform—annual accrued expenditure budgeting—has been recommended by the second Hoover Commission, by President Eisenhower, and by leading accounting and budgeting experts.

What it would do would be to give Congress continuing control over appropriations for long-term programs. As it is, funds are appropriated in a lump sum for a long-range program and Congress thereafter has little or nothing to say about it. The President also has little control over the spending once authority to incur obligations has been apportioned by the Budget Bureau.

At present some $70 billion out of control by Congress or the President is thus wandering around the executive departments. Portions of it may be deobligated and spent for purposes other than those for which it was appropriated.

Under the proposed new method, Congress would appropriate for long-range projects only 1 year at a time, and review the projects annually. Eventually the multi-billion-dollar carryover could be reduced by the simple process of not adding to it. Near chaos in one large area of budgeting would be replaced by at least semiorder. We should think the basic good business of it would commend itself as easily to the House as to the Senate.

Measures Proposed To Meet Present Economic Crisis

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 5, 1958

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a bill to provide for an emergency public works program. Immediate action is necessary to correct the recessionary condition of our economy which daily grows worse. Signs of serious trouble are present in all sectors of the economy—employment is increasing by leaps and bounds; farm conditions are worsening; credit is restricted and interest rates are high; production in the basic industries has been drastically curtailed; the rate of business failure has soared to unprecedented heights; businessman, worker, and consumer are uneasy about the future. In the light of all this, the administration is dragging its feet and imploring us all to smile, close our eyes and with blind faith wait, wait, wait.

If the Eisenhower administration refuses to accept its responsibilities, I suggest that the legislative branch step in and take immediate corrective action.

Fortunately, our country has the know-how, the resources, and the backlog of needed public works and projects on which only action is needed to prevent a depression.

I recommend the following programs to be carried out at the earliest possible date:

First. The massive Federal highway program should be accelerated. We have had advance planning on this program so could move very quickly.

Second. The tight-money policy must be totally abandoned and action taken to correct its serious consequences which are still very much in evidence.

Third. A liberalization of credit is necessary in order to stimulate the home building industry and to augment consumers purchasing power. My GI home loan bill, H. R. 10764, is designed to accomplish this purpose.

Fourth. Aid to small business is required in order to reverse the trend toward concentration and allow expansion of qualified companies. Accordingly, I have introduced H. R. 9959 to provide necessary tax relief and H. R. 10980, the Small Business Investment Corporation bill which would meet the small business need for equity capital.

Fifth. The personal exemption for income tax should be increased from $600 to $800. My bill, H. R. 809, would accomplish this.

Sixth. Urban redevelopment can and should be accelerated.

Seventh. Farm conditions must be improved.

Eighth. I am introducing a public works bill to check the growth of unemployment by providing for Federal assistance to States and local governments for the construction of needed public works and improvements. School construction is an important need which could be met by such a program.

It is in the nature of the case that these programs will have no effect for several months. That is why immediate action is required. If we wait too long as we once did, recovery will take years, needless human suffering will occur and American strength will be dissipated.

In these words I am not prophesying gloom or doom. Rather, the opposite is true. I am prophesying continued economic strength if we face our difficulties with courage, vigor, and wise, forward looking policies.

New Look and Old in Communist Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DONALD L. JACKSON
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 5, 1958

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following articles from the Los Angeles Times:

[From the Los Angeles Times of January 15, 1958]

RUSSIA AND SATELLITES—NEW LOOK AND OLD IN COMMUNIST POLICY

(By Robert G. Neumann)

I

The death of Josef Stalin on March 3, 1953, brought about considerable changes, both in the Soviet Union and in Moscow's relationship to the satellite countries.

The new rulers, especially Georgi Malenkov, did not have Stalin's tremendous authority and hence considered it desirable to strengthen their position by a moderate liberalization of the dictatorship of the Soviet Union.

While this did not go too far, a certain relaxation of the atmosphere was nevertheless unmistakable and added to the stability of the new course. But it became equally clear that while the new look may have strengthened the hands of the new leaders in Moscow, it weakened Moscow's control over the satellite empire.

The riots and revolts in East Berlin and East Germany on June 17, 1953, the first such uprisings within the Communist orbit, provided telling evidence that all was far from well in those countries, and that a sullen and rebellious population was merely waiting for a sign of weakness or confusion in Moscow in order to cause serious difficulties and even disintegration.

The events in East Germany probably contributed to the downfall of Malenkov and to the rise of Nikita Khrushchev. But there was no appreciable change in the policy which culminated in the latter's pilgrimage with Bulganin to Tito and in Khrushchev's amazing speech of revelation and condemnation against Stalin.

The new look in Russian policy gave rise to considerable optimism abroad, especially in Europe, where people hoped that there would also be a new look in Russian foreign policy. Although the American Government entertained doubts about the profoundity of Russia's changes, it did give in to great pressure at home and abroad and agreed to the summit conference in the summer of 1955.

This meeting of President Eisenhower, Prime Minister Eden, and Premier Faure with Bulganin and Khrushchev created a short period of ostensible goodwill. But it produced no tangible results. None of the problems which caused tension came one iota closer to a solution. And the second Geneva conference of Foreign Ministers in November 1955, which was to implement the decisions of the summit conference, ended in complete deadlock.

However, the forces set in motion by the period of relaxation within the Communist empire were not so quickly laid to rest. On June 28, 1956, the workers of Poznan, Poland, began to riot, an event which culminated in the removal of Poland's Stalinist leaders. Wladislaw Gomulka, an old-line Communist who had been purged by Stalin, returned to power. At the same time Hungary's Stalinist dictator, Matyas Rakosi, was also replaced by a nationalist Communist, Imre Nagy.

The Polish uprising was essentially a Communist affair, well organized and led by Communists who were by no means prowestern. Gomulka had been the architect of the Communist victory over the western-oriented Stanislaw Mikolajczyk in 1947 which gave the Communists complete domination of Poland.

In Hungary the leadership of the revolutionary forces quickly passed into the hands of determined anti-Communists. While Imre Nagy appeared as the nominal leader, well-known anti-Communists like Bela Kovacs, Anna Kethly, Cardinal Mindszenty rose behind Nagy.

The difference between those two rebellions decided, after a short period of indecision, the policy of Moscow. Evidently the Gomulka regime in Palond constituted the maximum concession which the Soviet leadership was willing to give. An outright anti-Communist regime, however, was intolerable to Moscow, and the Hungarian revolution was drowned by Russia in a sea of blood.

The crushing of the Hungarian revolution revealed once again the extraordinary solidity and exemplary discipline of world communism. There were a number of spectacular defections and important losses among fellow travelers, but when the smoke of controversy cleared away, the Communist parties emerged as strong as ever.

The Hungarian tragedy was compounded by the fact that it coincided with the bitter division within the western camp over the British-French-Israeli military intervention in Egypt. It must remain a moot question whether the West, and especially America, would have reacted more forcefully had the Suez crisis not intervened. Although America expressed its sympathy, and open intervention was not forthcoming for fear of creating a third world war.

Nevertheless, there has been no return to the monolithic uniformity of the Stalinists. In Poland, Gomulka's brand of national communism has resulted in a relatively freer atmosphere than Poland has known since 1947. Poland and its leadership are still Communist, there is no political freedom, and the freedom of speech and press is certainly very small indeed. But the interrupted contacts between Poland and the West have been resumed in large measure; even non-Communist Poles are permitted to travel abroad.

Western publications are widely read and distributed, and western institutions are treated with a measure of relative objectivity and even occasional praise. However, it is obvious that Gomulka is walking a tightrope between suppression and liberalization. It is this situation which has prompted the American Government to give some cautious aid to the Polish regime in the hope that its continued existence might have a corrosive effect within the Soviet orbit.

For similar reasons and with some good results, the regime of another undoubted Communist, Marshal Tito of Yugoslavia, was also supported.

With the elimination of Malenkov, Molotov, Kaganovich, and Zhukov, the consolidation of the Soviet leadership was completed. This was accomplished by the Moscow declaration of November 22, 1957, which for all practical purposes attempted to reestablish the Communist International with all its world revolutionary tendencies. This event constitutes a virtual declaration of war to the West and we would do very well to ponder its significance.

[From the Los Angeles Times of January 16, 1958]

BACK IN BUSINESS—MOSCOW DECLARATION REVIVES COMINTERN

(By Robert G. Neumann)

II

The first Communist International, often referred to as the Comintern, was founded in Moscow in March 1919. Its declared purpose was world revolution which at that time seemed to the Russian Bolsheviks the only way of guaranteeing the continuation of their own regime.

The Russian Communist Party maintained absolute leadership from the very beginning. In his famous "21 conditions" Lenin imposed upon every party entering the International the absolute duty to subordinate itself to Moscow. He also demanded periodic purges in the ranks of those parties in order to secure discipline.

In making these demands Lenin was influenced by his analysis of the reasons for the collapse of the Bolshevik regime in Hungary in 1919, which he blamed on the alliance between Communists and Socialists. This analysis also established the Communist habit of always blaming subordinate organs for any failure; the infallibility of Moscow became thus an article of the Communist faith.

Under Stalin the Comintern became purely and simply a tool of Soviet foreign policy and its complete subservience to Moscow was illustrated when, during the rise of Nazism, German Communists were ordered to concentrate their fight against the Social Democrats. This policy culminated quite naturally in the Communist policy of sabotaging the Allied war effort against Germany until Russia was attacked.

The Communist International was dissolved during World War II when Stalin sought to lull his allies and to arouse patriotic Russians in the prosecution of the war. When the cold war dawned, the International was revived as the Cominform. It established its first headquarters in Belgrade, and later moved to Bucharest. But it never achieved the significance of the Comintern. It was hard hit by its inability to destroy the Marahall plan, the collapse of the blockade against Berlin, and finally Tito's successful survival of his expulsion.

The Cominform was dissolved in 1956. But the period of de-Stalinization is now terminated, and the doctrine of each Communist Party following its own national development is abruptly halted.

The Moscow Declaration of November 22, 1957, reestablishes the absolute dogma of Moscow's leadership in the Communist world, to which the Chinese leader Mao Tse-tung specifically added that "there can be only one head for the Socialist camp, and that is the Soviet Union; and for Communist and the Workers' Parties there must also be one head, and that head is the Communist Party of the Soviet Union." The Moscow Declaration thus reestablishes, practically verbatim, the doctrine of 1928.

The text of the Moscow Declaration has dropped the formulation of the 20th congress of the Russian Communist Party according to which wars are considered avoidable, and returns to the Stalin-Zhdanov doctrine of the "dying imperialism" which can prolong its existence only through "aggressive" wars. This concept in turn is used as a justification for the return to the Comintern thesis of the "revolutionary wars."

Enemy No. 1 is significantly West Germany, about which the Moscow Declaration says that its militarism is being revived with United States help. "The struggle against West German militarism is a vital task facing the peace-loving forces of the German people and all the nations of Europe," the declaration says.

With extraordinary frankness the declaration demands that the "struggle for the liberation of the oppressed nations" shall be utilized for the achievement of Communist aims. Principal targets of the Communist campaign therefore are the Middle East, Africa and southeast Asia. In all the declarations emanating from Moscow at about that time the nations of Africa and Asia are carefully listed immediately after the Communist countries and ahead of the Communist Parties of non-Communist countries.

At the same time an attempt is made to exploit national traditions and resentments of America's European allies against the United States of America and to arouse the memory of anti-Fascist associations against Western Germany. Revival of popular fronts and any other form of alliance with workers' groups, national dissidence, national liberation movements, etc., is to demand disarmament and the outlawing of nuclear weapons as a principal propaganda target. Moscow calls also for the extraparliamentary struggle of the masses and finally for the nonpeaceful transition to socialism.

The return to the world revolutionary tendencies of the Communist International seems complete.

The Moscow declaration is not the result of a sudden change of course. It is the culmination of at least 3 years of careful preparation, which began when Khrushchev and Bulganin attempted to win Tito back into the fold but had its real start during the visit of the two heavenly twins to China. At that time, a working agreement was arrived at, which some observers interpret as meaning that Mao Tse-tung recognized the leading tactical role of the Soviet Union while he became the leading ideologue of communism.

The payoff came when the uprisings in Poland and Hungary placed Khrushchev in a difficult position. At that time China's Chou En-lai supported Khrushchev against Molotov, Kaganovich, and Malenkov, and traveled throughout Eastern Europe to bring the rebellious Communist Parties into line.

Significantly, the short period of liberalization in China came to an abrupt end at the precise moment when Khrushchev's victory became final.

These developments underline the absurdity of the theory of a growing gulf between Moscow and Peiping. The careful preparation of this event indicates that it is not the result of American intransigence, as some critics have charged, but is the result of a carefully drawn-up long-range plan which has now entered into a new stage.

[From the Los Angeles Times of January 17, 1958]

THE COMMUNIST ALLIANCE—POLES ON TIGHTROPE OF RUSS RELATIONS

(By Robert G. Neumann)

III

The virtual reestablishment of the Communist International, announced to the world by the Moscow declaration of November 22, 1957, was not accomplished without difficulties which are now beginning to come to the surface. These difficulties concern primarily Poland and Yugoslavia.

The announcement from Moscow merely confirmed that Poland had signed the declaration and gave no indication of differences of opinion. However, the report about the conference which the mayor of East Berlin, Friedrich Ebert, published in the East German newspaper Neues Deutschland aroused a number of speculations. Then Polish diplomats confirmed that there had in fact been controversy about the declaration's concluding sections concerning the preeminence of the Russian Communist Party.

The report of the Polish Communist leader, Wladyslaw Gomulka, which he gave over the Warsaw radio, indicates differences in some depth. Gomulka defended vigorously the true sovereignty of each party and opposed Suslov's demand for a formal international Communist center in Moscow.

Gomulka declared: "The dogmatic concept of the unity of Socialist countries and of the ruling Communist labor parties, which was stressed in the past during the period of the cult of personality, has done a great deal of damage to this unity."

Gomulka also judged very severely the defunct Cominform and, in agreement with the Yugoslavs, concluded that the record of that organization could not be considered a positive one. Instead of big international meetings he advocated bilateral conferences of Communist Parties and countries.

He also rejected the Stalinist practice of maintaining direct contact with individual groups within the Communist countries rather than through the official leadership itself. He categorically denied the right of such party conferences as just took place in Moscow to interfere with the affairs of the various Communist parties, and he allowed the validity of common decisions only where common interests and common problems are involved.

Gomulka's report reveals that in spite of his signature under the Moscow declaration he agrees much more with Yugoslavia, which did not sign, than with the content of the declaration. Why then did he sign? Obviously he is trying to walk a difficult tightrope between control by Moscow and his rebellious country. The fate of Hungary has shown Gomulka clearly what he and Poland cannot do. Poland must remain Communist; and where communism is attacked, freedom must be restricted.

But if the screw is tightened too much, it might lead either to a Hungarian-style development (perhaps not too likely), or to Gomulka's ouster. Poland is indispensable to Russia as an area of transit to Germany and as a guardian of the historic invasion routes into Russia. Hence an outright defection of Warsaw from the Communist camp would without doubt be bloodily suppressed.

But Moscow also holds another threat over Poland's head. That is the German frontier question. Germany lost a large part of her territory when the Potsdam conference handed to Polish administration the area east of the Rivers Oder and Neisse. This was to compensate Poland for the lands which she had lost to the Soviet Union. Hence all Poles are bitterly determined to hang on to the land they consider just compensation for their suffering at the hands of the Germans.

But the West German Government has frequently declared that it does not consider this question settled. It claims the return of that ancient German land. Every Pole knows that if Germany were ever to be reunified, the eastern frontier question would be quickly reopened. The character of this knowledge is clearly indicated by the constant complaint of Polish newspapers about the reluctance of Poles to settle in the newly acquired western provinces.

To maintain her claim to those lands, Poland needs Russia's support. Reliable Polish diplomatic circles have reported a recent conversation between Khrushchev and Gomulka in which the former said: "We actually see this border (the Oder-Neisse line) more clearly. It will remain clear for us as long as we can count Poland among our friends. This is no threat, but our attitude—clearly and unequivocally."

Even more profound is the dissatisfaction of the Yugoslavs. Their delegation refused to sign the Moscow declaration because it "contained a number of views not in conformity with those of the Communists of Yugoslavia," according to a declaration of the Yugoslav Communist Central Committee made December 7, 1957. Marshal Tito vigorously condemned the dogmatism of the Moscow declaration and heatedly refuted the accusation of being a revisionist. His remark that the accusation was also heard in 1948 (when Stalin and Zhdanov read Tito out of the Cominform) indicates the marshal's bitterness over his defeat at the Moscow conference.

Belgrade's isolation is indicated by a growing Russian press campaign against Yugoslavia. On December 10 Pravda published a leading article which accused the opponents of the Moscow declaration of nationalism and cosmopolitanism and calls them "revisionist agents of the imperialistic bourgeoisie."

And in Belgrade the fear is expressed that the growing power of Mihail Suslov and his Stalinist associates, Kuusinen and Ponomarev, highlights the danger of a rapid return to Stalinism.

Conditions within the Communist family are still too much in flux to permit a final assessment. The fact that Suslov's demand for the formal reestablishment of the Communist International, as well as the reissue of an international Communist journal, was turned down indicates that this man does not as yet have everything going his own way. It is also difficult to see why Khrushchev should not view Suslov as a dangerous rival who must be eliminated.

But whatever the outcome of this almost inevitable power struggle, the Communist front stands newly reunified, that it has declared war against the West, and has even announced the methods by which it is going to fight. If we fail to take the Moscow declaration seriously, we shall be sealing our doom.

The Pace of Change

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD BOLLING
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 5, 1958

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, former Senator William Benton, of Connecticut, delivered the following challenging speech on February 4, 1958, at the conference on America's Human Resources To Meet the Scientific Challenge held at Yale University:

THE PACE OF CHANGE

(By William Benton)

During Hitler's heyday Aldous Huxley remarked that technological improvements were enabling mankind to go backwards faster.

Since Hitler's extinction technology has improved at such an accelerating rate that we now seem to be in sight of the ultimate goal—the ultimate backwardness—extinction for all of us.

You scientists and educators and you alleged masters of the mediums of communication are gathered here in New Haven to help the world discover how technological improvements may help the rest of us to hold our own—and even perhaps to move forward.

As cosponsor of this conference, I have a simple opening message for this your second day: I urge you to cultivate the politicians, and to instruct them as you can. Politicians are educable. There is perhaps no more apt example than my late colleague, Senator Brien McMahon. I watched the atomic scientists educate him, in his role as the apostle of civilian control, when military control seemed the easy way.

During my tenure in the thirties as part-time vice president of the University of Chicago—and I may say that I learned more of the devious ways of politics from the academic manipulators there on the midway that I ever learned in Washington—the great sociologist Prof. Will Ogburn used to talk about the impact of technology on society. It was Ogburn who invented the concept and the phrase "cultural lag." He predicted continuous social change, forced by science and by technology—with no plateaus for adjustment. He prophesied the ever-accelerating rate of change—an ever-steeper climb up the ladder of change for all society.

Can democracy survive the new pace of change? Professor Ogburn isn't confident that it can. He questions whether we shall preserve our freedoms intact. Thus he seems to suggest that there is a wisdom lag more dangerous in its impact than any "cultural lag."

Our second day's sessions are to be devoted to education, which is our society's best hope though not its last hope. Education is the great hope for the long pull, and most appropriate it is that we dedicate ourselves to it here today in the city of Willard Gibbs. The general public, whose opinions ultimately determine and limit our national policies, didn't know this titan of mathematical physics when he lived, and hasn't heard of him since. Similarly, the discoveries of our Shannons and Schwingers today are unknown to the public even though they are heavy with public consequences.

Einstein once said, "Politics are more difficult than physics." The world, he said, is more apt to die of bad politics than of bad physics. And political leadership is surely one of the most difficult arts ever practiced

by men—if you will permit me to call it an art. The politician, if he is interested in the works of Gibbs, or of Shannon or Schwinger, and in their political import, must reckon, in our democracy, with the offstage presence of widespread citizen indifference. He must reckon also with an uninformed and irresolute political leadership.

In 1958, we have reason to be in a hurry. In 1958 we must ask ourselves and our political leaders: Is there time for the human race to learn to avoid blasting itself and its seed into eternal gibbering night? And what can we do to prolong the time?

The present status and influence of the social sciences give scant hope for quick rescue.

Efforts at political action by the natural scientists through an occasional bulletin or petition seem little more than anguished rhetoric, however poignant. I recall during the war years, when Chicago was the administrative center of the Manhattan project, the anguish of some of the world's great scientists when the bomb became reality, and thus as the time approached to drop it. I recall my phone calls which culminated in arranging, through the White House, for the meeting of a committee of three scientists with former Senator James Byrnes, who had served as Assistant President to Franklin Roosevelt. This was a tipoff on his forthcoming appointment as Secretary of State.

In our democratic western societies we can only depend for our safety on our politicians—those specialists in the art of the possible, those compromisers and choosers of the lesser evil, those followers and leaders of public ignorance and public insight.

I am told that a debate is now going on among the natural scientists about how to win greater public understanding for science. One group contends that the effort should be directed primarily to intellectuals. Another group holds that the target must be the general public. I suggest that both are wrong, that the starting point and the focal point should be the politicians.

Now how does a scientist set about educating the politicians?

One obvious way is to seek to emulate the atomic scientists who in 1945 got themselves "Washington representation." I put this phrase in quotes. In plainer language this is supposed to be a lobby.

A second way is to organize groups among you to visit Senators and Congressmen. Your own congressional representatives will listen most respectfully, and the key and relevant committee members will be attentive, too. Ask to testify at hearings. Write letters; thoughtful letters will be read and digested. Cultivate the administrative assistants and the committee staff.

A third way can turn out to be the best way; ask Senator PAUL DOUGLAS: Get into party politics yourself, in your free time, if you have any. And don't be surprised if you enjoy it.

We are now seeing a burst of public support for science. Due to my estimate of future Soviet policy, I personally believe it will prove lasting. The task of our own leadership, it seems to me, is constantly to hold up the vision of hope and of greatness. Most of the things we may do in the fields of education or basic research, because of the Soviet threat, we should be doing anyway, if there were no Russia. Nothing could be worse for science or society than a chronic appeal to fear, which can build the conviction that science is primarily an instrument and a creature of our defense needs.

At this moment, scientists working on the missiles programs may seem to the American public as precious as the minutemen at Concord and Lexington, or the RAF pilots during the Battle of Britain. But may we not also need now, in 1958, a protective crash program of education on the Bill of Rights, along with our programs in rocketry? This is of course a rhetorical question merely, to point up the obvious, that although we here today believe in science, we recognize that it is not an end in itself.

The laws of Newton, and the tables of Kepler, and the formulas of Einstein, translated into the Russian language, have opened new paths for weapons that can render entire regions of the world uninhabitable. But they have also opened new frontiers for man in space.

Writing in Stuart England, halfway between Elizabeth's death and Cromwell's reign, when the most recent household improvements were the knife-and-fork and the neatly named water closet, Sir Francis Bacon wrote that three inventions unknown to the ancients—printing, gunpowder, and the mariner's compass—"changed the appearance and state of the whole world." Bacon went on to develop his familiar admonition that knowledge is power, a dictum that appears ironic at this juncture of history. But Bacon distinguished three kinds of ambition. The ambition of men to enlarge their personal power in their own country he considered "vulgar and degenerate." At the second level he put men wanting power for their country, to help it to control mankind; this he deemed "more dignified but no less covetous." This is the state which we in the United States are sure the Soviets have attained; and they for their part seem no less sure of us.

"More sound and more noble than the other two," Bacon said in 1620, would be "if one were to endeavor to renew and enlarge the power and empire of mankind in general over the universe. Only let mankind regain their rights over nature, assigned to them by gift of God, and obtain that power, whose exercise will be governed by right reason and true religion." This third goal of Bacon's, we may hope, will emerge as the goal of conferences such as ours here today.

Almost all of the great thinkers of our civilization have identified the goals of science with the highest purposes of man, with the individual's freedom to develop himself in his highest powers, and the triumph of virtue and wisdom in the conduct of human affairs.

What can we teach our politicians about the goals of science and the projected pace of change? What promises for the future can we give them, so that they may in turn steer our people and our policy to a right view of science and of education—to postulate of hope and not of fear?

Some of our legitimate hopes and aspirations, growing from the onrush of technology, seem simple and obvious. With leadership and with luck; with a revitalized educational system; with a technology oriented not merely to defense but to the fulfillment of man's needs and aspirations, American can expect tremendous economic gains in a quarter-century. By that time Americans may look back at the 1920's as one of the lower points in the national history of our well being.

On the basis of trends already developing, the American people in a material sense can count on realizing at least three dramatic expectations by 1938, conceding certain premises of stability:

1. We shall be richer. Average family incomes in 1983 will be $15,300 a year in dollars of today's purchasing power, 2½ times the present level.

2. We shall be physically and mentally healthier. At least half the people now being killed and maimed by the three worst causes of disability—disease of heart and circulation, cancer, and mental disorders—will avoid them or survive in good health the attacks that would kill or disable them today.

3. We shall be more numerous. By 1983 there will be 250 million Americans.

All of us know vigorous octogenarians today. In a national population over 250 millions, due to steady advances in medicine, at least 100,000 Americans who are alive in 1983 will reach the age of 100 or more.

Family income will be more than enough to pay for the finest educational opportunities the world will ever have seen. Indeed, that is true today, if we elect so to use our income.

No matter what investment we allocate to schooling, we cannot guarantee to deliver Einsteins nor Fermis nor von Neumans. But if we make opportunity for learning as freely available to talent and ability as the water we drink, we return to an historic American assumption that our natural resources reside in the capacities and the aspirations of the coming generation.

The job of cutting through today's knots is all our own—our own job, and more particularly the job of those who practice the much-abused art of politics. That is why I urge you to cultivate the politicians and to seek to instruct them.

Whether we like it or not, politicians today hold the key roles in determining policies vital to every person in this room, and crucial to our country's survival: for example, the level of support for research and development; how much of this support will go to basic studies and how much for applied; the question of secrecy or exchange; above all, perhaps, the nature and level of support for education. The pace of change, I predict, will make the politician's role ever more important.

Let us get on with our job, and with our conference.

Israel's 10 Years

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 3, 1958

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I commend to the attention of our colleagues the following tribute to the State of Israel. The editorial appeared in the New York Herald Tribune of February 27, 1958:

ISRAEL'S 10 YEARS

Israel is here to stay.

That, above all, is the chief fact demonstrated by this new state's first decade of existence.

Its enemies wished it to be destroyed; it refused to be destroyed. Instead, Israel thrived on adversity.

When its enemies actually resorted to force, Israel proved that it was tougher than they were. It made them learn that Israel could not be conquered.

New tests, new ordeals, undoubtedly lie ahead. On its northern march Soviet arms and technicians are piling up, like plagues of locusts. No one can say what new adventures may be recklessly attempted by the latter-day imitators of Hitler. America, which did so much to help bring Israel to birth, has made it clear that any attack upon Israel will be opposed by us.

All of us owe Israel much. Our law and our religion derive from its prophets. It may be said now, as was said centuries ago, "If I forget thee, O Jerusalem, let my right hand forget its cunning."

As Foreign Minister Golda Meir wrote in this newspaper's series on Israel's first decade, Israel is no intruder in the Middle East, but an ancient people returned there with no other ambition but to rebuild it national life and freedom and security. Its existence, as Mrs. Meir put it, "constitutes no threat to the security and independence of its neighbors";

on the contrary, it knows that "an agreed solution of all outstanding problems between our neighbors and ourselves is vital for the peaceful and progressive development of Israel and for the security and stability of the Middle East as a whole."

The star of David has risen again upon the ancient and beloved land. It flies valiantly and indomitably against all adversity. We salute it, and wish it well.

House Should Block 5-Cent Mail

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE M. RHODES
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 27, 1958

Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, public resentment is growing against the unfair 5-cent letter-rate proposal. A few days ago the Philadelphia Inquirer, one of the Nation's large newspapers, came out with a 3-column editorial opposing the 5-cent rate.

The public is also awakening to some of the other unjust and discriminatory features of the postal-rate bill which passed in the Senate last week.

The postal-rate features of the Senate version of H. R. 5836 are vastly different from those contained in the bill passed by the House last August. In my opinion, the House provisions are far more realistic and equitable. While we all realize that any House-Senate conference must be a mutual give-and-take proposition, I hope that the House will stand firm on basic matters of principle involved in this legislation.

There are many provisions of the bill passed by the other body which are contrary to the sentiment as expressed by a majority of Members of the House.

First-class rates for out-of-town letters would be set at 5 cents for 3 years, beginning July 1, 1958. Local first-class mail would be set at 4 cents. The House bill would establish a uniform 4-cent rate for all first-class mail. Airmail would be raised to 8 cents instead of 7 cents as provided for in the House version.

As was pointed out so clearly during the Senate debate, this dual-rate provision would cause all kind of confusion, especially in metropolitan suburban areas, where out-of-town definition would be hazy. The most eloquent argument against dual-rate first-class mail was made 2 years ago before the House Post Office and Civil Service Committee by Postmaster General Summerfield himself. Here is what he said:

> Any rate differential between local and nonlocal first-class letter mail would be discriminatory, costly, and extremely difficult to administer. * * * As a result of public confusion, there would be a sharp increase in postage-due mail, which costs the post office an additional 5 cents to deliver and is extremely annoying to the recipient.

Mr. Speaker, the 5-cent first-class rate is grossly unfair to the individual mail user. The increase will be an additional burden in several ways. Not only will their personal postage costs be increased by 60 percent, but the increased postage costs to State and local governments will probably result in higher taxes. Such an increase would cost the State of Texas an estimated $1 million a year in higher postage costs, the city of New York over $1.5 million, and similar postage increases in my State of Pennsylvania and every other State in the Union. Postage costs are a legitimate deductible business expense and would result in a drastic reduction in tax revenues by business firms to the Federal Government.

The Senate bill provides for only 3 annual increases of 10 percent each year on the nonadvertising portions and 3 annual increases of 20 percent each year on the advertising portions of publishers' second-class mail. The House bill provided 4 annual 15-percent increases on both portions of publishers' second-class mail.

While easing the rates on publishers, the other body increased the rates on second-class publications of nonprofit religious, educational, labor, veterans, and fraternal organizations. The House bill exempted these nonprofit groups from the rate increases. Many of these groups, operating on a shoestring budget, would be unable to continue their publications if postal rates were increased.

The Senate committee eliminated the amendment which I sponsored in the House to place a $100,000 annual limitation on postal subsidies to any second-class mail user. During the debate, an amendment was offered by Senator CLARK, of Pennsylvania, and Senator PROXMIRE, of Wisconsin, to restore the principle of subsidy limitation to the postal rate bill. Their amendment for a subsidy limitation of $1,800,000 was finally rejected by a 33-to-57 rollcall vote.

Mr. Speaker, I do not see how this body can, in good conscience, approve increases in first-class mail unless some limitation is placed on these multimillion-dollar subsidies to a handful of large magazine publishers, whose profits are now at record high levels. I am hopeful that the House will insist on the establishment of this important principle of subsidy limitation in any postal rate legislation finally approved.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following editorial from the Philadelphia Inquirer, which urges the House to stand firm on postal rate legislation:

HOUSE SHOULD BLOCK 5-CENT MAIL

With a Senate majority voting for a 5-cent out-of-town first-class mail rate, it is at least momentarily encouraging to note gathering opposition in the House of Representatives to this measure.

The House has previously approved an increase from 3 cents to 4, which is tough enough. It should now buck the Senate's determined effort to jam through 5-cent postage. As the Inquirer has repeatedly pointed out, first-class mail at the existing 3-cent rate pays for itself.

The Senate has not justified its attitude by tacking the postal rate increases of about $700 million to a pay rise for 1,500,000 postal employees that would cost more than the rate boost. That move has raised possibilities of a presidential veto of the whole bill and drew from Senator STYLES BRIDGES the comment that the measure had become a mixed up mess.

Postal employees are entitled to increased pay, but there are more equitable ways to give it to them than through 5-cent first-class postage.

The Senate showed its hand when efforts to increase second-class mail rates by 30 percent a year for the next 3 years were swept aside on Thursday. This kind of mail includes newspapers and magazines. It is a big drain on the postal budget. According to Pennsylvania's Senator CLARK, the favorable second-class rates create a subsidy to magazines of about $32 million a year, a very juicy sop to publishers.

There are, in pending bills, moderate provisions for gradual second-class increases. But they don't approach the need to make second-class mail pay a reasonable share of the cost of the postal service.

Meanwhile, first-class mail—letters, Christmas cards, and similar communications—are to carry the load, if the Senate proposal is sustained.

That's where the House, which has uniformly opposed the 5-cent intercommunity charge, should take a stand and stick to it. Congressmen should not be deluded by a solemn Senate provision limiting the 5-cent rate to 3 years. Hard-pressed Americans can look forward to a permanent 5-cent intercity mail cost if this boost goes through. And the time to stop it is now—in the House.

Foreign Aid Is Necessary To Meet Russia's Dual Threat: Military Force and Economic Subversion

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER H. JUDD
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 5, 1958

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Mr. William Randolph Hearst, Jr., from the Hearst newspapers of February 23, 1958:

SURVEY UPHOLDS FOREIGN AID

(By William Randolph Hearst, Jr.)

Again this year President Eisenhower has asked Congress for $4 billion for the mutual-security program—oftentimes critically but erroneously referred to as our giveaway program.

It looks like he is going to have even more trouble getting Congress to ante up the desired sums this year because of our own money troubles here at home.

You may remember the United States Senate last year asked me—among others—to inspect and report our findings and opinions of the value of the tremendous amounts of taxpayers' money for mutual security in the various corners of the world each of us visited.

Regular readers of this newspaper may also remember that editorially we have been—to say the least—doubious, and often frankly critical, of the program in the past. The Senators must surely have known this when they appointed me, but they chose men who they thought would call the shots as they saw them.

It is, therefore, relevant to today's piece that, with the exception of specific detailed criticism of waste or excessive personnel, the Senate's 10 representatives who went into the field unanimously reported that the various military and economic investments had been and were necessary and approved the concept behind the program.

As concerns waste, United States Comptroller General Joseph Campbell told a closed session of the House Foreign Affairs

Committee a couple of days ago that military aid has never been subject to systematic and continous audit.

If this is so—and Mr. Campbell ought to know—it is the urgent duty of the administration and Pentagon to conduct such an audit and make it known to the people. Waste must be eliminated. But it is in American self-interest not to confuse it with the value of the program itself. Let's not throw out the baby with the bath water.

In Editor's Report of last August 25, when the issue was under debate, I wrote:

"My first point is that foreign aid is a misleading—sometimes erroneous—term. It suggests a giveaway or boondoggling waste of the money you and I contribute to Government. Actually, as it works today, we are buying defense at bargain rates."

Of the $3,900,000,000 the President is asking from Congress, more than half, or $2,600,000,000, would be used for military aid, either direct or for defense support of friendly powers. Most would be direct; that is, $1,800,000,000 to our allies such as those in NATO, the Baghdad Pact nations and SEATO (Southeast Asia Treaty Organization). Another $835 million would go to defense support of 12 nations—70 percent of this to Korea, Nationalist China, Vietnam and Turkey.

When I was in Turkey a few years ago I learned that a Turkish soldier could be equipped, trained, fed, housed, and clothed for $200 a year. That is correct, $200 a year. The cost may have gone up a little since, but it is still infinitesimal compared to the cost of maintaining an American soldier.

Similarly, when the Hearst task force was on its world tour in the spring of 1956, we learned that the cost of equipping, training, feeding, housing, and clothing more than 20 divisions of ROK troops in South Korea was equivalent to the cost of maintaining 2 American divisions. If this cost has gone up, it is only by a minute fraction.

You don't have to be an Einstein to figure out that military aid is bargain-rate defense, whether given directly in the form of arms or indirectly to support the economy of nations which otherwise could not afford troops or modern weapons in the amounts needed for adequate defense of our vital world perimeter.

Vice President DICK NIXON, in a speech in Los Angeles this past week, added to the impressive data. He said it cost 5 times as much to maintain 1 American soldier for 1 year as it does a soldier of 1 of the allied nations on the perimeter of the Communist empire.

These are facts that back up the President's warning of the consequences that would threaten us if the mutual-security program were wrecked. He listed such consequences as:

"A severe dislocation and basic impairment of free-world power.

"A certain crumbling, under Sino-Soviet pressures, of our strategic overseas positions and a forcing of these positions progressively backward toward our own shores.

"A massive increase in our own defense budget, in amounts far exceeding mutual-security appropriations, necessitating increases in taxes.

"A heavy increase in inductions of American youth into our Armed Forces.

"Ultimately, a beleaguered America, her freedoms limited by mounting defense costs, and almost alone in a world dominated by international communism."

This is just about the same warning that Adm. Arthur W. Radford, former Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, gave to the Senate Appropriations Committee last year.

So much for military aid, and I'll rest that phase of the case right here.

When you get into economic aid, for which the President is asking $1,300,000,000, the evidence is not nearly as clear, but in my opinion it remains vitally important.

Suppose I approach it this way:

In the long interview Frank Conniff, Bob Considine, and I had with Nikita Khrushchev last November, one point he emphasized was his absolute conviction that communism (socialism, he called it) was invincible and would inevitably conquer the world without the need for war.

In other words, he was counting on the weapons of economic penetration and subversion to make it easy to win.

These are not weapons merely in the figurative sense. In the Russian strategy they are weapons in a cold, hard, literal sense; weapons of actual conquest.

No one knows, of course, how much money Russia is spending to neutralize governments friendly to the United States (for example, the economic thrust of the Kremlin into Latin America); or how much it is spending to win over the allegiance of the so-called uncommitted nations (the economic thrust into Africa); or how much it is spending to turn into satellites nations that are tilted toward Russia and away from the West (Egypt, Syria, Yemen).

The amount must be tremendous. The Soviet Union is able to spend this money by depriving its people of essentials and comforts, by reneging on its bond issues—things that we would not and could not do here.

But that is not an excuse for forfeiting this life-and-death game. It is surely worth the effort to help nations out of the poverty that makes them susceptible to Soviet enticements, particularly since such aid is changing toward a loan basis, however soft those loans may be. And it is certainly to our advantage to help nations—which have shown themselves worthy of help—toward economic independence that would attract the interests of our private enterprise.

I wish to make it clear that I am not advocating blind acceptance by Congress of the President's program. Neither is he. I am not urging that it be voted without any survey or any cuts. Neither is he.

I am saying that the program ought to be considered item by item, nation by nation—thoroughly, fairly, and on the basis of what are the best interests of the United States in his battle for survival in which every American is engaged, whether he or she knows it or not.

Cushions in Our Economy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. COYA KNUTSON

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 25, 1958

Mrs. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker the Washington Window of the Public Affairs Institute discussed on February 28 the cushions in our economy—stopgap measures which can be used to prevent economic recession from turning into economic disaster. It illustrates the wisdom of New Deal-Fair Deal policies. Such means should be adopted as standard operating procedure by our country as guaranties toward the future of a growing economy.

The article follows:

CUSHIONS IN OUR ECONOMY

During the New Deal when the Roosevelt administration was pushing such social welfare measures as social security and unemployment compensation, there were cries from enraged conservatives in the Congress that these were out-and-out socialism.

Today, some 20 to 25 years later, our so-called modern conservatives wouldn't dream of sounding off on these measures. They may have their own private reservations about them but they are forced to accept the political and economic facts of life that they are here to stay.

It's not only that these benefits are a recognition of government's humane responsibilities but far from being give-aways are accepted as insurance against joblessness and old age.

In addition, these programs have even far greater value in the face of the economic recession we face. They are pumping millions of dollars each month back into our economy and may well take credit for the fact that the recession has not turned into a depression.

Even our most conservative economists admit that these New Deal measures as well as other stabilizers such as the graduated income tax and insured bank deposits, are providing us with at least a secondary line of defense against economic collapse.

Of course, the Eisenhower administration is being forced to resort to other pump-priming measures to meet the current emergency. It is providing added incentives in highway building, home building, defense contracts, etc.

But the comfortable thing about social security and unemployment compensation—even though the benefits are far lower than many would like to see them—is that they are always present as stabilizers in our economic system.

At the present time, with unemployment in the vicinity of 5 million, it is estimated that the State governments are aiding people who have lost their jobs to the tune of $250 million a month. This sum is not fantastically large but it is not hard to assume that every cent will be returned to the economy as these people buy the necessities of life.

Of course, if unemployment grows, then the total payments will increase. And there is an ample reserve for the fund. At the end of 1957 it was estimated at $8.7 billion.

More than 43 million persons, or 83 percent of all nonagricultural wage and salary workers are covered under the program. More than 3 million persons are presently receiving compensation and in some industrial States like Michigan, in excess of 10 percent of those insured are drawing benefits.

The amounts received by insured workers vary State to State. Louisiana pays as little as $5 a week in some of the low-wage categories while Michigan pays a maximum of $55.

There is presently pending in the Congress a bill, introduced by Senator JOHN F. KENNEDY, Democrat of Massachusetts, and Representative EUGENE MCCARTHY, Democrat of Minnesota, which would establish Federal standards, as far as length and rate of payments are concerned, far above present levels.

With many of the rates being so low, a new development has taken place in the last 2 years known as supplementary unemployment benefits. These have been negotiated by a number of unions. There are perhaps 2 million workers covered by these plans in steel, auto, rubber, glass, maritime, and allied industries.

No accurate estimate is available of the total amount of purchasing power SUB is pumping into the economy but at least $7.5 million was paid out in January. Employees of United States Steel received about one million dollars alone.

Social Security does not rise or fall with the economic tides as does unemployment compensation, but is paid out regularly whether times are prosperous or depressed.

During December 1957, $639,566,000 was paid out in Social Security benefits. Unquestionably this provided new and badly needed purchasing power for the economy.

All of these stabilizing factors—unemployment compensation, supplemental unemployment benefits and social security—have won the support of most if not all of the Nation's businessmen.

Only a couple of years ago strong words were uttered by the United States Chamber of Commerce against SUB. You don't hear such criticism any more. A good example is Donora, Pa., where bankers and businessmen as well as the workers say SUB saved the town from economic collapse.

We have come a long way in 25 years but we shouldn't forget all that we have learned.

Address of Hon. G. Mennen Williams, Governor of Michigan, to Communications Workers of America, AFL-CIO

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN D. DINGELL
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 5, 1958

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, on February 25, 1958, the distinguished Governor of the State of Michigan, the Honorable G. Mennen Williams, made an address to the Communications Workers of America, AFL-CIO, conference of local presidents at the Sherman Hotel, Chicago, Ill.

His remarks on that evening were such that I felt they deserved a place in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

EXCERPTS FROM REMARKS OF GOV. G. MENNEN WILLIAMS TO COMMUNICATIONS WORKERS OF AMERICA, AFL-CIO LOCAL PRESIDENTS CONFERENCE, SHERMAN HOTEL, CHICAGO, ILL., FEBRUARY 25, 1958

It would be pleasant to devote this whole evening to paying compliments to your great president, Joe Beirne. But I know you also want to use this time for a few thoughts on current economic events.

The American economy is in a deep recession. The dramatic evidence of this recession lies in the growing numbers of unemployed persons in communities from coast to coast.

Twenty-six of the 48 States have unemployment of more than 6.9 percent. Our economy putters along at 27 percent below full production. Privately built dwelling units slumped to less than 1,000,000 last year for the first time since 1940. The list of jobless nears the 5,000,000 mark.

The Nation's most immediate problem is to get these people back to work.

The Eisenhower administration can't seem to understand that very simple fact. The unemployed want jobs now—not conversation that next month, or next summer, or next fall employment will pick up.

What are these jobless workers supposed to eat in the meantime—secondhand Republican slogans? Are they supposed to clothe their families with platitudes, and pay the rent with promises?

Instead of action to revive the economy, the Eisenhower administration tells us to have confidence, and everything will come out all right. Well, this recession wasn't caused by talk, and it's not going to be cured by platitudes about having confidence. The economic policies of the Republican Party caused this recession, and only strong counteractions are going to cure it.

Are we supposed to have confidence in the hard-money policy? Is the record high cost of living supposed to make us delirious with joy? Is the purchasing power of unemployed workers supposed to start the factories humming again? Are we expected to have confidence in the Eisenhower-Benson farm policy, which has squeezed the small farmer dry?

The Nation has no confidence in the Eisenhower administration, because the recession itself was caused by the indifference of this administration to the warning signs of economic distress which were clearly evident early last year.

Herbert Hoover, the last Republican President, gave a speech about confidence in Pennsylvania last week. It sounded just like the Republican administration in Washington today. After he was finished speaking, Hoover admitted that the speech he gave last week was 27 years old. It was the same speech he gave in 1931—telling the people not to worry, things will take care of themselves if they just had confidence.

Well, confidence is built on deeds not on words. Confidence will be restored when leadership gives us programs for action, to build a better, stronger America. Programs to expand America, not to contract it, are the stuff of which confidence is made.

St. James tells us: "Even so faith, if it hath not works, is dead, being alone. Yea, a man may say, Thou hast faith, and I have works: show me thy faith without thy works, and I will show thee my faith by my works."

You know, if some citizen of the last century were to show up in America tomorrow, you wouldn't have to tell him there was a Republican administration in Washington.

Just tell him that we have high unemployment, high interest rates, and the highest cost of living on record—and he'd know the GOP was running the country.

There is no tragedy quite like the tragedy of mass unemployment. Unemployment eats away at the self-respect of a man. It fills his heart with fear as he watches his family cut down on food, and clothing, on recreation—on all the necessities of life.

And it brings with it despair, because the individual is trapped by circumstances not of his own making—circumstances which he, individually, is powerless to remedy. He cannot put himself back to work. Only major programs to give the economy a strong forward shove can start the wheels rolling again at full speed and reopen the jobs that have been lost.

We are a wealthy Nation—but we are not so wealthy that we can afford idle men and idle machines at a time when America's domestic needs have never been greater, and when we need all our strength to win for our way of life its contest with Soviet tyranny all over the world.

While the administration coasts along, awaiting some mysterious magic in the month of March—that's when prosperity finally begins to come around the old familiar corner, according to President Eisenhower—the Soviet Union pushes ahead on all fronts—rapidly expanding her industrial production, enlarging her foreign aid programs, energetically developing new weapons, zealously pushing the strongest educational program she can devise for her children and youth.

How does the Eisenhower administration answer the great needs of America at home and the great challenge to America abroad?

The answer is found in the budget it proposes for the fiscal year ending 1959. The Federal budget is clear mirror of the thinking of this of this Republican national administration. And the image of that thinking reflected in the budget mirror is alarming because it shows a small and narrow conception of what this Nation should be doing.

Truly, as President Truman said this week, the men of little faith are in the Republican Party. The Eisenhower budget proves it.

Under the guise of finding funds for increased military spending, the administration proposes cutbacks in health, education, housing, and welfare programs.

If the pattern they seek this year is carried through over the remaining years of this administration, it means cutbacks in Federal assistance to the needy aged, to dependent children, the blind, and the totally disabled.

They want to cut back on hospital construction funds, cut down on the Federal share of slum-clearance programs, increase interest rates in rural electrification programs, cut price supports on basic farm crops to 60 percent of partly.

No new public works starts—one at all—are included in the budget. They deleted funds to help combat juvenile delinquency, funds to train teachers to teach mentally retarded children and children with hearing and speech defects.

Federal aid to school construction—which your President, Joe Beirne was fighting for back in 1948—isn't mentioned at all, not even to say they regret eliminating this gravely needed assistance this year.

In this first Federal budget of the sputnik age, the Nation was ready for big thinking and dynamic action. Instead we got a depressing example of small ideas and stagnant plans.

The Eisenhower administration misreads the American people. It underestimates their willingness to face the challenges of today and tomorrow. It fails to comprehend at all the eagerness of the American people to roll up their sleeves and get to work rebuilding America, and rebuilding the world.

It doesn't begin to grasp that the American people have lost patience with this needless recession, with joblessness, with idle plant, with standing by and letting our mammoth domestic needs somehow get themselves fulfilled.

The Eisenhower administration has no grand design for a fuller, richer life for the American people. It has no dreams of expanding freedom at home and throughout the world. It does not feel the restlessness of people to find their way to a greater prosperity and to a stable and enduring peace.

If the Eisenhower administration understood the spirit of America, we would be rolling ahead at a speed that would make the world gasp in admiration at the resourcefulness and energy of America.

What would we be doing?

We would be building houses—not at the rate of less than 1 million a year, but at the rate of 2 million a year until every family would be able to have a decent home.

We would be rebuilding our cities, eliminating slums, finding solutions to the problems of industrial plant obsolescence, unclogging traffic.

We would be building schools as fast as bricks can be put on bricks from the primary grades to our colleges and universities. We would be training the technicians, the scientists, the scholars of all kinds by the thousands so that these precious skills could be available to advance democracy at home and abroad.

We would be planning and carrying through programs for our aged citizens—housing projects designed for their needs, medical programs for their benefit, recreation programs geared to their interests, and social security sufficient to give every aged person without exception the material means to live out the declining years of life in decency and comfort.

We would be expanding our research into mental illness a hundredfold to find the way to prevent this tragedy and to restore those unfortunate enough to be so afflicted to useful life.

We would be constantly trying new programs to distribute our agricultural surplus to the ill-fed and the ill-clad, and there are

plenty of such in America, so that our agricultural abundance would not be a burden on the market but a blessing for the people.

We would be developing our rivers and our power sites for the benefit of vast areas at home, and we would be carrying the great concept of TVA to any area of the world where it could help the people to a richer life.

We would be using all resources necessary to speed the development of atomic power for peacetime use.

We would eliminate discrimination in every part of this land and treat our fellow human beings as our brothers under God.

We would be building tomorrow's weapons today, not for the purpose of war, but for the purpose of peace.

We would be accepting the challenge of the Soviet Union wherever that challenge is made, in whatever area of strength they want to try to match us. We'd say to the Kremlin: "You think you can match us in action, in deeds, in the works of peace. Why, we'll make you look like you're standing still. We'll prove the vitality of democracy as a way of life. We'll show you what production for peace really is."

We have so much that needs doing—so much that the American people are ready and eager to do—that no short talk can include them all.

Let the American people judge for themselves who really has confidence in the strength and vitality of our Nation: An administration preferring to mouth platitudes about confidence? Or men who want to roll up their sleeves and get going? An administration with little plans, little programs, and little faith? Or the people who want bold ideas and gigantic action to realize the mammoth opportunities which lie before us?

We cannot look to the Eisenhower administration to initiate the plans and programs to give America a new lease on life. The initiative will have to come from the people in a ground swell of demand for action.

Then we can get this administration off dead center and begin to move at least a little forward between now and 1960. And in that year, I believe, the people will really move this Republican administration—right out of office, and then we'll get full speed action—from a Democratic President.

Great labor organizations, like the communications workers, can be—and I know you are—part of the ground swell right now, demanding bold plans and aggressive action in Washington.

Many Democratic Senators have proposed specific action programs to break the recession as the first order of business in getting on with our jobs. And 11 Democratic governors, of whom I was one, urged the President to act now—because the need is now.

So the pressure for action is building up across America. If the pressure builds big enough, even the Republicans won't be able to resist it much longer.

But the Republican administration can't solve these problems with slogans. Their chant of prosperity sounds pretty hollow to the nearly 5 million people looking for work. Their chant of peace sounds pretty strange to a Nation which has watched our world leadership decline steadily since 1953.

And their cliche of confidence is ironic to the families of the unemployed living on welfare payments.

All of us know we will get going again. And all of us pray that it will be soon. America is still strong, resourceful, and resilient. We can do anything we set our minds and hearts and hands to doing.

"Americans young, Americans strong,
The world awaits your rising song,
Americans strong, Americans young,
The song of songs is yet unsung."

Freedom and the Corporation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 4, 1958

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I commend to the attention of our colleagues a penetrating analysis of corporate management by one of the outstanding scholars in this field, Mr. A. A. Berle, Jr. Mr. Berle's article appeared in the Saturday Review, January 18, 1958, issue:

FREEDOM AND THE CORPORATION

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—The following article is taken from a longer piece by Mr. Berle, professor of corporation law at Columbia University, and a former Assistant Secretary of State, developed out of a continuing series of discussions, sponsored by the Fund for the Republic, on the impact of modern institutions on individual freedoms. Simultaneously with Mr. Berle's statement the Fund released an examination of freedom in the labor unions by Clark Kerr, president-elect of the University of California.)

(By A. A. Berle, Jr.)

Theoretically, the managements of American corporations got their legitimacy by the fact that they represented the will of the shareholders. This was a kind of quasi-amateur democratic legitimacy. Even so, on examination it was found that although the stockholders theoretically chose the management, in point of fact they were completely unable to do so. The management would send out a proxy naming three agents whom the stockholders appointed to cast their vote at a meeting. In older days the management often didn't even bother to say for what directors these proxies would cast their vote. Since the Securities and Exchange legislation they have to do that, but the corporation secretary who sent out the proxies was the man who really determined what happened for all practical purposes in the power relationship. The president or the directors could fire him, of course, so he did what they told him to do. When the directors wished to renominate themselves or to add to their number or to fill a vacancy, they did it. This is still the method by which the directors in a great corporation are chosen. This is an automatic self-perpetuating oligarchy.

These are a string of bad words. There was at least one court case in which it was held that a self-perpetuating oligarchy was illegal. This was the famous case in which a life insurance company in New Jersey purchased control of a trust company by buying a majority of the shares. Thereafter it caused the trust company to purchase a majority of its shares. The result was an unbreakable ring. A New Jersey court said that this was illegal, created an oligarchy and was contrary to the theory of New Jersey corporation laws.

However, thereafter, somebody asked whether corporations really should be run democratically. Should this group or that group or the other group campaign against each other, offering inducements to shareholders to vote for them instead of the other group? Could corporations assimilate this kind of democratic government? There was no answer. In point of fact, the choice of management depends not on an assent of balanced interest but on expert judgment of technical ability with a companion judgment of honesty and character. As a result, for all practical purposes, management controls the corporation unless it is itself controlled by another oligarchy with enough shares to dominate the situation at all times.

There is a good deal of loose thinking about this. It is commonly believed that the holder of 20 percent or 25 percent of a corporation's stock can control that corporation. This was the inference in the recent du Pont-General Motors case. This is not true. It is true that with 20 percent or 25 percent of the stockholders' list of a large corporation plus control of the directors it can be done. But if the directors of General Motors decided not to vote with du Pont, it is very doubtful whether the du Pont interest is sufficient to be able to go out and get the other 30 percetn of General Motors stockholders which it would need.

The control system in today's corporations, when it does not lie solely in the directors as in the American Telephone & Telegraph Co., lies in a combination of the directors of a so-called control bloc (a misnomer, incidentally) plus the directors themselves. For practical purposes, therefore, the control or power element in most large corporations rests in its group of directors and it is autonomous—or autonomous if taken together with a control bloc. And inheritance-tax distribution of stock being what it is, the trend is increasingly to management autonomy. This is a self-perpetuating oligarchy.

Meanwhile, the next phase has been emerging. It will stay with us and it will be of some interest. This involves what are known as pension trusts—welfare funds and pension-trust funds. A pension trust in most cases differs from an insurance trust in that it has an unlimited and indefinite obligation. It is there to pay pensions to X, Y, and Z, which shall be a fraction of the salaries X, Y, and Z will have collected during the years of their tenure. The pension-trust fund, if it is properly administered, has to think not merely of paying out a stated number of dollars in, say, 1980, as an insurance company does, but of having enough dollars to meet obligations later to be determined. No human being knows the future course of inflation of the dollar, prices, pay, and so forth. Nevertheless, although the payment period may be 20 or 30 years away, the pension trusts must keep abreast of inflation, at least, as it affects pay.

This suggests, of course, that they must invest in equities, whereas, classically, trust funds invested in fixed obligations. This is the sharp difference between the kind of burden resting on a pension trustee and on the directors of, say, the New York Life Insurance Co., whose business is to provide a stated number of dollars against stated contracts to pay those dollars with interest later on. The holdings of life-insurance companies include less than 5 percent in common-stock equities; in the pension-trust funds equities are running close to 30 percent of their assets and may be more. The total of pension-trust funds at the moment is almost $31 billion.

As a result of this broad-scale buying of equities, the pension trusts are slowly chewing up control of those corporations which offer the best means of equity investment. These are voting equities. Thus far no attempt has been made to make use of this, except in the case of the Sears, Roebuck pension-trust fund, which undertook to buy Sears, Roebuck stock, and presumably now has a controlling interest in the company. As a result, Sears, Roebuck is socializing itself via its own pension-trust fund, and is discovering that it is running into the same difficulty which a Socialist or any other form of oligarchic government has—that it has self-contained control and management is thus responsible to itself. Query: Does it continue to have "legitimacy" when the only mandate it can refer to is its own?

The present $30 billion in the pension trusts of course is doomed to increase. These

are compulsory savings and the funds must continue to accumulate. They now cover only about half of the nonfarm labor force; they will undoubtedly soak up a considerable part of the balance before long, and must increase, particularly in view of the population rise. In addition, it will be another 20 or 30 years before this levels off; that is, before the payment from the funds begins to balance the incoming. The pension trust funds will perhaps level out at somewhere in the vicinity of $70 to $80 billion, probably increased by the coefficient of the increase in population or the increase in labor force within the population. This will mean that if the pension trusts continue to take the good equities as they have been doing, they may well have the prevailing control stockholding position and the capacity to make it absolute. They will have, say, 20 percent to 30 percent of the good equity stocks and the capacity to increase that to 40 percent or 50 percent (45 percent for practical purposes is a majority at any big stockholders' meeting).

With the rise of the pension trusts into the "passive-receptive" end of the corporation structure the old "passive-receptive" stockholder is gradually disappearing. At best he is, shall we say, a pensionnaire. The last vestige of his power to legitimate a management by a vote is in the hands of the pension trustees. He has an expectation arising out of the fact that he may have performed a certain number of years of acceptable work and fulfilled a certain number of other conditions. But does he have any property right in the pension trust? The courts say no. The power—what is left of it—lies in the trustees, or in those insurance companies which administer trusts.

When power is lodged in a particular group it has no choice except either to exercise it or to try to revolutionize the system. There is no way of avoiding power. If you take it and refuse to exercise it you suffer the fate of King Lear—the king who wanted to be king but did not want to be bothered. The trust funds admit they have it but they have thus far refused to use it. This situation cannot last very much longer. Somebody is bound to use that power, of necessity. Pension trusts are so concentrated that a relatively small amount in equities outbalances any number of scattered holdings.

The private property system in production, which began with our great-grandfather's farm and forage, has almost vanished in the vast area of American economy dominated by this system. Instead we have something which differs from the Russian or Socialist system mainly in its philosophical content. Under a pure Socialist or Communist system, in theory, every worker has an old-age pension at the end of his labors. We are developing the same thing by socializing property without a revolution. It is one of our more amazing achievements. Whether one likes it or not depends on one's philosophy.

Possessory private property in this area has been metamorphosed. In its place is a power pyramid. At the moment this is a management pyramid, but it is beginning to be balanced by a pyramid of men who have no property interest in the actual corpus but do have the power of choice—the pension trustees. These are naked power vehicles, with the receptive end so far dispersed that it cannot even be discerned. To make the joke complete, let us suppose that a pension trust liquidated itself tomorrow and satisfied its contract obligations. If it was a well-run trust, there would be a balance left over. That balance would very likely escheat to the state because there was no claimant to it left. In the most violently private-property-minded country in the world this is perhaps one of the most magnificent economic jests the world has seen.

None of this has come about as a result of the villainy of conspiring men. That might have been true in the free-wheeling corporation days of 100 years ago, but it would be as ridiculous an assumption today as is the basic assumption of the Supreme Court decision in the recent Du Pont case. This decision apparently assumed that because Du Pont bought 23 percent of General Motors 40 years ago, perhaps hoping that it could control General Motors, Du Pont still holds to the intention of exercising this control. Actually, there has been a kind of continual biological progression over the years. Change is part of the progression. Bigger enterprise was needed to satisfy the desires of the population. In addition, the techniques which made it possible to satisfy certain necessities made it impossible to rely only on the individual. Consequently, organization and power, not ownership, had to meet the resulting problems. The progression has been natural.

Today approximately 50 percent of American manufacturing—that is everything other than financial and transportation—is held by about 150 corporations, reckoned, at least, by asset values. If finance and transportation are included, the total increases. If a rather larger group is taken, the statistics would probably show that about two-thirds of the economically productive assets of the United States, excluding agriculture, are owned by a group of not more than 500 corporations. This is actual asset ownership. (Some further statistical analysis is called for if financial corporations be included, for these, of course, double up. One of the largest and most plainly oligarchically controlled corporations in the United States, the Metropolitan Life Insurance Co., duplicates assets because it holds securities of other corporations) But in terms of power, without regard to asset positions, not only do 500 corporations control two-thirds of the nonfarm economy but within each of that 500 a still smaller group has the ultimate decision-making power. This is, I think, the highest concentration of economic power in recorded history.

We can talk about the various alleged legal controls which somehow or other, when the chips are down, neither control nor even seek to control. We can point out the fear of monopoly and restraint of trade and say that from time to time this fear has checked the process. True, our law has prevented any one of these power groups from becoming a monopoly, but it has not seriously prevented the concentration of power as power, though it has prevented certain ultimate results. The question is then: Why has concentrated economic power in America not got completely out of hand? Many of these corporations have budgets, and some of them have payrolls, which, with their customers, affect a greater number of people than most of the ninety-odd sovereign countries of the world. American Telephone and Telegraph, for example, based on combined population and wealth, would be somewhere around the 13th State of the Union in terms of budget, and certainly larger than many of the countries of South America. Some of these corporations are units which can be thought of only in somewhat the way we have heretofore thought of nations.

Whether we like it or not, this is what has happened. As noted, it is not the product of evil-minded men. I believe that we must try to work with the system. The dangers are obvious. But history cannot usually be reversed. Until engineers and economic forces give us a way by which a man can manufacture an automobile in his backyard we will continue to have organizations the size of General Motors or Ford—as long as people want Chevrolets or Fords. We will have railroads the length of the Union Pacific as long as people want to go across the continent by railroad. In other words, until a combination of technique and organization can be invented permitting individuals to do the job, we are bound to try to make the best we can out of the situation. To my mind most of the results are rather surprisingly good.

This does not mean, however, that I am not afraid. I am. I believe it is the content of these systems rather than their form that matters. Their power can enslave us beyond present belief, or perhaps set us free beyond present imagination. The choice lies with the men who operate the pyramids, and with the men affected who can demand what they really want. Our Anglo-Saxon democratic liberties, after all, were beaten out, not against the framework of the personal possessory property regime, but against the background of two of the most brutal despotisms in western history: the Angevin dynasty in Normandy and the Tudor dynasty in England.

We have to accept this power situation as, let us call it, a neutral mechanism subject to the control of the body politic as long as we keep it subject to that control. That control, I believe, will be essentially intellectual and philosophical, capable of being translated into legal rules when necessity arises. In that respect I make three points in summary:

1. The first is that whenever there is a question of power there is a question of legitimacy. As things stand now, these instrumentalities of tremendous power have the slenderest claim of legitimacy. This is probably a transitory period. They must find some claim of legitimacy, which also means finding a field of responsibility and a field of accountability. Legitimacy, responsibility and accountability are essential to any power system if it is to endure. They correspond to a deep human instinct. A man desires beyond anything else to have someone give him the accolade of "well done, thou good and faithful servant," thereby risking the condemnation of "you have been no good—get out." If he has to say it to himself, or hear it from a string of people whom he himself has hired or controls, he is apt to die a cynical and embittered man.

The medieval feudal power system set the lords spiritual over and against the lords temporal. These were the men of learning and of the church who in theory were able to say to the greatest power in the world: "You have committed a sin; therefore either you are excommunicate or you must mend your ways." The lords temporal could reply: "I can kill you." But the lords spiritual could retort: "Yes, that you can, but you cannot change the philosophical fact."

In a sense this is the great lacuna in the economic power system today. In theory the stockholders can act as the lords spiritual through their vote. In fact they cannot, and they know they cannot. Are the pension trustees or their equivalent slowly emerging as the men who can? They had not thought so—nobody had thought so. They have been essentially a method of transmission of choice and not much else. We are looking for the kind of thing that C. Wright Mills in his recent book on the American power elite rightly said did not exist. He wrongly concluded, therefore, that the system was a mess, which it obviously is not. But every time we have had the chance to construct this kind of elite we seem to have abandoned it, and chucked in an administrator instead.

2. My second summary point is that the sheer power of invading personality is great and that a doctrine is already at work which plays a second joke on our constitutional system. The United States began by saying that its Federal Government could not construct corporations and apparently by assuming that the States would not. Both have done so. It also said that corporations should be kept apart from governmental power. De facto, they have not been. We are now, in fact, beginning to converge on a doctrine which may well push right over

the line when the next case comes up. This doctrine is that where a corporation has power to affect a great many lives (differing from the little enterprise which can be balanced out by the market) it should be subject to the same restraints under the Constitution that apply to an agency of the Federal or State Government. In that case, the Bill of Rights and the 14th and 15th amendments would apply. At the moment this is one jump ahead of current law. Yet it seems probable that this will be the next phase—just as we already have the constitutional doctrine that under the first amendment you may not by private contract prohibit a Negro from buying land.

3. My third point is destined to be in infinitely greater controversy, and I do not know what the end of the controversy will be. Great corporate power is exercised in relation to certain obligations:

1. It should supply the want in the area of its production. Where the community has come to rely on a corporation for steel, oil, automobiles, or cigarettes, the corporation is obliged reasonably to meet that demand.

2. The price must not be considered extortionate. It must be "acceptable"—which doesn't necessarily mean fair or just.

3. It must provide at least some continuity of employment.

4. It must give a continuing attention to the technical progress of the art.

At every point in the individual history of large corporations there has been some moment of impact on the community when either the community felt the corporation was not fulfilling its obligations or, alternatively, the corporation realized it was up against a situation it could not handle. In every case the result has been either a friendly and orderly, or unfriendly and disorderly, hassle out of which a piece of planned economy emerged. Roughly two-thirds of American industry or much of American finance is now controlled by a formal or informal Federal industrial plan. Here are two illustrations at each end of the cycle.

The oil industry claims to be the most nonsocialist, free-wheeling, private business that ever was. But the fact is that after many vicissitudes it sought control by, and is controlled by, various acts of Congress. After orderly discussion certain laws were passed. Under these laws, first, the Bureau of Mines of the Department of Interior estimates the probable consumption month by month of gasoline and the chief oil products. Second, an interstate treaty exists among the oil-producing States, ratified by the Congress. Third, a congressional act makes it illegal to transport oil in interstate commerce which has been produced in excess of a State allowance. This legislation might break down if it were not for the fact that because there is a relatively concentrated system in the oil industry the refineries will not buy "noncertified" oil anyway. As a result, the big companies do not violate the act; the little ones cannot; and the result is a planned oil economy by which supply is equated to demand and the oil industry from well to refinery to gas station is more or less geared to meet it.

Here is a disorderly example: Aluminum was manufactured by a monopoly which was ordered to be split up under an antitrust decree. By a combination of administrative orders entirely without administrative rationale but all working toward the same end the Federal Government used the aluminum plants it had itself created during World War II in order to set up two competitors to Alcoa. It likewise required Alcoa to sell its Aluminum of Canada shares. This was not enough by itself, so the Government for a period of years handled its defense orders in such a way that the new companies had adequate assurance of a market until they could get properly underway. The policy still is to make certain that the new companies, which can stay in business only by being assured a reasonable market, will get the extent of market they need. There was a stockpiling arrangement at one time, followed later by the release of part of the stockpiled aluminum. In a wholly disorderly way which only the American system could ever conceive, there arose the equivalent of a de facto planned economy in aluminum. At the moment this industry now sails away, freewheeling. But there is not the slightest doubt that if conditions required transition back into a planned economy it would happen.

Obviously a system like this is just as good as the ideas and strength of the body politic behind it. The same system in the hands, for example, of a Latin American dictator could produce terrible oppression.

There is a gradually growing feeling that pension trusts, for example, must be controlled. A pension trust ring could be something to bind a man beyond belief. It could bind him to his job. He could not change it without losing a substantial part of his life savings. He might be controlled in all sorts of ways. We are beginning to think even that the pension trust right which cannot be transferred to some other pension trust is suspect.

As men think, so they are. We are really seeking now a body of doctrine which will control power. I close by returning to my first point, which related to the desperate search for a field of responsibility and accountability referent to some point of view outside the system: that is, to some modern lords spiritual.

Secretary Benson Presents the Facts on American Agriculture, Past and Present, and His Plans for the Future

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER H. JUDD

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 5, 1958

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, the Secretary of Agriculture, the Honorable Ezra Taft Benson, visited my city 2 days ago to address the 12th annual farm forum sponsored by the Minneapolis Chamber of Commerce.

In his address he restated the essential principles and polices of this administration's farm program, every clearly and forcefully. Recent charges and countercharges on this subject have led to much confusion and misunderstanding in the public mind. The only way to correct confusion is to present the facts; with respect to the past—how our agricultural difficulties developed—the present situation, and his plans for the future.

Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am happy to include this important address setting forth convincingly the economic fundamentals on which alone sound agricultural programs can be based:

ADDRESS BY SECRETARY OF AGRICULTURE EZRA TAFT BENSON AT THE 12TH ANNUAL FARM FORUM, MINNEAPOLIS CHAMBER OF COMMERCE, MINNEAPOLIS, MINN., MARCH 3, 1958

It is both a great pleasure and a signal honor to participate in this 12th annual farm forum.

I congratulate all those who have pioneered in the establishment of this nonpartisan, impartial, and objective forum. For more than a decade this annual meeting has provided the stage for a thorough, objective and open discussion of the broad problems related to agriculture, industry and labor of this area. One of the basic concerns of this meeting today—shared by all of us—farmers, businessmen, housewives, and those of us in the Department of Agriculture—is that farmers are not participating equitably in the national prosperity they have helped to create.

There has been some real hardship among farm families. You know it and I know it, and I would be less than honest with you if I told you that I have a simple cure-all for all farm problems. No one does.

The pains of adjustment to our fast moving economy are sometimes severe, and the responsibility of the Government to help cushion the effects of these changes is fully recognized. These things cannot be accomplished overnight but I am convinced that we are moving in the right direction.

However, it is entirely fitting at such a meeting as this that we should also pay tribute to the tremendous achievements of American farmers. Never in history have so many depended on so few to feed and clothe us so well.

One farm worker on the average produces in 1 hour today what it took 2 hours to produce in 1940 and 3 hours in 1910. He is producing food and fiber for himself and 20 others. With 7,000 additional mouths to feed every day the farmer will shortly feed himself and 25 others.

Farmers can accomplish this remarkable task only by the aggregate effects of education, research, machines, plant food, specialized mixed feeds, better seed and soil added to their own unceasing labors.

Let us pay tribute to the farmers of the United States as the most efficient in the world. How else can we explain the fact that these 20 million people, less than 1 percent of the world's population, are producing between two-fifths and one-half of the world's production of eggs, red meat, and milk. Let us be unstinting in our praise of American farmers for their productive ability. This is the major factor enabling American consumers to have the best diet in the world and to spend a smaller percentage of their income for food than in most countries. This basic fact also undergirds our standard of living—the highest in the world.

Notwithstanding the remarkable production record, our farmers are confronted with problems. You recognize this in the theme of this 12th annual farm forum "Who Will Solve the Farm Dilemma?" And the particular question that has been proposed for today's meeting is "To whom does the farmer look?" He looks to several sources for help, first to himself and his own efforts.

Farms have to be run, and decisions have to be made, and responsibilities have to be borne by the families on the farms. He may join with his neighbors in self-help programs, and certainly he has every right to look to his Government for help. There are many ways in which government can help to promote stability without limiting opportunity.

I am dedicated to a principle which I am sure is equally cherished by most of you. It is that government should not—should never—be your master.

Here in Minnesota it is obvious from an examination of the facts of recent history that the farmers have chosen freedom—freedom to plant, to market, to compete. In 1957 farmers chose not to participate in the corn acreage allotment program. Only 1 acre in 10 was planted within the allotment. Also, for wheat, 1 acre out of 4 was planted in excess of the allotment—36 percent of the wheat farmers. For the allot-

ment crops 5 out of 6 acres were planted in complete disregard of the allotments.

Let me make one point clear. Contrary to myths peddled by some, the level of these allotments are determined by statistical formulas spelled out in the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938. I know that these acreage allotments are too low. That is why we are trying to get the law changed. Also, that is why for the first time in history, in 1956 and again in 1957, we made supports available for corn grown outside the allotments.

Let us now look at Minnesota from the standpoint of its sources of agricultural income. The propaganda mills grind out tales about the importance in Minnesota of the basic crops. Actually only 12 percent of the cash receipts of this State comes from the basic crops. In view of the Minnesota farmers' free choice to plant in excess of their allotments, they are, therefore, ineligible for full price support. Thus, it is doubtful that farmers here relied on the allotment program for as much as 2 percent of their income.

Here in Minnesota the basic-crop acreage-allotment program has resulted in the loss of corn markets amounting to hundreds of millions of bushels. Witness the expansion of grain sorghum and barley production on the acreage diverted from wheat and cotton. Witness the fact that this loss of markets to other feed grains meant a buildup in carryover stocks of corn—now estimated at 1.5 billion bushels on October 1, 1958. Witness the fact that under the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938 the increased carryover forced a cut in the allotments to levels so low that most farmers chose to ignore them.

Yes; I know, and you know, that corn producers can't live within their allotments—which is why only one-seventh of the corn produced in the commercial area last year was in compliance. These conditions pose a threat to hog producers—to the entire livestock industry—to poultry producers—to the dairy industry. That is another reason why we are seeking changes in the program.

The loss of productive wheat acres in the upper Midwest has been a direct result of the provisions of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938. You folks know better than anyone that Minnesota, the Dakotas, and Montana have been a Wheat Belt since the time our pioneer forefathers first turned over the rich, black soil of these prairies. They worked with courage and determination and out of the sod they carved themselves homes and a vast wheat empire.

This region has appropriately been termed the "breadbasket of the Nation." Traditionally it has produced milling wheat of the highest quality. Tremendous capital has been invested in milling businesses to work and provide a ready market for farmers and utilize to the fullest the God-given resources of this area.

In many years of normal production there was not enough of your high-quality milling wheat to meet the demand. In spite of this, this region has lost wheat acreage allotments under our outmoded farm law that was based in the late thirties. For example, in 1939, North Dakota had a total wheat acreage of 8.3 million acres and by 1958 this had decreased to 7.3 million acres. In contrast, during this same period, other Western and Southern States were receiving considerable expansion of wheat acreage allotments.

Why did this happen? Because we lost large portions of our cotton and tobacco markets through pricing ourselves out of competition. Winston-Salem, N. C., was once the largest tobacco-exporting market in the world but southern Rhodesia now claims that distinction. At one time we lost 60 percent of our world cotton market by placing cotton in Government warehouses instead of selling it abroad. Those farmers who produced cotton and tobacco had no choice but to divert acres to corn, wheat, and livestock.

But as acreage allotments were cut back on your best crops in the upper Midwest, you did not have the choice of equally good alternatives that was true in other sections of the country. I have yet to see any increase in cotton or tobacco produced in Minnesota.

It doesn't make sense to me that this traditional wheat area should be deprived of production and economic wealth by unsound farm programs that lose markets and depress prices through imbalance of natural production.

That is why the President has recommended changes in the old basic farm law which would restore the rightful agricultural position of the upper Midwest and be fair to farmers in each of the 48 States. Farm programs that cause one region of the Nation to benefit at the expense of another region are unsound, uneconomic, and completely undesirable to the Nation's welfare.

Now what are the sources of cash income here in Minnesota? Two out of ever $3 come from livestock, dairy, and poultry. There is an approximately equal division between cattle, hogs, and dairy products. Soybeans provide about four times the income from wheat. Minnesota has now climbed to be the third most important soybean-producing State. These facts show how little the farmers of this great State rely on the production-control apparatus. The overwhelming majority of farmers here are those who foster freedom to plant—to market—to compete.

Those who don't want to compete in price, promotion, and quality must either build warehouses or get the Government to do it for them, or attempt to control production. I deplore the tactics of those who advocate farm programs devised to fill storehouses instead of stomachs. Farmers should not be misled by those who are more interested in keeping the Government paying storage costs on warehouses filled with grain rather than working for farm programs providing profitable markets for farmers.

If we are to develop programs for agriculture to meet the needs of today and tomorrow we must be sure the facts are presented to the American people. It is only from an understanding of the facts that we can move forward to solutions.

Let us first review some of these facts:

Income per person on farms last year—including income from all sources—was the highest income per person on record—up 2 percent over 1951, the previous high year.

The level of living on farms is higher today than ever before.

Farm exports in fiscal 1957 set a new record of $4.7 billion—68 percent higher than in fiscal 1953.

The surplus production of American farms is being made available for hungry people at home and abroad.

The postwar downtrend in prices which started in 1951 has been stopped. Prices received by farmers in February were 8 percent above a year ago and 11 percent above 2 years ago, and are at the highest level since May 1954.

The buildup of surpluses has been reversed. Government investment in surplus-farm products owned and under loan has dropped about one-sixth in the past year and a half.

These are some basic facts. I believe that the American people have a right to know them.

However, despite these favorable developments, agriculture is still having some difficult times. Nobody knows that better than I. And nobody is more deeply concerned about it.

I know that the farm part of our economy is not sharing properly in our national prosperity.

My basic and continual concern as Secretary of Agriculture is that farmers of this Nation must participate fairly in our dynamic and prosperous economy. This, too, is your concern.

Our primary effort—and to this task I am wholeheartedly devoted—must be to further improve farm income soundly—not with short term panaceas which disregard sound economics and basic facts. That being the case, I would like to spend a few minutes with you today discussing the major factors affecting net income—the cost-price squeeze. Here are some facts.

During the period from 1939 to 1952 the index of prices paid by farmers, including interest, taxes, and wage rates, more than doubled. From January 1953, the time this administration took office, to January 1958, this index rose only 6 percent. Make no mistake about it—the heritage left by the previous administration included an inflated cost structure, particularly as far as farmers are concerned.

Farmers who feel daily the impact of the cost-price squeeze, realize the effect of inflated costs on net income. They can understand the effect of these inflated costs when they know that although the 1957 gross farm income is up about $2.3 billion above 1950, farm costs have gone up $3.7 billion.

If farm costs had stabilized at the 1948 level, then the 1957 realized net income would have been higher by about $4 billion, or about $800 per farm. Think of it—$4 billion consumed in higher costs.

Every thoughtful farmer is disturbed by the recent increases in the cost of steel. It is an understatement to say that this creates hardships to farmers. Must the competitive strength of labor and management forces always be resolved in higher prices? I say no. Should higher and higher costs keep the net income of farmers from improving further? Again I say no.

It is not for me to say what labor or industry should do at this juncture. But as a spokesman for agriculture in the Federal Government, I am concerned by any action which adds to the production costs of farmers at this time. This is an area where restraint and statesmanship are needed for mutual advantage.

There are many weapons with which to fight these rising costs: Some of these are the maintenance of a responsible monetary policy, sound farmer cooperatives, and improved efficiency, particularly in marketing and distribution. Recently, in this area the cooperative efforts of farmers, processors and the railroads resulted in a reduction in the freight rates for exporting soybean oil. All those who took part in this should derive great satisfaction from this constructive effort.

However, we will never attain satisfactory prosperity by increasing gross income if rising costs are allowed to siphon off all our gains. All responsible segments of our economy should be aware of these facts and give more than lip service to a solution.

One of the major decisions which we have had to make recently has been with respect to the support level for dairy products. Let me make one point clear. One of the most compelling reasons for this decision is that it was required by law—the Agricultural Act of 1949.

Contrary to the tirades of the smoke-screen spreaders the fact is that under this legislation, the Secretary is required—notice I said, required—to establish price supports at such levels between 75 and 90 percent of parity as will assure an adequate supply.

Prior to making this determination we checked with the technicians in the Department of Agriculture for their best estimate of the probable output of dairy products in the 1958–59 marketing year at various levels of support. The technicians advised that there was no question but that support at 75 percent of parity would result,

in the production of more than an adequate supply of dairy products and that the Commodity Credit Corporation would be required to purchase substantial amounts under the support program. I must carry out my legal responsibilities as specified by Congress.

In addition, we checked with the bipartisan National Agricultural Advisory Commission and the bipartisan Commodity Credit Corporation Advisory Board. In both instances the recommendations to adjust price supports to the 75-percent level was virtually unanimous.

Dairy production has been increasing. The rising production per cow has more than offset the reduction in cow numbers. Production in 1957 was about 12 billion pounds higher than the 1952 level. In view of the record supplies of feed and the high dairy-feed ratio, it is likely that at the announced support level, production will again outstrip requirements.

We will continue to cooperate fully with the industry in promotion and merchandising programs. The Extension Service and other agencies of the Department will join with the dairy industry in stepped-up efforts to acquaint the consuming public with facts about milk as a health food.

We will continue the nationwide brucellosis cleanup, which has made such excellent progress during the past year under the accelerated program.

We will carry out field educational efforts aimed at sound programs to cull low producers from the Nation's dairy herds—as part of generally increased efficiency in dairy farm operations. The fact that beef prices are good now will help in cases where dairymen want to sell their more unprofitable animals.

We have urged the continuation of programs designed to increase the consumption of fluid milk. We have recommended to the Congress that they authorize the continuation of the $75 million special school-milk program designed to increase consumption of milk by children. In addition, we urged continuation of the program under which we are paying about half the cost of milk purchased by military agencies and veteran hospitals above their normal purchases. My fundamental pledge is that we will do everything feasible that is sound and in the interest of dairy producers. Farmers deserve better than short-term soothing syrup that results in a major, if not fatal, disease a year or two later.

One of my great problems as Secretary of Agriculture has been in being misrepresented. There are some who consciously try to do this. Because of the smokescreen of untruth about agriculture which some demagogues have poured out, it sometimes is difficult for some people to distinguish between fact and fiction.

There are several facts I should like to stress here this afternoon.

Fact No. 1: As Secretary of Agriculture, I want to make myself perfectly clear, we have never proposed—and we do not now propose that we should scrap price supports. There is nothing wrong with the idea of providing more orderly marketing and much-needed stability to agriculture through a sound and realistic storage and loan price-support program.

I should like to quote a very significant paragraph in the President's message: "For commodities like the feed grains, with respect to which the Secretary of Agriculture has had wide discretion in the past, price support has been offered at levels as high as could be justified under the criteria specified by law. This will be the Secretary's practice under the recommended legislation."

The 1958 support prices have followed the policy enunciated above and will continue that way under this administration. Incidentally, in checking back I find that in 1950 and 1951 the price supports for flaxseed, a crop in which the upper Midwest has considerable interest, were established at 90 percent of parity, 5 percentage points lower than our recent announcements.

What is wrong today—and what has been wrong for several years—is the attempt to supply price support and acreage control by rigid formula—to fix prices and acreage allotments by Government mandate. These attempts have failed. Agriculture is a dynamic, changing industry. The farms and ranches of America cannot be run from a desk in Washington, D. C.

Fact No. 2: It was not rigid price supports that forced farm prices up during the forties and early fifties—but it was war, the insatiable demands of war and wartime inflation. Farmers sold all they produced at well above support levels. In fact, their prices would have been higher yet had it not been for Government-imposed price ceilings.

Fact No. 3: It is untrue that high, rigid price supports can hold up farm income even though surpluses accumulate. The fact is there was just 1 year between 1947 and 1955 that farm income did not decline. In all these years until mid-1955, high, rigid price supports on basic commodities were in effect. Our present farm problem developed under such price supports. If high, rigid price supports were the answer, we would have no problem.

Fact No. 4: The old support program does not materially help the small farmer. The fact is that more than half of our farms market only 9 percent of agricultural production. Obviously, most of the Government dollars are routed in the direction of the biggest producers.

Fact No. 5: Most farm products are being sold competitively and on free markets. It is untrue that most farm prices and incomes are Government supported and on an artificial basis. Only 19 crops, plus dairy products, are being supported—out of 250 commodities that farmers produce.

Fact No. 6: Agricultural production cannot be successfully controlled by Government action. The fact is that since 1940, the per acre yield of corn has risen 56 percent—wheat, 40 percent—cotton, 67 percent. Last year's yields of all major crops averaged 27 percent above the 1947–49 level. To control crops effectively so as to maintain price at 90 percent of parity would mean setting allotments impossibly low. Congress would never vote such controls. No Secretary of Agriculture could effectively enforce them. And American farmers just wouldn't stand for such regimentation. Agriculture is undergoing a technological revolution which is irreversible. It cannot and should not be controlled by Government mandate.

Fact No. 7: The family farm has been, is now, and always will be the backbone of American agriculture—operated by the most efficient farmers in all the world.

The charges by our opposition that farm programs of this administration are driving people off the farm are not only false—they are ridiculous. The fact is that more people left the farms during the last 4 years of the previous administration than in any other period before or since.

I have cited some of the gains we have made since 1953—and mentioned some of the problems that still exist. To deal with these problems we need to push forward again—we need to supplement the progress that has been made. This is the goal of the new farm, food, and fiber program presented to the Congress in January by the President of the United States. Farmers can look to this program designed to provide a sound solution.

The adoption of this program will mean progress in three general areas:

First. The program will develop bigger markets. We have asked that the surplus disposal program be extended and expanded and that research into new uses for farm products be increased.

We need to drive hard for further expansion of markets. There are no satisfactory substitutes for markets and a Government warehouse is not a market. Forty percent of our record agricultural exports in fiscal 1957 moved under Government programs. The biggest factor in these programs was the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act, or Public Law 480. As you know, this law provides for movement of surplus farm commodities through sales for foreign currencies, barter, donation, and other means. We must push to the limit sales through commercial markets.

Three-fourths of the surplus farm-product disposals by CCC in the past fiscal year were made through export channels. More than 60 percent of all our grain exports moved under Government programs.

I wish I could help you visualize how our exports are helping the free world meet the challenge of communism by raising living standards abroad, building good will, laying the groundwork for future markets.

We also need increased agricultural research for market expansion. Only about 7 percent of the products of our total farm acreage now go into industrial outlets. Surely we can do better than this. Research can develop new uses and new markets, and there are few things wrong with commercial agriculture that new and expanded markets won't cure.

Second. The recommended program will allow more freedom for farmers. We are seeking revision of the acreage control and price-support programs to permit farmers more freedom to plant and to widen markets.

The program changes proposed by the President would give farmers more freedom to plant by increasing acreage allotments. Some of these allotments have become so small as to cripple efficiency. Do you know that 7 out of 9 cotton allotments are less than 15 acres, and that the average burley tobacco allotment is 1 acre?

The program we have proposed would make price supports more realistic by widening the range of supports. The present range of 75 to 90 percent of parity on the basic crops and dairy products does not permit sufficient market growth. These commodities are being priced out of potential markets. Increased allotments and a wider range of price support logically go together.

The program would eliminate the so-called escalator clauses.

These are formulas which provide that the level of price support shall rise as the surpluses decline. So long as this basic law is unchanged, farm people can expect to be kept continually under the shadow of price and income depressing surpluses.

Third. We must help the forgotten segment of agriculture—those people on small, low-income farms.

The rural-development program as a new and basic approach to the problems of farm families in underdeveloped rural areas has gained wide support. This is truly a national program, going forward in all regions of the country. Objectives of the program have been endorsed by members of both parties, farm organizations, and church groups.

Here in Minnesota farm and nonfarm agencies, working closely together, have initiated a carefully planned rural-development program. Their work will give significant help to farm, business, civic, and other lay leaders in your northern counties as they move forward with a long-range program of balanced farm, industry, and community betterment.

As you know, the Minnesota Rural Development Committee has selected three demonstration counties—Hubbard, Itasca, and Carlton. In each of these counties local citizens and agency workers have joined to-

gether to take a fresh look at their resources—and their problems—and to develop a sound, long-range development program which will solve the serious problems of underemployment on farms in the northern area.

Let me congratulate you on the progress of your State in the rural-development program which a widely read midwestern farm magazine has called perhaps the soundest of all our efforts so far to deal with the farm problem.

We must move forward by adopting the President's recommendations, so we can consolidate and add to the progress that has been made these past few years.

Bigger markets—more freedom for farmers—special help for the small low-income farms—these are some of the steps which would be taken under the Farm, Food, and Fiber Act of 1958 to help farmers make the adjustments they must make. We feel certain they are sound, effective, and reasonable, and they will work to provide the freedoms farmers want.

This is not just another nation—it is not just one of the family of nations. This is a nation with a great mission. I believe with all my heart that it was established by the God of Heaven to be a beacon to liberty-loving people everywhere.

Let us pledge ourselves to keep America strong and sound—economically, socially, and, above all, spiritually—so that we may fulfill that mission.

Strength and freedom must go hand in hand. That is why we stress so much the need for freedom in agriculture—that our farm people should be free to produce, free to market, free to compete, free to make their own management decisions.

With God's help, we must—we will—have an agriculture that is prosperous, expanding, and free. Such an agriculture is the basis of a prosperous, expanding, and free America.

Statement of Judge William Old Before the Senate Committee on the Judiciary

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WATKINS M. ABBITT
OF VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 26, 1958

Mr. ABBITT. Mr. Speaker, on February 26, 1958, the Honorable William Old, judge of the circuit court of Chesterfield County, Va., appeared before a subcommittee of the Senate Committee on the Judiciary in support of Senate bill 2646 which has as its purpose withdrawal from the Supreme Court of the United States appellate jurisdiction in certain specified fields.

Judge Old made a splendid presentation of the dire necessity of curtailing the unconstitutional and unlawful usurpation of power by the Supreme Court of the United States of America.

Judge Old is well versed in the law. He has a splendid legal background. He is an outstanding student of constitutional law. He is the father of the present-day interposition doctrine. He is beloved by all who know him and respected for his calm, judicial approach to legal questions, for his ability, his integrity and for his love of constitutional government as well as his determination to preserve for posterity our way of life and the heritage that has been handed down to us by the founders of this great Nation.

It was my honor and privilege to introduce Judge Old to the subcommittee on February 26 when he appeared before them. His presentation should be read by every Member the Congress. It is a masterpiece and points out the necessity of curbing the power-crazed Supreme Court if we are to preserve our republican form of government.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include Judge Old's statement to the Judiciary Committee in favor of the so-called Jenner bill. The statement is as follows:

STATEMENT OF WILLIAM OLD BEFORE THE SENATE COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY, FEBRUARY 26, 1958

Senate bill 2646, "introduced by Senator JENNER, would withdraw from the Supreme Court of the United States appellate jurisdiction in certain specified fields, namely, first, with respect to the investigative functions of Congress; second, with respect to the security program of the executive branch of the Federal Government; third, with respect to State antisubversive legislation; fourth, with respect to home rule over local schools; and, fifth, with respect to the admission of persons to the practice of law within individual States."

This bill is predicated upon the provisions of article III, section 2, paragraph 2, of the Constitution, which reads as follows:

"In all cases affecting Ambassadors, other public ministers and consuls, and those in which a State shall be party, the Supreme Court shall have original jurisdiction. In all the other cases before mentioned, the Supreme Court shall have appellate jurisdiction, both as to law and fact, with such exceptions, and under such regulations as the Congress shall make."

Thus, the Congress is clothed with full power to make exceptions to the appellate jurisdiction of the Supreme Court and to regulate the exercise of such jurisdiction. It is indeed regrettable that it has become necessary for the Congress to consider the expedient of withdrawing from the Supreme Court appellate jurisdiction in the fields specified in the bill under consideration. However, it is now clearly apparent, from a long list of revolutionary decisions by the Supreme Court, headed by Chief Justice Warren, that the Court is determined to destroy our dual system of government under the Constitution, and create, by usurpation and encroachment, a judicial oligarchy of unparalleled proportions.

Washington in his Farewell Address pointed out the dangers which now beset us when he said:

"The spirit of encroachment tends to consolidate the powers of all the departments in one, and thus to create whatever the form of government, a despotim. A just estimate of that love of power and proneness to abuse it which predominates in the human heart is sufficient to satisfy us of the truth of this position. The necessity of reciprocal checks in the exercise of political power, by dividing and distributing it into different depositories, and constituting each the guardian of the public weal against invasions by the others, has been evinced by experiments ancient and modern, some of them in our country and under our own eyes. To preserve them must be as necessary as to institute them."

It seems to me that the decision in the case of Steve Nelson against Pennsylvania is fraught with great and mortal danger to the institutions of our country. For in that case the Supreme Court invented and laid down the doctrine of preemption. Under the leadership of HOWARD W. SMITH, the distinguished dean of the Virginia delegation in the House of Representatives, the Congress enacted the Smith Act to curb the subversive and seditious efforts of the Communist conspiracy in this country. It is incredible that anyone could conceive that an act proposed by Judge SMITH would intend to impair State laws in the field of sedition or any other field. Moreover, the Smith Act itself specifically negatived any such intent. Yet the Supreme Court, without any semblance of constitutional authority, held that Congress by merely entering the field of sedition, regardless of its expressed intention, preempted the whole field and struck down all State laws involving sedition. Although the State government might be in mortal danger of being overthrown by the Communist conspiracy, they could do not act to defend themselves.

Just what was the purpose of the Supreme Court in inventing that doctrine of preemption? Was the Court so anxious to free Steve Nelson, so that he might continue his subversive career, that it would destroy laws vital to the sovereign States under such a flimsy pretext? We don't know, but it seems incredible that concern for Steve Nelson could have been the motivating reason. If this doctrine of preemption were a sound constitutional principle could or should it be confined to the field of sedition? Is, or can it be, the purpose of the Court to destroy the sovereign States? To ascribe to the Court such a purpose is a horrible thought. But if that doctrine of preemption should, at a propitious moment, be extended to the field of taxation, the governments in the 48 States would be laid in ruins by one fell act, unless the States respectively should interpose their sovereignty against such a dire result.

In the Slochower case the Supreme Court held that New York City could not fire a teacher who refused to state whether he was a Communist or not, although State and municipal law required him to be fired under such circumstances. Just what is the purpose and underlying motive of that decision? And what is the constitutional principle under which it was enunciated? We don't know, but it seems incredible that the Court should have wished to reward Professor Slochower for defying the law under which he was employed. Can that decision, at a propitious moment, be extended to embrace hiring as well as firing, and force the States and municipalities to take their enemies into their employ as well as to keep them there? If not, why not?

The great and sovereign State of California has been ordered to admit to the practice of law a person whom its board of law examiners did not consider to be morally fit for such admission. The great and sovereign State of Illinois was deprived of its sovereign autonomy in the matter of appellate procedure in its own State courts. The great and sovereign State of Oregon was deprived of its jurisdiction over non-navigable streams. In the Girard College case an extremely well reasoned opinion of the Supreme Court of the great and sovereign State of Pennsylvania was nullified by a 5½ line per curiam memorandum opinion, which could hardly be considered otherwise than as a studied insult to that great court of Pennsylvania. All of these encroachments, and many more, have been inflicted upon the sovereign States by the Supreme Court of the United States during the few years of the Warren court.

But the Supreme Court has not confined its usurpations and encroachments to the sovereign and reserved powers of the sovereign States. It has thrust its tentacles into the constitutional powers of the Congress and of the Executive, which with the courts constitute the three great coordinate branches of the Federal Government. The Jencks case

encroached upon the constitutional powers of the executive branch of the Federal Government and struck a mortal blow at the ability of the FBI to deal with the subversive and criminal elements of this country. So destructive was this blow that Attorney General Brownell came before Congress beseeching relief against the Supreme Court's decision. Another lethal blow was struck at the police system of the Nation's Capital further curtailing their efforts to deal with a seething and spiralling criminal condition there. Mallory, a brutal Negro rapist, was freed by the Supreme Court upon the flimsy technical ground that Mallory was questioned by the police before arraignment. There was no question of Mallory's guilt. He admitted it. So the Washington Police Department and presumably every police department in the Nation is, by this infamous decision, precluded from holding a person, to whom suspicion points without arraignment for a few hours, for questioning and for investigating the available evidence. No police department can function under any such restriction.

These decisions probably are predicated on the nebulous provisions of section 1 of the 14th amendment. In its opinions in the cases referred to above, the Supreme Court has been particularly remiss in setting forth the constitutional basis for the inordinate power which it seeks to exercise. However, the Court simply ignores specific provisions of the Constitution which in the clearest language would seem to preclude the exercise of any such power. We Virginians and the citizens of the other Southern States, since the deplorable decision of May 17, 1954, have been bombarded with statements asserting that decisions of the Supreme Court constitute the law of the land. These assertions are made as though handed down by some Olympian oracle, without citing a single provision of the Constitution which could confer upon the Supreme Court—power to make law, or power for carrying into execution any power vested by the Constitution in the Government of the United States, without a law enacted by Congress to carry such power into execution. Suppose we should concede that the Supreme Court does have the prerogative to define the extent and limits of the power vested in the Government of the United States by section 1 of the 14th amendment and conceding further that the 14th amendment, although adopted under tainted circumstances, is a valid part of the Constitution, what then? Who is to make law for carrying such powers into execution? Section 8, article I of the Constitution is explicit on that point. The first 17 paragraphs of section 8 itemizes specific powers delegated exclusively to Congress, which cannot be exercised by the Supreme Court or by the Executive or by the Supreme Court and the Executive, without law enacted by Congress. Paragraph 18, section 8, article I, of the Constitution reads:

"Congress shall have power: To make all laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into execution the foregoing powers, and all other powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any department or officer thereof."

Can the plain and explicit language of that provision be interpreted, construed or twisted, by the process of any mental gymnastics, to mean otherwise than that the Congress is the sole and exclusive lawmaking agency of the Federal Government? If Congress is endowed with exclusive power to make all laws which may be necessary and proper for carrying into execution all powers vested by the Constitution in the Government of the United States, how can the Supreme Court validly make any enunciation or decree having the force of law, regarding any power vested in the Federal Government, unless and until Congress shall have carried into execution such dormant power by necessary and proper law? It seems certain that it was never intended that the provisions of section 1 of the 14th amendment, which is the source of all our troubles, should be self-executing or be enforced by any agency, judicial or executive, except pursuant to legislation enacted by Congress. Section 5 of the 14th amendment reads:

"Congress shall have power by appropriate legislation to enforce the provisions of this article."

We take the position that any enunciation or decree of the Supreme Court which undertakes to carry into execution any power vested by the Constitution in the Government of the United States except pursuant to valid act of Congress is not the law of the land, but is an illegal encroachment upon the constitutional powers of Congress and the sovereign and reserved powers of the sovereign States. The Supreme Court, by making the above-mentioned decisions, without legislative authority from Congress, has abused its appellate jurisdiction, and Congress is in duty bound to withdraw appellate jurisdiction in the respects enumerated in S. 2646.

The Virginia convention of 1788, which ratified the Constitution, set forth the following principle which should never be forgotten: "That Government ought to be instituted for the common benefit, protection, and security of the people; and that the doctrine of nonresistance against arbitrary power and oppression is absurd, slavish, and destructive of the good and happiness of mankind."

No Distinction Because of Nativity

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER H. JUDD
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 5, 1958

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, one of the most stimulating experiences of my 3 months of service last fall as one of our United States delegates to the United Nations General Assembly, was the privilege of getting to know Mr. Philip Klutznick, another of our delegates. He has had a distinguished career as lawyer, Government administrator, banker, and businessman. He has an unusually incisive mind, a deep understanding of the things that are most important and unique in our American heritage, and that rarest of qualities, moral courage.

At the dinner given by the Anti-Defamation League on March 3 to honor the 85th Congress for its part in enacting the Civil Rights Act, Mr. Klutznick, who is president of B'nai B'rith, gave an address which is a classic in the sensitive insights it portrays regarding the finest things about our country and our culture, including the standards to which we aspire and by which we judge ourselves when we fall short. As long as we can honestly analyze our shortcomings and courageously move to correct them, America will be great, her heritage safe, and her influence ever-expanding.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include the address by Mr. Klutznick:

TEXT OF ADDRESS BY PHILIP M. KLUTZNICK, PRESIDENT OF B'NAI B'RITH, AT ANTI-DEFAMATION LEAGUE OF B'NAI B'RITH, AMERICA'S DEMOCRATIC LEGACY AWARDS DINNER, MAYFLOWER HOTEL, WASHINGTON, D. C., MARCH 3, 1958

Some years ago—87 to be exact—a predecessor of mine as president of B'nai B'rith received a letter from the President of the United States, from which I quote:

"The United States, knowing no distinction of her own citizens on account of religion or nativity, naturally believes in a civilization the world over which will secure the same universal views."

The man who write the letter was Ulysses S. Grant. The man who received it was Benjamin Franklin Peixotto, a B'nai B'rith leader of estimable qualities. The purpose of the letter was a presidential appointment wherein Mr. Peixotto was dispatched by our Government to serve as the United States consul at Bucharest. His selection was dictated by persecution and the denial of civil rights of the Jews of Rumania.

Mr. Peixotto was a diplomat of persuasive talents. He held up to the people of Rumania, and to her royalist leaders, the image of his native America in which the spirit of human freedom and the dignity of the individual were then, as they are now, the cherished ideals of our national life. Even in the 1870's, the majesty of the United States was such that this point prevailed. The persecutions abated.

The object lesson is apparent that success was achieved by presenting the United States to a foreign people in that characteristic which distinguishes us as a Nation, our preference for liberty over authoritarian rule.

In this complex era of moon satellites and cold wars; of 1 billion people in Asia and Africa flushed with new-found political freedom and many reluctant to commit themselves between the Soviet Union and the free West: of grave debate on the principal issues of peace and freedom; of a seeming paradox in which the peoples of some lands threaten to abandon freedom for what they mistakenly believe to be security—in this atmosphere of stalemated uncertainty and frustration, this special characteristic which makes us what we are is more fundamental to our destiny than ever before.

People the world over recognize us by it. They applaud us for it.

The same critics who envy our abundance of wealth and resources, who deride our culture, who are quick to point out that the sputnik got there first—these same critics are genuine in their own souls in their admiration of our standards of human freedom.

That being the case, we must, in this world struggle for men's minds and hearts, make the most of it.

For, in this generation, the United States has inherited, or won, or had thrust upon her—whichever you choose—the position of champion for the cause of the free nations. It is an undisputed role and, at best, a difficult one. Inevitably, a champion is subject to the critical examination of those who surround him. His every weakness is magnified; his defects are distorted out of proportion; his motives are constantly under challenge; he cannot disguise himself in anonymity.

Ours is not a comfortable role in a world that abounds with all manner of problems and prejudices. But it is a role we cannot escape and dare not neglect. Our security as a free Nation depends on it—and no less the freedom and security of other peoples who are our partners in a global struggle.

One need but rub shoulders with the peoples of other nations in the free world, or see them in their homes or at work, to realize how much they look to us for their security and their status as free men. In this

framework of global responsibility, our sins, which are not ours exclusively, are the burden and worry of our friends—as, indeed, our achievements are their joys to share.

No nation in this world is completely free of the taint of prejudice or discrimination. Even some recently born to freedom, with fresh memories of foreign domination, cannot face the bar of world opinion with complete equanimity. Among older states, some long devoted to ideals of human dignity, there remains the persistent task of narrowing the gap between these ideals and the practice of them. History suggests that time and patience are the means by which progress in human affairs travels its inexorable path. But history also reminds us that the nation thrust into the dominance of leadership is denied the luxury of patience if its leadership is to survive and be meaningful.

A setback for human rights in our land does not escape the critical notice of either our friends or our enemies. This is perhaps an ironic business. In lands where basic freedoms and civil rights are foreclosed, all is hidden from public view. Yet, it is precisely these nations which distort and make the most vicious propaganda of even our progressive efforts to rid ourselves of ancient shackles. In this way, they exploit with cunning the incident of Little Rock, a sad and difficult experience which, under our freedoms, is available for all the world to see, while they, in turn, invoke the discriminations and prejudices which are the bitter hallmarks of tyranny.

If our freedoms are to speak for us with force and clarity we cannot allow our voice to be muffled by the misdeeds of the few that bring confusion to our friends and glee to our enemies. In our sensitive role of the champion of freedom, each misstep, inevitably magnified and overdramatized lessens our strength and reduces our effectiveness in the struggle to achieve righteousness over evil.

Against this backdrop, the action of the 85th Congress takes on its international significance. Not only did it bring us a step closer to the realization of our ideals as a Nation, but it served to strengthen the whole fabric of the free world's determination to win the constant battle for freedom and human rights. It was a robust demonstration on Capitol Hill that we are a Nation unafraid to face our own deficiencies.

I suggest to you, however, that our civil rights statutes—including the historic piece of legislation for which we honor the Congress this evening—need to be justified by positive acts of citizenship. A brilliant researcher, the late Dr. Julian Woodward, once reminded us that the true measure of our civil rights is not a statistical balance of how many good laws are enacted, or favorable court decisions rendered, against bad ones. A more realistic index, is to ask: How many citizens actually participate in the rights which are freely available to them?

On that score, we are wanting—to the detriment of our national life and our stature before the world. We cannot look for redress from legislators or jurists, since the negligence comes entirely from our own contradictory behavior as citizens in a land of freedom.

As a nation, we are, unquestionably, four-square for civil rights. We take pride in their cumulative freedoms. At the same time, we present to the world the paradox of being downright negligent about practicing some of our rights.

One of our basic credos, for example, is that "rulers shall govern only with the consent of the governed." We cherish our right of franchise. But half of us generally don't bother to vote.

We glory in our principle of free speech, and too many of us foolishly deny it to ourselves by compulsions of fear and conformity, lest we find ourselves expressing controversial thoughts.

Our vaunted economic strength flows from our freedom of enterprise. Yet, how often these days do we find our people turning their backs on it in favor of the limiting, short-sighted goal of security.

We speak of ourselves as "a nation of joiners." This is a misleading boast. In truth, the shibboleths of conformity tend to frighten many Americans away from active participation in politically-minded movements. This behaviour of the mute bystander has its corroding effect on our freedom to assemble in voluntary association with like-minded citizens.

We have freedom of inquiry. We accept it as so vital to our way of life that we strengthen it with the bulwark of free compulsory education. But we have allowed public education in our land to deteriorate, and we tend to neglect the citizen's responsibility to question and to probe instead of accepting whatever political or social gospel is handed to us.

These are among our cherished rights. If they are meaningful to our existence and to our leadership in the world, as we constantly and vociferously declare them to be—I simply propose this: let's use them more often, and with greater vigor.

No one can underestimate the security needs of our Nation or its allies in these fearsome days of outer space. But to win the race in this vital sector without liberating ourselves of the waste of discrimination and prejudice is to win a hollow prize. To defend freedom but not to have it is a fraudulent gesture; to reach the moon through science, but to keep peoples enslaved is a fool's errand which fools no one but ourselves. The greatness of America in the eyes of the world has been in the constant upward course of our human values. This task must keep apace with the achievements of science. To do less is to dishonor our heritage and to destroy the capacity of our blessed Nation to lead the world out of bondage as Moses led the people of ancient Israel to their promised land.

Annual Meeting of German Society of Pennsylvania

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KATHRYN E. GRANAHAN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 26, 1958

Mrs. GRANAHAN. Mr. Speaker, it was my great privilege last fall to be among those Members of the House of Representatives chosen by Speaker RAYBURN to participate in an official congressional visit to West Germany as guests of the Parliament of the Federal Republic.

Early this year, I was invited to discuss my experiences at the annual dinner of the German Society of Pennsylania, commemorating the 193d anniversary of the founding of this organization in Philadelphia in 1764. The German Society of Pennsylvania, a cultural and charitable organization, is the oldest German Society in the United States.

Of course the members of this organization knew much more about Germany than I do, since I have been there only this one time and then only for 2 weeks, but I found the audience most interested in hearing my reaction as a Member of Congress to the things which I saw and heard in this whirlwind trip.

Other Members of the House may also be interested in the reactions of a first-time visitor to today's Germany, and so I include for printing in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD my talk of January 19 to the German Society of Pennsylvania, as follows:

REMARKS BY CONGRESSWOMAN KATHRYN E. GRANAHAN AT 193D ANNIVERSARY DINNER, GERMAN SOCIETY OF PENNSYLVANIA, SUNDAY, JANUARY 19, 1958

I have heard lawyers telling each other that the best time to ask for and collect a fee in a law case is when the client's tears are still warm, not when the case is over. Others say the same thing in the phrase "strike while the iron is hot." Your president, Mr. Herman Witte, may or may not have had those admonitions in mind when he decided to invite me to this affair tonight, but I will say that he went about it in just such an irresistible manner.

For I found his letter—and a very gracious one it was—waiting for me as soon as I returned to Philadelphia from my trip to Germany last month. Of course, at that moment, my mind was full of thoughts of that wonderful trip abroad to the extent that I could think of very little else. So when I read Mr. Witte's letter inviting me to come here to talk to you about that trip, naturaly I found the invitation irresistible.

Since then, however, I have had some second-thoughts on the matter, and I am not so sure about the advisability of my acceptance of your kind and flattering invitation. You see, this was my first trip to Germany—my first to Europe. And I was in Germany only 2 weeks altogether. It was something of a whirlwind trip—on the go every moment—on a sort of conducted tour which accounted for every second of every minute of the day—and although I saw a great deal and learned a great deal and found the trip invaluable, I am very conscious of the fact that many of you, if not most of you, know much more about what I saw than I do.

Your society, I note, is approaching its 200th anniversary, and during all of these years generations of members of this society have been learning about Germany and visiting Germany and developing your wonderful and complete library about Germany.

Whereas my experience with Germany consists of a 2 week whirlwind tour. So I am very conscious of my limitations in talking to you. On the other hand, I know you will take all of that into account and not expect me to give you a scholarly and profound lecture on German history or German science or German culture or even a travelogue full of heretofore unknown information.

What I can do is this—and I assume that in inviting me you and your president had just this in mind: I can tell you of the impact of modern-day Germany on a Member of the United States House of Representatives who previously knew little about the country—and nothing from first-hand knowledge—but who must, as part of my official duties, take actions and vote in the Congress on matters affecting that part of the world.

I was part of an official delegation named by the Speaker of the House of Representatives, Speaker RAYBURN, to represent the Congress in acceptance of a gracious invitation from the German parliamentary leaders. That invitation came to us—to the House of Representatives—as a gesture of

reciprocity and friendship in return for visits which German leaders had previously made to Washington. They felt they had been treated very courteously and had learned a lot in their tour over here, and they were anxious to repay the favor.

Speaking for myself—but mindful of the feelings and thoughts of the other Members of Congress who were part of the delegation—I can say that the favor was very pleasantly returned and the trip was most enjoyable. As taxpayers, you will be pleased to know that this trip was taken at the expense not of our own taxpayers but of those of the Republic of Germany.

We left New York on November 13, by the German airline, Lufthansa, and flew to Frankfurt. I had never been much for flying before—I rather disliked the idea of a long plane flight—but I found this one most pleasant and enjoyable. On the way, of course, we were briefed on some of the things we would see and we were given a good idea of what to expect.

But of course seeing these things was so much different from being told about them that when we did arrive and plunged into a round of official sightseeing and receptions, dinners, interviews, and so on, it was a rather overwhelming experience. And one I shall always treasure.

We were only in Frankfurt for a few hours on November 14 and then flew to Munich where we had dinner and then fell into bed rather exhausted from the long journey. But beginning at 10 a. m. the next morning, we were busy every moment, for the next 2 weeks. We toured beautiful Munich, attended a reception by the speaker of the Bavarian Parliament, went to another reception that evening given by the United States Consul General, and then we attended the opera that night.

From Munich we drove to Bonn for several days of official discussions with the various ministers of the Federal Republic, with parliamentary leaders, and others, and we had dinner at the American Ambassador's. Then we drove to Cologne, to Duesseldorf, to Hanover, and to Hamburg. From Hamburg we flew to Berlin and from there back to Frankfurt.

Now I have just condensed into a few short paragraphs an itinerary which you know was worth many thousands of words and many descriptive adjectives to do it justice.

But, as I said at the start, I am not going to give you a travelogue about ground many of you have yourselves covered more leisurely and more thoroughly. But I want to give you some impressions.

There were many high points of the trip—not any single one you could pick out and say that this was the one biggest thing. Probably meeting and talking to Germany's impressive Chancellor, Herr Adenauer, would rank among the biggest of all.

But to me there was a genuine thrill in seeing and sensing the attitude not just of Chancellor Adenauer but of all of the top-ranking officials of today's democratic government in Germany with whom we came in contact—an attitude of determination to make democracy succeed this time in Germany, and to assure the German people and the German nation a place of prestige and respect and admiration and affection among the free peoples and the free nations of the world for their devotion to freedom and to the rights of the individual.

This is what we all hoped for—hoped to see and hoped to find—and it was there. We found it. We saw it. It was, as I said, a genuine thrill, and one which continued for all the time we were there.

The scars of war are still there—they still exist. But it is truly difficult for me even yet to realize the extent of the damage and the destruction and the devastation which marked Western Germany when the shooting stopped nearly 13 years ago. We saw pictures of some areas of the major cities—of whole cities, in fact—which had been reduced to rubble. But standing in those cities today, looking at the modern architecture, the good urban planning, the fine apartments and homes, the spectacular stores, the great public buildings, it is most difficult to imagine how so much could have been achieved in such a short time.

Frankly, in some parts of Western Germany, I felt I was right here in Philadelphia. The spirit was the same—rebuilding a better city than ever before; bringing beauty to areas which had been eyesores or worse; building, building, building, improving, beautifying—this was the spirit I saw and the results were simply breathtaking.

We saw German industry booming and bustling and turning out high-quality goods for world markets. We visited and toured the great Volkswagen plant, and heard how they are running a year and a half behind their orders. How Detroit would love to be able to say the same thing right now. And how all of us who are citizens of the United States and anxious for our own economy in this nervous period of recession would also wish Detroit could be saying something of the same thing.

I am, as most of you know, a liberal in politics—a believer in full employment and prosperity widely shared. I believe we have prosperity in this country as a whole only when our people are fully employed and have good purchasing power.

In view of that, I was most sincerely impressed by the German economy, for there is a soundness to it that is gratifying. People have jobs and they work hard and there is full employment and there is even an ability in that economy to absorb the thousands of refugees who stream across the border from repression and the slavery of communism to freedom and free air and light in the western sector—in Western Germany.

Now in contrast, we very briefly visited the eastern sector of Berlin. Presumably, this should be communism's showplace area, for it is a place where there is sufficient traffic back and forth so that the contrasts, if they existed, could be very striking and very damaging to communism. I am sure the Russian masters of Eastern Germany recognize that.

Even so—even despite the prod and the spur to make the contrast with West Berlin less striking—the contrast is there and it is the most dramatic contrast one could ever expect to see between 2 ways of life and 2 economies.

We were permitted in East Berlin only an hour and a half. Had we stayed beyond that, the police of the puppet regime would have been looking for us, probably to arrest us. But there were no incidents. We were driven about by American personnel who knew exactly what would be permitted and took absolutely no risks with us. So there was no dramatic incident—no guns pointed at us menacingly or anything of the sort, although that sort of thing has been known to happen in the past to Members of Congress who took pictures or otherwise violated Communist regulations there. It is unnecessary for me to say that we took no pictures.

But while the Communists could prevent us from capturing the poverty and hopelessness and despair and vacuum of East Berlin on photographic film, they could not prevent us from capturing these undying impressions on the film of our minds. We saw—and we remembered what we saw. We shall never forget what we saw.

This was a part of Berlin damaged no worse than the rest in the war. They have had equal time to rebuild. They have had the resources of Russia to help them rebuild, as part of the cold war.

They have built a front—a false front. It is like the settings of a stage play, or the frontier towns that Hollywood builds out of plywood for movies or television—just a front. The fronts of the buildings adjoining the western sector look new and prosperous, but behind those fronts are ruin or neglect or squalor.

The people we passed in the streets looked at us with a blank, sullen, hopeless look of despair. They looked as if they had nothing to live for—unless it might be to escape. And of course, each month, perhaps 2,000 persons escape from Eastern Germany to the West.

One sight I shall never forget: A young girl, perhaps 15, poorly dressed, obviously not too well fed, standing and looking in surprise—almost as if in wonder—at our cars going by. Now we were riding in just plain black automobiles, not fancy limousines. Yet this 15-year-old acted as if seeing a car was most unusual—the way we might have watched a helicopter a few years ago.

In Western Berlin and in Western Germany, where there is prosperity, and life, and delight in life, and things to see, and things to do, and good clothes to wear, and good food to eat, children went about their own happy pursuits, too busy with too many childish wonders of their own to stand and look blankly and wonderingly at adult activities. They were as bright and smiling and happy as American children on a weekend or at school recess. But not in East Berlin.

I saw one other sight which I will keep with me always—women in the eastern sector of Berlin dragging themselves about in the cold weather dressed in discarded or badly worn army overcoats.

These are impressions which underline and underscore—which emphasize and point up—the comparative well-being of the Federal Republic of Germany and its people. No one can visualize or understand the contrast between freedom and communism without seeing these two economies and societies so close together, and yet worlds apart.

What I am telling you about this is certainly not new or news to you. Let me tell you a bit then, about the political climate:

While we were in Germany, the Bundestag was not in session for the very reason that the Congress right now is not passing much major legislation. They were selecting their committees and this is done in conferences and leadership meetings. Our own Congress is in that process to some extent right now.

But although we did not see the Bundestag in session, we met many of the leaders and ministers and talked about the future of freedom in a world divided. I took away two impressions from these talks:

First, as I said, a sense of the determination of the German leaders to make democracy work. This meant, as they saw it, assuring all of their people a solid foundation of opportunity. In many respects, they are ahead of us in social welfare activities while being behind us in others. Labor and management take active partnership roles in many activities. The individual is considered important.

That was one impression. The second was this: These leaders of Germany are deeply grateful to the United States of America for every bit of help we have given them over the years. This I am sure is genuine and sincere. It is not one of those cases of "What have you done for me lately?" They know we have done much—a tremendous amount for them. And they appreciate it. They showed us plaques erected on various buildings and plants saying they were built under the Marshall plan. They have not forgotten. They have not forgotten CARE. They have not forgotten the kindness of so many Americans of German descent too.

The best spokesman for this point of view was, of course, the great Chancellor Adenauer. The arrangements for us to meet

with him had broken down for some reason or other; in any event, it was not to be on our schedule as finally worked out. But at the last moment, when we were about to go to the opera one evening, word came through we could see Mr. Adenauer if we wished, and of course we wished.

It was the day after President Eisenhower's stroke. We knew very little about the situation here at home. We were as shocked as you were and as the whole world was shocked. Chancellor Adenauer was deeply disturbed by the turn of events.

This tall, erect, youthful looking man of 82 spoke kindly of the President, as the symbol of America in the free world. What, he asked us, would we do if the President's illness was so serious that he could not attend the forthcoming NATO conference. Of course we did not know.

Mr. Adenauer said that if President Eisenhower could not come we should very definitely not send a substitute for Eisenhower is the President and he would be meeting with heads of states. He advised against sending Mr. NIXON to assume the role. If Mr. Eisenhower could not come, he said, then the conference should be changed from one of heads of states to foreign ministers. He was most emphatic about that.

In any event, after speaking of this one matter which was uppermost in everyone's mind at the time—the illness of our President in the light of the forthcoming NATO meeting—Mr. Adenauer then talked about Germany and America, our relationships and our goals for mutual progress, and about the free world. He spoke in German, through an interpreter, much to my regret. I understand he understands English but does not speak it. Unfortunately I am not conversant with German.

But despite the language barrier, his thoughts came through. He wanted us to know—and to bring back to America—the deep gratitude of the German people for our leadership in behalf of freedom in the world. He wanted to make clear to us that Germany was committed to freedom, and against communism, and was an ally which we could count on through NATO. He spoke solemnly of the Communist threat—as one who has seen it up close and recognizes its hateful face.

And then he expressed his heartfelt desire for Mr. Eisenhower's full recovery. He indicated that in view of his background and past career, Mr. Eisenhower can play a role right now which no one else in the administration could attempt in the realm of world affairs. It was almost as if this 82-year-old man was saying that the future of world affairs depends upon good health and leadership from the American President during the rest of his term in office. And we ourselves thought how much the future of Germany seems likewise to depend upon this 82-year-old man. Who could take his place if anything were to happen?

Well, we here tonight know, as Americans, that men help to make the times but the times help to make the men, too. If Germany has rebuilt well, if the instinct for democracy has been properly instilled, Germany will go on no matter what. That is the hope, and there is good solid foundation for it. Just as we go on and have gone one here in the United States despite the circumstances of individual lives or leaders. It is all according to what the people think and want and insist upon.

In that connection, I think Germany today is faced in the right direction, and determined to follow the right path. That was my impression, shared by the others in the delegation. That was our hope, too. For a free Germany, united for freedom and democracy, can be one of the greatest instruments for a peaceful, better world.

Thank you.

LAWS AND RULES FOR PUBLICATION OF THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

CODE OF LAWS OF THE UNITED STATES

TITLE 44, SECTION 181. CONGRESSIONAL RECORD; ARRANGEMENT, STYLE, CONTENTS, AND INDEXES.—The Joint Committee on Printing shall have control of the arrangement and style of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and while providing that it shall be substantially a verbatim report of proceedings shall take all needed action for the reduction of unnecessary bulk, and shall provide for the publication of an index of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD semimonthly during the sessions of Congress and at the close thereof. (Jan. 12, 1895, c. 23, § 13, 28 Stat. 603.)

TITLE 44, SECTION 182b. SAME; ILLUSTRATIONS, MAPS, DIAGRAMS.—No maps, diagrams, or illustrations may be inserted in the RECORD without the approval of the Joint Committee on Printing. (June 20, 1936, c. 630, § 2, 49 Stat. 1546.)

Pursuant to the foregoing statute and in order to provide for the prompt publication and delivery of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the Joint Committee on Printing has adopted the following rules, to which the attention of Senators, Representatives, and Delegates is respectfully invited:

1. *Arrangement of the daily Record.*—The Public Printer will arrange the contents of the daily RECORD as follows: First, the Senate proceedings; second, the House proceedings; third, the Appendix: *Provided,* That when the proceedings of the Senate are not received in time to follow this arrangement, the Public Printer may begin the RECORD with the House proceedings. The proceedings of each House and the Appendix shall each begin a new page, with appropriate headings centered thereon.

2. *Type and style.*—The Public Printer shall print the report of the proceedings and debates of the Senate and House of Representatives, as furnished by the Official Reporters of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, in 7½-point type; and all matter included in the remarks or speeches of Members of Congress, other than their own words, and all reports, documents, and other matter authorized to be inserted in the RECORD shall be printed in 6½-point type; and all rollcalls shall be printed in 6-point type. No italic or black type nor words in capitals or small capitals shall be used for emphasis or prominence; nor will unusual indentions be permitted. These restrictions do not apply to the printing of or quotations from historical, official, or legal documents or papers of which a literal reproduction is necessary.

3. *Return of manuscript.*—When manuscript is submitted to Members for revision it should be returned to the Government Printing Office not later than 9 o'clock p. m. in order to insure publication in the RECORD issued on the following morning; and if all of said manuscript is not furnished at the time specified, the Public Printer is authorized to withhold it from the RECORD for 1 day. In no case will a speech be printed in the RECORD of the day of its delivery if the manuscript is furnished later than 12 o'clock midnight.

4. *Tabular matter.*—The manuscript of speeches containing tabular statements to be published in the RECORD shall be in the hands of the Public Printer not later than 7 o'clock p. m., to insure publication the following morning.

5. *Proof furnished.*—Proofs of "leave to print" and advance speeches will not be furnished the day the manuscript is received but will be submitted the following day, whenever possible to do so without causing delay in the publication of the regular proceedings of Congress. Advance speeches shall be set in the RECORD style of type, and not more than six sets of proofs may be furnished to Members without charge.

6. *Notation of withheld remarks.*—If manuscript or proofs have not been returned in time for publication in the proceedings, the Public Printer will insert the words "Mr. ——— addressed the Senate (House or Committee). His remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix," and proceed with the printing of the RECORD.

7. *Thirty-day limit.*—The Public Printer shall not publish in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD any speech or extension of remarks which has been withheld for a period exceeding 30 calendar days from the date when its printing was authorized: *Provided,* That at the expiration of each session of Congress the time limit herein fixed shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee.

8. *Corrections.*—The permanent RECORD is made up for printing and binding 30 days after each daily publication is issued; therefore all corrections must be sent to the Public Printer within that time: *Provided,* That upon the final adjournment of each session of Congress the time limit shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee: *Provided further,* That no Member of Congress shall be entitled to make more than one revision. Any revision shall consist only of corrections of the original copy and shall not include deletions of correct material, substitutions for correct material, or additions of new subject matter.

9. The Public Printer shall not publish in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the full report or print of any committee or subcommittee when said report or print has been previously printed. This rule shall not be construed to apply to conference reports.

10. *Appendix to daily Record.*—When either House has granted leave to print (1) a speech not delivered in either House, (2) a newspaper or magazine article, or (3) any other matter not germane to the proceedings, the same shall be published in the Appendix except in cases of duplication. In such cases only the first item received in the Government Printing Office will be printed. This rule shall not apply to quotations which form part of a speech of a Member, or to an authorized extension of his own remarks: *Provided,* That no address, speech, or article delivered or released subsequently to the final adjournment of a session of Congress may be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

11. *Estimate of cost.*—No extraneous matter in excess of two pages in any one instance may be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD by a Member under leave to print or to extend his remarks unless the manuscript is accompanied by an estimate in writing from the Public Printer of the probable cost of publishing the same, which estimate of cost must be announced by the Member when such leave is requested; but this rule shall not apply to excerpts from letters, telegrams, or articles presented in connection with a speech delivered in the course of debate or to communications from State legislatures, addresses or articles by the President and the members of his Cabinet, the Vice President, or a Member of Congress. For the purposes of this regulation, any one article printed in two or more parts, with or without individual headings, shall be considered as a single extension and the two-page rule shall apply. The Public Printer or the Official Reporters of the House or Senate shall return to the Member of the respective House any matter submitted for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD which is in contravention of this paragraph.

12. *Official Reporters.*—The Official Reporters of each House shall indicate on the manuscript and prepare headings for all matter to be printed in the Appendix, and shall make suitable reference thereto at the proper place in the proceedings.

Appendix

Use of Senate Caucus Room

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LYNDON B. JOHNSON
OF TEXAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, March 6, 1958

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I have received from the chairman of the Committee on Rules and Administration a letter report on the incident which involved the use of the Senate caucus room for a press conference a week ago Wednesday. I ask unanimous consent that this report be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD for the information of the Senate and the country.

There being no objection, the report was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNITED STATES SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON RULES
AND ADMINISTRATION,
March 3, 1958.

The Honorable LYNDON B. JOHNSON,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR JOHNSON: Pursuant to the discussion which recently transpired on the Senate floor in connection with the use of the Senate caucus room by Mr. Walter Reuther for a press conference last Wednesday, I have obtained signed statements from the Superintendent of the Senate Press Gallery and the Superintendent of the Senate Office Building and transmit copies herewith. These enclosures substantially confirm, I believe, the factual account of the incident given to the Senate, on the following day, by Senator HUMPHREY. (See CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Feb. 27, 1958, pp. 2630-2631.)

It is of course not the practice or policy of the Committee on Rules and Administration or af any Member or employee of the Senate to permit the use of rooms in the Senate Office Building for formal private press conferences. To the extent that the event involving Mr. Reuther was accompanied by some advance announcement, the incident was unique and isolated. I am reliably informed, however, that it is the frequent habit of our accredited newspapermen to interview Senators and other prominent persons and participants, in various rooms and corridors of the Senate Office Building, during intermissions and after recesses of committee hearings. As long as we enjoy freedom of the press and its concomitant privileges, that custom of the press is one I think no Senator would willingly proscribe.

Reverting again to the situation of last Wednesday, the circumstances under which the location of the Reuther conference was changed from the press room to the caucus room in the Senate Office Building are set forth in the attached statements. It seems hardly necessary to add that an original request for the use of the Senate caucus room for a private press conference of the representative of a commercial organization of any kind would be summarily denied.

It is the firm general rule that space assigned to the Senate will not be utilized for activities disassociated from a Senate committee or a sponsoring Senator. In the supervision of this rule, there may be an occasional difference of opinion as to the pertinency or propriety of a particular request for assignment of the caucus room, or any other Senate facility. The Committee on Rules and Administration exercises its best discretion to grant no request likely to be disconsonant with the desires of the Senate or the public interest. Individual sponsoring Senators and Senate committees are necessarily accountable for activities indulged during the periods of the temporary assignments made to them. Generally speaking, I believe this accountability has been circumspect.

I hope this letter will sufficiently answer the inquiries initiated by the interview, on February 26, 1958, of Mr. Walter Reuther by members of the press in the Senate caucus room. If you or my colleagues believe broader inquiry is necessary, please let me know. Whether or not you decide to insert this letter and its enclosures into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD or otherwise make them public, I leave to your sound good judgment.

With warmest regards to you, as always.

Yours sincerely,
THOMAS C. HENNINGS, Jr.,
Chairman.

P. S.—I am sending a carbon copy of this letter to Senator KNOWLAND for his information.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
PRESS GALLERIES,
Washington, February 27, 1958.

Hon. THOMAS C. HENNINGS, Jr.,
Chairman, Rules and Administration Committee, Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR HENNINGS: Upon my return Wednesday, February 26, at 11:40 a. m., from the White House press conference, I was informed by several members of the Senate Press Gallery that Mr. Walter Reuther had scheduled a press conference to be held in the pressroom of the Senate Office Building at 1:00 p. m. that day. This press conference was not cleared through me or any member of my staff.

As you probably know, there were 8 or 10 committee hearings in the Senate Office Building on that day, and the pressroom was a very busy place. Quite a number of newspapermen asked me not to permit this press conference to be held in the pressroom where some of them were typing or dictating stories.

After an unsuccessful attempt to reach Mr. Reuther's press assistant, in an effort to cancel the press conference, I went to the pressroom at 12:30 p. m. to see his press representative, who arrived at about 10 minutes to 1. I informed him that the press conference could not be held in the pressroom.

There were 75 or 80 newsmen in or around the pressroom at that time, and some of them suggested that the press conference be held in the hall or some committee room. I told them that any use of a committee room, or even the hall, would have to be cleared through the custodian's office or by an official connected with the committee now using the room.

My assistant, Don Womack, telephoned the custodian's office and requested permission to use the caucus room for this purpose. He also telephoned someone connected with the Select Committee on Labor Activities for their permission, which was also granted; in order to accommodate the press.

I gave no instructions to the police on the door of the caucus room to bar Senators or any Senate official from the room, only tourists.

Thank you for the opportunity of explaining how this happened.

Yours very truly,
JOSEPH E. WILLS,
Superintendent, Senate Press Gallery.

UNITED STATES SENATE,
SENATE OFFICE BUILDING,
February 27, 1958.

Hon. THOMAS C. HENNINGS, Jr.,
Chairman, Committee on Rules and Administration, United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR HENNINGS: At approximately 12:30 p. m. yesterday someone called this office. The phone was answered by Harry Clarke, service officer.

The caller stated that he had read on the teletype that a press conference was to be held in the caucus room at 1 p. m. for Walter Reuther. The caller wanted to know how Mr. Reuther obtained the room and permission to use it. The unidentified caller was told by Mr. Clarke that we knew nothing about the conference. I found out last night that the call came from the office of Senator GOLDWATER.

At approximately 12:45 yesterday Don C. Womack, Assistant Superintendent of the Senate Press Gallery, called this office. Mr. Harold Brannon, service officer, received the call. Mr. Womack asked if he could use the caucus room in the Senate Office Building for a press conference for Walter Reuther. Mr. Brannon told Mr. Womack that the room was assigned for the day to the Select Committee on Labor Management, and that he would have to have the permission of that committee.

Mr. Womack called back a few minutes later and stated that he had contacted Mrs. Ruth Watt, clerk of the committee, and that she stated it was all right for them to use the room. Mr. Brannon asked Mr. Womack if he wanted the room unlocked, and Mr. Womack stated that he was already in the room.

Sincerely yours,
J. LEWEY CARAWAY,
Superintendent.

Address by Hon. Edward Martin, of Pennsylvania, to the National Guard Association of the United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD MARTIN
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, March 6, 1958

Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania. Mr. President, on October 8, 1957, at Louisville, Ky., I delivered an address to the

convention of the National Guard Association of the United States. I ask unanimous consent to have the address printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS OF UNITED STATES SENATOR EDWARD MARTIN, OF PENNSYLVANIA, AT THE CONVENTION OF THE NATIONAL GUARD ASSOCIATION OF THE UNITED STATES, LOUISVILLE, KY., TUESDAY, OCTOBER 8, 1957

It is a distinct honor to be invited to speak to this historic and distinguished organization which has worked so courageously to protect and advance the American way of life.

As members of the National Guard you hold a unique position. You are both citizens and soldiers. You know the dangers involved in excessive taxation and the high cost of government. You also realize that one of the most important obligations of American citizenship is to share in the defense of our Republic.

Over the centuries the best minds of the world have tried to outlaw war. In spite of these efforts armed conflict has come generation after generation, in greater magnitude and with greater cost in money and in human agony and suffering.

In the eight wars in which we have been engaged 965,572 Americans have given their lives and another 1,276,520 have been wounded. The overall cost in money can hardly be estimated, but it is by far the largest item in our combined budget.

We are a peace-loving people. As Americans we do not want armed conflict because we do not covet anything that any other nation possesses. Everything that is honorable should be done to prevent war. The record of history proves that treaties, resolutions, and good intentions will not bring peace to the world. Strength is the only means by which war can be prevented.

More than 300 years ago George Herbert, the English poet and philosopher, expressed that thought when he wrote:

"One sword keeps another in the sheath."

We can be brought to disaster if we allow our Nation's sword to become dull and rusty.

Our wise forefathers realized that one of the most important functions of government is to provide for the common defense. They recognized the dangers of war and that it can be avoided only by adequate preparation. Therefore, they set forth the plans for our Nation's defense in the Constitution. One of the fundamental objectives of the immortal document, as stated in the preamble, is to provide for "the common defense."

The Constitution itself provides for calling out the militia to execute the laws of the Union, suppress insurrections and to repel invasions. It further provides for organizing, arming and disciplining the militia, "reserving to the States, respectively, the appointment of the officers and the authority of training the militia according to the discipline prescribed by Congress."

This wise reservation of certain powers to the sovereign States was to prevent an overpowerful central government from destroying the authority of the States. The National Guard is a fundamental part of that plan. It must be sacredly guarded. Even Federal appropriations for National Guard purposes must be carefully watched because they may be used to gradually destroy the direct State control of the guard. We must always remember whenever we seek financial aid from a higher level of government we may surrender some controls.

The National Guard, and its predecessor, the militia, have taken a glorious part in all our wars. They have served in the front lines from the Revolution to the frozen hills of Korea. Local pride and pride in the history of their organizations have carried them forward. From the days of the Roman legion it has been found that men make better soldiers when they fight at the side of their neighbors.

The embattled farmers at Concord and Lexington gave new ideals to military work. They stood their ground against trained British regulars because they believed in the cause for which they took up arms.

Every State has many historic outfits, many of them dating back to the Revolution.

In this discussion of national defense we must face a world of realities. Peace among nations, the great hope of mankind, will come slowly. It must grow out of education in which the spiritual will take a great part. Until the world knows how to live we must have a stabilizing police force.

While the slow process for peace continues, the American school system must provide for the education of all the children in the principles of the Republic. In that education we must emphasize patriotism, respect for the law, the rights of the individual, and loyalty to the Constitution. In this educational crusade we must also reach the many misguided American-born who have really forgotten the ideals of their fathers and the liberties we enjoy.

We must never forget that individual morality is our own responsibility. We must not forget that justice is an inward expression and not an outward force. We cannot legislate justice in the hearts of men. We all must aid the powers of righteousness so we may live in peace and good will under God. But until that great day comes, we must be prepared to defend our freedom and our national honor.

George Washington, as you so well know, wanted a well-regulated militia—well organized and well established.

In planning the military defense of our Republic, I believe we should have the best trained Regular Army in the world. It should have the most modern equipment. It should be the fastest with the greatest firepower the world has ever known. It should be prepared to move by air and sea to any place in the world.

Our National Guard should be under the control of the States until called into the Federal service. It should be trained by the best and most patriotic brains of the Regular Army.

We should have a great Reserve Corps of citizens, trained as both officers and enlisted men, and the training should be under the supervision of the best the Regular Army can provide.

We should have an Air Force so powerful that we could have complete supremacy in the air and enough planes to carry our ground troops to any part of the world.

We should have the world's most powerful Navy so that we and our allies will have complete command of the sea.

We should have a great merchant marine.

To guard and defend our liberty we must have great military strength, but equally important, we must have economic, industrial, agricultural, cultural, and spiritual strength.

We must maintain a strong and expanding economy that will provide employment for our workers at a wage scale adequate to sustain the American standard of living, and to provide the equipment for the Armed Forces.

We must have a high level of production in our mills, factories, and mines.

We must have the maximum production of food on our farms to meet the needs of our Armed Forces and our civilian population.

We must strengthen our financial position through economy in Government, and sound fiscal policies in order to prevent inflation.

We must economize in every function of Government. The cost of defense can be reduced by greater unification of procurement. There are more than 2,000 posts, stations, and camps in the continental United States with a civilian employment of more than 1 million. Many of these could be eliminated at a great saving in cost.

We must never forget that we have obligations in America as well as rights. We will have no rights of any value unless we preserve our great ideals.

Following that principle I believe that every American, regardless of his station in life, should be ready to defend his country and should be prepared by taking basic training.

A great American statesman, Daniel Webster, summarized the obligations of free men in his inspiring speech when he said:

"God grants liberty only to those who love it and are always ready to guard and defend it."

But defense means more than weapons. It means trained manpower. For many years I have maintained that universal military training is the only real solution. It is the right way for a republic, because if a republic is to survive, its wars must be fought by the people. There is much opposition to this plan. Some criticism comes from fathers and mothers and from those with deep and sincere religious conviction, but much of the opposition is expressed by politicians seeking the easy way.

Another group in opposition, and the real danger, are those subversive elements who would deliberately weaken and destroy our country by playing on the fears of others to serve their own sinister purposes.

Actually universal military training is real democracy, in that the rich and humble alike, share equally the responsibility of our Nation's defense.

If America is to be preserved as the greatest nation of all time every citizen must accept a full share of individual responsibility. Every American must join with complete loyalty and unselfish devotion to the task of building a national defense so strong that no aggressor will dare threaten our safety and security.

To meet the challenge of these disturbing times we need a great new wave of patriotic fervor. We need the power and strength of a united people, combining 100 percent Americanism with the highest moral and spiritual standards. We need the resolute courage and the high morale of God-fearing, clean-living, law-abiding people who appreciate our precious heritage of liberty and independence and are willing to make every sacrifice in defense of our ideals.

We all hope and pray that we may be spared the tragedy of another war. But if war should come, I don't want to see the youth of America thrown into battle without proper training.

That training should not only be the best in military work but the trainee should also be taught the meaning of our form of government and what the American way of life means.

When his basic training is completed the trainee could elect service for a fixed period in the Regular establishment or a longer period in the National Guard or Reserve, which would excuse him from additional military obligation, except during a declared emergency. Thus we would be able at all times to muster a citizen army, ready, trained and prepared to meet any threat to our national security.

A plan of this kind would train every American in the basic principles of military work. It could be done at a time that would least interfere with the career or the education of the citizen, such as 2 yearly 3-month periods during June, July, and

August. All of the clerical and supply work could be done at home.

The training should be done by carefully selected officers of the Regular Army, National Guard, and Reserve. It would be helpful if the training was done as near home as possible.

From the trainees, or those serving in the Regular establishment, National Guard, or Reserve, there should be selected by the officers in charge of training certain men who are qualified for schooling in our various colleges and universities. These men, with special training, would always provide a large reservoir of well prepared officers and technical men.

Universal military training would show the world that we are prepared and would be a great step for peace.

As military men we must recognize the world situation. There is a contest for world domination. It may be through a cold war or it may be a shooting war. In either case, America must be prepared and every American must do his full duty.

We, in the United States, recognize the liberty and freedom of the individual as God given. Any other philosophy is nonreligious and un-American. Anyone advocating deviation from these ideals does not belong in the United States and if he does not volunteer to leave our shores he should be sent to a country where he and his philosophy of government may be exercised.

What do we need to prepare ourselves for the great task of defending our freedom?

1. We need accurate information as to our standing among the nations of the world. We must know our enemies and their real strength. We must know who our real friends are and what they can and are willing to contribute in defenes of the common cause.

2. Our plans should be made. The part to be taken by each element should be clearly known.

3. Training should be thoroughly consistent with our financial situation.

4. Means for the production of supplies should be adequate.

5. We must have high morale as a Nation.

By precept and example we must inspire deeper love of our country, greater respect for its laws, more active support of the church and more individual assistance in all public spirited undertakings.

Let us emulate our forefathers by taking a more active part in Government.

Our forefathers were courageous and self-reliant. Without seeking governmental aid, they crossed the mountains with Bibles, rifles, axes, and plows. The axes and plows provided their food and shelter. The rifle was for protection. The Bible was the source of their deep religious faith.

Let us depend more upon ourselves and less on Government.

It is not necessary to relate to this real American audience how the early settlers toiled, suffered and died to start and then build this country. While this continent is more richly endowed by nature than any other of the world—its development was the result of the spirit of America.

That spirit built the solidity of the eastern coast line, developed the fertility of the great Central West, made the beauty of the Deep South, crossed the rugged Rockies and placed the hand of real progress on the slopes of the Pacific. That spirit made us a United Nation, the greatest in all history.

If we, in our day, live by that spirit, America will go forward to still greater achievement in the years that lie ahead.

Address Commemorating 91st Birthday of Nebraska as a State

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROMAN L. HRUSKA

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 6, 1958

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, Saturday, March 1, was the 91st birthday of the State of Nebraska. It was particularly appropriate, therefore, that members of the Nebraska State Society, of Washington, D. C., should meet to commemorate the event.

Also in the spirit of the day was a short address delivered to the members of the society by Representative R. D. "Bob" HARRISON of the Third District of Nebraska. In his remarks, Representative HARRISON traced the colorful history of Nebraska to its achievement of statehood on March 1, 1967.

All Nebraskans, Mr. President, take great pride in the initiative and perseverance of those who established our great State on the plains of the Midwest. This pride is well reflected in Representative HARRISON's remarks.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the speech, Nebraska Becomes a State, by Hon. R. D. HARRISON, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NEBRASKA BECOMES A STATE

(By Hon. R. D. HARRISON)

Ladies and gentlemen of the Nebraska State Society, it was very kind of you to invite me to talk to you for a few minutes, and you may be sure that the invitation was accepted with genuine pleasure. In the 7 years that I have been in Washington, I have derived very real satisfaction as a member of our State society; I have observed the pleasure we, one and all, obtain from our gatherings. And these meetings and social occasions serve a deeper purpose than mere entertainment: they serve to remind us that we are all sons and daughters of the same mother State; they forge anew the bonds between us, so that wherever in this, the National Capital, we chance to meet, we can say that the meetingplace is constructively, for the time being Nebraska soil.

I should like to talk to you for a few minutes this evening on the origin and beginnings of our statehood: I feel the more confident, not because of my own powers, but in my choice of topic, for that subject must always be of interest to us Nebraskans.

I take it that all of us know the origin of our State's name; still, "just for the record," as we say on the Hill, I will quote briefly from that admirable book on Nebraska in the American Guide Series:

"In 1842," we read, "Lt. John C. Frémont led an expedition to explore the country lying between the Kansas and Platte Rivers. On his return, he attempted to descend the Platte, but gave up the venture after dragging his boat for 3 or 4 miles over the sandy bottom of the river. In his report to the Government he wrote: 'The names given by the Indians are always remarkably appropriate; and certainly none was ever more so than that which they have given to this stream—the Nebraska, or Shallow River.'"

Recent finds in the western portion of the State point to the existence of an extremely ancient culture, estimated by conservative scientists to have existed some ten to twelve thousand years ago. These archeological discoveries whose type was first unearthed near Folsom, are known as the Folsom Culture. As for the historic Indians, at the time of the Lewis and Clark expedition in 1804–06, the Pawnee was the largest indigenous tribe of Nebraska Indians, their number probably reaching 10,000. There were four divisions, but after 1804 these united to form the Great Pawnee Nation. After various treaties with the United States Government, the Pawnees in 1875 finally ceded their Nebraska reserve and removed to Indian territory in Oklahoma.

In 1541 the Spanish adventurer, Francisco Vásquez Coronado, with 30 soldiers, moved northeastward from the Arkansas River under the guidance of the Indian Ysopete. The conquistador was seeking the Quivera—a land to the northwestward where, according to the fantastic report of a plains Indian, living as a captive at Pecos pueblo, gold was so common that the natives did not care anything about it. The old Spanish conquistadors were motivated by lust for that metal quite as much as by missionary zeal, and they were completely taken in by the report of the Indian captive who was, of course, by way of revenge, gloriously spoofing them.

The party marched for 40 days and at last came upon an Indian village somewhere near the present Kansas-Nebraska line. Here the adventurers heard of a large watercourse farther to the north—presumably, the Platte. From here, the white men moved eastward and may have reached the Missouri River. Though Coronado claimed actually to have found the mysterious kingdom of Quivera, it is not known just where he thought he had discovered it: the Republican River Valley in Nebraska has been named as the most likely place. Certainly the old conquistador found no gold; he and his followers, however, could probably claim to be the first white men to have set foot in what is now Kansas and Nebraska.

For the next two and a half centuries the region was occasionally entered by both Spanish and French explorers and by French traders and fur trappers. France's claim to the entire vast territory drained by the Mississippi was finally established by the Sieur de la Salle, who in 1682 explored the basin of the mighty river and took posession in the name of the French Crown.

American interest in the Kansas-Nebraska territory dates, of course, from the Louisiana Purchase in 1803 and the explorations of Meriwether Lewis and William Clark in 1804–06. Many of the earlier explorers were far from impressed by the region—indeed, from some reports, one would gather that it formed part of the Great American Desert. In these early years of American possession much of the exploration and all of the earliest settlements were connected with the fur trade. Manuel Lisa established the first fur-trading post at Fort Lisa in 1807, near the site of the present village of Fort Calhoun. Fort Atkinson served as a military post in the same area. Bellevue on the Missouri, in the present day Sarpy County, became the nucleus of the first permanent white settlement in 1823.

In 1934 Nebraska had been included in that territory designated by Congress as Indian country, from which all white men were excluded except the military and certain agents and officials who had special Government authorization. In 1844 Stephen A. Douglas introduced the first bill to create a Nebraska Territory. Not succeeding, he introduced similar bills in 1848 and 1852. By this time the slavery versus antislavery agitation had reached the boiling point, which was to lead to the fiery ordeal of the rebellion. After a conference at the White House with President Pierce and his Secretary of War, Jefferson Davis, Douglas submitted to the Senate one of the most fateful measures ever to reach that body. This was the Kansas-Nebraska bill. Instead of creating a single territory of Nebraska, the new bill provided for two territories, divided by the 40th parallel: Kansas, to the south, to admit slavery, while Nebraska to the north would probably be free soil. The new bill repealed the ancient, time-honored Missouri Compromise of 1820, declaring it inoperative and superseded by the legislation of 1850 (Clay's, Webster's, and Calhoun's famous compromise). The bill became law with the signature of the President, May 30, 1854. It is unnecessary to dwell upon the terrific storm which this ill-starred legislation provoked: suffice to say, that no measure laid before the Senate since the Jay Treaty with Great Britain in 1795 ever stirred such bitter opposition; that it was the greatest single concrete factor which made inevitable the looming Civil War, and that its consequences to the States, the Nation and the world were immeasurable and are felt to this very day and hour in which I speak.

So the great war came, and all else was forgotten in the fierce struggle on the part of the North to save the Union.

The war over, the thoughts of the people of the Nebraska Territory turned toward statehood, and after a long and acrimonious controversy involving considerations both of expense and national political questions, Nebraska at last became a State, March 1, 1867. A new State constitution was adopted in 1875, and revised by constitutional convention in 1920. The most magnificent subsequent revision was the adoption of the unicameral legislature, which became effective in 1937, and which was largely due to the unremitting efforts of George W. Norris.

In these brief moments at my disposal it is obviously impossible for me to offer, even in barest outline, the history of our State. This much, however, can be said in conclusion: As Nebraska near the century mark of her admission to the Union, we may look back with pride and affection upon the noble, truly heroic record of our pioneer forebears—indeed, we feel we can claim that the pioneer spirit has not departed from our midst; we hail with equal satisfaction the advances, scientific and commercial, intellectual and cultural, of the modern generation, and we feel we can honestly claim that we have lived up to, and shall continue to exemplify, the noble motto of the State: "Equality Before the Law."

I thank you.

Importance of Reaching the Russian People

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN F. KENNEDY

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 6, 1958

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the major part of a statement recently submitted by former Senator William Benton, of Connecticut, before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee.

Mr. Benton's statement is a searching and valuable analysis of ways by which the United States can improve its cultural and psychological effort against the Soviet Union. He points out ways in which we can break the Iron Curtain and effectively reach the Soviet people and its nongovernmental leadership. This is one of the most thoughtful expositions of the problem which I have heard.

The Public Printer estimates that it will cost $216 to print this in the RECORD. Nonetheless, I ask unanimous consent that the statement be printed.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

IMPORTANCE OF REACHING THE RUSSIAN PEOPLE

Two years ago, Christian Pineau of France, present Foreign Minister and former Premier, said: "If Communist propaganda can continue indefinitely in the West, while the West cannot spread its propaganda in Communist countries, then one day we shall all be subjugated. This is my firm conviction."

Pineau said our hope of survival rests upon the ability of the Western nations to reach the Russian people. Only when propaganda becomes a two-way street, he said, will there be an opportunity to modify profoundly the intransigent attitude of the Soviet regime.

The diplomats of Washington may scoff at Bulganin's letters, but those of Asia and Africa do not. Indeed, each and every one should have been answered in exhaustive detail, not for the American people but for those for whom the letters were actually intended. The primary purpose of the most recent letters, as everyone knows, was to blanket the NATO meeting in Paris and to emphasis the great, pure and peaceful aims of the Soviet Union while the Western nations were talking about armaments. The letters reached the world, but no replies to them from us reached the Russian people.

Khrushchev's world-wide success as a publicist is founded on the fact that this is a peace-hungry world. His formula seldom varies, and good Marxist dogma it is: we want peace and you want war. His current theme is "Let's get together and talk peace."

Some weeks back, he proposed a special session of the General Assembly of the United Nations to take up nuclear armaments. Time after time he has suggested another summit meeting. He has also hinted that, to end the present impasse, Russia and the United States should perhaps go it alone in bilateral talks.

DEEDS VERSUS WORDS

Khrushchev has known in advance what the free world's answers would be. They are nearly always an anguished, "No". The world is told that we won't be taken in by Khrushchev's obvious propaganda tricks; and further that Communist Russia must prove its good intentions by deeds and not words. This last maxim has been used so often that it seems to have frozen the creative thinking of the West and indeed, in today's world is not the maxim being misapplied? Are deeds really as much more important than words as we like to think? Could it be, as Mr. Pineau suggests, that we have missed the key to Communist success, and thus helped insure our own futility?

I suspect that those of our diplomatic leaders, and these include Democrats of the last administration as well as Republicans of this—I suspect that those who keep saying, "It is the deed, not the word that counts," are doing us a great disservice. Ideally, I agree that what counts is the deed and it counts most when coupled with the word. However, the word can obscure and minimize and offset a bad deed. Furthermore, sometimes words generate desired deeds. When Khrushchev calls for a summit conference, isn't that his effort by the words of propaganda to create the deed he desires?

Since World War II, the United States has acted with unprecedented generosity in the conduct of its foreign affairs. It has given to friend and former foe alike. It even offered to forsake its monopoly of of nuclear weapons on equitable terms. During this same time, Communist Russia has followed a policy often based upon intrigue, terror, force, and the suppression of human values. Yet on the barometer of world esteem the prestige of the Moscow Government appears to be rising steadily. Ours has fallen to a new low. This hardly supports the thesis that deeds and not words form the only ultimate test.

Samuel Adams didn't hesitate to launch his Committee of Correspondence against the might of the British Empire. He got powerful assistance from the stirring words of Thomas Jefferson and Tom Paine. Are we not today, in our timid and fearful attitude toward propaganda, neglecting a powerful spiritual weapon of our common heritage? The Communists are not neglecting theirs. Lenin wrote in 1905 that "propaganda is of crucial importance for the triumph of the party." He knew that ideas are the weapons of propaganda. He knew well, as Lord Keynes put it, that "soon or late, it is ideas, not economic interests, which are dangerous for good or evil." When I served in the State Department, I watched the Communist propaganda soften up China for conquest. And China fell more to propaganda than to military might.

Last month a Gallup poll in New Delhi turned up the following percentages on its question, "Which is doing more to help peace in the world, Russia or the West?" Russia, 54 percent; West, 18 percent; don't know, 28 percent. Note the ratio—3 to 1 for Russia.

The same poll asked citizens of 12 world capitals, "Who is ahead in the cold war, Russia or the West?" Russia was rated ahead in 10 capitals—in some cases by 4 or 5 to 1 among those who gave definite answers—and the West in only 2. And, please note this, 1 of the 2 was New Delhi.

U. S. S. R. CALLS THE RULES

I believe that after investigation your committee will conclude that the U. S. S. R. is shellacking us with its propaganda. Further, I think you will discover that the United States has foolishly allowed Russia to call the rules of the propaganda game.

Now, there is no law of international comity which suggests that certain nations shall have an exclusive privilege of defaming the good names of others throughout large areas of the world. This, of course, is possible only because of the complete veto power of the Communist countries over news and information from the West. Because of this, the Iron Curtain can nullify our attempts to reach an agreement for the easing of international tensions.

There is, of course, irony in the fact that a ruthless dictatorship may use the tools of freedom to win a supreme psychological advantage over nations which cherish these tools as the touchstone of their culture. And there is further irony in the fact that Khrushchev, who wields this psychological whip, heads a Government which is deeply troubled by the urge for freedom and liberty now running among its own subjects.

I suggest that it's time the free nations got up off the psychoanalyst's couch and started hitting the Soviet Union psychologically at its weakest point. That point is

the Iron Curtain which blocks its people from exposure to the developing world around them.

For too many years, the West has accepted the delusion that the Iron Curtain is invincible. That view is a most pernicious outcropping of a Western inferiority complex.

VULNERABILITY OF U. S. S. R.

The Soviet Government is vulnerable because it has consistently deceived its own people. If we can get through to the Russian people, the arrogance of the Soviet propaganda will visibly melt. If we can crack the Iron Curtain, it should be possible to create a world climate of opinion in which no nation would dare employ nuclear weapons to make war or to use its stockpile to intimidate other peoples. Essential to this climate of opinion is the attitude of the peoples within the U. S. S. R. Increasingly it seems evident that only through their understanding can worthwhile disarmament agreements evolve. Peace talks will be futile until the Russian people are brought into the world community of thought. Further, we should do all we can to bring an understanding of this to other countries throughout the world.

The first step is to shake up our psychological approach to the Soviet impasse from cellar to garret. We must ourselves announce a peace program, both bold and imaginative, and so comprehensive in its terms that its purpose and scope will snatch the peace initiative from the Soviet Union. The bedrock for such a program lies scattered over a dozen different proposals and policies over the past dozen years. The target of the program, as Mr. Pineau suggested, must be the peoples of the Communist bloc.

It is necessary to make a change of 180° in the arc of our propaganda policy—from No to Yes. For example, why should not every Moscow peace proposal for a summit meeting—why should it not be accepted with alacrity—but with our own "if"—upon the strict proviso that such deliberations should be made known in full to the Russian people.

In his many roles beside that of peacemaker, Mr. Khrushchev fancies himself as the leading exponent for the new people-to-people diplomacy—that movement of broader cultural, social, and scientific ties across national boundaries. This is the new diplomacy of the rocket age and Khrushchev has exploited it with his usual artistry. Does this not give us a superb opportunity to challenge him to open up the Iron Curtain? And to keep challenging him to admit publicly that he is afraid to let in the truth to the Russian people?

A race to the moon is advertised as the next contest in the scientific sweepstakes between the Communists and the free nations. It would be nice for us to win that race. It might be even nicer if we asked Mr. Khrushchev to join us in a cooperative venture by which we could reach the moon together. But in my judgment it is infinitely more important to reach the Russian people than it is to get to the moon.

Mr. Khrushchev's speech of January 22 in Minsk, which hasn't received the attention it deserved in this country, illustrates my thesis that ideas can get through the Iron Curtain, and that the Kremlin is sensitive to the impact of ideas on its public. This was a speech intended for a local audience, and apparently spontaneous. Much of it was a belligerent reply to President Eisenhower. The status of the countries of East Europe is not a subject for discussion at a summit conference, Khrushchev said; the idea of a plebiscite is ridiculous. The idea prevalent in the West that the 20th congress of the Communist Party caused or revealed division and confusion in the socialist world must be controverted. Khrushchev agreed with President Eisenhower's thesis that deeds, not words, are what count; let the United States display deeds by giving up the bases which ring the Soviet Union.

(I shall be happy to submit the text of Khrushchev's speech, which I do not believe has been published in the United States.)

Has there perhaps been a subtle transition in American thinking and policy within recent weeks? If so, this is most promising. Governor Stevenson has suggested a world conclave of distinguished private citizens to explore and make recommendations for ending the deadly armaments race. President Eisenhower has suggested a meeting of humanists, gathered from across the earth, to assess the world's condition and to make suggestions for making it a better place in which to live.

Recently, and more importantly, President Eisenhower wrote a letter to Bulganin which posed positive and constructive proposals, such as the abolition of the veto in the U. N., a letter which the Soviets haven't seemingly known how to answer, at least not yet.

Such ideas are positive though tentative steps which express the genuine idealism of the American people. I suggest to this committee today that we must group these overtures and develop them into a full symphony.

HOW TO BREAK THE IRON CURTAIN

We have at hand the weapons to break the Iron Curtain. One weapon, as suggested by Khrushchev's speech in Minsk, is the worldwide moral power of the Presidency of the United States. Great Presidents like Jefferson, Lincoln, Wilson, and Roosevelt never hesitated to use it and the influence they wielded stands unmatched in the temporal affairs of men. They literally shook up the world with their ideas about freedom and the essential need for human brotherhood.

Here are some further suggestions of the kind of positive things which I believe we should be doing; these are merely samples:

1. President Eisenhower might announce his desire to make a peace appeal directly to the Russian people and request the cooperation of the Soviet Government in providing the necessary press and radio facilities. A talk of this nature would be one of the most dramatic in world history. As an aid to peace it could be worth a dozen summit meetings. He could even ask for a monthly talk to the Russian people, and offer Khrushchev the same opportunity here.

2. The Soviet proposal for a special session of the General Assembly of the United Nations to discuss disarmament should be accepted—with the strict proviso that the deliberations at this meeting shall be fully reported by the Soviet press and radio to the Russian people, as they will be to ours.

3. The Congress could adopt a resolution expressing its sense that the United Nations should take the lead in sponsoring complete freedom in the exchange of news and information between the people of the Communist countries and the people of the United States. (This was the dream of the United States delegation, of which I was chairman, at the U. N. Conference on Freedom of Information in Geneva in 1948.)

4. Some engineering experts are now convinced that a breakthrough is possible of the Soviet radio jamming. Responsible estimates put the cost to the U. S. S. R. of jamming at $114 million annually, more than the total budget of the USIA.

One responsible expert tells me there is a possible way to end the jamming—not a certainty, but with perhaps an even chance of success—and that a research expenditure of less than $1 million might produce the new technique required. I happen to think such a technique would be a bargain to the United States at the Soviet annual cost of $114 million. Our top physicists are needed on this project at least as much as for satellites.

5. The United States should tell the Russians again and again that we shall be glad to have them operate a radio station in Washington if they will permit us to operate one in Moscow. This was a proposal I made publicly 12 or more years ago when I was serving as Assistant Secretary of State.

6. The world should be told once again that if Soviet Russia will agree to a rigid system of nuclear disarmament, the United States is prepared to spend as much as 10 billions annually to help the economic development of less favored nations. The savings on armaments alone would make this possible. This was a proposal of my colleague, Senator Brien McMahon.

7. Why shouldn't we ask the Soviets to take all of our students they are willing to accommodate at their universities? We need young people who speak Russian. I happen to think our students there, as evidenced by countless reports, would be great ambassadors for our way of life.

(There's of course no real hope of the Soviets agreeing to exchange two or three hundred thousand students, though the offer seems worth making. But why should we not encourage a quarter million American students to study abroad? The tidal wave of American youngsters due to hit our colleges will raise the number of qualified applicants from the present 3 million to 6 million by 1970. College administrators see little or no hope of doubling their facilities. Tuition and living costs at foreign universities, even the most famous, average substantially less than private United States colleges and universities. Would it not contribute greatly to international understanding if 250,000 young Americans were enrolled abroad every year? This seems to me a good idea, and it's a cheap idea because it won't cost our economy any more than if we keep these students at home. Such a positive proposal would, I believe, arouse world-wide interest, particularly if coupled with a more aggressive program to bring foreign students to this country.)

8. We should at once begin the construction of vastly expanded and more powerful radio transmitters, beamed behind the Iron Curtain; and indeed we would press with more vigor every idea that holds any reasonable promise of eroding the curtain.

9. We should mobilize our science and engineering talent to devise means of obtaining compulsory access to the Soviet audience. Further, Soviet scientists want contact with ours; they don't argue about the facts of science; our scientists can become most potent ambassadors.

There is no belligerency in proposals such as these. Indeed, they reflect the desire of the American people for lasting peace.

A talk by the President to the Russian people will capture the imagination of men everywhere if only because all mankind has a stake in the outcome of the present armaments race. Our Chief Executive could assure the frightened masses of the U. S. S. R. that our democratic and spiritual background is a firm guaranty that nuclear weapons will never be used for an assault upon the Soviet Union. He can give renewed assurance that the United States and its allies are ready now, as they have been for a decade, to enter a fair and effective pact for the banishment of nuclear weapons.

Indeed, the summit meeting, which the Kremlin is promoting and which seems increasingly imminent, could provide the perfect opening for a talk by the President to the Russian people.

Next, the moral prestige of the Congress in world affairs is great and we have neglected this potential weapon. In suggesting that the United States should assume the lead in boring a hole in the Iron Curtain, the Congress will be following the precedent it established 7 years ago when it passed the McMahon-Ribicoff resolution expressing the sincere desire of the American people for lasting friendship with the people of Russia. This resolution was sponsored by two of the mose eminent Representatives of my State who have served in the Congress. President Truman sent it to the

Soviet Government with the request that it be made known in full to the Russian people. Stalin not only gave it complete coverage by press and radio but he even said that he was willing to approve a limited exchange of news articles between Soviet and American journals. Unfortunately this chink in the Iron Curtain was never followed up. This may have been one of our mistakes.

There are members of this committee who sponsored this friendship resolution who will be interested to know that a prominent official of our overseas information program assured me not long ago that it was one of the best good-will gestures this country ever made.

Thus I believe that an occasional congressional resolution can do an immense amount of good and beyond this can uphold the President in his dealings with the U. S. S. R. For example, if Congress should suggest that both President Eisenhower and Mr. Khrushchev appear before the United Nations to state their views on disarmament, with full publicity in all countries, this might help us get through to the Russian people.

A KEY SOVIET GROUP: THE MIDDLE LEADERSHIP

In our efforts to penetrate the Iron Curtain, we must remember that it is necessary particularly to reach the middle leadership in the Soviet world, its new and rapidly growing class of well-schooled engineers, professional men and administrators. I reported 2 years ago on this expanding group to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy. I think it is wise for us, in formulating policy, to share Mr. Allen Dulles' cautious hope that it is impossible to educate men and women to think about mathematics, physics and biology—without opening their minds to the possibility of thinking about politics and disarmament and even about justice and freedom.

The top Soviet leadership, which we identify with the Kremlin, can only agree to effective measures of arms reduction and control if the middle leadership is in favor of it. The top leadership must count upon support from the middle leadership; otherwise it will be knifed in the back by rival factions which may interpret any attempt to make a genuine agreement as a betrayal of Soviet interests.

This middle leadership is a tacit constituency that does in fact provide administrative and moral support for the top layers of the Soviet system. Its members tend to favor measures to increase the standard of living of wider and wider circles in the Soviet world. The middle leadership tends to favor measures of decentralization, and a far higher level of reward for skill. It includes the scientists and engineers, and many from the creative arts; the administrators of education, agriculture, transportation, mining, manufacturing, public health planning, construction and finance; and a segment at least of the officers' corps.

Unless the middle leadership has a steady stream of accurate information about the nature and intentions of Americans, it is left entirely to rumor and to official channels of Soviet propaganda. Its members are now cut off from access to information about us that is in fact vital to their own security. A prime objective of American policy should be to achieve direct contact with this powerful group. If wars begin in the minds of men, as stated in the UNESCO charter which I helped to frame, then hydrogen wars can only begin in hermetically sealed minds. As the London Economist states, "Truth is no longer the first casualty of war; it must be assassinated before war can be made."

However, we shall go wrong in our propaganda policy if we neglect the man at the bottom. We must pursue him too, and with every available means. I like the remark of Voltaire. "History is written by the satin slippers going downstairs as the wooden shoes go up."

THE UNITED STATES–U. S. S. R. CULTURAL PACT

Your committee asked me to state my views on cultural pacts. The present pact with Russia seems to me to be good, even though it is in one sense a disappointment. It is good in arranging for a small-scale exchange of professors and students. It is a disappointment because under its terms the Kremlin retains a complete veto power over the exchange of ideas and political talks. In that sense, the Iron Curtain remains intact.

There is a fundamental difference between what Moscow wants and knows it wants—and what we should want and don't know we want—to accomplish by such pacts. The Kremlin wants technical information to improve its economy. We should be driving for a free flow of ideas as one great way to avoid war. We not only want the Soviet peoples to know more about us; we want to know more about them. It seems to me that we should demand that in exchange for our technical information we be granted access to the U. S. S. R. We should seek free play within the U. S. S. R. for American journalists, broadcasters, sociologists, cameramen, political scientists, motion-picture operators, labor leaders, and opinion makers generally. We want their admittance into Russia and free movement throughout Russia for a frank review of the contrasting values of communism and democracy and a constant check on Soviet life and progress. This is what the Soviet Union has to give us in a program of exchanges. This is what we want and what they haven't yet given. In return we are glad to welcome their engineers, technicians, and specialists.

The pact states that the proposal to exchange delegations of deputies of the Supreme Soviet and Congress shall be subject to further discussion. I hope this exchange comes off. There are some plain-spoken members of this committee I should delight to see addressing the Supreme Soviet of Russia and doing so without those inhibitions which naturally circumscribe the work of our diplomatic corps. In fact, an exchange of delegations by Congress and the Supreme Soviet could be the most fruitful exchange of all.

As part of our own efforts within the United States, the signing of this recent pact with the Soviet Union presents another reason why we should seek to untangle our own Redtape Curtain, the cumbersome maze of visa, immigration, and postal provisions that lead many peoples, including the Russians, to accuse us of erecting our own impenetrable barriers.

CONCLUDING SUM-UP

Summed up, the essence of my testimony is this—let's start talking peace and then back up our words with genuine proposals big enough to meet the menace of rocket warfare. For too long the Russians have called the rules for international debate. It's time for us to establish a few rules of our own. Lieutenant General Gavin has used that powerful phrase "missile blackmail" to describe the present course of the Soviet Government.

Khrushchev's success in stealing the mantle of peace is perhaps without precedent. The United States has the moral weapons to cut Khrushchev's ideas down to manageable proportions. Until that happens, the only alternative seems to be an endless armaments race or something infinitely worse.

FOOTNOTE ON THE USIA

I am not here to discuss the USIA. The head of USIA is at this moment opening the defense of his budget before the House Appropriations Subcommittee. I will only say that the USIA budget request for fiscal 1959—$105 million for operations and $5 million for construction of radio facilities—is far too small—if we assume that the USIA is to be adequately led and staffed. It is smaller than the USIA budget for fiscal 1957, and this at a moment when it is becoming dramatically clear that we are losing the psychological duel.

I would urge the immediate return of United States information activities to the Department of State. The USIA was removed from the Department largely on the personal desire of Secretary Dulles to be rid of it. Outside the Department, the USIA has no real voice in policymaking. It can only try to pick up the pieces afterward.

USIA belongs in the State Department for many other reasons, including the coordination of its career service with the Foreign Service, and the elimination of duplicating policy staffs and duplicating research and intelligence services. But perhaps the best argument for a reunion is the continuing necessity for improving and educating and building up the State Department, which must remain the key to our overseas operations. The Department, I am told, and especially since sputnik, has become increasingly sensitive to, and puzzled by, public opinion in foreign lands. I submit that the Department will benefit greatly by such a reunion. The USIA may suffer temporarily. But United States foreign relations will improve.

I recommend that, under the overall direction of the Secretary of State and an Under Secretary, three major divisions or departments be created within the State Department, the Department of International Political Affairs, the Department of International Economic Affairs, and the Department of International Public Affairs. These cover 3 of the 4 major areas of foreign policy—with which I began those of deals, goods, and words—leaving force to the Department of Defense. Each of the three departments should have its own Under Secretary, or perhaps even its own Secretary as in the Defense Department. Each should have its own Assistant Secretaries. Each of the three departments should have full line operating authority—and all officers should report up to their own Under Secretary or Secretary, who in turn would report to the Secretary of State.

The Honorable Henry C. Dworshak, of Idaho

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEVERETT SALTONSTALL
OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 6, 1958

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, on February 24, 1958, the Boston Herald published a very pleasant and truthful article, written by Holmes Alexander, concerning the distinguished senior Senator from Idaho [Mr. DWORSHAK]. I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Boston Herald of February 24, 1958]

DON'T BLAME CONGRESS—SENATOR DWORSHAK SHARP ON FACTS

(By Holmes Alexander)

WASHINGTON.—Senator HENRY DWORSHAK, Republican, of Idaho, is built hefty yet agile,

like a big-league catcher, and he doesn't let many wild pitches get past him.

The other day Dr. Alan T. Waterman, Director of the National Science Foundation, was throwing some high and fast ones at a Senate Subcommittee on Research Development. DWORSHAK broke in and called for pitches in the strike zone with some astute questioning.

Why had Russia surpassed the United States in certain phases of science? Why did Russia have more graduates in science? Had the American volunteer system of education choosing and job seeking failed? Had the American free-enterprise system proved itself lacking? Had Congress neglected to supply the necessary funds? In short, where did the source of the trouble lie in our educational shortage?

IN THE GROOVE

Dr. Waterman's answers were very much in the groove. Every young Russian with any talent is trained for science, a field which offers many special privileges in the Soviet Union. There is little need for compulsion. As for the American shortcomings, Dr. Waterman, with admirable candor, laid the blame where it belonged—on the American people in general; on American parents in particular. The Waterman quotes as I caught them were:

"Whatever the answer (as to who's guilty), it seems to me (to be) the lack of appreciation on the part of the people, not the Congress or the Government."

And again: "If the parents realize that (science education) is very important, they are in the best position to do something about it."

DWORSHAK fights shy of national publicity and seldom gets any. But he's a good ambassador for his State at the National Capital. He's a Senators' Senator in that he pores over his homework and rates at or near the top each year in attendance to Senate sessions. For more than a decade DWORSHAK has served on the moneyraising committees of the House and Senate. He has been saying lately that the American public is getting the wrong idea about this country's alleged lack of defense and educational facilities.

At no time, says DWORSHAK, who is speaking from the record, has Congress been niggardly on funds for defense and/or education. In the case of weapons, Congress has pushed money on both Presidents Truman and Eisenhower faster than their administration could spend it. And in the matter of education, as Dr. Waterman testified, there is no reasonable way to blame Washington for the apathy or contrariness of schoolboards back home.

REASSURING OUTLOOK

Luckily, there are many ground-level efforts to stimulate the American educational system, not just in science but in culture. Hundreds of American individuals and corporations are offering scholarships to students who show an aptitude for science. Dr. Waterman seemed to feel that our volunteer system is a natural selection, and that it would suffice in the end. He said that young scientists with a single eye for research gravitate toward the industrial or governmental laboratories. Others who feel the intellectual stimulation of exchanging ideas go into the universities—and gladly teach.

There is a danger, often mentioned by the educators, in an overconcentration on science and technocracy. The cultural subjects suffer, and among these subjects would be contemporary history—notably a knowledge of the difference between the United States of America and the U. S. S. R. Particularly, this is a crucial matter in a day when we are beginning a large-scale exchange program with the Russians. When you send a boy or girl out in the world, you should give him the facts of life. And in this mingling with the intellectual saboteurs of communism, we should be sure our rising generation is better prepared than we were.

Letter From Federation of Teens of America Clubs Relating to Shocking Case of Charles Starkweather

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROMAN L. HRUSKA
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, March 6, 1958

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, some weeks ago I made mention of the shocking case of Charles Starkweather of Lincoln, who committed some 11 brutal murders, before his apprehension and imprisonment.

Mr. President, I recently received a letter from the president of the Federation of Teens of America Clubs, which I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FEDERATION OF TEENS OF AMERICA CLUBS,
Omaha, Nebr., February 18, 1958.

Senator ROMAN HRUSKA,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR HRUSKA: I have been reading in the World-Herald that the distinguished Members of Congress have been discussing the recent, shocking case of Charles Starkweather, of Lincoln.

Starkweather and his 11 brutal murders is indeed an unfortunate case, but even more unfortunate is the fact that many adults read of things like this and the New York situation and form opinions that all teenagers fit the hoodlum category. I am sure that you and all your colleagues realize that this is not true. The typical "hood" may wear a long duck tail, wear a black-leather jacket, and wear his jeans low, but these characteristics do not always mean a "hood," and it is very unfortunate that the two are usually associated.

Rock and roll, hotrods, wild ideas, and lives, and little reponsibility do not mean juvenile delinquency; simply growing up. I realize that when you look at the teenagers of today it must be hard for you to believe that we will soon be called upon to carry the burdens of the world, but past generations have had their "flapper" girls, their Charleston, and what-have-you, and the world is still in good hands. A few years ago the present leaders were in their roaring teens.

It is high time that teen-age crime got back-page space in the news and the many great achievements and deeds of the decent—the majority—teens were headlined on the front page.

Sir, you may assure the Members of Congress that Charles Starkweather is definitely not a representative of the youth of Nebraska. He is, in fact, an awful example of youth anywhere.

There should be a national campaign to give youth the tribute it deserves, and I can think of no better place than the Halls of Congress to start it.

Thank you and I remain,
Sincerely yours,

L. JACK ALLEN,
President of the Federation of Teens of America Clubs.

Claim by Cyprus for Self-Determination

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN F. KENNEDY
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, March 6, 1958

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement recently written for the Boston Daily Record by Archbishop Markarios.

This statement defines clearly the Cypriote position regarding this matter which is one of the most serious unresolved crises within the NATO alliance.

Archbishop Markarios, the religious and national leader of the Greek people of Cyprus, develops the position which he has taken during the discussion and negotiation which so far have failed to resolve this issue. While there may be disagreements with some portions of this statement, I believe it important that this point of view be a matter of public record.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Boston Daily Record of December 12, 1957]

CYPRUS' CLAIM FOR SELF-DETERMINATION

(By Archbishop Makarios)

The discussion of the question of Cyprus is now pending in the United Nations. The claim is for the right of self-determination to be applied to the people of Cyprus. It is a claim founded upon the inalienable right of every people to attain their independence and decide their own status and political future.

The people of Cyprus once more look to the United Nations with heightened expectations. They await a decision leading to freedom and peace. For they realize that it is only in freedom that a people can work out their national life and fulfill their destiny.

The efforts of the people of Cyprus to throw off colonialism and attain their independence are of long standing. They date back to the earliest days of British occupation. Since then the Cypriote demand for freedom has been voiced repeatedly by every available means of public expression.

The official rejections of the claim were often coupled with semiofficial British explanations of the refusal and have been varying in nature and often conflicting.

In 1907 the reply of Winston Churchill, as Colonial Under Secretary, to the Greek members of the legislative council was to the effect that the convention of 1878 by which the island was taken over from the Turks, a convention then in existence, prevented Britain from satisfying the national aspiration of the people of Cyprus, which he termed as natural and patriotic.

Yet, after the elimination of that impediment in 1914, by the abrogation of the 1878 convention, the Cypriotes were nevertheless again refused their freedom.

In 1929, it was Britain's difficult position toward India, then struggling for independence, that made it impossible to accede to the Cypriote delegation's claim to self-determination. India has long since achieved its full independence but Cyprus remained static.

In 1946 the reason given for a similar refusal to a new Cypriote delegation was that Britain required Cyprus because she had a

base in Suez. Conversely in 1954 it was because Britain no longer had a base in Suez that Cyprus was said to be necessary.

On each occasion external circumstances, it was said, rendered the timing of the claim wrong. But timing is an ever elusive phantom. The time for freedom is always the present.

So with moving times, new reasons and excuses were continually found and brought to the fore. At one time it was the requirements of free world defense. When that defense was shown not to tally with colonial domination in Cyprus, the reason was shifted to the necessity of protecting British oil interests in the Middle East.

As international developments and new weapons minimized the military importance of Cyprus, emphasis was increasingly laid on Turkey's objections. It is well known that the recent Turkish attitude on the subject is British-inspired in its origin, and has been conveniently adopted and magnified by the Turkish government. But Turkey can have neither a legal nor a moral right to dictate on the future of Cyprus and stand in the way of Cypriote freedom.

The attempt to draw argument from her past occupation of Cyprus, during the period when Turkey ruled by force over the whole eastern Mediterranean, seems ludicrous. She might equally put in a claim over all the free states of the Balkan Peninsula and the Middle East.

At a time when people are no longer bartered as chattel, and an actual ruler's possession cannot be evoked against the people's right to freedom, how could anyone speak of the rights of past foreign rulers?

The argument of proximity to the Turkish coast is no less farfetched. Numerous are the cases of closer proximity, as for instance the channel islands to France, Ceylon to India, and others, but it has never been claimed or suggested that any such territories should be deprived of their freedom because of the wishes of neighboring foreign states.

Syria and Lebanon, who are equally near Cyprus, or even Egypt might upon the same strange logic also claim a similar right.

As to the other argument that because of the presence of a 17.5 percent Turkish minority in Cyprus, the will of the large majority should be frustrated and overridden by that of the minority, is as undemocratic as it is unreasonable.

Adequate protection of minority rights is to be found in international safeguards, in accordance with all similar precedents.

We are ready and willing to guarantee such safeguards to the Turkish minority with whom the Cypriot Greeks have in the past lived together in amity, and look forward to doing so in the future to the common benefit, and in the broader interest of Greco-Turkish understanding.

The main obstacle to the solution of the Cyprus problem is still the reluctance of the British government to adjust itself to present day realities and abandon unfruitful concepts of outmoded colonialism. Diplomacy aimed at the rule of one people over another is barren and should be replaced by one aiming at cooperation in equality and freedom.

The will of the people cannot be denied forever; nor can world public opinion be ignored. As Woodrow Wilson said, "Self-determination is a dynamic principle that statesmen can only ignore at their peril."

In the debate on Cyprus in the United Nations we expect to have the support of America and all nations dedicated to freedom.

It has been said that the United States finds it difficult to take a definite stand on what is termed a difference between friends, and prefers to stay neutral. We could well understand the difficulty, if the matter were one not involving basic principle.

There can be no neutrality as between right and wrong. Particularly should there be no American neutrality in a case of justice and freedom. An indifferent attitude would seem to run counter to the very spirit of the great American Nation and its responsibilities in the moral leadership of the world.

Last year during the Suez crisis the United States took a clear stand in support of right and principle, even against a close ally and in favor of one who was not. That was a policy of imagination and wisdom.

How much more would that policy be fitting on an issue of freedom where both sides are equally friends and allies. Sacrificing principle to supposed expediency defeats its own purpose.

There cannot be two standards. Freedom is one and indivisible; and history has proved that expediency in the long run can only be served by doing what is right. Indeed, wisdom cannot be divorced from morality and continue to be wise.

The early termination of the present unnecessary strife and tension over Cyprus by a just solution of the problem based on self-determination is a compelling necessity not only in the interests of Cyprus but also in those of peace, security and freedom in the whole Middle East area.

The people of Cyprus will in any case continue their efforts until justice prevails and freedom makes its home in the island.

Visit to the Senate by Students of University High School, Baton Rouge, La.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RUSSELL B. LONG
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, March 6, 1958

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the names of the 39 students and 4 chaperones from University High School of Baton Rouge, La., who are visiting the Capitol today.

The full name of the school these young men and women represent is the University High Laboratory School of the College of Education of Louisiana State University. In 1933, I had the honor of being president of the freshman class of that school and today my two daughters are both students of that school.

The total enrollment of University High is only 250, and this figure is augmented by a little less than 200 in the grammar school grades. Although small in size, the school is constantly making a name for itself, both scholastically and in the field of athletic competition. At the present time, 6 members of the senior class are finalists in the national merit scholarship award, which select group represents one-half of 1 percent of the top scholars in the Nation. Last year 1 University High senior earned a scholarship from this competition and the previous year 2 students were successful.

This high school has for its specific educational mission the training of future teachers and the conducting of demonstration classes where supervisors teach new and improved methods. Throughout the years of its existence, the school has done an outstanding job in performing these missions and it gives me a great deal of pleasure to welcome the senior class on its third annual trip to Washington, D. C.

There being no objection; the list was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Chaperones: Mrs. Julius Mullins, Miss Nina Jean Carruth, Mr. Oran Teague, Mr. Coburn Hood.

Students: Nell Jacks, Ann Holloway, Peggy Owen, Ann Warriner, Flo Wallace, Jeanie Mullins, Madelon Manner, Adele Sherrill, Helen Reddy, Bert Durrett, Carolyn Asbury, Jo Ann Huenefeld, Suzanne Sabin, Carol Loree, Sarah Hood, Nita Clare Roberts, Mary Ann Johnson, Bill Alford, Mac Vick, Joel Safer, David Smith, Pat Rickey, Byron Kantrow, Charlie Malone, Bob Terry, Charlie Kennon, John Kean, Creighton Miller, Jim Field, Jarrie Long, Beck Payne, Arthur Haas, Lyttleton Harris, Floyd Cox, Ernest Hanchey, Foster Semple, Jorn Dakin, John Wilson, Ward Bond.

A New World Bank

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MIKE MANSFIELD
OF MONTANA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, March 6, 1958

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Another World Bank?" The editorial has to do with the statesmanlike proposal of the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY] for the establishment, on a multilateral basis, of a long-term, low-interest-rate banking agency. The editorial was published on March 3 in the Christian Science Monitor.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ANOTHER WORLD BANK?

Senator A. S. "MIKE" MONRONEY, of Oklahoma, has come forward with a proposal for a new world bank. It would aid underdeveloped nations that have not been able to qualify for loans from the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development. Eugene R. Black, president of the International Bank, says it is willing to explore this idea for a second organization.

It would be linked to the World Bank, and its purpose would be to make loans in mixed currencies (dollars and other national currencies). The loans would be repayable in the currencies of the borrowers instead of dollars or other hard currencies (i. e., currencies readily exchangeable for gold or dollars).

Loans would be, moreover, under control of an international, multilateral group. Presumably they would be free from what some people have regarded as a sort of dollar veto, which arises from the World Bank's rule that loans can be made only when there is prospect of repayment in hard currency.

There are many resources on which such a bank could call for capital. For example, there are the foreign currencies the United

States is now accepting for surplus commodities sold abroad; these funds may grow embarrassingly large unless new uses can be found for them. There are also unexpended counterpart funds of European currencies in European banks as a result of Marshall plan rules.

And this money could be profitably lent at lower interest rates than the World Bank is required to charge. At 2 percent the new loans might give Moscow some real competition on the economic cold-war front. Senator MONRONEY says Russia is now offering better terms than the United States to underdeveloped countries.

As Mr. Black of the World Bank has said, the plan certainly deserves exploration. At this writing there seems good reason to believe that Senator MONRONEY is offering a timely, creative, and economical idea for action in a direction others also have urged.

Hoover Book To Expose Communism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HERMAN E. TALMADGE
OF GEORGIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, March 6, 1958

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, on next Monday Henry Holt & Co., of New York City, will release a book which is destined to be acclaimed as one of the finest and most authoritative works ever written on the dangers of communism.

It is Masters of Deceit by Hon. J. Edgar Hoover, the distinguished and respected Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation.

Masters of Deceit is the first book of its kind to reveal the complete story of communism in America and to expose the menace to this country and the American way of life posed by international communism.

No American is better qualified to write such a book than is Mr. Hoover and it should be required reading for every American who is proud of his heritage and concerned about its preservation.

I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the review of Mr. Hoover's book as contained in volume VII, No. 5, of the Firing Line, official publication of the National Americanism Commission of the American Legion.

There being no objection, the book review was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FIRING LINE,
Indianapolis, Ind., March 1, 1958.

FULL DISCLOSURES OF THE COMMUNIST THREAT IN AMERICA

In our life-and-death struggle against the worldwide Communist revolutionary movement, every American must be constantly alert to the dangers of this increasing menace. To fully enable us to expose, isolate, and destroy the Communist enemy, it is imperative that we first have an accurate and complete understanding of this Soviet-directed conspiracy which is unceasingly active in our country. Every citizen should read and study FBI Director J. Edgar Hoover's new book entitled "Masters of Deceit," an exhaustive report on the Communist Party in the United States. Published by Henry Holt & Co., of New York City, Masters of Deceit will be available at your local bookstores on March 10, 1958, for $5 a copy.

Appropriately titled, "Masters of Deceit" scholarly describes the origination of communism in the Soviet Union and its subsequent development in the United States. The book takes the reader behind the scenes of life in the Communist Party and fully exposes its many conspiratorial activities on a day-to-day basis. Masters of Deceit thoroughly discusses and reveals many important facets of this destructive international movement, including such subjects as: Who Are the Communists? How the Party Is Organized, Why Do People Become Communists? Why People Break With Communism, Communist Discipline, Infiltration, The Communist Front, Communism and Minorities, How the Underground Works, and Espionage and Sabotage.

Masters of Deceit is completely documented by actual case histories which not only clarify the various subjects but maintain a continuous pattern of absorbing reading. The book contains many excellent features, including a valuable index, appendixes, and bibliography of major Communist classics. In fighting this powerful subversive force, the author has recognized the importance of providing a glossary of over 40 terms frequently used by the Communists. Among the Communist jargon listed in his glossary, Mr. Hoover has comprehensively defined the following: bourgeoisie, capitalism, chauvinism, class struggle, communism, democracy, democratic centralism, dialectical materialism, historic mission, Marxism-Leninism, party line, proletariat, self-criticism, socialism, united front, and war.

In addition to being the first book of its kind which authoritatively reveals the complete story of communism in America, Masters of Deceit carries a forceful message of how the menace can be fought. Mr. Hoover's purpose has been to assemble, organize, and present basic, everyday facts of communism which will be of maximum help to the people of our country in recognizing and fighting the enemy in our midst. The author, who is more intimately familiar with the Communist problem than any other American, has warned that our danger may lie in not recognizing the Communist threat until it is too late.

Facing the Communist challenge, Mr. Hoover declared, "Never has there been a time when we have so much need for one another. * * * If our Government is to remain free, it needs the help of every patriotic man, woman, and child."

St. John's University, Collegeville, Minn.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, March 6, 1958

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, the Minneapolis Star for February 21, 1958, contains an excellent feature article on St. John's University, Collegeville, Minn., and its distinguished priest, scholar, editor, and coach, the Rev. Dunstan Tucker, O. S. B.

We in Minnesota are proud of St. John's University, and we are proud of the gifted and talented Father Dunstan Tucker who symbolizes so much of the best in our private and public life.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of this article be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ST. JOHN'S PROUD OF FATHER DUNSTAN
(By Herm Sittard)

The coach didn't call for hard base running when the oldtimers played the varsity last spring on St. John's University baseball diamond.

The oldtimers—most of them in their early thirties—weren't in condition; so their coach, Father Dunstan Tucker, O. S. B., decided against calling plays that would demand undue exertion.

If you'd seen him at that game—or any game—you'd pick out Father Dunstan as a coach. Though his hair has greyed, he has a healthy young man's complexion.

His rugged features reflect a serenity you don't ordinarily associate with coaches. He's softspoken; gestures frequently, cigarette in hand while he talks.

"The pitcher," recalls Father Dunstan, "wasn't able to go the full nine innings; so, as soon as his arm tired, we'd put in a sub. The oldtimers had slowed down since their student days," he chuckled, "but they were crafty, and they could still hit well."

Despite some hilarious errors, the oldtimers taught the varsity a trick or two—trounced the students 12 to 6.

During the game the old-timers didn't argue much with the umpire. As St. John's baseball coach for 20 years prior to 1951, Father Dunstan taught his players not to use the umpire's decision as an alibi for their mistakes. He had learned this lesson from his father, Oliver Tucker. Oliver was a good amateur baseball player; but Father Dunstan can recall only one instance—he was 17 at the time—when his father coached him.

He had watched a game in which I was called out on strikes with the bases loaded. Like most ballplayers, I had growled at the umpire.

That evening at dinner he turned to me and remarked very coldy, "Young man, with the bases loaded, any pitch good enough to be called a strike is good enough to hit."

The atmosphere suddenly became tense. For once I did not argue. But I understood what he meant. I think that was my last hitting alibi.

Later, as a coach, I used the same words with my teams—and with equal effectiveness.

Before he entered the Order of St. Benedict, Father Dunstan played center field 2 years on St. John's team in Collegeville. At that time, a scout from the Minneapolis baseball club asked if he would like to play professionally.

"I told him I was flattered," said Father Dunstan, "but that I was going to study for the priesthood."

When a man enters the Order of St. Benedict, the abbot gives him a new name as a member of the religious community. The late Abbot Alcuin Deutsch of St. John's abbey selected the name Dunstan, for William Joseph Tucker.

Abbot Deutsch told Dunstan he had chosen the name because of his English descent and because St. Dunstan was abbot of the Benedictine abbey of Glastonbury, England, in the 10th century.

By coincidence, it was from this part of south central England that John Tucker, Father Dunstan's grandfather, had come to Minnesota.

John Tucker took a homestead at Hassan, Minn., (near Fergus Falls) when he met and Oliver Tucker, was born at Hassan. Oliver was operator of a grain elevator at Tintah, Minn., an English settlement near Osseo. married Alice Flynn.

Oliver Tucker retired in 1946 after 56 years Tintah.

"I knew grain from the time I was a little boy," recalls Father Dunstan. "I used to get a job in the grain elevator in the summer, helping my father. I helped load grain into railroad boxcars.

"You had to put paper on the floors and walls of the boxcars first to prevent grain leakage. I stood near the spout of the chute that brought the grain from the elevator bins down to the car. If the grain backed up to the spout, I'd shovel the grain out of the way."

After Dunstan got his bachelor's degree at St. John's in 1925, Abbot Deutsch sent him to the Benedictine International College in Rome to study theology.

At Aix les Bains, a Benedictine monastery in southern France, Dunstan brushed up on French during his first summer vacation in Europe. The following summer, he stayed at the order's monastery at Beuron in southern Germany, and polished his German.

After talking Italian a few months, he became interested in Dante's Divine Comedy. Later he made an original contribution to Dante scholarship by analyzing the influence of the Catholic liturgy on Dante—as revealed in passages of his famous poem.

Later he became interested in Spanish—wanted to read Don Quixote in the original. (He's been teaching Spanish classes since 1953.)

Before returning from Europe in 1927, Father Dunstan visited Downside Abbey in England, near the site of the monastery where St. Dunstan had been abbot. He returned to St. John's, completed the required 4 years of theological studies and was ordained to the priesthood in 1929.

Postgraduate work in literature and languages at the University of Chicago, Fordham University, the University of Minnesota (master of arts in English), and the University of Mexico gave him background for his position as chairman of St. John's modern language department.

He's been teaching English since 1931, taught French literature a few years, headed the English department for 20 years prior to 1952.

But he isn't the only teacher in the Tucker family. One of his sisters became a Benedictine nun, taking her mother's name in religion. Sister Alicene, O. S. B., teaches history and Latin at Regis High School, Eau Claire, Wis. Mrs. John Zimmermann teaches in Owatonna. Still another sister, Mrs. George Zimmermann lives at 4584 16th Avenue South.

To reach Collegeville and the campus where Father Dunstan teaches, you make a left turn off U. S. Highway No. 52 about 80 miles northwest of Minneapolis, and swing south a mile through a heavy stand of timber. You are cruising down a corridor of towering Norway spruce trees when your car suddenly noses over a rise in the blacktop.

Ahead of you—hugging the ground as though it had grown there—is the new St. John's monastery building.

Marcel Breuer, famed Hungarian architect, designed the rugged three-story structure. Concrete slabs divide its walls into giant shadow boxes faced with chunks of rough granite and sheets of glass.

Breuer's design expresses the centuries-old monastic tradition. The monastery's strong, clean lines are in the best contemporary vein; yet honest use of granite outside and natural wood finishes inside retain the atmosphere of a monastic rule with roots in the past and interest in the future.

Just past the new monastery stands the historic old (1879) red brick abbey chapel. Its tall twin towers house massive clocks and heavy steeple bells that count the hours as the monks pursue the worship and work St. Benedict prescribed for his companions more than 14 centuries ago.

The monks of St. John's are not exactly newscomers to the Minnesota scene. In its one hundred and first year, St. John's is the oldest Catholic institution of higher learning in the upper Midwest.

A century sounds like a long time—and it is, but the Benedictines have been dedicating their lives to work and worship ("Laborare et orare") for 1,429 years thus far.

During 36 years in the order, Father Dunstan became acquainted with many students. "Before the Second World War you knew everybody," he reminisced, "but there are too many students now to recognize them all."

Congressman EUGENE MCCARTHY, of St. Paul, was one of Father Dunstan's students. "I'm very proud of him," he commented. "He was an A student, completed 4 years' work in 3 years, and received his bachelor's degree in English summa cum laude.

MCCARTHY taught English at St. John's from 1941 to 1942, and was assistant baseball coach with Father Dunstan in 1942.

From 1940 to 1943, Father Dunstan edited the Catholic Art Quarterly, a magazine promoting the Catholic philosophy of art. A year later he became a Navy chaplain, served aboard the aircraft carrier, *Point Cruz*. He returned to the university in 1947.

Right now, he is working on the further development of the St. John's humanities program. (He is chairman of the curriculum improvement committee.)

"Like most professors," says Father Dunstan, "I have little tolerance for the idea of a young man going to school only to play at a sport. It's the most expensive way of having a good time I know. I was always proud of my ballplayers—particularly when they became good professional men.

"Four of my former players are now successful doctors, a few are dentists, some are bankers, businessmen, priests, and teachers. Only 2 of the 20 or so who entered professional baseball are still in the game—Vedie Himsl with the Chicago Cubs, and Vincent Plumbo, a manager for the Kansas City chain.

"Ernest Sowada, who pitched for Minneapolis just before the war, is now a doctor in St. Paul. Austin McCarthy (Representative MCCARTHY's brother), now a doctor at Willmar, had an offer to join the Detroit Tigers. I begged the scout not to speak to him about it before he graduated, for fear that a fine potential medical man might be lured away prematurely from his profession.

"We all played for the fun of it—very much as I coached them—and I think we had great times together."

Death of John Hearding, Pioneer Iron Executive

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD J. THYE

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 6, 1958

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, there appeared in the Duluth News-Tribune of Sunday, March 2, 1958, an article referring to the death of John Hearding, a pioneer for iron ore activities.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JOHN HEARDING, PIONEER IRON EXECUTIVE, DIES

John Harris Hearding, Sr., pioneer iron ore mining executive and 15th member of the Duluth Hall of Fame, died Friday night at his home at the age of 93.

Mr. Hearding lived at 2305 East Third Street, the same home he and Mrs. Hearding established in 1909.

His rise as a mining man reflected the growth of United States Steel's Oliver Iron Mining division. In 1932, he retired as OIM's assistant general manager.

His influence and leadership was felt in Duluth and on the Iron Range for many years because of efforts on behalf of civic enterprises.

Mr. Hearding's career in volunteer public service started in 1888 when he joined the Ironwood, Mich., volunteer fire department.

In 1939, his work was recognized by the American Legion when he was named Duluth's "First Citizen for 1938" at the annual Hall of Fame dinner.

He was honored for his 30 years of activity in the then St. Louis county poor commission, his work in organizing the North Star council, Boy Scouts of America, Duluth Lighthouse for the Blind and service in the Duluth YMCA.

As a mining man, Mr. Hearding was widely known throughout the United States and held membership in many mining groups.

Born February 3, 1865, in Houghton, Mich., Mr. Hearding was the son of William H. Hearding and Jane Sanger Hearding. His father was a Government engineer who made the first survey of the Duluth harbor in 1861.

The family moved to Milwaukee in 1867 where Mr. Hearding attended elementary and high schools. After graduation from high school, he worked as a machinist apprentice until obtaining an appointment to the United States Military Academy at West Point at the age of 20 in 1885. He was a classmate of the late Gen. John J. Pershing, who later commanded troops during World War I.

He left the academy after 1 year's study and returned to Milwaukee where he was employed by a railroad. He moved to Ironwood in 1887 for his first job in the mining industry. He was hired as a timekeeper at the Norrie mine and rose through the ranks to become chief clerk and master mechanic when he left in 1894.

In November of that year, he entered northeastern Minnesota mining activity which was to occupy him for the rest of his professional career.

He went to Eveleth as superintendent of the Adams mine, a Lake Superior Consolidated Iron Mining Co. operation which was later taken over by the Oliver division. At that time, a forest covered the wealth of the mine, which still is operating today.

Under his direction, stripping operations were begun at the mine, heralding open pit work in the Eveleth district. For more than a month, the new superintendent hitch hiked about 5 miles a day to and from his work. He moved from Virginia to Eveleth on Dec. 12 when a shack was made available for his use.

At Eveleth, Mr. Hearding evidenced his love for civic activities. He was the first president of the St. Louis County club and first master of the Eveleth Masonic lodge, which was formed in 1901.

If there was a fire in Eveleth, Mr. Hearding was at the scene, usually handling a hose nozzle as an unofficial member of the fire department. During the 1908 Chisholm fire, he headed a committee to obtain supplies for the stricken citizens.

In 1901, his duties were expanded to include supervision of both the Adams and Spruce mines. He became general superintendent of the Eveleth district for OIM

and served in that capacity from 1904 to 1909.

He became a member of the Eveleth school board and was instrumental in the construction of the Spruce and Fayal elementary schools. He was transferred to Duluth as assistant general manager in 1909.

Mr. Hearding also was supervisor of Missable Mountain township from 1895 to 1901, and a director of school districts Nos. 22 and 39 in Eveleth. Aurora's Hearding High School, dedicated in 1911, was named after him.

Mr. Hearding was president of the Businessmen's Association, Eveleth's first commercial club organized in 1903. As a member of the county poor commission from 1903 to 1933, he was instrumental in the formation of a Duluth hospital that bore his name for many years.

Each year he headed Christmas seal campaigns. A former president of the North Star Council, Mr. Hearding served on the executive board for 21 years.

After helping to found the Lighthouse for the Blind, he served as president from 1925 to 1938. He also was a director of the Duluth YMCA from 1909 to 1916.

As a member of the Duluth Chamber of Commerce, he attended meetings of the chamber of commerce agriculture and health committee until 1952.

In fraternal life, he was a member of the Eveleth Masonic lodge. He was active in the Royal Arch Masons, Knights Templar, and Aad Temple of the Shrine, and was a 33d degree member of the Scottish Rite bodies. On November 19, 1945, he was made inspector general honorary at a Minneapolis ceremony.

In recognition of his long service to OIM, firm executives presented him with a 45-year medal on July 18, 1932.

Other notable service and memberships included the Elks lodge, county Republican committee, and presidential elector for Theodore Roosevelt in 1904; Northland Country Club, and the Duluth Kiwanis Club. He was a member of the Lake Superior Mining Institute from 1893 to 1930, and St. Louis County chairman of the Citizens Military Training Corps (CMTC), Fort Snelling, for 16 years.

His particular interests included history and biographical research. He lectured and wrote extensively on the early history of mining and the development of Minnesota, Wisconsin, and Michigan mining areas. A member of the St. Louis County Historical society, his writings are on file in its library and in that of the Minnesota historical societies. He served on the executive board of the county organization.

Mr. Hearding was a member and vestryman of St. Paul's Episcopal Church in Duluth. He served many years as a trustee of the Duluth Episcopal diocese.

Surviving are his wife, the former Lucy Hartwell, who he married in 1896 in Zenia, Ohio, and a son, John H. Hearding, Jr., now general superintendent of OIM operations in the Hibbing-Chisholm district, and a daughter, Mrs. O. C. Davidson, Rochester, N. Y., and 5 grandchildren and 7 great-grandchildren. A second son, William Sanger Hearding, was killed in a railroad accident in 1928.

Funeral services will be conducted at 2 p. m. Tuesday in St. Paul's Episcopal Church, Duluth. In lieu of floral tributes, the family suggests contributions be made to the church or to the North Star Council.

The Career of Judge John A. Carver, of the Fifth Judicial District of Idaho

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK CHURCH

OF IDAHO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 6, 1958

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, the Pocatello (Idaho) Sunday Journal on March 2 carried an account of a life of service and devotion to the public which ornaments the recent history of Idaho as do few other similar accounts. The career of Judge John A. Carver, of the fifth judicial district of Idaho, is one in the highest tradition of the American bar and bench. His service as an attorney in private practice as prosecuting attorney for Franklin County, as municipal judge in Pocatello, as a United States district attorney for 20 years, and finally as a member of Idaho's judiciary, has always been marked by a high degree of dignity and probity, and by an inflexible determination to put the public's welfare ahead of his own convenience and repeated opportunities for lucrative private employment. Judge John Carver's 40 years of service to that stern yet rewarding taskmaster, the law, deserves the gratitude of every citizen of Idaho. As one such grateful Idahoan, I wish to extend my congratulations to him in these pages, and I ask unanimous consent that the article referred to above be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD following these remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JUDGE CARVER FINDS DISTRICT BENCH MOST SATISFYING

(By Ken Robison)

On the occasions that the Fifth District Court convened in Preston in the years just before World War I, one of its most faithful observers was young John A. Carver.

Forty-one years later, he returned to the same scene as judge of the court, a position he regards as the most satisfying of many in a distinguished 40-year law career.

Between those times, he passed the bar examination before going to law school, and was elected to a probate judgeship he couldn't take over because he was too young.

Judge Carver was elected to the district court here in 1954, a year after the return of a Republican administration had led to resignation from his position as United States attorney for Idaho after 20 years.

He was becoming a pretty good lawyer while in high school when he sat in on district court sessions in Preston in the years from 1913 to 1915.

He learned from the courtroom work of able lawyers like the late T. D. Jones and Gen. D. C. McDougall, both of Pocatello. On the bench was Judge Alfred Budge, father of Idaho Congressmen HAMER H. BUDGE.

Judge Carver has been blind since a childhood accident at 5, but has never let the handicap be an obstacle to achievement.

After elementary schooling at the Utah State School for the Blind in Ogden he attended high school in Preston, where his father farmed. A close friend of the family who had received his doctor of jurisprudence degree from the University of California was starting a law practice, and also teaching morning classes at the high school.

BECOMES ASSISTANT

Carver became his typist and stenographer, and a devoted student of the law. He was at the law office between class hours, on Saturdays and for long periods in the summer.

Before he finished high school, he was handling collection cases on his own. When he graduated in 1915 he started his own collection agency, still using a friend's office, and continued to study law.

He met his wife in 1917 and they were married the same year. She began reading law to him intensively, so that in 1918 he felt ready to take the Idaho Bar Association examination. He passed it.

After 3 years of practice in Preston, however, he enrolled at the University of Idaho law school, "because I had a feeling the college lawyer had something I didn't have."

He returned to Preston, where he was elected to three consecutive terms as Franklin County prosecuting attorney. In 1928 he moved his family to Pocatello and opened a law office. Shortly after he was appointed municipal judge and served for 4 years.

Judge Carver developed an early interest in politics. He ran for probate judge and was elected in 1916, then couldn't take the office because the term began 60 days before his 21st birthday.

He was defeated in a bid for prosecuting attorney in Bannock County, but his political activities led to his appointment by President Roosevelt as United States attorney in 1933.

Three years later he ran for a nonjudicial position, the United States Senate.

LOST NOMINATION

"I lost the nomination [to the late Idaho Governor C. Ben Ross]," he recalls. And he also lost the election to the late William E. Borah—"as I would have lost it if I had won the nomination."

Judge Carver is interested, but not active in politics, in his present position.

When he was sworn in as United States attorney, he was immediately confronted with a flood of claims against the Government by World War I veterans. They were claiming money under insurance policies to compensate for total and permanent disability resulting from war injuries.

Judgments were being given the veterans at about the same rate cases were filed, although it was obvious to many that men who had been working for 10 years were not totally disabled. Judge Carver's office brought a reversal to the pattern as the Government started winning cases.

The New Deal brought another interesting series—the hot oil cases arising under the National Recovery Act.

During World War II the office was involved in evacuation of Americans of Japanese descent from the West Coast. Tom C. Clark, later a Supreme Court justice, was sent by the Department of Justice to work out of the Boise office on one phase of the evacuation. Judge Carver visited communities in the State where feeling was strong against the Japanese in an effort to bring calm.

His office handled legal work in the procurement of military installations, including the Naval Ordnance Plant here, a major part of the Atomic Energy Commission site near Arco and the Mountain Home Air Base.

INTERRUPTED FBI CHIEF

Judge Carver was elected vice president and presided over one session of the United States Attorney's Association in Washington, and recalls having to interrupt FBI director J. Edgar Hoover who was running overtime in a speech. He resigned as United State Attorney after the Republican victory in 1952.

"We were glad to return to Pocatello in 1953," he said. It had always felt like home. He opened a law office, and served 15 months as justice of the peace before winning election to the district court bench in 1954.

Of his long legal career, he regards his work on the district bench as "the most interesting, the most challenging, and from my standpoint, the most satisfying."

His 20 years of work with Federal courts helped shape his approach to the district court here.

Discipline and decorum in the courtroom and speed and dispatch in handling cases are stressed.

When he first went on the bench, veteran lawyers here at first offered some objection to the rigidity in way the judge conducted the court, but that has passed.

The pretrial conference, an important device under Federal procedural rules, is a powerful tool in the hands of Judge Carver. Because of it, many cases never get into the courtroom, and if they do, the trial is faster and the issues clearer.

It is an informal meeting of the attorneys with the judge in his office.

"I sit down with them informally and we examine the pleadings, narrow and spotlight issues, and get the parties to concede certain factual points," he explains.

LEAD TO SETTLEMENT

Often the conference leads to an out of court settlement.

"Many attorneys feel if they try to negotiate a settlement, it is a sign of weakness in their case. But in the conference the court will look at the pleadings and suggest a settlement."

"I ask the plaintiff's attorney if there has been any attempt to negotiate. Or the defendant's attorney if he has any kind of an offer. In a few minutes I've got them talking and the ice is broken.

"I've sent lawyers out time and time again, saying 'You fellows go over and get a coke and settle this lawsuit,' and they have."

That not only saves the parties time and money, but saves the taxpayers the cost of paying a jury to hear a courtroom fight.

In his office, Judge Carver is helped by his wife, who is a capable secretary. She works without pay from the State. The Judge also has high regard for his reporter Ray D. Bistline, who has served the court for more than 40 years, and for his clerk, Mrs. Antoinette Webster.

All the Carvers' seven children had left home before they moved here from Boise. There are four sons, John Jr., who is administrative assistant to Idaho Senator FRANK CHURCH; Monroe D., with the United States Bureau of Mines in Albana, Oreg.; Dr. Terrell O., administrator of the State Health Department, and Murray A., with a Boise insurance company.

Three daughters are all married, Anna, in Citrus Heights, Calif.; Helen, in Boise, and LaVerne, in Bozeman, Mont.

As to the future, Judge Carver plans to stay on the district court bench. He will mark the 40th anniversary of his admission to the bar by running for reelection this fall.

What the Schools Can Do for Themselves

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM E. PROXMIRE

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 6, 1958

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, when I announced my cosponsorship of the School Assistance Act of 1957, introduced by the distinguished senior Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], I pointed out that one of the elements of the crisis in American education is the need for good teachers to staff our classrooms. The provision for Federal grants to the States, as contained in that bill, will go far to meet the need.

Nevertheless, Mr. President, if 3 out of every 5 college graduates prepared for high-school teaching do not enter teaching, and if many who do, later on leave teaching, no amount of Federal money is likely to be enough to solve the problem. Yet, this is precisely the present situation.

One of the things that keeps qualified teachers out of the classrooms is the discouraging burden of nonteaching duties they are called upon to carry, according to Miss Malvina Lindsay, as her views on this subject are set forth in her regular column in this morning's edition of the Washington Post and Times Herald. In other words, they quit teaching because they have been given so little chance to teach.

Miss Lindsay's article suggests that the teaching force could be increased simply by assigning clerical and other nonteaching chores to those who are not teachers, thus leaving the professional teacher more time to do what only he or she can do. This seems to me to make good sense. Our hospitals have discovered that it does not take the same training to know how to carry a tray into a sickroom that it does to know how to help a doctor in surgery. They have found that a division of labor and responsibilities among their staffs allows them to make the maximum use of their trained nurses. Our schools might well ask themselves whether they are making best use of the human resources they now have.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD Miss Lindsay's article entitled "Teachers Need Chance To Teach."

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TEACHERS NEED CHANCE TO TEACH

(By Malvina Lindsay)

No oracle or quiz program has yet come up with the answer as to where the needed teachers of the future are coming from. Even money won't buy enough, though it will increase the supply of competent ones. But other bait will be needed to entice new teachers into the classroom, to keep experienced ones there.

The competition of other occupations is drawing away many teachers, especially those able to teach science and mathematics. It is a shortage of science teachers rather than of scientists that is the main educational problem, Dr. Robert J. Havighurst of the University of Chicago told the American Association of School Administrators last week.

A recent study by the National Education Association shows that only three of every five college graduates prepared for high-school teaching do so. In the last decade high-school enrollments have increased 39 percent, high-school teachers 33.4 percent.

But able teachers already in service leave the classroom and that is the greatest loss of all. Many could be held by better salaries. But many also leave because of teaching conditions.

Much discontent with teaching used to arise because of its social restrictions. If a woman teacher married she generally lost her job. The Mrs. Grundys of communities strictly supervised the personal lives of teachers.

But now the village and its social mores have largely lost their hold on American life. The new discontent with the classroom grows out of trends in today's culture—the emphasis on bigness and mass production, on unceasing activity, organization, paperwork.

All this means that modern teachers have too little chance to do what they are primarily interested in doing—teach. They must be traffic directors, policemen, organizers, coaches, masters of ceremony, impressarios and, above all, clerks, and bookkeepers.

The amount of recordkeeping and other paperwork that teachers must handle is overwhelming. In an article, Why the Able Public School Teacher Is Dissatisfied, in a recent Educational Research Bulletin of the College of Education of Ohio State University, Dr. Robert E. Jewett of the university presents a partial list of the actual load of clerical tasks during one school year of a city high-school teacher.

It included 29 clerical tasks, many being daily activities. Reports, often in duplicate or triplicate, had to be made out on attendance, grades, number of recitations, excuses, passes, lunch permits, schedules, pupils' backgrounds, personalities, character traits, geographical distribution, parents' names, occupations, addresses, telephone numbers.

This teacher had to provide reports on pupils for local community organizations, check tuition fees, keep track of lost books, collect money for needy families, for senior dues, and miscellaneous social functions, count and sort sales stamps.

Dr. Jewett, who made an investigation of why capable teachers were leaving teaching, reports that in "school after school, when I have asked teachers to enumerate the working conditions that stand in the way of teaching, they listed clerical work as the chief obstacle."

He points out that while most of this work is related to the efficient operation of the school, it should be assigned to nonteaching personnel and the teacher be freed to teach. This, it would seem, would be one way of stretching the limited teacher supply of the future.

Repeatedly Dr. Jewett found that teachers with the scholarship, insights and skill necessary to promote learning were being drained of energy and ardor through extra duties. Most had too many pupils to permit effective teaching. Too much was required of them in overseeing or promoting school activities. What Dr. Jewett calls the "rhythm of the teacher's total school day" was too breathless. He observes that "prize fighters rest between rounds."

This march of detail, spurred by today's complex living, invades many occupations.

But teachers, particularly, need relief from it if they are to do what the country is calling on them to do—find and develop the young talent so urgently needed.

Klamath Indian Termination Question

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD L. NEUBERGER
OF OREGON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, March 6, 1958

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, with the Senate soon scheduled to consider the thorny Klamath Indian Reservation problem, I believe that my colleagues should see all major expressions of opinion and sentiment from the State of Oregon, where this valuable reservation is located.

We seek to protect the public resources of the reservation, and to do justice and equity to the Indian owners of the resources.

I ask unanimous consent that a thoughtful editorial on this problem which appeared in the Portland Journal of February 24, 1958, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD. The title of this editorial is "Uncle Has a Responsibility."

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNCLE HAS A RESPONSIBILITY

Probably the simplest solution to the complex Klamath Indian termination problem would be for Congress to repeal the 1954 act, amended in 1957, which calls for the sale of reservation assets and release of the Indians, those who want to be released, from wardship under Uncle Sam.

As the act now stands, it calls for liquidation sale of 750,000 acres of perhaps the finest pine timber in the United States by August 1960. This poses the threat of clear-cutting of a stand which has long been managed on a sustained-yield basis, and almost everybody with knowledge of the situation recognizes this would produce chaos in the lumber industry and spell economic disaster for the Klamath Basin.

But to repeal the act would fly in the face of a conviction which has been developed slowly over a long period of time that the Indians ought to emerge from their special status. They ought to integrate, if they want to, with the general population and become like other citizens. The Klamath termination is a sort of pilot program. It may set the pattern for the gradual release of other Indian tribes across the country where the disposition of assets of like value is involved.

It is for this reason that the Federal Government has a special responsibility, and herein may lie the clue to a better solution than the present act offers.

In the Senate are 2 bills, 1 by Senator NEUBERGER and 1 by Secretary of the Interior Seaton, which are really more similar than they are different. The Neuberger bill calls for outright purchase by the Federal Government of all the timber assets, at an estimated value of $123 million. The Seaton bill would first offer the timber to private operators, requiring them to pay retail value but stipulating they must manage the timber on a sustained-yield basis for 75 years. It would call for selling only that part of the timber required to pay off those Indians who want out of the tribe. This is estimated at 70 percent. The Seaton bill provides that if no private operators bid, the Federal Government would buy it.

Seaton objects to that part of the Neuberger bill which requires the sale of all the timber. NEUBERGER objects to some features of the Seaton bill, although, as chairman of the Indian Affairs Subcommittee, he introduced it by request.

As a practical matter, few persons believe that, under the Seaton bill, any private operators would or could pay retail prices for timber that has to be managed on a sustained-yield basis. Some regard this feature as a sop to those who object to more timber going into Federal ownership.

Oregon's bipartisan legislative interim Committee on Indian Affairs unanimously approves Federal purchase. It testified in Washington in behalf of the Neuberger bill but did not oppose the Seaton bill.

Actually, the two bills provide the basis of compromise. Reports from Washington indicate a better understanding of the termination problem is seeping through and the chances are deemed better now that Congress will act to prevent the disaster which the present act could bring. But only Congress can solve it, and no better plan than Federal purchase of most of the timber seems to be in the cards.

Poll in the Manchester (N. H.) Union Leader on Key Issues Facing the 85th Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STYLES BRIDGES
OF NEW HAMPSHIRE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, March 6, 1958

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the results of a public opinion poll which appeared on Monday, March 3, in one of New Hampshire's leading daily newspapers, the Manchester Union Leader.

The questions in this poll were published at an earlier date by the Manchester Union Leader, consistent with that newspaper's highly commendable policy of stimulating discussion and response by its readers on current matters of vital concern to our country. While the entire results of this poll are both interesting and thought provoking, I was particularly impressed by the almost unanimous opposition, expressed by readers of the Manchester Union Leader, to the continuation of military and economic aid to Communist Poland and Communist Yugoslavia.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Manchester (N. H.) Union Leader of March 3, 1958]

Results of the just concluded Union Leader poll on the key issues facing the 85th Congress reveal that 79 percent of those polled disapproved of President Eisenhower's handling of the presidency.

Out of a total of 602 ballots received, 561 answered the question: "Do you approve of President Eisenhower's handling of the Office of the Presidency?" One hundred and eighteen answered "yes" and 443 "no."

The Union Leader statewide poll, conducted February 17–21, also shows 85.2 percent in opposition to a summit conference with the Communists and 82.4 percent opposing to inviting the heads of Communist countries to visit the United States for conferences.

Other revealing results show that although 57.9 percent of those polled are in favor of sending economic aid to friendly nations, 97.9 percent expressed themselves as being opposed to military aid and 92.7 percent opposed to economic aid for Red Poland and Communist Yugoslavia. Opposing economic aid for India are 71.2 percent.

The complete results of the 13-question Union Leader poll: "How do you vote on these key issues?" follow:

1. "Do you favor a summit conference meeting with the Communists?" Yes, 88; no, 508. Opposed are 85.2 percent.

2. "Do you favor inviting the heads of Communist countries to visit the United States for conferences?" Yes, 105; no, 490. Opposed are 82.4 percent.

3. "Do you favor the President's recommendation to extend Reciprocal Trade Agreement Act?" Yes, 138; no, 412. Opposed are 74.9 percent.

4. "Should we send military aid to friendly nations?" Yes, 373; no, 186. In favor are 66.9 percent.

5. "Should we send economic aid to friendly nations?" Yes, 326; no, 237. In favor are 57.9 percent.

6. "Do you favor military aid for Red Poland and Yugoslavia?" Yes, 12; no, 579. Opposed are 97.9 percent.

7. "Do you favor sending economic aid to Red Poland and Yugoslavia?" Yes, 43; no, 544. Opposed are 92.7 percent.

8. "Do you favor economic aid to India?" Yes, 162; no, 400. Opposed are 71.2 percent.

9. "Should we further liberalize our immigration laws?" Yes, 76; no, 502. Opposed are 86.9 percent.

10. "Should we share atomic secrets with our allies?" Yes, 186; no, 369. Opposed are 66.5 percent.

11. "Do you favor Walter Reuther's profit-sharing proposal?" Yes, 263; no, 302. Opposed are 53.4 percent.

12. "Do you approve of President Eisenhower's handling of the Office of the Presidency?" Yes, 118; no, 443. Disapproving are 79 percent.

13. "Do you favor President Eisenhower's recommendation of a 6 percent cost of living pay increase for Federal civil service and postal workers?" Yes, 341; no, 220. In favor are 60.8 percent.

An Open Letter to Members of Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM F. KNOWLAND
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, March 6, 1958

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, from time to time Members of both Houses of Congress, those in the executive branch of the Government, those in industry, and those in labor have made their views known on what might best be done to meet some of the economic conditions facing the Nation. Recently there was published an open letter to Members of Congress, expressing the views of the National Federation of Independent Business.

Mr. President, because I believe the Members of Congress should have an opportunity to consider all views that are presented, I ask unanimous consent that the open letter to Members of Congress be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AN OPEN LETTER TO MEMBERS OF CONGRESS

You were home during the recent congressional recess. You heard directly what is foremost in the minds of your constituents. Your small-business friends are in trouble. Many of them are having to close their doors. Unemployment is growing. You know that small business hasn't been given the consideration by Congress that it rightfully deserves. If present trend continues there will be many questions asked this fall that will hard to explain away. There is a solution to many of these problems and, bear in mind, without Congress having to run to the money till for any sizable amounts.

LET'S PUT FIRST THINGS FIRST

You found the health of American free enterprise first and foremost in their minds. Full employment demands it. After all, 7 out of 10 jobs in retailing, wholesaling, and service industries are in small, independent firms. Strength against communism demands it. Many in Government forever talk about dealing from strength. What greater strength to deal from for America, for the entire free world, than a strong independent business and economic system.

ACT NOW BEFORE YOU'RE BOGGED DOWN

It's understood the internationalists, free traders, socialist schemers now swarm around you like flies in Maytime. Take time to listen to them now, you'll be tied up through summer. They'll wait. They can afford to; after all, they want billions from you. Small business wants no handouts. In addition, much groundwork is already done. Small business only asks action from you now. Get it over in a couple of weeks, and then, if you like, you can take the rest of the session to listen to the high-level moochers.

NOT MORE SURVEYS BUT ACTION NOW

Don't let any group or groups sidetrack you by advising still further studies. Who would throw another shovelfull of dirt on Mount Everest? And who would throw another report on the mass of data and testimony you have already taken showing the urgency of these measures? You now have studied enough facts. In addition, in your own files, personally signed by your business constituents, are the mandate ballots of the National Federation of Independent Business giving their sentiments.

ARE WE DOING AS ROME DID?

Ancient Rome's Senate contained men whose intellect and integrity are legendary even today. Yet because they concentrated all attention on foreign matters, they failed to keep Rome economically strong. And when the chips were down, free bread and circuses had failed to provide the citizens the spiritual strength to stem the barbarians from the north. Mighty legions, while most necessary, are not by themselves sufficient to guard against the 20th century savages of northern steppes.

WHO LAUGHS AT MEIN KAMPF NOW?

Once it was thought very funny that a madman named Hitler wrote down his plan of conquest. But after more than 20 million violent deaths, who laughs now? Neither should the published blueprints of communism be considered comical. Lenin wrote the greatest obstacle to American communism is the great number of independent enterprises. Karl Marx wrote that eventually the American system could be influenced to bankrupt itself into destruction. These are not the ravings of imbeciles.

RUSSIA IS WINNING THE STRUGGLE

Without firing a shot, Russia is winning. Face the facts. They are cunning. They look to the day when the American economy is concentrated in the hands of few. Before communism there must be monopoly to sap individuals of hope, of opportunity. Remember the 1940 lesson of France. Discouragement at home is the prelude to defeat from without. Two blood baths in this century taught West Germany the necessity of antitrust laws. No nation with antitrust laws has succumbed to communism.

YOU CAN'T MAKE A GIFT OF EQUITY

You will be assailed by those who would have you believe that just tax-relief measures for small business is favoritism. Yet many of these false prophets pleaded with you for relatively unknown, if not actually hidden, tax advantages for huge corporations in the form of fast writeoffs, other benefits, on the grounds such measures were necessary for expansion. Is it sound to only water the big trees to bear more fruit and let the young growing trees die of drought?

PROPAGANDA WINDS SCATTER FACTS

You in Congress may well have remarked at this session's opening: "This is where I came in," for in recent years every session has been presented with a shiny new crisis accompanied by pleas for more billions for more bureaucracy. This course, it is claimed, is the will of the people. But the people can speak for themselves, and are doing so in the voted mandate ballots which they are sending to you, which are signed by the responsible, thinking people you know personally back home.

SMALL BUSINESS ASKS FOR NO DOLE

It costs little, or no money, to strengthen small business. For just a fraction of the money poured out into global boondoggling, small business can have the tax and other relief needed to expand. This expansion in turn will produce even more tax revenues in years ahead, eliminating constant need to increase the national debt limit. For literally peanuts now, you can avoid killing the goose that lays the golden eggs. And you can also look forward to bigger golden eggs in the future.

ACT NOW ON VITAL DOMESTIC ISSUES

Before becoming too occupied with matters of less importance, act on these vital issues now. The promotion of foreign gifts and bureaucracy will be with you, yea, verily, until the end of your days. When home you found your constituents demanding action on small-business problems and Government economy. What they want to know is this: Are you going to take quick action to safeguard American independent business and the present and future jobs of this Nation? It is a temper of the times that party regularity will not serve as an excuse for failure.

HERE'S HOW THE BOX SCORE STANDS ON SMALL-BUSINESS MEASURES

Measures on third base

1. Act making Small Business Administration permanent. Passed by House 392-2. Needs Senate action.

2. Act slashing redtape in small-business stock offerings up to $500,000. Passed by Senate. Needs House action.

Measures on second base

1. Act strengthening Government's arm in blocking monopoly-producing mergers. Has passed House committee. Needs final action on floor of House and Senate.

Measures on first base

1. Acts defining good-faith interpretations of antitrust laws to protect small business against ruinous price cutting. Has gone through Senate hearings. Needs action on floor of Senate and House. House, in earlier Congress, voted overwhelming in favor.

Measures needing to go to bat

1. Correct labor laws that are designed only to meet production requirements of large manufacturers, but under which small producers cannot operate efficiently, or compete effectively in the market place.

2. Reduce corporation taxes on first $25,000 of taxable income.

3. Reduce costly reporting burden by reducing number of withholding and social-security forms businessmen must file.

4. Permit fast tax writeoffs on purchases of used property to $50,000 value per year.

5. Permit installment payments of estate taxes.

6. Permit corporations choice of paying taxes at lower partnership rates.

(NOTE.—There are other important small-business bills that demand your attention and action now, but these are the basic measures.)

NATIONAL FEDERATION OF INDEPENDENT BUSINESS,
C. W. HARDER, *President*.

Letter From a Fulbright Scholar From Alabama

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN J. SPARKMAN
OF ALABAMA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, March 6, 1958

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I have just received a letter from a young Alabamian which I think merits the attention of each Member of the Senate. This young man is a Fulbright scholar and is studying international relations at the University of London. He states so well the importance of the Fulbright program that I ask for unanimous consent that the letter be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LONDON, *March 2, 1958.*

The HONORABLE JOHN J. SPARKMAN,
United States Senator from Alabama,
Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: I realize that this is the time of year in which you must receive voluminous correspondence requesting favorable budgetary consideration of various projects and agencies. I hesitated before adding to this deluge of letters, but I have finally been overcome by the importance, in my opinion, of this very small item in terms of the total appropriation. It is an appropriation for which I am sure there is no external lobby or pressure group; thus, maybe an individual's letter will carry a little weight.

In my occasional visits to the United States Educational Commission in the United Kingdom, I have recently become aware of the apprehensiveness over new appropriations for the Fulbright scholarship program. (I might say here that this letter is being written solely on my own initiative.) From an educational standpoint I think that this is one of the more valuable governmental programs. If anything the program should be liberalized and expanded, not curtailed. In the rush to provide funds for scientific and technological education, whose importance I do not wish to minimize, to overlook

or to neglect other educational programs would be a great disservice to the Nation. As Dr. Killian recently said, we need not just to train more people in the technical and physical science disciplines, but also to give more priority to high-level talent which has the capacity to lead, to innovate and to imagine—and thus to advance our society. If we are to maintain our place in the world in the cultural, social, and political spheres, we cannot afford to neglect the arts, the humanities, or the social sciences; to expand technical education at the expense of the latter fields would in my opinion be a horrible mistake.

The value of the Fulbright program extends far beyond the opportunity for purely academic pursuits and achievements. It provides the student an opportunity to observe and study at first hand the origins of our own political and cultural heritage. (I feel that this is especially true in the United Kingdom.) But probably more important, the opportunity to study abroad provides the student with an insight into the social, economic, and political conditions of the host countries, an idea of the prevailing public opinion and attitudes that exist, and some understanding of the internal and external pressures that determine political and social policies. This knowledge is invaluable to a real understanding of the international scene today, and those who have an opportunity to gain such knowledge can make a great contribution to international understanding. And, if I may say so without seeming to deprecate the latter, the student is generally better able than the serviceman or tourist to leave a favorable impression of his own country while at the same time showing an appreciation of the host country that adds to the respect and good will shown toward the United States. We must not be satisfied that we may now have the political support of a Government in office, but we should seek to maintain that support and understanding by giving it a broad base among the people. Only in this way may we assure perpetuation of that support regardless of what political party or coalition may form the Government.

I am now studying international relations at the University of London under a Fulbright grant; thus this is not an appeal for an appropriation from which I expect any considerable personal gain in the future. My experience has been invaluable in my own field, and I am sure that most other students here feel the same. My only regret is the lack of time and financial ability to take greater advantage of the opportunities available. If there is any change in the program I feel that it should be an increase in appropriations and an extension of the opportunities available to future Fulbright scholars.

If my plea seems excessively long, it is only an indication of the importance I attach to this program. I apologize for any unnecessary time I may have taken.

Respectfully yours,

CHARLES D. WARD.

Federal Expenditures for Rivers, Harbors, and Flood Control

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANCIS CASE

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 6, 1958

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, on the Senate floor on Tuesday, March 4, the distinguished Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] presented a comprehensive report on Federal expenditures for rivers, harbors, and flood control. The Senator from Louisiana presented this material in rebuttal to an article which had recently appeared in the Saturday Evening Post.

Just today an article in the January-February 1958 issue of New York Waterways, written by Brig. Gen. J. L. Person, came to my attention. The Senate knows that General Person is the Assistant Chief of Engineers for Civil Works.

The article entitled "Pork Versus Caviar," concerns itself with some of the issues which Senator ELLENDER raised, and I would like to commend it to the attention of the Senate. I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD following my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PORK VERSUS CAVIAR

(By Brig. Gen. J. L. Person, U. S. Army, Assistant Chief of Engineers for Civil Works, U. S. Corps of Engineers)

I'm going to talk today for a little while about my pet hate—the term "pork barrel" which so many people, including some sincere and honest individuals, are so fond of applying to river and harbor and flood-control projects. The term implies just what it is used to imply—that projects for water resource development are wasteful, boondoggling, political raids on the Treasury. This is simply not true, as I intend to demonstrate by citing a few facts.

The corps has been in the so-called pork-barrel business since 1924, when Congress appropriated $75,000 for the removal of snags in the Ohio River. Since that time we have spent a total of about $10.5 billion in planning, constructing, and operating river and harbor improvements. What have the American people bought with this $10.5 billion?

The list is a long one, and I will try not to bore you with too many details. But we have, on the navigation side, produced 22,600 miles of improved inland waterways, over 400 improved commercial harbors, and, of course, the Great Lakes navigation system. In the last year of record, our inland waters carried 385 million tons of cargo, our harbors handled 496 million tons, and 211 million tons moved on the Great Lakes, giving a total for the United States of over a billion tons. The ratio of the annual benefits to the annual costs of our overall navigation system is estimated at about 3 to 1—in other words, we are getting $3 in benefits for every dollar we are spending. Of even greater importance—incalculable importance—is the effect of navigation on our national economy. For example, without our pork-barrel program our great seaports could not handle our vast world trade, our steel industry would starve for lack of the ore that comes through the Soo locks, and the Ohio Valley would not have earned its nickname of Atom Valley and the Ruhr of America without its adequate water supply and its free water transportation.

FLOOD CONTROL

The first major activity of the Federal Government in flood control began in 1928 when Congress authorized the project for flood control in the Alluvial Valley of the Mississippi. Flood control on a nationwide basis had its beginning some 8 years later when, in 1936, Congress passed the first general flood control act. During the intervening period about 500 projects have been completed or placed in partial operation for flood control purposes. On the average this group of projects has been in operation for a period of less than 15 years, yet they have already prevented flood damages totaling about $8⅔ billion, about twice the total Federal appropriation for construction of flood-control projects, including those multiple-purpose power projects which also serve flood-control purposes.

This is a part of the story the public hears too little about. Maybe it is not as spectacular for a reporter to tell of the damage that is prevented, the many lives that are saved, and the human suffering that is avoided because projects operate effectively, as it is to tell of the ravages and havoc caused by the major floods such as those that occurred in the Northeast and on the west coast in 1955, and in the Southwest in 1957.

The fact that such disasters still occur is not an indictment of the effectiveness of projects that are in operation. On the other hand, they emphasize the fact that we are not progressing fast enough with our flood control plans. The results obtained through operation of flood-control projects have proven that most of the flood damage now experienced can be prevented by comprehensive river basin development of our water resources. Gentlemen, if that is "pork barrel," I say let us have more pork.

Navigation and flood control alone do not represent the total benefits realized from the civil works program. Large additional values also accrue through conservation and the use of our water resources through multiple-purpose development. These include development of hydroelectric power, storage of water for industrial, municipal, and agricultural use, and the numerous benefits which result from improvement of low river flows. In many cases the projects also provide large public recreational values and opportunities for the preservation and enhancement of fish and wildlife resources. To mention but a few figures showing the impact of these important collateral functions:

HYDROELECTRIC POWER

A total of 22.6 billion kilowatt-hours was generated at Corps of Engineers' installations during fiscal year 1957, representing 18.2 percent of the hydroelectric power produced and 3.6 percent of the total production by all sources of the Nation's utility systems. This hydroelectric power has been of vital importance to industry and development generally in many parts of our country. This is particularly true in the Pacific Northwest which is almost wholly dependent upon water power.

WATER SUPPLY

The Corps of Engineers is providing over 1 million acre-feet of storage space in the interest of domestic and industrial water supply, and almost 4 million acre-feet is being operated either exclusively or jointly for irrigation and other uses. In addition, conservation and power releases from reservoirs operated by the Corps of Engineers have in many cases improved the quantity and quality of water available for downstream supplies. These releases in fiscal year 1957 amounted to about 30 million acre-feet (almost 11 trillion gallons). During the recent drought in the southern Great Plains area, water in these reservoirs or releases from them prevented the shutdown of important industries and provided the margin of water supply that enabled many communities to endure through that difficult period.

PUBLIC RECREATION

Land and water areas at Corps of Engineers projects provide abundant recreational opportunities to the general public for such activities as boating, swimming, camping, fishing and hunting. In 1956 over 70 million visitor-days of recreational use were counted at Corps of Engineers reservoirs.

The importance of this use can be seen when it is realized that it is in the same

order of magnitude as the attendance at all of our national parks. This large public recreational resource, nationwide in scope, has been provided at a Federal cost of only $10 million for basic access and public use facilities, while States and other non-Federal agencies have spent more than ten times as much in developing the recreational potential.

I have tried in brief to give you some concept of what the civil works program has and will accomplish. The solid facts of the record speak for themselves. They are the main reason why I detest this term "pork barrel" which is tossed around by critics who are uninformed of who wilfully choose to ignore that record.

We do not object to healthy and constructive criticism. I know that any agency which handles a large public works program and which deals with a controversial resource like water must expect criticism. But I do strongly object to attacks which mislead the public as to the value of a large Federal program and reflect upon the integrity of the Corps of Engineers. On this latter point I can refer you to the findings of the second Hoover Commission (an agency certainly not biased in favor of the corps and not benefiting from "pork"), which stated:

"The Corps of Engineers has an enviable record for safe and adequate engineering design, that it has demonstrated its ability to carry out very large engineering projects, and that it has been signally free of any taint of fraud or dishonesty in the administration of the vast construction program with which it has been entrusted.

"And this applies to 131 years during which it had those great responsibilities.

"The Commission wishes no sentence in the report to be construed as a reflection upon the corps."

Now, let's look for a minute at the Russian version of pork-barrel activities. Theirs is not a pork barrel, it's a caviar jar. We have invested a total of $10.5 billion over a period of 134 years. Just one of their bond issues, about 6 years ago, was for $7 billion for increasing their water-resource development program. Comprehensive development on the Volga, which has pushed forward largely since World War II, already has provided the 3,000-mile main stem of an integrated inland waterway system extending from the Black and Caspian Seas, now interconnected by a canal, on the south, to the Baltic and Arctic White Sea on the north. East to west it stretches from the foothills of the Urals far across the European Russian plains. Construction is well advanced, and vessels of 11.5-foot draft regularly travel the approximately 1,000 miles between Moscow and the Black and Caspian Seas. Each of the 17 dams has or will have good-sized navigation locks which we estimate to be possibly as large as 100 by 1,000 feet with minimum depth of 18 feet over the sills.

Quite impressive hydroelectric plants are being built at the Russian dams. The largest, on the Volga, at Stalingrad, scheduled for operation next year, will have 2.3 million kilowatts capacity, about 18 percent greater than that of our largest hydro plant, Grand Coulee. Project development is already underway or planned in other river basins, including three mammoth hydroelectric plants in Siberia with capacities in the order of 3 million to 5 million kilowatts each.

If development of water resources is a wasteful pork-barrel or caviar-jar program, why are our Russian friends proceeding with this program at a rate far ahead of ours? In 1939, Sir Winston Churchill said that "Soviet policy is a riddle wrapped in a mystery inside an enigma, but perhaps there is a key. That key is Russian national interest." Former Governor Miller of Wyoming, in a recent Saturday Evening Post article, joins the chorus of many who combine the term "pork barrel" with "logrolling" and "political back scratching." Well, gentlemen, Mr. Khrushchev does not need to roll any logs. And Mr. Khrushchev does not need to scratch any political backs. Mr. Khrushchev has repeatedly said that Russia does not need to defeat us in a war—she will defeat us on the economic front. I don't mean that she would not defeat us in a war if we dropped our guard, and I certainly don't mean to belittle the vital urgency of maintaining and improving our armed strength. But I do not believe that we can afford to neglect our economic strength and our economic growth. Certainly, in these days of tremendous demands on the Federal Treasury we must look ever more critically at the economics of all projects, and must concentrate on those which are most urgently needed. Certainly we must continue to encourage the increasing assumption of responsibility by local and State governments. But if we neglect the development of our water resources we jeopardize the development of our national economy. This we cannot afford if we mean to maintain our position of strength, on which rests the future of the free world.

Rural Businessmen Join Farmers in Protests Against Dairy-Support Cut

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM E. PROXMIRE
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, March 6, 1958

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, it gives me great satisfaction to be able to report that Wisconsin small-business men and professional people are continuing to line up with their neighbors on the farms in opposition to the cut in dairy prices ordered by Secretary of Agriculture Benson.

This week I received a letter from officers of the Valders, Wis., Lions Club stating that this fine organization strongly opposes the order to cut milk price supports.

I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, to insert this statement from the Lions Club of Valders, Wis., in the Appendix of the RECORD, along with similar statements by a rural cooperative and an officer of a dairy farmers' organization. These three statements symbolize the unity in my State in opposition to Secretary Benson's order.

There being no objection, the statements were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

VALDERS, WIS., *February 27, 1958.*
The Honorable WILLIAM PROXMIRE,
United States Senator,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR PROXMIRE: The Valders Lions Club strongly opposes the Secretary of Agriculture's plan of lowering the price support for milk. We feel that such talk is unwarranted when farmers have been receiving a smaller and smaller percentage of the dollar. We can see the repercussions in agricultural communities with further curtailment of the farmers' purchasing power.

We feel the benefits of price support far outweigh its cost. The surplus milk is but a small amount of the whole amount of milk produced. The cost of absorbing this small amount goes way ahead of what can be gained from keeping the price of milk at a respectable level to give the farmer a fair place in the American standard of living.

We feel it is your duty to help maintain the farmer's fair share in our economy. Do not let milk price supports slip to the point suggested by Mr. Benson.

Sincerely yours,

EARL MULLENS,
Lion President.
WILLIAM DAYTON,
Lion Secretary.

TAYLOR COUNTY ELECTRIC COOPERATIVE,
Medford, Wis., March 3, 1958.
The Honorable WILLIAM PROXMIRE,
Senate Office Building,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR PROXMIRE: Whereas we, the members of the Taylor County Electric Cooperative, 217 South Eighth Street, Medford, Wis., in 1958 annual meeting assembled, and representing 1,851 farm families either directly engaged in dairy farming or primarily dependent upon dairy farming for our livelihood, fear that if Secreary Benson's proposal to cut dairy price supports on April 1, 1958, is permitted to take effect, the agricultural economy of Wisconsin will suffer a staggering blow: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That we petition Congress to immediately enact legislation which will hold the line on dairy price supports heretofore in effect until such time at least as there has been an opportunity for a full hearing, study, and careful consideration of self-help proposals such as contained in bill S. 3125; be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to Senators WILEY and PROXMIRE and to Congressman O'KONSKI.

TAYLOR COUNTY ELECTRIC
COOPERATIVE,
ALVIN LISKE,
Secretary-Treasurer.

EAST TROY, WIS., *February 26, 1958.*
Hon. WILLIAM PROXMIRE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: As vice president of the Mukwonago local of the Pure Milk Association, I would like to put a big "No" against the reducing of dairy support prices as announced by Secretary of Agriculture Benson, for Mr. Benson's plan, I believe, would make a bad matter worse, would hasten an already started depression.

Where are our learned men who should know that when you lower or remove the farmers' buying power, you slow down or stop industry? When industry slows down or stops, what happens to the laborer? And the one-man dairyman-farmer works 7 days a week. What would happen to milk prices if the dairyman organized a labor union and got paid skilled laborer wages?

I feel sure Mr. Benson and his followers would quickly change their program, if they visited average dairy farms and studied the dairy situation from the raising, feeding, and milking of dairy herds on through the consumer.

I also believe there would be no dairy surpluses if the great difference in price between the dairyman and the consumer could be lowered and the average and below average American family could buy the milk they needed.

Duplicates of this letter are being sent to our other Senators and Representatives in hopes that each will help get things started back on the right track and that business and industry will again prosper.

Sincerely,

G. GAROLD KEGLEY.

Freeman Sets Pattern for Small Town

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANCIS CASE
OF SOUTH DAKOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, March 6, 1958

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, recently one of the more progressive communities in South Dakota held its annual community achievement day. It is an occasion when the farmers of the community and the folks in town get together, share with others their hobbies, skills in handicraft, culinary art, and the produce from the fertile soil.

Mr. John Kennedy, publisher and editor in chief of the Sioux Falls Argus-Leader, was invited to speak on his recent trip to Russia. He was accompanied by Editor and Mrs. F. C. Christopherson, which prompted the editor to write of his pleasant experience.

I congratulate the good people, both town and country, on their community spirit, their faith in the future. With such unity the small town will and can meet all competition to its existence.

I ask unanimous consent that an editorial entitled "Freeman Sets Pattern for Small Town," which was published in the Sioux Falls (S. Dak.) Argus-Leader, of February 13, 1958, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FREEMAN SETS PATTERN FOR SMALLER TOWN

FREEMAN, S. Dak.—It is good to get out occasionally into the board and fertile area that surrounds Sioux Falls and to refreshen our association with what is in effect the heartland of South Dakota.

South Dakota actually isn't a State of big cities. Sioux Falls, its largest community, is in truth just a big small town. And we're glad of that.

In general South Dakota is made up of communities such as Freeman, comfortable, well-ordered and wholesome centers of population where life is pleasant and friendly. To know and understand Freeman is to know and understand South Dakota.

PROUD OF ACHIEVEMENT DAYS

Reason for the visit to Freeman was its annual Community Achievement Days. John A. Kennedy, publisher and editor-in-chief of this newspaper, was scheduled to make a speech on Russian education and Mrs. Christopherson and I went along for the ride. And glad we are that we went.

Freeman is proud in a modest way of its Community Achievement Days. Set aside for the occasion is Pioneer Hall at Freeman Junior College. Filling its spacious basement were countless exhibits of handiwork and farm produce.

Erwin R. Gross, general chairman of the event, beamed with a wholly warranted satisfaction as he escorted us around the booths and the displays.

"Everybody participates," he explained, "and it is good for us to have this little get-together each winter. It brings a closer association between the community and the farm country and it is helpful to all of us."

DO IT YOURSELF DISPLAY

One small display, with ribbons indicating prizewinners, caught our interest and I must confess that the three visitors from Sioux Falls were at a loss to identify the items.

Our first guess was that it was cheese. But the absence of odor dispelled that idea.

A friendly farm woman, however, straightened us out. "That's homemade soap," she said. "I always make my own soap and so do many others."

The soap, however, was but one example of the many evidences of handiwork to be seen in Pioneer Hall. Hobbyist, young and old, had brought to the event their best specimens and took a modest pride in explaining why and how they were made.

Evidences of abundance were everywhere—grains from the fields and luscious pies from the kitchens. Ears of corn that seemed almost perfect, potatoes, carrots, onions, and beets, magazine racks, ball bats, pictures, and trays, aprons, too, and dresses and needlepoint. All in all, a striking demonstration of a do-it-yourself program in a practical application.

EXAMPLE FOR OTHERS

My purpose in dwelling at some length upon the event at Freeman is because of its significance and its example.

What Freeman is doing, other communities of similar size can do. The opportunities exist everywhere.

The difference, if any, is that the civic leaders in Freeman are aware of their opportunities and make the most of them.

The Community Achievement Days constitute but one example of Freeman enterprise.

In the first place, it is well to recognize that the people of Freeman are proud of their town. They like it and they say so and they are constantly striving to make it a better town.

As a consequence, the community has good schools, excellent public facilities, a splendid small college and an active civic program.

WHAT DETERMINES SIZE

The role of the smaller community in South Dakota is a frequent subject of discussion.

Are such communities to grow smaller as transportation improves? Will they fade away? Or do opportunities exist?

The answer, of course, is to be found in the future. It may be said, however, that communities, both big and small, will be influenced by the service they supply and the role they occupy.

If they offer little or nothing, they will shrink. If they offer something, they will hold their own or advance.

Some of the smaller communities just conclude that there's nothing they can do about it, fold their hands and gradually die.

Other communities—and Freeman is a good example—realize what they can do to maintain and broaden their town's value and proceed to do it.

FREEMAN'S OBJECTIVE

In all of this, a lesson is to be found and learned. One need not wonder why two communities, similarly situated, move along different paths. The reason usually is the civic attitude and the approach to public problems.

Freeman—and we employ it again as an example because of this visit—is demonstrating the way to constructive growth.

The citizens of Freeman have in mind no bustling metropolis. They don't expect to exceed Sioux Falls. They move forward instead with a practical appreciation of the scope of their sphere of service. In so doing, they are building solidly on a substantial foundation.

Not in their program is any visionary development that could rise a bit and then topple with disturbing consequences. They know that that kind of activity isn't a part of their prospects and proceed with that understanding.

That's why Freeman is a good town and that's why, I am confident, Freeman will continue through the years to be one of South Dakota's better towns.

F. C. CHRISTOPHERSON.

A Small-Business Problem

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN J. SPARKMAN
OF ALABAMA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, March 6, 1958

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, last week I received a letter from a small-business man in Texas, presenting a problem which I feel may be of interest to other Members. It concerns a matter which was forceably brought to my attention during the tax hearings of the Senate Small Business Committee last fall. Like other matters discussed in the committee Report No. 1237, Tax Problems of Small Business, this situation arises chiefly because of the manner in which the Treasury interprets and administers an act of Congress.

The Western Hemisphere Trade Corporation Act was passed by Congress in 1942 to promote trade with our neighbors and allies in this hemisphere. It provided tax benefits for concerns which derived income solely outside of the United States, but from countries within this area.

It now seems that a regulation by the Treasury largely nullifies the purpose of this law for smaller business concerns. As was pointed out in the testimony of witnesses before the Small Business Committee last fall and in the letter which I have here, the Treasury hinges the application of this provision completely on a legal question, passage of title. This technical point was not mentioned in the law nor in the original regulations.

The letter to which I have referred is from Mr. John H. Wilson, Wilson Export Corp., Wichita Falls, Tex. Mr. Wilson's letter clearly and concisely states the problem caused by the relatively recent interpretation of this provision by the Treasury. I ask unanimous consent that this letter may be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD so that all Senators may know of this situation.

There being on objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WILSON EXPORT CORP.,
Wichita Falls, Tex., February 19, 1958.
Hon. JOHN J. SPARKMAN,
Senate Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: On October 21, 1942, the Congress passed an act which is commonly known as the Western Hemisphere Trade Corporation Act. This act was originally known as section 109 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1939, as amended. It is now known as section 921 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954. In these acts a Western Hemisphere trade corporation is defined as "a domestic corporation all of whose business is done in North, Central, or South America, or the West Indies, and which sat-

isfies these conditions: (1) At least 95 percent of gross income for the 3-year period immediately preceding the close of the taxable year (or for that part of this period during which the corporation was in existence) was derived from sources outside the United States; and (2) at least 90 percent of gross income for this period (or part thereof) was derived from the active conduct of a trade or business" (sec. 941; 1.921–1).

In pursuance with the terms of this act, and in order to promote the sale of our products in the Western Hemisphere, we incorporated a company known as the Wilson Export Corp. and a charter was issued on January 2, 1948. This company successfully promoted the sale of drilling rigs and winches manufactured by the Wilson Manufacturing Co. of Wichita Falls, Tex., and did a fairly extensive business of this kind, and was recognized by the Internal Revenue Department as a Western Hemisphere trade corporation and taxed in accordance with the regulations for a Western Hemisphere trade corporation for a period beginning January 2, 1948, through and including the calendar year 1954. But when the 1955 return was checked by the Internal Revenue Department they issued a ruling that they would no longer recognize this as a Western Hemisphere trade corporation and entitled to the tax benefits accorded such a corporation. A hearing was held in the Federal Building in Wichita Falls, Tex., in which the facts regarding this matter were presented and while as a result of the information given during this hearing it was recognized that the Wilson Export Corp. met all the requirements of the law and regulations governing Western Hemisphere trade corporations which had been published in the various Internal Revenue Regulations, nevertheless they arbitrarily decided that they could no longer recognize it as a Western Hemisphere trade corporation. The basis for this decision was that they claimed that title to the goods sold passed before the goods left the United States and that, therefore, the sale was made in the United States and not in a foreign country.

The regulations as set up for the Western Hemisphere trade corporation (being the regulations issued under the 1939 Code), which are in paragraph 39–109–1 state "The gross income from sources without the United States and within the United States shall be determined as provided in section 119 and the regulations prescribed thereunder." The only applicable paragraphs which affect us are in section 39–119 (a)–6, which reads as follows:

"Income derived from the purchase and sale of personal property shall be treated as derived entirely from the country in which sold. The word 'sold' includes 'exchanged.' The 'country in which sold' ordinarily means the place where the property is marketed."

You will note that it states specifically that the "country in which solds means the place where the property is marketed," and in every case the country in which the property is marketed is a South American country such as for instance Mexico, Argentina, Venezuela, etc. There is no reference whatever in the act or the regulations to "the place where the title to the goods passes." It was freely admitted by the hearing examiner that we met all the published regulations 100 percent, but the new regulation which, to the best of our knowledge, has never yet been published, on which the decision was based, hinges upon "the place where title passes."

Now, as far as we can see, any sale made in a foreign country and where the material is shipped by steamship, title would almost necessarily pass in this country, or at least upon the delivery of the goods to the steamship line which would accept the goods in an American port. And, therefore, quite plainly speaking it would be practically impossible to have a sale in a foreign country where the title to the goods passed only after it left the United States. And, therefore, it would be practically impossible to have such a thing as a Western Hemisphere trade corporation, if this criterion should apply.

When the Congress passed this act or amendment to the Revenue Act in 1942 it recognized the need for promoting trade with Western Hemisphere countries. It recognized that it is considerably more difficult to deal with customers in foreign countries than it is in the United States proper, and usually considerably more expensive as well, and it also recognized that this foreign trade was desirable to provide an outlet for the sale of American products and to provide work for the American working man, and so this act was passed to promote these purchases. But now by simply changing a regulation and not even publishing the regulation, the Internal Revenue Service has nullified an act of Congress and made it impossible for a company set up under the terms of this act of Congress to receive the benefits which Congress plainly intended they should receive.

Two bills have been introduced in Congress which are titled H. R. 3805 introduced by Mr. BOGGS, and H. R. 128 introduced by Mr CURTIS of Missouri, which are substantially identical and either of which would reinstate the Western Hemisphere trade corporation as originally enacted by Congress, and we feel that whereas the Internal Revenue Service has arbitrarily usurped the power of Congress and in effect changed the law by writing new regulations, we respectfully request your vote, aid, and assistance in restoring to the Western Hemisphere trade corporations the status originally given them by the Congress.

We feel sure that there are a considerable number of small businesses affected by this change in Internal Revenue regulations. And we particularly want to call to your attention the fact that it is mostly small business that is so affected. Larger companies simply set up a corporation in a foreign country which pays no United States tax at all. An example of this among our own competitors is the National Supply Co., and the National Supply Co., of Mexico. Here the profits are completely untaxed in this country unless and until these profits are returned to this country. Thus large corporations pay no tax in this country while small business is taxed the full 52 percent on any profit it may make.

In these times of high cost, slow business, and growing recession a small business is hard pressed and is in urgent need of tax relief to help it pull through the difficult days ahead, and restore prosperity to our country.

The domestic oil business is in such a depressed condition that relatively little equipment is being bought in this country, while in foreign countries, particularly South America, a considerable amount of equipment is being bought. But under the Internal Revenue regulation Western Hemisphere corporations are as heavily taxed as any other domestic corporation, while foreign corporations are completely untaxed in this country on the profits they make on sales to these Western Hemisphere countries. And we believe that this is contrary to the intent of Congress as shown by their act passed in 1942.

To sum up, we believe the following are true facts:

1. That the plain intent of Congress has been ignored and nullified by a change in regulations of the Internal Revenue Service which completely reverses all previous regulations, and prescribes criteria which are not to be found in the act passed by Congress.

2. That this change in regulations will cause great harm to small business, and will increase the power and profits of large business.

3. That the final result of this change will be an actual loss of revenue to the United States Treasury because the profits from the sale of this equipment will go to foreign subsidiaries of large corporations which are untaxed in this country, instead of smaller American companies which cannot compete because of the burdensome taxes imposed upon them.

4. That in a period of growing recession and increasing unemployment, it behooves Congress to enact measures which will assist business in general, and small business in particular, and which will provide more jobs for American workingmen.

And, so again, we respectfully request your vote, aid, and assistance in restoring to the Western Hemisphere Trade Corporations the status originally given them by Congress by supporting and voting for either H. R. 3805 or H. R. 128.

As briefly as possible the above letter states the circumstances regarding the Western Hemisphere Trade Corp. which we formed some years ago, and which is wholly owned by the Wilson Manufacturing Co., Inc. If the regualtions now in effect are to be continued it will be necessary for us to fold up this corporation for the simple reason that any profits which are paid back to the parent corporation will be subject to a 15-percent tax in addition to the full 52-percent tax levied on all corporation profits. And if this becomes necessary it will also become necessary to practically withdraw all efforts to sell in export and this in turn will mean a decreased amount of business and probably lay off some of our employees.

We sincerely urge that you give this matter your immediate attention and do everything you can to correct an unfair condition and one which can cause considerable increased unemployment, not only to our own company, but surely to dozens of other small companies all over the United States.

Thanking you in advance for any assistance you may be able to give us.

Very truly yours,

WILSON EXPORT CORP.,
JOHN H. WILSON,
President.

Antitrust Laws for Labor Unions

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD MARTIN
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, March 6, 1958

Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania. Mr. President, our distinguished colleague, the senior Senator from Maryland [Mr. BUTLER], delivered on the Dean Manion Forum an outstanding speech which should have the thoughtful consideration of every American.

Too many Americans—labor leaders, industrial leaders, agricultural leaders, and intellectual leaders—seem to be advocating the philosophy of prosperity at any price, soft living, and the get-rich-quick theory.

I ask unanimous consent to have the address printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Senator BUTLER. Thank you, Dean Manion. At the outset, let me make this perfectly

clear: I know the vast majority of men and women constituting organized labor are as dedicated to the perpetuation of the free-enterprise system as I am.

However, in far too many cases our citizens have formed opinions about the American economy and the integrity of its leaders from statements by certain labor bosses and political demagogs.

In this time of crisis, when the fate of humanity hangs by a thread, our military security requires a strong domestic economy. We must produce a larger national income in dollars of constant value so that the increased burdens of defense can be borne without reducing the American standard of living.

This will require hard work. We cannot afford to continue to generate inflationary pressures. Unions cannot force round after round of wage increases which greatly exceed the increase in the productivity of our economy without jeopardizing our security.

Yet, with the threat of more inflation on the horizon, the well-worn legend that business has been reaping excessive profits is once more abroad in the land. As usual, in the forefront in advancing this charge is CIO President Walter Reuther. His accusations, and the facts concerning wages and prices, need careful examination.

Some people forget that the compensation of employees is not only income to the employee, but also a cost to the employer. It must be recovered in the price charged the consumer or we shall have neither employers nor employees.

An examination of the distribution of the increase in the national income through the last decade shows that for every additional dollar of corporate profits after taxes, employees receive an additional $40.

Furthermore, labor's share of the total national income rose from 65.3 percent in 1947 to 70.3 percent in 1956. On the other hand, corporate profits after taxes dropped from 9.3 percent of the national income in 1947 to only 6.1 percent in 1956.

If all corporate profits before taxes in 1956 had been paid as additional compensation to employees, their total income would have been increased by less than 18 percent. However, if there were no corporate profits, the Government would have received $22 billion less from corporate income taxes.

With the existing level of Government expenditures, higher personal income and consumer excise taxes would have been required. Since income taxes in the upper brackets have already reached the point of diminishing returns, most of this increase would of necessity have been imposed on lower-bracket taxpayers.

All of this goes to show that the profiteering legend will not stand up as an explanation for the inflation that besets our economy.

From my close observation of Reuther's political interests, I am convinced that he regards the bargaining table as a platform for the acquisition of political power. His statements clearly show that if he were in a position of greater political power, he would attempt to destroy competitive capitalism.

For a concrete example, we need only to turn to Mr. Reuther's latest proposal to the automobile manufacturers. He advocates that 50 percent of all profits in excess of 10 percent of invested capital before taxes be shared evenly between workers and consumers. He alleges that, under such a procedure, in 1956 General Motors workers would have received $286 million in additional compensation and that consumers of its products would have received a rebate of the same amount. What he fails to say, and this is an important point, is that corporate income taxes for this one firm alone would have been approximately $300 million less.

HAS BIG BROTHER COME OVER THE HORIZON?

If Mr. Reuther's plan were universally adopted, the Government would lose upwards of $4 billion in corporate tax revenue. Incredibly, he must now vision himself as an economic dictator representing consumers, stockholders, workers, and citizens alike. In fact, he would supplant the Congress of the United States in determining the Government's revenue.

Obviously, this is more of Mr. Reuther's special brand of economic hogwash—all of which is pointed to an eventual destruction of the free-enterprise system. His statements are propaganda in its most vicious form.

Before the advent of pattern bargaining, lower prices for all Americans were the result of improved technology and increased capital investment. Every individual had an opportunity to advance further through experience and the development of superior skills. In recent years, however, national productivity has been preempted by certain union agreements. Labor costs have outdistanced national productivity, thus forcing prices to rise.

As a result, Government employees, retired people and farmers have suffered a great disadvantage. The efforts of these groups to equalize their position with organized labor has placed additional demands on budgets at all levels of Government. Increased labor costs require additional appropriations for Federal expenditures on defense materiel, one of the largest items in the Federal budget.

Similarly, the budgets of local and State governments have been strained to equalize the compensation of firemen, policemen and schoolteachers. With limited tax resources, some have pressed for Federal aid to education and other grant-in-aid programs to States and local communities.

Meanwhile, price increases for manufactured goods have depressed the parity index for farm products. This automatically results in great expenditures by the Federal Government under our price-support programs. The harassed taxpayer is thereby denied needed relief.

This is the deadly circle of inflation and economic intervention by government; it must be broken. After careful study, I have concluded that the first step in reversing this dangerous trend is to make it impossible for any group to exercise monopoly power.

Let no one misunderstand my position. I am opposed to monopoly—so much so that I have publicly stated that I would support legislation to have our antitrust laws apply to all segments of our economy. I would even make them apply to unions which were granted exemptions for many of their activities by the passage of the Clayton Act in 1914.

Certainly labor unions with millions of members, and controlling the investment of many billions of dollars through welfare funds, are in a position to exert monopoly powers.

BIGNESS NO CRIME; MONOPOLY—SOMETHING ELSE

I steadfastly believe that the antitrust laws have made this country strong. They have given us the competitive society upon which our future rests. I do not believe that bigness and monopoly are synonymous.

The Congress, during the 67 years since the Sherman Act was placed on the books, has never adopted legislation making bigness a crime. Repeated decisions of the United States Supreme Court have also stated that bigness per se is not a violation of the antitrust laws. I am interested in strengthening these laws so as to preserve a vigorous competitive society. We cannot operate in the world of today without big business.

However, some labor leaders primarily interested in exercising political power have attempted to justify their activities on the basis that they are working for the good of the entire economy to increase purchasing power by the device of raising wages.

Prof. Edward H. Chamberlin, one of the most distinguished economists of our generation, has just made a detailed study of the economics underlying this theory. Professor Chamberlin's views are of particular interest to those concerned with monopoly. He was the originator of the phrase "monopolistic competition". His theories have influenced economists, legislators and businessmen since the late 1930's. In his most recent study, Professor Chamberlin said:

"Whoever receives a higher money income gains relative to others who do not, and there is nothing in the argument to indicate why union laborers any more than anyone else should be chosen to have the agreebale privilege of mysteriously spreading prosperity in this way.

"But since some laborers, and some other elements of society) have more power to raise their money income than others (some, such as receivers of contractual incomes, life insurance beneficiaries, pensioners, etc., have zero power) those who have more power gain at the expense of those who have less. The interest of those who gain is hardly to be identified with the whole, if the whole includes also those who lose."

This statement is in complete contradiction to Mr. Reuther's high-sounding economic theories. His carefully designed scheme to replace our competitive enterprise system with variegated socialism, or Reutherism, as I choose to call it, must be nipped in the bud. The doing will require the wisdom, cooperation and patience of government, labor, management and the general public alike.

It is my considered conviction that we must now establish equality of treatment before the law for all organized groups in our economy—labor as well as business.

During the early days of the labor movement, there may have been some justification for labor unions receiving special treatment under the antitrust laws. Today, they have great financial resources and exercise vast political and economic power. Special treatment is no longer justified.

Cotton Figures

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LINDLEY BECKWORTH

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 6, 1958

Mr. BECKWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I include in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD some cotton figures. They relate to other cotton data I placed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD January 23, 1958, page A518, and June 27, page A4769.

The table follows:

COTTON.—*Average value per allotment, and number of allotments 1950 and 1955, and increase or decrease in value per allotment and in number of allotments 1950–55, by State and county*

State and county	Average value per allotment, 1950	Average value per allotment, 1955	Increase or decrease, 1950-55	Number of allotments		
				1950	1955	Percent increase or decrease (−) 1950-55
ALABAMA						
Autauga	$880.68	$1,918	$1,037	1,183	996	−15.8
Baldwin		575	575		811	
Barbour	583.25	1,170	587	1,702	1,574	−7.5
Bibb	571.16	1,181	610	774	631	−18.5
Blount	383.66	1,061	677	4,017	3,200	−20.3
Bulloch	895.80	1,766	870	815	753	−7.7
Butler	490.54	993	503	1,856	1,632	−12.1
Calhoun	284.03	882	598	1,803	1,238	−31.3
Chambers	1,050.64	1,349	298	1,416	1,037	−26.8
Cherokee	1,328.49	2,411	1,083	2,142	1,811	−15.5
Chilton	364.87	912	547	2,622	2,169	−17.3
Choctaw	212.31	618	406	1,638	1,614	−1.5
Clarke	193.60	522	328	1,694	1,599	−5.6
Clay	225.21	545	320	1,744	1,208	−30.7
Cleburne	198.27	596	398	1,192	646	−45.8
Coffee	831.64	1,445	613	2,088	1,971	−5.6
Colbert	1,549.72	2,525	975	1,990	1,520	−23.6
Conecuh	406.83	907	500	2,387	2,163	−9.4
Coosa	140.28	394	254	988	545	−44.8
Covington	594.52	1,068	474	2,691	2,381	−11.5
Crenshaw	606.57	1,138	531	1,644	1,447	−12.0
Cullman	612.41	1,149	537	6,829	6,282	−8.0
Dale	453.42	861	408	1,341	1,198	−10.7
Dallas	1,292.83	3,732	2,439	1,634	1,467	−10.5
DeKalb	450.72	1,187	736	6,024	5,447	−9.7
Elmore	1,002.25	2,047	1,045	2,240	1,658	−26.0
Escambia	658.90	1,495	836	1,588	1,460	−8.1
Etowah	325.58	1,030	704	3,044	2,269	−25.5
Fayette	341.56	892	550	2,392	1,835	−23.3
Franklin	460.81	1,074	613	2,648	2,144	−19.0
Geneva	1,158.01	1,485	327	2,116	2,101	−.7
Greene	839.37	2,523	1,684	1,342	960	−28.5
Hale	920.84	2,142	1,221	1,814	1,441	−20.6
Henry	1,137.19	1,850	713	1,322	1,245	−5.8
Houston	923.84	1,372	448	2,764	2,574	−6.9
Jackson	404.22	1,361	957	4,254	3,508	−17.5
Jefferson		669	669		888	
Lamar	549.28	1,044	495	2,424	1,896	−21.8
Lauderdale	739.94	1,324	384	3,971	3,362	−15.3
Lawrence	1,543.37	2,641	1,098	3,183	2,855	−10.3
Lee	863.18	1,400	537	1,183	975	−17.6
Limestone	1,873.27	2,853	980	3,491	3,312	−5.1
Lowndes	1,077.16	2,975	1,898	823	757	−8.0
Macon	1,108.29	1,866	758	1,616	1,444	−10.6
Madison	2,278.39	3,294	1,016	3,500	3,392	−3.1
Marengo	841.05	1,560	719	1,951	1,848	−5.3
Marion	430.65	861	430	3,381	2,556	−24.4
Marshall	635.87	1,488	852	5,015	4,607	−8.1
Mobile		671	671		808	
Monroe	613.13	1,945	1,332	2,176	1,938	−10.9
Montgomery	884.94	2,055	1,170	1,171	1,021	−12.8
Morgan	859.20	1,683	824	4,125	3,548	−14.0
Perry	866.81	2,144	1,277	1,215	1,090	−10.3
Pickens	582.75	1,479	896	2,295	1,822	−20.6
Pike	868.74	1,437	568	1,601	1,507	−5.9
Randolph	458.62	634	175	2,714	2,208	−18.6
Russell	930.76	1,728	797	831	775	−6.7
St. Clair	242.40	778	536	1,878	1,174	−37.5
Shelby	555.39	1,443	888	971	715	−26.4
Sumter	999.16	2,081	1,082	1,238	1,172	−5.3
Talladega	452.55	1,009	557	2,282	1,759	−22.9
Tallapoosa	619.11	1,035	506	1,545	1,063	−31.2
Tuscaloosa	598.07	1,392	794	3,264	2,194	−32.8
Walker	178.56	548	369	3,259	1,994	−38.8
Washington		520	520		711	
Wilcox	537.15	1,718	1,181	1,453	1,251	−13.9
Winston	316.30	794	478	2,282	1,537	−32.6
Total	383.64	1,453	1,069	142,586	122,714	−13.9
ARIZONA						
Pinal	8,283.41	62,582	54,299	1,037	791	−23.7
Cochise		6,508	6,508		372	
Graham	9,776.63	9,859	82	499	256	−48.7
Greenlee		4,368	4,368		87	
Maricopa	6,985.37	30,069	23,084	1,944	1,487	−23.5
Mohave		38,000	38,000		7	
Pima	8,460.00	23,908	15,448	66	229	247.0
Santa Cruz		18,857	18,857		21	
Yavapai		4,000	4,000		1	
Yuma		13,672	13,672		607	
Total	8,376.35	29,544	21,168	3,546	3,858	8.8
ARKANSAS						
Arkansas	877.68	1,876	998	1,430	988	−30.9
Ashley	3,479.09	6,669	3,190	1,057	868	−17.9
Baxter		182	182		33	
Boone		200	200		5	
Bradley	354.63	1,080	725	1,206	858	−28.9
Calhoun	331.63	1,473	1,121	839	503	−40.0
Chicot	2,397.26	4,453	2,056	1,729	1,462	−15.4
Clark	249.46	1,621	1,372	1,148	433	−62.3
Clay	1,256.85	2,019	762	3,544	3,135	−11.5
Cleburne		497	497		793	
Cleveland	383.56	1,031	647	1,184	708	−40.2
Columbia	389.73	830	440	2,732	1,838	−32.7
Conway	$334.53	$1,432	$1,198	1,951	813	−58.3
Craighead	2,532.37	3,595	1,063	4,032	3,544	−12.1
Crawford		3,103	3,103		29	
Crittenden	9,999.48	13,929	4,040	1,728	1,726	−.1
Cross	4,332.19	5,999	1,667	1,536	1,405	−8.5
Dallas		908	908		393	
Desha	4,174.36	7,313	3,139	1,582	1,379	−12.8
Drew	1,178.79	2,165	986	1,474	1,204	−18.3
Faulkner	413.37	1,137	724	2,907	1,745	−40.0
Franklin		949	949		78	
Fulton		354	354		260	
Garland		167	167		6	
Grant	150.44	398	248	688	246	−64.2
Greene	1,187.87	2,040	852	3,521	2,998	−14.9
Hempstead	345.59	2,045	1,699	2,510	1,034	−58.8
Hot Spring		568	568		111	
Howard	235.84	1,021	785	951	288	−69.7
Independence	279.55	1,541	1,262	1,584	713	−45.0
Izard	46.02	482	436	1,408	589	−58.2
Jackson	3,685.59	4,627	941	1,672	1,485	−11.2
Jefferson	6,146.09	9,925	3,779	1,904	1,487	−21.9
Johnson		3,206	3,206		68	
Lafayette	1,544.60	3,729	2,184	1,122	664	−40.8
Lawrence	1,080.51	1,980	900	2,121	1,474	−30.5
Lee	3,718.21	5,748	2,030	2,348	2,111	−10.1
Lincoln	3,570.20	6,330	2,760	1,468	1,153	−21.5
Little River	825.08	2,988	2,163	752	332	−55.9
Logan		1,505	1,505		216	
Lonoke	2,264.37	4,243	1,979	2,830	2,141	−24.3
Marion		192	192		26	
Miller	875.94	2,793	1,917	1,122	687	−38.8
Mississippi	8,524.45	11,925	3,401	3,399	3,317	−2.4
Monroe	2,706.42	4,613	1,907	1,711	1,550	−9.4
Montgomery		207	207		29	
Nevada	197.00	713	516	1,620	711	−56.1
Newton		200	200		20	
Ouichita	201.93	855	653	911	429	−52.9
Perry		1,593	1,593		182	
Phillips	3,590.60	7,813	4,222	2,605	2,380	−8.6
Pike		597	597		72	
Poinsett	6,646.71	8,645	1,998	2,072	1,840	−11.2
Poke		333	333		15	
Pope	145.31	1,360	1,215	1,266	364	−71.2
Prairie	1,184.47	1,748	564	1,263	966	−23.5
Pulaski	2,088.09	5,611	3,523	1,194	570	−52.3
Randolph	540.99	1,662	1,122	1,636	854	−47.8
St. Francis	6,414.91	8,547	2,132	1,911	1,698	−11.1
Saline		245	245		49	
Scott		333	333		60	
Searcy		434	434		53	
Sebastian		918	918		73	
Sevier		528	528		195	
Sharp	153.68	653	499	1,142	502	−56.0
Stone		190	190		79	
Union	131.86	476	344	1,219	597	−51.0
Van Buren		222	222		333	
White	431.20	969	538	4,429	3,386	−23.5
Woodruff	3,563.50	5,911	2,348	1,371	1,204	−12.2
Yell	464.94	3,283	2,818	1,319	427	−67.6
Total	2,049.71	4,262	2,212	85,148	63,984	−24.9
CALIFORNIA						
Fresno	14,198.00	10,668	−3,530	3,660	4,775	30.5
Imperial		20,236	20,236		715	
Kern	14,968.31	31,011	16,043	2,100	1,888	−10.1
Kings	21,059.17	12,748	−7,311	1,080	1,570	45.4
Los Angeles		333	333		9	
Madera	8,373.29	6,863	−1,510	1,260	1,229	−2.5
Merced	14,324.03	11,838	−2,486	372	489	31.5
Riverside		15,196	15,296		392	
San Benito		15,000	15,000		4	
San Bernardino		1,043	1,043		23	
San Diego		11,250	11,250		4	
Tulare	8,179.98	8,101	−79	3,972	4,124	3.8
Total	13,517.00	13,091	−426	12,444	15,222	22.3
FLORIDA						
Alachua		806	806		31	
Baker		1,000	1,000		1	
Bay		500	500		12	
Calhoun		540	540		126	
Clay		667	667		3	
Columbia		121	121		157	
Escambia		732	732		343	
Gadsden		189	189		122	
Hamilton		338	338		325	
Holmes		567	567		1,105	
Jackson		364	364		1,982	
Jefferson		345	345		411	
Lafayette		153	153		111	
Leon		338	338		284	
Levy		333	333		3	
Liberty		250	250		4	
Madison		371	371		744	

COTTON.—*Average value per allotment, and number of allotments 1950 and 1955, and increase or decrease in value per allotment and in number of allotments 1950–55, by State and county*—Continued

State and county	Average value per allotment, 1950	Average value per allotment, 1955	Increase or decrease, 1950-55	Number of allotments		
				1950	1955	Percent increase or decrease (—) 1950-55
FLORIDA—continued						
Nassau		$250	$250		4	
Okaloosa		759	759		323	
Santa Rosa		1,183	1,183		840	
Suwannee		203	203		400	
Taylor		111	111		18	
Union		111	111		9	
Walton		586	586		556	
Washington		327	327		339	
Total		502	502		8,253	
GEORGIA						
Appling		525	525		953	
Atkinson	[illegible]	396	396		250	
Bacon		423	423		579	
Baker		1,115	1,115		340	
Baldwin	$744.38	725	19	414	342	−17.4
Banks	495.43	903	408	949	627	−33.9
Barrow	667.81	1,316	648	1,045	754	−27.8
Bartow	1,447.36	3,270	1,823	1,248	1,043	−16.4
Ben Hill	568.77	1,153	559	549	531	−3.3
Berrien		548	548		670	
Bibb		1,284	1,284		155	
Bleckley	1,799.07	2,072	273	583	531	−8.9
Brantley		91	91		22	
Brooks	511.27	1,060	549	1,272	1,265	−.6
Bryan		145	145		69	
Bulloch	980.34	1,052	72	1,770	1,536	−13.2
Burke	2,271.39	3,493	1,222	1,414	1,258	−11.0
Butts	1,315.90	1,437	121	483	389	−19.5
Calhoun	1,351.27	2,280	929	353	339	−4.0
Candler	1,311.13	1,175	136	595	532	−10.6
Carroll	393.10	660	267	2,605	1,736	−33.4
Catoosa		655	655		296	
Chatham		353	353		17	
Chattahoochee		136	136		44	
Chattooga	205.50	1,342	1,136	920	588	−36.1
Cherokee	24.44	391	367	1,289	266	−79.4
Clarke	472.41	862	390	506	347	−31.4
Clay		1,978	1,978		279	
Clayton		800	800		155	
Clinch		229	229		48	
Cobb	38.78	407	368	1,439	305	−78.8
Coffee	398.30	629	231	1,128	1,097	−2.7
Colquitt	1,253.40	1,599	346	1,773	1,887	6.4
Columbia		587	587		351	
Cook		652	652		682	
Coweta	773.73	1,331	557	1,139	688	−39.6
Crawford		1,142	1,142		226	
Crisp	1,650.67	2,410	759	628	576	−8.3
Dade		264	264		140	
Dawson		175	175		80	
Decatur		425	425		731	
De Kalb		459	459		133	
Dodge	1,172.16	1,290	118	1,340	1,133	−15.4
Dooly	1,832.34	3,204	1,372	1,063	955	−10.2
Dougherty		908	908		195	
Douglas		588	588		177	
Early	1,149.02	2,066	917	1,158	1,066	−7.9
Echols		42	42		24	
Effingham		363	363		350	
Elbert	708.93	1,486	777	1,463	1,192	−18.5
Emanuel	1,065.88	1,560	494	1,415	1,265	−10.6
Evans		818	818		363	
Fannin						
Fayette	799.90	1,099	299	802	546	−31.9
Floyd	466.49	1,652	1,186	1,403	747	−46.8
Forsyth	80.55	565	485	1,466	555	−62.1
Franklin	748.83	1,031	282	1,642	1,362	−17.1
Fulton	212.90	623	410	1,001	475	−52.5
Glascock	1,070.03	1,425	355	361	339	−6.1
Gordon	517.60	1,550	1,033	1,599	1,157	−27.6
Grady		660	660		791	
Greene	407.55	594	187	776	540	−30.4
Gwinnett	232.56	687	454	2,007	908	−54.8
Habersham		345	345		148	
Hall	102.21	582	480	1,555	552	−64.5
Hancock	743.98	1,285	541	961	824	−14.3
Haralson	169.47	460	291	1,231	730	−40.7
Harris	550.63	684	133	491	288	−41.3
Hart	956.64	1,634	677	1,643	1,469	−10.6
Heard		777	777		466	
Henry	1,137.40	1,534	697	1,245	898	−27.9
Houston	1,037.63	1,496	458	565	409	−27.6
Irwin	1,179.37	1,564	385	855	845	−1.2
Jackson	971.47	1,158	187	1,506	1,257	−16.5
Jasper	1,413.19	2,230	817	423	291	−31.2
Jeff Davis		365	365		534	
Jefferson	1,591.33	2,410	819	1,149	991	−13.8
Jenkins	1,729.71	2,182	452	694	631	−9.1
Johnson	1,911.23	2,563	652	848	767	−9.6
Jones		377	377		130	
Lamar	612.28	905	297	513	357	−30.4
Lanier		241	241		191	
Laurens	1,483.13	1,792	309	2,170	1,920	−11.5
Lee		1,408	1,408		304	
Liberty		42	42		95	
GEORGIA—continued						
Lincoln		$1,090	$1,090		277	
Long		267	267		172	
Lowndes	$287.86	448	160	791	814	2.9
Lumpkin		225	225		40	
McDuffie	1,220.11	1,343	123	564	458	−18.8
Macon	1,815.32	3,255	1,440	693	581	−16.2
Madison	937.38	1,210	273	1,517	1,430	−5.7
Marion		1,590	1,590		315	
Meriwether	1,344.79	1,876	531	1,157	970	−16.2
Miller		1,181	1,181		609	
Mitchell	108.12	1,656	1,548	1,096	1,012	−7.7
Monroe		640	640		258	
Montgomery	777.34	869	92	518	481	−7.1
Morgan	2,460.68	3,471	1,010	795	705	−11.3
Murray	170.56	788	617	934	613	−34.4
Muscogee		525	525		40	
Newton	1,158.19	1,867	709	808	652	−19.3
Oconee	1,250.36	2,212	962	728	613	−15.8
Oglethorpe	691.94	1,429	737	1,193	974	−18.4
Paulding	234.12	884	650	1,081	473	−56.2
Peach		2,262	2,262		194	
Pickens		541	541		135	
Pierce		366	366		612	
Pike	1,144.67	2,246	1,101	643	435	−32.0
Polk	316.73	1,125	808	1,323	825	−37.6
Pulaski	1,688.49	1,988	300	544	501	−7.9
Putnam		748	748		266	
Quitman		978	978		134	
Randolph		1,984	1,984		432	
Richmond	654.12	1,090	436	347	210	−39.5
Rockdale	575.36	901	326	565	345	−38.9
Schley	1,548.36	2,119	571	299	252	−15.7
Screven	1,298.53	1,245	−53	1,308	1,110	−15.1
Seminole		1,408	1,408		500	
Spalding	834.09	1,241	407	508	294	−42.1
Stephens		486	486		296	
Stewart		997	997		332	
Sumter	1,707.70	2,736	1,028	784	712	−9.2
Talbot		420	420		276	
Taliaferro	478.14	550	72	387	291	−24.8
Tattnall	414.92	568	153	980	868	−11.4
Taylor	1,297.08	2,705	1,408	568	451	−20.6
Telfair	449.48	584	135	859	760	−11.5
Terrell	2,434.38	4,299	1,865	555	546	−1.6
Thomas	392.33	671	279	824	869	5.5
Tift	736.36	1,037	301	858	832	−3.0
Toombs	813.24	1,081	268	973	816	−16.1
Treutlen		1,282	1,282		354	
Troup	305.30	609	304	645	343	−46.8
Turner	807.58	1,663	855	670	608	−9.3
Twiggs		828	828		464	
Union						
Upson		808	808		219	
Walker	118.00	428	310	1,350	722	−46.5
Walton	1,875.40	2,679	804	1,387	1,267	−8.7
Ware		203	203		344	
Warren	1,848.76	2,411	562	598	514	−14.0
Washington	1,174.55	2,232	1,058	1,226	1,049	−14.4
Wayne		666	666		404	
Webster		657	657		251	
Wheeler		877	877		463	
White		302	302		304	
Whitfield	116.04	422	306	1,379	524	−62.0
Wilcox	1,156.66	1,738	581	951	780	−18.0
Wilkes	478.35	1,215	737	1,016	474	−53.3
Wilkenson	209.65	603	393	595	418	−29.7
Worth	1,138.95	2,133	994	1,368	1,230	−10.1
Total	963.64	1,377	413	90,850	86,504	−4.8
ILLINOIS						
Alexander		693	693		231	
Pulaski		532	532		233	
Total		612	612		464	
KENTUCKY						
Ballard		167	167		6	
Calloway		74	74		163	
Carlisle		200	200		40	
Fulton		3,506	3,506		423	
Graves		69	69		175	
Hickman		475	475		362	
Marshall		56	56		54	
Total		1,382	1,382		1,223	
LOUISIANA						
Acadia	936.23	1,392	456	2,151	1,298	−39.7
Allen		274	274		303	
Ascension		188	188		277	
Assumption		67	67		15	
Avoyelles	751.22	1,361	610	3,926	3,627	−7.6
Beauregard	47.41	148	101	310	176	−43.2
Bienville	199.53	795	596	1,751	913	−47.9

COTTON.—*Average value per allotment, and number of allotments 1950 and 1955, and increase or decrease in value per allotment and in number of allotments 1950–55, by State and county*—Continued

State and county	Average value per allotment, 1950	Average value per allotment, 1955	Increase or decrease, 1950–55	Number of allotments 1950	Number of allotments 1955	Number of allotments Percent increase or decrease (–) 1950–55
LOUISIANA—continued						
Bossier	$2,873.16	$3,484	$611	1,421	981	−31.0
Caddo	4,803.90	6,707	1,814	1,438	1,119	−22.2
Calcasieu		234	234		77	
Caldwell		1,644	1,644		522	
Cameron		166	166		145	
Catahoula	1,204.52	1,818	614	990	953	−4.3
Claiborne	436.23	744	308	1,889	1,166	−38.3
Concordia	2,285.90	2,575	289	603	584	−3.2
De Soto	430.86	1,070	639	1,740	1,206	−30.7
East Baton Rouge		180	180		462	
East Carroll	2,281.72	4,279	1,997	990	921	−7.0
East Feliciana	341.06	600	259	789	670	−15.1
Evangeline	1,580.09	1,428	−152	2,138	1,958	−8.4
Franklin	2,564.21	3,782	1,218	2,341	2,335	−.3
Grant	1,138.89	1,398	259	379	241	−36.4
Iberia		376	376		465	
Iberville		241	241		174	
Jackson		283	283		371	
Jefferson Davis		270	270		174	
Lafayette	842.09	1,105	263	2,549	2,086	−18.2
La Salle		364	364		129	
Lincoln	237.79	744	506	1,305	581	−55.5
Livingstone		161	161		255	
Madison	3,966.75	5,418	1,451	720	682	−5.3
Morehouse	3,580.71	5,733	2,152	1,157	1,138	−1.6
Natchitoches	2,239.48	2,431	193	1,805	1,204	−33.3
Ouachita	1,955.04	2,904	949	988	732	−25.9
Pointe Coupee	1,036.24	1,716	680	1,090	991	−9.1
Rapides	1,638.48	2,312	674	1,588	1,273	−19.8
Red River	1,795.90	2,697	901	921	564	−38.8
Richland	2,673.90	4,269	1,595	2,000	1,992	−.4
Sabine	159.01	423	264	1,329	565	−57.5
St. Helena		273	273		905	
St. James		167	167		12	
St. John the Baptist		667	667		3	
St. Landry	1,034.28	1,656	622	4,055	4,028	−.7
St. Martin	632.21	902	270	1,632	1,505	−7.8
St. Tammany		210	210		181	
Tangipahoa		212	212		895	
Tensas	4,248.94	3,660	−589	689	849	23.2
Terrebonne						
Union	315.29	747	432	1,864	1,106	−40.7
Vermilion	381.28	804	423	2,284	1,006	−56.0
Vernon		241	241		547	
Washington	336.89	608	271	1,628	1,345	−17.4
Webster	474.57	1,237	762	1,422	820	−42.3
West Baton Rouge		1,054	1,054		168	
West Carroll	1,529.13	2,326	797	2,080	2,067	−.6
West Feliciana		1,027	1,027		260	
Winn	106.59	336	229	613	271	−55.8
Total	1,473.57	1,931	457	54,270	49,293	−9.2
MISSISSIPPI						
Adams	520.18	897	377	336	319	−5.1
Alcorn	576.43	1,213	637	2,179	1,872	−14.1
Amite	629.41	807	178	1,677	1,656	−1.3
Attala	586.50	1,217	631	2,520	2,017	−20.0
Benton	1,094.87	2,381	1,286	1,005	939	−6.6
Bolivar	10,182.40	13,697	3,515	2,185	2,087	−4.5
Calhoun	736.70	2,147	1,410	1,843	1,637	−11.2
Carroll	1,140.65	2,114	973	1,558	1,424	−8.6
Chickasaw	1,032.97	1,758	725	1,642	1,425	−13.2
Choctaw	346.96	583	236	1,436	1,228	−14.5
Claiborne	835.47	1,399	564	622	631	−1.4
Clarke	371.73	455	74	1,748	1,513	−13.4
Clay	755.91	1,273	517	1,193	1,031	−13.6
Coahoma	18,166.81	27,766	9,599	928	866	−6.7
Copiah	398.99	779	380	1,888	1,771	−6.2
Covington	496.70	791	294	2,116	1,966	−5.7
De Soto	2,966.34	4,453	1,487	1,553	1,454	−4.4
Forrest	178.50	387	209	600	434	−27.7
Franklin		485	485		458	
George		409	409		374	
Greene		358	358		497	
Grenada	2,054.24	3,376	1,322	868	792	−8.8
Hinds	1,492.74	2,187	694	2,157	2,053	−4.8
Holmes	2,465.57	4,407	1,941	2,100	2,007	−4.4
Humphreys	6,612.08	11,131	4,519	1,232	997	−19.1
Issaquena	3,532.82	3,098	−435	485	407	−16.1
Itawamba	500.63	1,057	556	2,391	1,940	−18.9
Jasper	455.48	584	129	2,185	1,901	−13.0
Jefferson	617.14	975	358	784	728	−7.1
Jefferson Davis	872.65	1,296	423	2,060	2,076	.8
Jones	477.37	599	122	2,756	2,329	−15.5
Kemper	879.14	1,073	494	1,766	1,552	−12.1
Lafayette	984.24	1,809	825	1,812	1,627	−10.2
Lamar	283.35	620	337	1,139	1,017	−10.7
Lauderdale	348.71	750	401	1,913	1,391	−27.3
Lawrence	488.04	819	331	1,552	1,437	−7.4
Leake	708.62	1,365	657	2,958	2,709	−8.4
Lee	1,024.27	2,159	1,135	2,458	2,227	−9.4
Leflore	15,047.44	17,790	2,743	1,027	983	−4.3
Lincoln	306.02	468	162	2,124	1,585	−25.4
Lowndes	970.02	1,911	941	1,815	1,593	−12.2
Madison	1,841.90	3,533	1,691	2,032	2,037	.2
Marion	479.28	845	366	2,247	2,041	−9.2
MISSISSIPPI—continued						
Marshall	$1,082.25	$3,531	$1,849	1,816	1,781	−1.9
Monroe	1,065.52	2,422	1,357	2,847	2,548	−10.5
Montgomery	612.36	1,624	1,012	1,209	1,129	−6.6
Neshoba	664.24	980	316	3,128	2,744	−12.3
Newton	543.89	581	37	2,589	2,187	−15.5
Noxubee	1,415.05	2,969	1,554	1,443	1,150	−20.3
Oktibbeha	285.23	492	207	1,312	1,098	−16.3
Panola	2,072.22	4,233	2,161	2,266	2,105	−7.1
Pearl River		223	223		166	
Perry		396	396		642	
Pike	279.63	510	231	1,863	1,578	−15.3
Pontotoc	687.96	1,408	720	2,720	2,675	−1.7
Prentiss	841.59	1,581	739	2,151	2,010	−6.6
Quitman	8,875.56	12,952	4,076	1,189	1,149	−3.4
Rankin	557.40	1,181	624	1,924	1,637	−14.9
Scott	642.72	1,152	509	2,129	1,898	−10.9
Sharkey	6,787.63	8,972	2,184	653	506	−22.5
Simpson	637.10	952	315	2,358	2,155	−8.6
Smith	689.87	922	232	2,270	2,006	−11.6
Stone		183	183		82	
Sunflower	13,124.52	16,412	3,288	1,698	1,752	3.2
Tallahatchie	5,963.42	9,374	3,411	1,491	1,435	−3.8
Tate	2,201.86	4,375	2,173	1,445	1,303	−9.8
Tippah	691.00	1,500	809	2,129	2,030	−4.7
Tishomingo	308.00	819	511	2,198	1,827	−16.9
Tunica	14,052.41	21,874	7,822	667	565	−15.3
Union	722.74	1,736	1,013	2,171	2,005	−7.6
Walthall	611.70	1,230	618	2,071	1,914	−7.6
Warren	1,287.63	2,482	1,194	723	488	−32.5
Washington	9,482.65	12,479	2,996	1,651	1,435	−13.1
Wayne	446.01	672	226	1,557	1,490	−4.3
Webster	690.78	1,226	526	1,567	1,358	−13.3
Wilkinson		875	875		634	
Winston	701.99	1,144	442	2,199	2,057	−6.5
Yalobusha	813.45	1,731	918	1,279	1,127	−11.9
Yazoo	4,270.33	8,139	3,869	1,551	1,188	−23.4
Total	1,344.71	2,960	1,615	125,154	114,912	−8.2
MISSOURI						
Butler	506.81	848	301	3,329	3,089	−7.2
Dunklin	3,052.14	3,910	858	3,734	3,352	−10.2
Mississippi	2,720.54	4,706	1,986	1,202	1,114	−11.7
New Madrid	4,711.69	6,947	2,235	2,528	2,311	−8.6
Pemiscot	4,540.55	7,586	3,046	2,703	2,570	−4.9
Scott	2,336.29	3,241	905	874	822	−5.9
Stoddard	1,754.24	2,995	1,241	2,726	2,593	−4.9
Total	2,808.89	4,087	1,278	17,156	16,434	−4.2
NEVADA						
Clark		4,000	4,000		1	
Nye		19,000	19,000		17	
NEW MEXICO						
Chaves	10,367.18	14,133	3,766	744	663	−10.9
Curry		2,750	2,750		60	
De Baca		1,394	1,394		71	
Dona Ana	7,517.36	5,347	−2,170	1,828	1,922	5.1
Eddy	11,653.86	14,040	2,386	554	580	4.7
Grant		818	818		1	
Guadalupe		1,000	1,000		2	
Hidalgo		12,317	12,317		123	
Lea	4,258.83	12,668	8,409	459	476	3.7
Luna		11,170	11,170		283	
Otero		5,810	5,810		63	
Quay		2,870	2,870		146	
Roosevelt		2,037	2,037		896	
Sierra		4,072	4,072		167	
Socorro		1,588	1,588		194	
Valencia		167	167		12	
Total	8,449.00	7,474	−975	3,585	5,669	58.1
NORTH CAROLINA						
Alamance		85	85		94	
Alexander		197	197		561	
Anson	714.77	1,298	583	2,273	1,620	−28.7
Beaufort		128	128		725	
Bertie	178.29	399	220	1,664	1,628	−2.2
Bladen	84.50	179	95	2,371	1,930	−18.6
Brunswick		67	67		312	
Burke		145	145		76	
Cabarrus	287.21	689	402	1,600	990	−38.1
Caldwell		172	172		29	
Camden		315	315		158	
Carteret		83	83		36	
Catawba	126.41	310	184	2,415	1,319	−45.4
Chatham		132	132		438	
Chowan	151.92	346	194	673	651	−3.3
Cleveland	815.63	1,713	897	4,096	3,512	−14.3
Columbus		153	153		1,577	
Craven		67	67		387	
Cumberland	326.50	657	330	2,543	2,271	−10.7

COTTON.—*Average value per allotment, and number of allotments 1950 and 1955, and increase or decrease in value per allotment and in number of allotments 1950–55, by State and county*—Continued

State and county	Average value per allotment, 1950	Average value per allotment, 1955	Increase or decrease, 1950–55	Number of allotments		
				1950	1955	Percent increase or decrease (−) 1950–55
NORTH CAROLINA—con.						
Currituck		$154	$154		194	
Davidson		245	245		563	
Davie		174	174		1,319	
Duplin	$138.25	367	229	1,604	1,192	−25.7
Durham		154	154		78	
Edgecombe	393.56	715	321	1,518	1,391	−8.4
Forsyth		105	105		133	
Franklin	174.73	836	661	2,870	2,621	−8.7
Gaston	168.56	601	432	1,620	919	−43.3
Gates	128.07	274	146	1,123	966	−14.0
Granville		140	140		228	
Greene	221.57	509	287	853	802	−6.0
Guilford		84	84		95	
Halifax	395.53	786	391	3,212	3,102	−3.4
Harnett	244.06	520	276	3,487	2,933	−15.9
Hertford		495	495	1,248	1,112	−10.9
Hoke	1,555.73	1,671	115	1,129	1,056	−6.5
Hyde		73	73		150	
Iredell	347.10	480	133	3,753	3,059	−18.5
Johnston	263.41	459	196	5,626	4,927	−12.4
Jones		138	138		160	
Lee	86.28	237	151	991	595	−40.0
Lenoir	135.61	372	236	815	634	−22.2
Lincoln	363.60	700	336	2,099	1,742	−17.0
Martin	135.47	281	146	958	708	−26.1
Mecklenburg	414.98	911	496	2,115	1,374	−35.0
Montgomery		971	971		243	
Moore		448	448		581	
Nash	284.14	518	234	2,781	2,481	−10.8
New Hanover		67	67		15	
Northampton	470.24	1,159	689	2,366	2,395	1.2
Onslow		243	243		111	
Orange		84	84		95	
Pamlico		73	73		179	
Pasquotank		89	89		247	
Pender		87	87		367	
Perquimans	65.69	213	147	833	602	−27.7
Pitt	134.45	382	248	1,790	1,679	−6.2
Polk	108.49	538	430	803	433	−46.1
Randolph		100	100		80	
Richmond	494.86	790	295	1,296	1,056	−18.5
Robeson	812.72	1,174	361	4,739	4,743	.1
Rowan	500.36	463	−37	2,416	1,834	−24.1
Rutherford	124.95	633	508	3,283	2,407	−26.7
Sampson	262.43	587	325	5,044	4,699	−6.8
Scotland (sic)	2,144.09	248	−1,896	894	880	−1.6
Stanly	128.76	501	372	1,781	673	−62.2
Tyrrell		122	122		188	
Union	322.84	794	471	4,577	3,637	−20.5
Vance		275	275		1,202	
Wake	103.44	300	197	3,108	2,031	−34.7
Warren	143.88	352	208	2,761	2,325	−15.8
Washington		110	110		356	
Wayne	285.47	545	260	2,961	2,327	−21.4
Wilkes		123	123		73	
Wilson	211.89	457	245	2,082	1,858	−10.8
Yadkin		83	83		72	
Total	352.33	624	272	96,171	90,237	−6.2
OKLAHOMA						
Adair		118	118		17	
Atoka		332	332		367	
Beckham	1,767.72	2,003	235	2,030	1,955	−3.7
Blaine	688.49	988	300	931	1,090	17.1
Bryan	85.47	785	700	2,721	1,668	−38.7
Caddo	554.65	1,506	951	3,969	3,344	−15.7
Canadian	548.45	1,217	669	980	1,058	8.0
Carter		272	272		272	
Cherokee		118	118		34	
Choctaw	67.90	625	557	1,731	634	−63.3
Cleveland		966	966		205	
Coal		708	708	740	387	−47.7
Comanche	282.42	664	382	1,478	1,079	−27.6
Cotton	86.81	1,103	1,016	1,013	1,095	8.1
Craig		105	105		38	
Creek	8.02	352	344	2,222	426	−80.8
Custer	1,330.43	1,513	183	1,030	1,357	31.7
Dewey	372.21	650	278	840	806	−4.0
Ellis		385	385		109	
Garfield		83	83		12	
Garvin	89.65	810	720	1,775	715	−59.7
Grady	240.62	1,376	1,135	2,981	1,545	−48.2
Grant		333	333		3	
Greer	1,848.08	2,320	472	1,445	1,261	−12.7
Harmon	2,970.67	4,361	1,390	1,068	1,045	−2.2
Harper		500	500		2	
Haskell	57.24	964	907	1,390	395	−71.6
Hughes	9.46	540	531	2,227	879	−60.5
Jackson	1,990.54	3,665	1,675	2,066	1,744	−15.6
Jefferson	600.49	1,247	647	1,173	881	−24.9
Johnston		650	650		417	
Kay		169	169		68	
Kingfisher		370	370		257	
Kiowa	1,998.32	1,737	−261	1,945	2,137	9.9
Latimer		171	171		76	
Le Flore	65.41	1,246	1,181	2,097	317	−84.9
Lincoln	$12.87	$232	$219	1,986	319	−83.9
Logan	71.46	429	358	1,272	422	−66.8
Love		772	772	1,158	696	−39.9
McClain	189.02	1,202	1,013	1,637	794	−51.5
McCurtain	243.58	1,946	1,702	1,710	576	−66.3
McIntosh	69.02	855	786	2,939	1,524	−48.1
Major		338	338		364	
Marshall		1,435	1,435		283	
Mayes		395	395		129	
Murray		618	618		55	
Muskogee	156.37	1,328	1,172	2,925	1,677	−42.7
Noble		274	274		223	
Nowata		475	475		101	
Okfuskee	42.43	523	481	2,540	903	−64.4
Oklahoma		408	408		49	
Okmulgee	35.20	571	536	2,424	1,314	−45.8
Osage	179.02	1,173	994	736	266	−63.9
Pawnee	75.70	465	389	1,303	510	−60.9
Payne	61.67	294	232	1,220	497	−59.3
Pittsburg	47.51	883	836	1,849	666	−64.0
Pontotoc		372	372		226	
Pottawatomie		406	406	1,286	170	−86.8
Pushmataha		181	181		127	
Roger Mills	850.57	1,077	226	1,311	1,115	−15.0
Rogers		329	329		173	
Seminole		230	230		379	
Sequoyah		1,743	1,743		113	
Stephens	60.71	687	626	1,779	553	−68.9
Tillman	3,889.97	3,587	−303	1,568	1,948	24.2
Tulsa		1,376	1,376	635	141	−77.8
Wagoner	93.49	680	587	2,112	1,241	−41.2
Washington		83	83		12	
Washita	2,701.93	2,230	472	2,711	2,762	1.9
Woodward		442	442		77	
Total	590.62	1,402	811	72,953	48,097	−34.1
SOUTH CAROLINA						
Abbeville	545.04	1,289	744	1,608	1,120	−30.3
Aiken	1,000.10	1,331	331	2,379	1,895	−20.3
Allendale	1,600.50	2,196	596	674	514	−23.7
Anderson	715.69	1,846	1,130	4,216	2,886	−31.5
Bamberg	1,090.40	1,338	248	1,108	943	−14.9
Barnwell	1,336.95	1,962	625	1,338	925	−30.9
Beaufort		149	149		745	
Berkeley		294	294		2,117	
Calhoun	1,796.30	2,258	461	1,069	934	−12.6
Charleston		100	100		799	
Cherokee	349.36	1,435	1,086	2,235	1,596	−28.6
Chester	762.40	1,741	979	1,490	1,106	−25.8
Chesterfield	991.12	1,628	637	2,825	2,509	−11.2
Clarendon	1,364.97	1,357	−8	2,766	2,666	−3.6
Colleton	242.43	515	273	2,399	2,094	−12.7
Darlington	1,519.28	1,932	413	2,166	1,994	−7.9
Dillon	1,433.33	1,371	−62	1,376	1,295	−5.9
Dorchester	692.83	776	83	1,577	1,572	−.3
Edgefield	945.13	1,936	991	1,380	926	−32.9
Fairfield	532.90	899	366	1,065	850	−20.2
Florence	355.87	782	426	3,681	3,882	5.5
Georgetown		127	127		913	
Greenville	299.55	1,153	854	4,297	2,476	−42.4
Greenwood	437.73	1,080	642	1,100	615	−44.1
Hampton	675.55	920	245	1,154	975	−15.5
Horry		146	146		2,777	
Jasper		367	367		815	
Kershaw	747.71	1,185	437	1,923	1,779	−7.5
Lancaster	349.44	1,128	779	1,790	1,163	−35.0
Laurens	1,031.23	2,029	998	2,281	1,538	−32.6
Lee	2,675.88	3,735	1,059	1,537	1,387	−9.8
Lexington	499.25	800	301	2,098	1,722	−17.9
McCormick	497.32	1,177	680	738	479	−35.1
Marion	649.11	614	35	1,488	1,393	−6.4
Marlboro	4,074.55	4,639	565	1,188	1,024	−13.8
Newberry	697.08	1,077	380	1,751	1,172	−33.1
Oconee	374.52	985	611	2,492	1,567	−37.1
Orangeburg	1,452.74	1,493	40	4,718	4,503	−4.6
Pickens	257.02	795	538	2,351	1,389	−40.9
Richland	408.86	776	367	1,562	1,156	−26.0
Saluda	635.30	1,313	678	1,630	1,100	−32.5
Spartanburg	398.37	1,098	700	5,353	3,600	−32.7
Sumter	1,625.94	2,026	400	2,820	2,679	−5.0
Union	637.25	1,441	804	976	628	−35.7
Williamsburg	793.19	616	177	3,556	3,692	3.8
York	704.27	2,083	1,379	2,185	1,570	−28.1
Total	920.91	1,260	330	84,340	75,380	−10.6
TENNESSEE						
Bedford		328	328		616	
Benton	230.51	392	162	1,372	877	−36.1
Bradley		216	216		527	
Cannon		83	83		24	
Carroll	724.08	942	218	3,969	3,582	−9.8
Chester	628.75	1,449	820	1,507	1,482	−1.6
Coffee		374	374		623	
Crockett	2,030.98	2,965	934	2,228	2,186	−1.9

COTTON.—*Average value per allotment, and number of allotments 1950 and 1955, and increase or decrease in value per allotment and in number of allotments 1950–55, by State and county*—Continued

State and county	Average value per allotment, 1950	Average value per allotment, 1955	Increase or decrease, 1950–55	Number of allotments 1950	Number of allotments 1955	Number of allotments Percent increase or decrease (–) 1950–55
TENNESSEE—continued						
Davidson		$100	$100		10	
Decatur	$222.41	588	366	1,180	851	−27.9
DeKalb		100	100		30	
Dyer	1,938.54	2,691	753	2,479	2,440	−1.6
Fayette	2,229.43	3,685	1,456	2,030	2,087	2.8
Franklin	569.49	882	313	1,764	1,447	−18.0
Gibson	1,141.78	1,553	411	5,582	5,513	−1.2
Giles	357.02	508	151	2,414	2,100	−13.0
Grundy		277	277		83	
Hamilton		199	199		327	
Hardeman	910.32	1,943	1,033	2,145	1,979	−7.7
Hardin	317.39	749	432	1,977	1,647	−16.7
Haywood	2,604.41	3,218	614	2,527	2,406	−4.8
Henderson	632.42	1,323	691	2,600	2,501	−3.8
Henry	323.80	340	16	2,307	1,925	−16.6
Hickman		40	40		25	
Humphreys		91	91		11	
Lake	6,880.63	11,557	4,676	567	465	−18.0
Lauderdale	2,495.53	3,140	645	2,251	2,327	3.4
Lawrence	504.92	839	324	3,628	3,403	−6.2
Lewis		282	282		149	(1)
Lincoln	711.67	1,042	330	2,032	2,031	−(1)
Loudon		200	200		5	
McMinn		115	115		406	
McNairy	418.02	1,230	812	2,972	2,921	−1.7
Madison	1,344.26	1,926	582	3,245	2,965	−8.6
Marion		529	529		104	
Marshall		207	207		217	
Maury		102	102		176	
Meigs		174	174		322	
Monroe		86	86		209	
Moore		406	406		32	
Obion	707.35	1,071	364	2,066	1,833	−8.6
Perry		329	329		73	
Polk		439	439		237	
Rhea		56	56		18	
Rutherford	427.21	509	82	1,939	1,476	−23.9
Shelby	1,307.43	2,385	1,078	3,977	3,380	−15.0
Tipton	2,541.46	3,400	859	2,760	2,766	.2
Van Buren		67	67		30	
Warren		170	170		312	
Wayne		375	375		928	
Weakley	388.37	505	117	3,156	3,093	−2.0
White		70	70		71	
Williamson		131	131		84	
Wilson		244	244		45	
Total	1,956.43	1,598	−358	64,614	65,468	1.3
TEXAS						
Anderson	141.96	384	242	2,574	1,831	−28.9
Andrews		2,557	2,557		61	
Angelina	348.04	674	326	677	473	−30.1
Aransas		4,056	4,056		18	
Archer		670	670		106	
Armstrong		1,411	1,411		56	
Atascosa		439	439		667	
Austin	711.82	1,695	983	1,694	1,453	−14.2
Bailey	834.96	6,405	5,570	1,370	1,321	−3.6
Bastrop	726.13	635	91	1,086	846	−22.1
Baylor	1,833.07	2,253	420	479	580	21.1
Bee	700.00	439	261	639	592	−7.4
Bell	2,002.69	1,593	410	3,094	2,722	−12.0
Bexar	363.40	482	119	530	361	−31.9
Blanco		214	214		14	
Borden		3,814	3,814		210	
Bosque	623.95	526	−98	1,057	759	−28.2
Bowie	328.82	2,432	2,103	1,716	764	−55.5
Brazoria	2,118.80	3,762	1,643	533	518	−2.8
Brazos	3,621.52	7,024	3,403	527	370	−29.8
Brewster		7,333	7,333		6	
Briscoe	180.00	5,261	5,081	354	471	33.1
Brooks		140	140		215	
Brown	210.00	281	71	798	601	−24.7
Burleson	2,457.35	3,233	776	1,290	1,117	−13.4
Burnet	391.77	723	331	663	274	−58.7
Caldwell	2,028.11	1,797	−231	853	681	−20.2
Calhoun	4,787.49	6,616	1,829	350	370	5.7
Callahan		422	422		574	
Cameron	3,977.55	3,459	518	6,225	6,334	1.8
Camp	70.06	449	379	1,094	403	−63.2
Carson		568	568		37	
Cass	148.24	648	500	2,958	1,294	−56.3
Castro		8,138	8,138		906	
Chambers		1,000	1,000		11	
Cherokee	169.57	597	427	2,890	2,000	−31.0
Childress	3,316.45	3,508	192	890	896	.7
Clay	465.88	1,572	1,106	646	446	−31.0
Cochran	5,765.33	10,370	4,605	405	679	67.7
Coke		606	606		254	
Coleman	897.70	747	151	1,408	1,173	−16.7
Collin	998.91	1,611	612	4,200	3,460	−17.6
Collingsworth	2,703.40	3,578	875	1,271	1,191	6.3
Colorado	636.79	1,162	525	1,047	832	−20.5
Comal		462	462		26	
Comanche		189	189		1,139	

State and county	Average value per allotment, 1950	Average value per allotment, 1955	Increase or decrease, 1950–55	Number of allotments 1950	Number of allotments 1955	Number of allotments Percent increase or decrease (–) 1950–55
TEXAS—continued						
Concho		$1,973	$1,973		406	
Cooke	$115.42	601	486	1,377	631	−54.2
Coryell	838.86	902	63	1,363	1,072	−21.3
Cottle	6,563.77	6,020	544	664	615	−7.4
Crockett		7,000	7,000		2	
Crosby	7,268.47	9,925	2,657	1,162	1,058	−9.0
Culberson		26,431	26,431		51	
Dallam		333	333		3	
Dallas	1,223.08	1,495	272	1,950	1,314	−32.6
Dawson	9,458.64	7,636	−1,823	1,770	1,751	−1.1
Deaf Smith		2,242	2,242		421	
Delta	7,001.71	4,252	−2,750	1,401	1,169	−16.6
Denton	482.13	928	446	2,056	1,132	−44.9
De Witt	764.44	845	81	1,515	1,341	−11.5
Dickens	4,162.50	4,109	−53	848	798	−5.9
Dimmit		5,404	5,404		52	
Donley	1,162.29	2,317	1,155	805	763	−5.2
Duval	278.22	60	−218	942	843	−10.5
Eastland		162	162		736	
Ector		8,250	8,250		4	
Ellis	3,431.38	3,010	−421	3,447	3,137	−9.0
El Paso	7,604.63	4,344	−3,261	1,589	1,532	−3.6
Erath	163.89	248	84	1,698	1,083	−36.2
Falls	2,660.26	2,006	−654	2,831	2,659	−6.1
Fannin	317.78	1,837	1,519	4,131	3,085	−25.3
Fayette	660.92	958	297	2,928	2,506	−14.4
Fisher	4,790.60	3,708	−1,083	1,481	1,426	−3.7
Floyd	4,128.98	6,888	2,759	1,045	1,382	32.2
Foard	2,060.22	2,644	584	359	360	.1
Fort Bend	2,711.63	4,733	2,021	2,152	2,187	1.6
Franklin		984	984		364	
Freestone	481.14	550	69	1,948	1,855	−4.8
Frio		1,313	1,313		262	
Gaines	3,179.39	5,249	2,070	668	803	20.2
Galveston		143	143		14	
Garza	3,979.29	6,014	2,035	536	515	−3.9
Gillespie		136	136		147	
Glasscock		7,018	7,018		113	
Goliad		647	647		283	
Gonzales	651.76	851	199	1,332	1,021	−23.3
Gray		1,031	1,031		195	
Grayson	164.69	984	819	3,293	1,903	−42.2
Gregg	159.74	465	305	417	241	−42.2
Grimes	1,287.88	1,690	402	1,046	1,019	−2.6
Guadalupe	948.13	937	−11	1,623	1,129	−30.4
Hale	5,099.67	11,385	6,285	1,819	2,090	14.9
Hall	5,203.04	5,950	747	1,072	1,069	−.3
Hamilton	279.02	350	71	1,187	871	−26.6
Hansford		688	688		16	
Hardeman	2,137.29	3,712	1,575	745	753	1.1
Hardin		176	176		17	
Harris	621.44	2,348	1,727	347	273	−21.3
Harrison	198.25	573	375	2,249	1,636	−27.3
Haskell	643.48	3,823	3,180	1,868	1,917	2.6
Hays	1,431.07	2,072	641	383	251	−34.5
Hemphill		1,181	1,181		83	
Henderson		454	454		1,248	
Hidalgo	3,190.94	3,219	28	5,962	8,308	39.3
Hill	1,650.10	1,953	294	3,844	3,434	−10.7
Hockley	7,101.58	9,841	2,739	1,902	1,873	−1.5
Hood		326	326		374	
Hopkins	417.00	1,196	779	2,836	1,705	−39.9
Houston	719.42	1,264	545	2,169	1,817	−16.2
Howard	924.00	4,879	3,955	810	799	−1.4
Hudspeth	30,019.53	30,824	805	129	142	10.1
Hunt	841.86	2,542	1,700	4,257	3,150	−26.0
Irion		1,000	1,000		20	
Jack		426	426		141	
Jackson	1,771.23	3,953	2,182	707	642	−9.2
Jasper		102	102		205	
Jeff Davis		21,750	21,750		8	
Jefferson		200	200		10	
Jim Hogg		83	83		84 6	
Jim Wells	1,001.06	279	722	869	761	−12.4
Johnson	1,647.12	1,733	86	1,573	1,212	−22.9
Jones	3,470.30	2,502	−968	1,997	1,981	−.8
Karnes	1,109.57	728	−382	1,662	1,308	−21.3
Kaufmann	1,606.03	1,950	344	2,577	1,844	−28.4
Kent	4,042.25	3,855	−187	383	339	−11.5
Kerr		143	143		7	
Kimble		440	440		25	
King	11,100.73	6,012	−5,089	82	84	2.4
Kinney		8,750	8,750		4	
Kleberg		263	263		300	
Knox	5,683.63	5,275	−409	997	971	−2.6
Lamar	888.83	3,605	2,716	2,450	1,794	−26.8
Lamb	4,190.34	7,810	3,620	2,471	2,544	3.0
Lampasas		338	338		195	
La Salle		1,287	1,287		108	
Lavaca	734.57	956	221	3,088	2,813	−8.9
Lee	344.72	446	101	1,296	1,080	−16.7
Leon	512.30	1,150	638	1,111	998	−10.2
Liberty	665.81	1,074	408	382	350	−8.4
Limestone	2,660.79	1,462	−1,190	2,038	2,284	12.1
Live Oak	990.45	151	−839	802	648	−19.2
Llano		234	234		47	
Loving		6,250	6,250		12	
Lubbock	10,071.34	13,572	2,901	2,605	2,616	.4

1 Less than 0.05 percent

COTTON.—*Average value per allotment, and number of allotments 1950 and 1955, and increase or decrease in value per allotment and in number of allotments 1950–55, by State and county*—Continued

State and county	Average value per allotment, 1950	Average value per allotment, 1955	Increase or decrease, 1950-55	Number of allotments		
				1950	1955	Percent increase or decrease(−) 1950-55
TEXAS—continued						
Lynn	$9,791.91	$7,825	−$1,967	1,632	1,564	−4.2
McCulloch	857.26	1,196	339	636	556	−12.6
McLennan	2,072.98	1,471	−602	3,442	3,101	−9.9
McMullen		114	114		44	
Madison	674.14	1,089	415	679	586	−13.7
Marion		289	289		443	
Martin	10,486.87	8,879	−1,608	795	793	−.3
Mason		376	376		173	
Matagorda	1,726.06	3,674	1,948	762	699	−8.3
Maverick	4,775.81	5,482	706	186	197	5.9
Medina		374	374		174	
Menard		358	358		67	
Midland	4,742.29	5,436	694	341	314	−7.9
Milam	1,694.73	2,544	849	2,245	1,657	−26.2
Mills		456	456		248	
Mitchell	6,793.15	4,437	−2,356	1,022	989	−3.2
Montague		570	570		358	
Montgomery		305	305		269	
Moore		3,667	3,667		3	
Morris	107.35	503	396	887	312	−64.8
Motley	3,045.23	3,630	585	512	516	.8
Nacogdoches	212.21	565	353	1,682	933	−14.5
Navarro	2,465.58	1,883	−583	3,304	3,249	−1.7
Newton		76	76		237	
Nolan	4,844.82	3,046	−1,799	747	759	1.6
Nueces	4,781.31	1,791	−2,990	1,711	1,696	−.9
Oldham		143	143		7	
Palo Pinto		373	373		236	
Panola	153.12	593	440	1,909	1,242	−36.9
Parker		271	271		425	
Parmer		7,476	7,476		974	
Pecos	6,193.40	20,691	14,498	282	269	−4.6
Polk		852	852		438	
Potter		750	750		4	
Presidio		7,234	7,234		107	
Rains		1,174	1,174		533	
Randall		969	969		64	
Reagen		5,300	5,300		20	
Real		5,000	5,000		1	
Red River	464.00	3,533	3,069	2,006	992	−50.5
Reeves	24,317.93	45,478	21,160	251	393	56.6
Refugio	472.50	3,980	3,508	304	300	−1.3
Roberts		1,500	1,500		2	
Robertson	2,820.80	5,884	3,063	1,079	647	−40.0
Rockwall	1,807.53	2,338	531	717	588	−18.0
Runnels	2,919.25	1,740	−1,179	1,770	1,684	−4.9
Rusk	182.79	624	441	2,967	1,816	−38.8
Sabine		485	485		379	
San Augustine	457.63	805	347	743	706	−5.0
San Jacinto		532	532		534	
San Patricio	5,347.28	5,032	−315	1,137	1,213	6.7
San Saba		555	555		506	
Schleicher		796	796		142	
Scurry	5,111.18	2,776	−2,335	1,234	1,121	−9.2
Shackelford		906	906		170	
Shelby	147.95	624	476	2,482	1,344	−45.9
Smith	124.30	448	324	2,695	1,467	−45.6
Somervell		306	306		144	
Starr	534.18	1,074	540	1,268	1,069	−15.7
Stephens		274	274		117	
Sterling		$200	$200		15	
Stonewall	$3,291.06	3,174	−117	483	533	10.4
Sutton		3,000	3,000		1	
Swisher		5,468	5,468		992	
Tarrant	992.89	1,656	663	591	323	−45.3
Taylor	1,459.96	1,453	−7	1,353	1,081	−20.1
Terry	5,753.61	7,260	1,506	1,352	1,332	−1.5
Throckmorton	2,081.02	767	−1,314	255	421	65.1
Titus		849	849		485	
Tom Green	5,615.48	2,467	−3,148	837	839	.2
Travis	2,203.10	2,006	−197	1,282	1,085	−15.4
Trinity	533.93	564	31	623	640	2.7
Tyler		544	544		114	
Upshur	67.16	333	266	1,577	594	−62.3
Uvalde		5,268	5,268		41	
Val Verde		5,750	5,750		4	
Van Zandt	419.80	888	468	2,601	1,752	−32.6
Victoria	2,022.42	3,412	1,390	1,010	912	−9.7
Walker	452.97	622	169	848	760	−10.4
Waller	730.28	1,512	786	516	379	−26.6
Ward	6,002.07	11,689	4,787	174	132	−24.1
Washington	1,762.93	1,287	476	2,410	1,983	−17.7
Webb		3,095	3,095		59	
Wharton	2,830.49	5,093	2,263	2,407	2,358	−2.0
Wheeler	940.32	2,123	1,177	952	840	−11.8
Wichita	416.10	1,483	1,067	523	315	−39.8
Wilbarger	2,718.85	4,453	1,734	1,232	1,157	−6.1
Willacy	11,703.81	6,098	−5,606	1,227	1,499	22.2
Williamson	2,850.19	2,321	−529	3,612	3,319	−8.1
Wilson	336.51	491	155	797	548	−31.2
Winkler		1,000	1,000		1	
Wise		411	411		309	
Wood	305.17	398	93	1,904	752	−60.5
Yoakum		5,240	5,240		346	
Young	805.99	621	−185	584	552	−5.5
Zapata		3,232	3,232		95	
Zavala		11,643	11,643		157	
Total	2,755.31	2,951	196	217,922	206,072	−5.4
VIRGINIA						
Accomack		1,500	1,500		2	
Brunswick	73.85	156	83	1,497	1,286	−14.1
Caroline		500	500		2	
Charlotte		36	36		28	
Dinwiddie		90	90		201	
Franklin		500	500		4	
Greensville	96.96	478	381	1,138	1,045	−10.8
Isle of Wight		118	118		211	
Lunenburg		225	225		129	
Mecklenburg	110.67	205	94	1,171	886	−24.3
Nansemond	85.59	209	123	1,285	880	−31.5
Norfolk		86	86		35	
Prince George		83	83		72	
Southampton	180.12	407	227	1,521	1,338	−12.0
Sussex		238	238		718	
Total	109.44	273	164	6,612	6,837	3.4

The American Red Cross, Our No. 1 Instrument of Humanitarianism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 6, 1958

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, my colleagues are aware that, in all our home States there commenced Tuesday a nationwide appeal on behalf of our No. 1 instrument of humanitarian assistance—the American Red Cross.

For example, Vice President Nixon has called upon the American people to refill the Red Cross pocketbook which had been emptied by 650 disasters in the past 2½ years.

As every American is aware, 365 days of the year, 24 hours a day, the Red Cross is on the job.

There has never been an instance where it has been found wanting, when emergency has struck, for the American people.

GENERAL CLAY'S ADDRESS IN MILWAUKEE

As was explained last week in Wisconsin's largest city, Milwaukee, by Gen. Lucius B. Clay, the American Red Cross faces an emergency of its own today.

For the first time since World War II, General Clay told a meeting of Red Cross volunteers there, "We come before the people with no reserves."

The $65 million reserve with which the Red Cross emerged from World War II has been wiped out by extraordinary expenses.

This reserve must be replenished.

Fittingly enough, General Clay pointed out in his address that the city in which he spoke is a real "Red Cross city" for, in 16 consecutive years, Milwaukee has gone over the top in its campaign appeals. Other Wisconsin cities likewise have an excellent record, as does my State as a whole.

And, fittingly enough, too, it was General Clay who pointed out that 1 out of every 3 Red Cross dollars is spent on service to the Armed Forces and the families of servicemen.

INTANGIBLE VALUE OF RED CROSS

The morale-boosts which Red Cross service represents cannot be measured in material value in dollars and cents any more than we can measure the value of split-second assistance to stricken Americans in time of flood, hurricane, tornado, and other natural and man-made disasters.

And so, I urge the American people to join in making this current drive an outstanding success.

I salute Red Cross officers from Gen. Alfred M. Gruenther down to all the grassroots civic leaders and volunteers throughout the country whose work is so indispensable to the success of the Red Cross.

I send to the desk excerpts from the 1957 Annual Red Cross Report, which I have received, which eloquently describes some of the diverse humanitarian work of this great organization. I ask unanimous consent that these excerpts from the annual report be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, to be followed by a list of the worthy Americans who serve at the Red Cross' helm through the land.

There being no objection, the excerpts from the report and list of names were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EXCERPTS FROM 1957 ANNUAL RED CROSS REPORT

A Nation's character shapes its institutions. For 350 years the belief that individual freedom and well-being are largely dependent upon people helping themselves and one another has been a cherished part of the American credo. Nowhere is this belief more strongly held and practiced than in the Nation's great voluntary organizations, of which the Red Cross is one. For 76 years the Red Cross has reflected in its activities and services the will of the American people, keeping pace with the demands of the times and of the American conscience.

The record of things done under the emblem of the Red Cross during the past year spells continued faith in this American concept. It is a record written in the hearts of the 40 million junior and adult members of the organization and by the hands of the 2 million volunteer workers whose interest and effort made it possible. It is also indelibly imprinted in the minds and hearts of the millions whose needs were met in time of suffering and distress.

The meaning of the American Red Cross to the people of the country and to the world is well expressed in the words of newspaper columnist Roscoe Drummond. Writing from the scene of relief operations after Hurricane Audrey had lashed the coastal region of Louisiana and Texas, he called the Red Cross "the trustee of the Nation's humanity."

DISASTER

The year 1956–57 was another bad disaster year. Red Cross services were provided in 295 relief operations, 16 of which were of major proportions. Wind and water were the chief destroyers. Hurricanes, tornadoes, and other winds of high destructive force cut wide swaths through inhabited areas, flattening buildings and driving people from their homes. Torrential rains, swollen rives and streams, and tidal waves forced other thousands to flee for their lives, leaving their homes and belongings to the mercy of the elements. The spectacular sinking of the *Andrea Doria* and numerous fires and explosions brought tragedy and suffering to still others.

Despite the strain upon its workers and the drain on its resources, the Red Cross was at the scene of every disaster. It provided for all displaced persons needing them, shelter, food, clothing; and, for the sick and injured, medical and nursing care as long as the emergency condition continued. Not least of the services rendered immediately following each disaster was the handling of thousands of inquiries from anxious relatives and friends concerned for the welfare of persons residing in the stricken areas. And after the emergency was over, the Red Cross moved efficiently to the less glamorous task of rebuilding and repairing, helping to resettle and reestablish disaster victims in their homes and at their means of livelihood. Significant in this connection was increased activity by local advisory committees in helping to determine the soundness of family rehabilitation plans and in granting funds.

This huge task was accomplished only through effective and coordinated effort by all concerned. Red Cross volunteers in chapters in the stricken communities gave heroic service in the early hours of disasters. Later, their efforts were bolstered by those of Red Cross workers from surrounding chapters and of highly skilled area and national headquarters relief workers dispatched to the scene. Disaster operations during the year were characterized by excellent understanding and working relations between the Red Cross, the Federal Civil Defense Administration, and other agencies and organizations. Each did what it was best equipped to do in a cooperative effort to get the disaster-stricken community back on its feet.

Between disasters great progress was made in arriving at understandings and agreements between the Red Cross and other organizations and agencies (both private and governmental) that are vitally concerned with one or another aspect of disaster relief. These agreements help prevent overlapping of activities and help insure the best and most effective use of available funds. Progress was made, too, in planning for full cooperative effort in future disasters or in the event of enemy attack upon this country.

SERVICE TO THE ARMED FORCES

This was a big year of service to the men and women of the Armed Forces, veterans, and their families. Approximately 2,800,000 men and women in uniform were deployed far and wide in the United States and around the world. Distance and isolation created many problems and made service difficult at times. Nevertheless, the traditional high standard of Red Cross service was maintained.

Red Cross fieldworkers were with the Armed Forces everywhere, counseling and guiding servicemen and aiding and comforting the sick and injured. Helping them in their efforts at many installations, particularly overseas, were service wives acting as Red Cross volunteers.

On the home front, Red Cross workers, mostly volunteers, performed similar tasks for the families of servicemen and women and at domestic military installations and military hospitals.

Between the Red Cross field director anywhere in the world and the Red Cross chapter at home a world-encircling network of rapid communication made possible the exchange of information that did much to help solve problems and to maintain the morale of both the man in the service and the family at home.

Thus it was possible in thousands of cases for chaper workers to help servicemen's families apply for Government benefits or to help them financially pending the receipt of allotments or allowances. In this way hardship was frequently avoided. On the other end, it was often possible for the field director to get information through the chapter concerning the welfare of the serviceman's family that dissipated his anxiety regarding them. In many cases, too, the field director was able to get accurate information regarding family situations and conditions that helped military authorities to determine need for emergency leave or arrange for emergency discharge from military service if necessary.

Of considerable importance during the year were the activities of Red Cross workers with convalescent patients in military hospitals. Medically approved programs of entertainment, recreation, crafts, hobbies, and personal and welfare services contributed immeasurably to the recovery of thousands of patients.

Recreation programs were provided for able-bodied servicemen in communities adjacent to isolated installations in France and Morocco and by clubmobile visits to outposts in South Korea.

Noteworthy was the joint development by Red Cross and FCDA of a basic course in emergency mass feeding. New in the disaster scene this year were four unusually well-equipped mobile canteens donated to the Red Cross by the AFL–CIO. They proved their worth many times over as they moved from disaster to disaster and were a constant reminder of the friendly cooperative relations that exist between the Red Cross and the working men and women of America.

Last year 593 chapters in 44 States, Alaska, Puerto Rico, and Hawaii gave assistance following disaster, 311,000 persons received emergency mass care, 88,000 families received assistance to aid them in recovery, and 82,000 volunteers were active in disaster relief and preparedness activities.

Many veterans of World War I sought hospitalization and medical and nursing care last year because of infirmities. In increasing numbers, veterans of World War II required medical attention and hospitalization. Ever mindful of the debt owed to the men and women who served their country, the Red Cross has moved steadily ahead in its program for veterans in chapters, at veterans hospitals, and in Veterans' Administration offices.

Last year 144,000 members of the Armed Forces, veterans, and their families were served each month in chapters, 98,000 members of the Armed Forces were served each month in military hospitals and installations here and overseas, and 8,200 volunteers served each month in home service to help members of the Armed Forces, veterans, and their families.

* * * * *

THE VOLUNTEERS

In every activity and program carried on by the American Red Cross during the year the faithful, hard-working volunteer performed magnificently. From its volunteer officers and Board of Governors, who formulate national policy, determine program, and guide the destinies of the Red Cross, to the volunteer serving in the smallest chapter, the volunteer was the backbone and substance of the organization during the past year, as in every year.

Volunteers officered and constituted the boards of directors of more than 3,700 chapters throughout the land. Volunteers planned and conducted the local campaigns for members and funds, by means of which the money required for Red Cross operations was raised. Volunteers gave leadership, trained other volunteers, and did most of the work of the organization throughout the year.

Outstanding were the community services rendered by Red Cross Gray Ladies, nurse's aids, staff aids, social-welfare aids, motor service drivers, canteen workers, and the volunteers serving in entertainment and supply, arts and skills, and production activities. The services they provided to others were of incalculable value.

The record of achievement of the American Red Cross here set forth is one of which all Americans can be proud.

Last year 1,900,000 hours of service were given by Red Cross volunteers in 2,185 military hospitals and installations; 2,206,000 hours of service were given by Red Cross volunteers in 176 Veterans' Administration hospitals; and 4,980 civilian hospitals, including 180 civilian mental and 3,400 other community institutions and agencies were served each month by Red Cross volunteers, such as Gray Ladies, nurses aids, and canteen workers.

HONORARY OFFICERS

Honorary chairman, Dwight D. Eisenhower, President of the United States; honorary counselor, Herbert Brownell, Jr., Attorney General; honorary treasurer, George M. Humphrey, Secretary of the Treasury.

BOARD OF GOVERNORS

Members appointed by the President of the United States

E. Roland Harriman, Chairman of the American National Red Cross, and Chairman of the Board of Governors; Loy W. Henderson, Deputy Under Secretary of State; W. Randolph Burgess, Under Secretary of the Treasury; Donald A. Quarles, Deputy Secretary of Defense; William H. Francis, Jr., Assistant Secretary of Defense; Dr. Frank Brown Berry, Assistant Secretary of Defense; James P. Mitchell, Secretary of Labor, Marion B. Folsom, Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare.

Members elected by the chapters

Terms expiring in 1958:

Clarence S. Beesemyer, vice chairman, consultant, General Petroleum Corp., Los Angeles, Calif.; Durwood DuBois, vice president, Ohio Citizens Trust Co., Toledo, Ohio; Benjamin Goodman, lawyer, Memphis, Tenn.; Thomas W. Gregory, Jr., senior vice president, First National Bank of Houston, Houston, Tex.; Howard L. Kelly, executive director and secretary, Manufacturers Association, Erie, Pa.; Mrs. Thomas L. Kerney, chapter vice chairman, Trenton, N. J.; W. W. Overton, Jr., board chairman, Texas Bank and Trust Co., Dallas, Tex.; Mrs. Franklin E. Parker, Jr., vice chairman, Connecticut Council of the Red Cross, Greenwich, Conn.; J. G. Ragsdale, lawyer and municipal judge, El Dorado, Ark.; Philip K. Robinson, vice president, Northwestern Mutual Life Insurance Co., Milwaukee, Wis.

Terms expiring in 1959:

E. La Mar Buckner, partner, Buckner Insurance Counselors, Ogden, Utah; Edward P. Curtis, vice chairman, vice president, Eastman Kodak Co., Rochester, N. Y.; Mrs. Joe Hume Gardner, former national director, office of volunteers, Marshall, Va.; Mrs. Charles W. Goodyear, Jr., chairman of volteers, Bogalusa, La.; Matt Himsl, automobile dealer, Kalispell, Mont.; Harry G. Kincaid, lawyer, Jacksonville, Fla.; Phil H. Lewis, lawyer, Topeka, Kans.; Alan R. Morse, president, United States Trust Co., Boston, Mass.; Taylor M. Simpson, realtor, High Point, N. C.; Joseph R. Stewart, vice chairman, associate general counsel, Kansas City Life Insurance Co., Kansas City, Mo.

Terms expiring in 1960:

Louis J. Colombo, Jr., lawyer, Detroit, Mich.; William H. Crow, physicist, Los Alamos, N. Mex.; Cornelius T. Dalton, public-relations director and board member, Courier-Journal and Times, Louisville, Ky.; Philip B. Deane, retired business executive, York, Pa.; Samuel F. Downer, vice president, Exchange National Bank, Colorado Springs, Colo.; W. Croft Jennings, lawyer, Columbia, S. C.; Robert G. Fraser, lawyer, Omaha, Nebr.; Russell V. Hokanson, lawyer, Seattle, Wash.; Dr. Charles N. Leach, physician, Newfane, Vt.; William L. Travis, lawyer, Hammond, Ind.

Elected by the board as members at large

Terms expiring in 1958:

Margaret Hickey, public-affairs editor, Ladies' Home Journal, St. Louis, Mo.; Dr. F. D. Patterson, Director, Phelps-Stokes Fund, New York, N. Y.; John S. Sinclair, President, National Industrial Conference Board, New York, N. Y.; James D. Zellerbach, United States Ambassador to Italy.

Terms expiring in 1959:

Stanley C. Allyn, President, National Cash Register Co., Dayton, Ohio; Fred Lazarus, Jr., Chairman, Federated Department Stores, Inc., Cincinnati, Ohio; Mrs. John J. McCloy, President, Board of Managers, Bellevue Hospital School of Nursing, New York, N. Y.; Mrs. Bernice T. Van derVries, Board Member, Chicago Transit Authority, Winnetka, Ill.

Terms expiring in 1960:

Erle Cocke, Jr., Vice President, Delta Air Lines, Atlanta, Ga.; David J. McDonald, President, United Steel Workers of America, Pittsburgh, Pa.; Dr. Alonzo G. Moron, president, Hampton Institute Hampton, Va.; William F. Schnitzler, Secretary-Treasurer, American Federation of Labor and Congress of Industrial Organizations, Washington, D. C.

AREA ADVISORY COUNCIL, EASTERN AREA

Terms expiring in 1958:

Ned C. Boatright, Lebanon, Ind.; Mrs. William A. Howe, Rochester, N. Y.; Kirtland J. Keve, Montpelier, Vt.; Arthur A. Kron, Englewood, N. J.; Charles D. Littleton, Troy, Ohio; Mrs. J. Alvey Long, Hagerstown, Md.; Thomas Motley II, Boston, Mass.

Terms expiring in 1959:

John S. Andrews, Youngstown, Ohio; Marian Dunlop, Providence, R. I.; James W. Griswold, Exeter, N. H.; S. C. Lampert, Norfolk, Va.; Mrs. James M. Mason III, Charles Town, W. Va.; Joseph S. Schuchert, Pittsburgh, Pa.; Mrs. E. W. Skilton, Winsted, Conn.

Terms expiring in 1960:

Robert P. Crawford, Glens Falls, N. Y.; Lyman A. Cousens, Jr., Portland, Maine; Mrs. Karl M. Harrop, Bristol, Va.; Carleton W. Pierson, Summit, N. J.; Willard G. Rouse, Baltimore, Md.; Henry V. Scheirer, Allentown, Pa.; Mrs. Leo C. Wardrup, Middlesboro, Ky.

AREA ADVISORY COUNCIL, MIDWESTERN AREA

Terms expiring in 1958:

Mrs. John A. Bohnert, Pine Bluff, Ark.; Clarence E. Hinds, Lincoln, Nebr.; John Kaney, Blackwell, Okla.; Frank T. Nye, Cedar Rapids, Iowa; Walter Schimmel, Wichita, Kans.; Mrs. Bert W. Wallace, Kearney, Nebr.; Mrs. Lloyd L. Fisher, Kansas City, Kans.

Terms expiring in 1959:

Donald E. Barnes, Boulder, Colo.; J. W. Hedges, Atlantic, Iowa; Marshall E. Jones, Laramie, Wyo.; F. W. Mohr, Jr., Fargo, N. Dak.; Mrs. L. M. Peters, Rhinelander, Wis.; Theodore S. Scibienski, Corpus Christi, Tex.; Mrs. Mahlon B. Wallace, Jr., St. Louis, Mo.

Terms expiring in 1960:

Judge Jan Clawson, Lubbock, Tex.; Morys Hines, Albuquerque, N. Mex.; Mrs. C. J. Reese, Muskegon, Mich.; Mrs. Arthur C. Regan, Minneapolis, Minn.; Mrs. Edwin Sale, Kankakee, Ill.; J. J. Warkentin, Aberdeen, S. Dak.; E. Grainger Williams, Little Rock, Ark.

AREA ADVISORY COUNCIL, SOUTHEASTERN AREA

Terms expiring in 1958:

Wilmer S. Guillory, Lake Charles, La.; Ralph G. Holberg, Jr., Mobile, Ala.; William Dudley Human,, Wartburg, Tenn.; Mrs. Stovall Lowery, Clarksdale, Miss.; Mrs. C. Kersey Smith, Kinston, N. C.

Terms expiring in 1959:

Frank Binford, Thomaston, Ga.; E. F. Reddy, West Palm Beach, Fla.; King W. Rogers, Jr., Dyersburg, Tenn.; Mrs. Benjamin C. Russell, Alexander City, Ala.; Charles W. F. Spencer, Jr., Rock Hill, S. C.

Terms expiring in 1960:

Elmer D. Conner, Jennings, La.; Lauren J. Drake, Clearwater, Fla.; C. C. Hope, Jr., Charlotte, N. C.; Jack Pace, Magee, Miss.; Mrs. Ralph Pope, Gainesville, Ga.

AREA ADVISORY COUNCIL, PACIFIC AREA

Terms expiring in 1958:

L. Gray Beck, Everett, Wash.; Mrs. John S. Day, Medford, Oreg.; Mrs. Thelma Farmer, Florence, Ariz.; Carroll V. Henderson, Bozeman, Mont.; Eric Brooks Kirkland, Moscow, Idaho.

Terms expiring in 1959:

Myron J. Fulrath, Provo, Utah; William D. Ray, Walla Walla, Wash.; Mrs. Samuel Roberts, Reno, Nev.; Paul Straniford, Fresno, Calif.; Mrs. Albert L. Ward II, San Diego, Calif.

Terms expiring in 1960:

Frederick Greenwood, Portland, Oreg.; Mrs. Almon F. Manspeaker, Palo Alto, Calif.; Paul H. Marston, Pasadena, Calif.; King Taylor, Phoenix, Ariz.; H. Allyn Wood, Berkeley, Calif.

CORPORATE OFFICERS

E. Roland Harriman, chairman; Alfred M. Gruenther, president; James T. Nicholson, executive vice president; Harold W. Starr, counselor and secretary; W. Randolph Burgess, treasurer.

ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICERS

Ramone S. Eaton, vice president; Robert F. Shea, vice president; DeWitt Smith, vice president; John C. Wilson, vice president; Presnell K. Betts, comptroller; Joseph L. Carter, manager, eastern area; W. W. Jefferson, manager, southeastern area; Frederic S. Laise, manager, midwestern area; Walker L. Millner, manager, Pacific area.

THE RETIREMENT SYSTEM, BOARD OF TRUSTEES

Eliot Wadsworth, chairman, Daniel W. Bell, Robert V. Fleming, George A. Garrett, E. Roland Harriman, Joseph M. Hartfield, Mary B. Settle, DeWitt Smith, vice chairman, Harold W. Starr.

Officers: Eliot Wadsworth, chairman; DeWitt Smith, vice chairman; Joseph M. Hartfield, counselor; J. H. Finkle, secretary and comptroller; C. Wade Downing, treasurer; Ella Costello, assistant treasurer; Harold B. Atkinson, assistant secretary; George M. Schneider, assistant comptroller; George B. Buck, consulting actuary.

THE ENDOWMENT FUND, BOARD OF TRUSTEES

Members whose terms expire December 31, 1957:

H. P. Davison, president, J. P. Morgan & Co., Inc., New York, N. Y.; B. M. Edwards, chairman of the board, the South Carolina National Bank, Columbia, S C.; Robert V. Fleming, chairman of the board, Riggs National Bank, Washington, D. C.

Members whose terms expire December 31, 1958:

S. Sloan Colt, chairman of the board, Bankers Trust Co., New York, N. Y.; Marion B. Folsom, Secretary, Health, Education, and Welfare, Washington, D. C.; James B. Forgan, vice chairman of the board, First National Bank of Chicago, Chicago, Ill.

Members whose terms expire December 31, 1959:

Daniel W. Bell, president and chairman of the board, American Security & Trust Co., Washington, D. C., Gale F. Johnston, vice chairman of the board, Mercantile Trust Co., St. Louis, Mo.; W. Randolph Burgess, Under Secretary of the Treasury, Washington, D. C.

Officers: Daniel W. Bell, chairman; C. Wade Downing, secretary; S. M. Nichols, assistant secretary, Riggs National Bank, Washington, D. C., treasurer and fiscal agent.

NATIONAL MEDICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE

Terms expiring in 1957:

Dr. Randolph Lee Clark, Jr., director and surgeon-in-chief, University of Texas Hospital and M. D. Anderson Hospital, and Tumor Institute, Houston, Tex.; Dr. James R. Reuling, member, board of trustees, American Medical Association, Windermere, Fla.; Dr. Maxwell M. Wintrobe, professor and head of department of internal medicine, University of Utah School of Medicine, Salt Lake City, Utah.

Terms expiring in 1958:

Dr. Frank W. Konzelmann, director of laboratories, Central Dispensary and Emergency Hospital, Washington, D. C.; Dr. William D. Stovall, director, State laboratory of hygiene, Madison, Wis.; Dr. George M. Wheatley, third vice president, health and welfare, Metropolitan Life Insurance Co., New York, N. Y.

Terms expiring in 1959:

Dr. David N. W. Grant, Washington, D. C.; Dr. John S. Lawrence, University of Califor-

nia School of Medicine, Los Angeles, Calif.; Dr. John S. Lundy, Rochester, Minn.

NATIONAL NURSING ADVISORY COMMITTEE

Helen L. Bunge, chairman, executive officer, Institute of Research and Service in Nursing Education, Teachers College, Columbia University, New York, N. Y.; Katherine J. Densford, director, School of Nursing Education, University of Minnesota, Minneapolis, Minn.; Rena Haig, chief, Bureau of Health Nursing, California Department of Public Health, San Francisco, Calif.; Mrs. Lillian Holland Harvey, dean, School of Nursing, Tuskegee Institute, Tuskegee Institute, Ala.; Dr. Elizabeth L. Kemble, dean, School of Nursing, University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill, N. C.; Helen L. Fisk, chief, division of public health nursing, Maryland State Department of Health, Baltimore, Md.; Julia Miller, dean, School of Nursing, University of Arkansas, Little Rock, Ark.

How To Attract Industry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANCIS CASE

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 6, 1958

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address delivered by Willard V, Merrihue, manager in charge of personnel practices and community relations for General Electric Co., of New York, before the Metropolitan Area Economic Development Conference in Washington on November 27, 1957.

Mr. Merrihue lays out a blueprint in this address for attracting new industry to cities while not forgetting the employers they already have.

Recognizing that a diversified economy is the strongest economy, cities and towns all across this great Nation, including those in my own State of South Dakota, are seeking to attract new industries. Their success in this endeavor is important not only to them and their citizens, but also to the Federal Government, for a city that is strong economically will not be so quick to look to the Federal Government for aid in the form of costly construction programs or other Federal assistance.

Under the leadership of Gov. Joe Foss, South Dakota has created a special agency, known as South Dakota Industrial Development Expansion Agency—SDIDEAA, headed by Mr. Noel Tweet, which is achieving notable success. Towns and cities working on similar programs will find many helpful suggestions in Mr. Merrihue's address.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WHAT A COMPANY LOOKS FOR IN SEEKING A NEW LOCATION

(By Willard V. Merrihue, manager, personnel practices and community relations, General Electric Co., New York)

In the short period that I will have with you today, I hope to achieve two goals:

1. To tell you what a company, such as our own, looks for in seeking locations for its new plants.

2. To suggest some action that a community, or an integrated economic region such as metropolitan Washington, might do to improve its batting average in holding present employers and seeking new ones.

Let me emphasize the virtue of showing some affection for the employers you already have. Certain areas of the highly industrialized Northeast suffered grievous losses because of their indifference and apathy toward present job-producing enterprises. In fact, the attitude of many of these areas reminds me of the Vermont farmer who stopped rocking one evening and said in a crisp nasal twang: "Eliza, when I think of how much you've meant to me well nigh these 40 years, it's sometimes more than I can stand not to tell you about it."

COMPETITION FOR INDUSTRY

Currently, there exists a competition, so healthy that at times it approaches the status of a cold war, between entire States and regions, in an attempt to bring in new business and industry. Hardly a month passes that some governor does not come to New York with loud fanfare and a battery of public-relations experts to charm national companies into bringing some of their expansion into their particular States. Having had luncheon with a number of them, I can tell you that cigar passing and baby kissing are passe if you want to be a successful governor. Today you've got to be a success at economic development if you want to be considered a favorite son in 1960.

Why are cities, regions, and States so interested in attracting new employers? What is the prize? The economic research department of the Chamber of Commerce of the United States has studied the effect of industrial expansion in the community. For example, it estimates that a new plant of only 250 employees will bring these benefits to a community: 740 more people in the community, 240 more households, 428 more workers in other establishments, $1,474,000 more personal income per year, $675,000 more bank deposits, and $900,000 more retail sales.

These are desirable results to contemplate, but—how does one go about bringing such a bonanza into a community?

NEW CRITERIA

The most useful information I can give you is this: Progressive industrial companies are today utilizing a new set of criteria for evaluating prospective plant locations.

The old orthodox criteria—such as nearness to marketing centers, accessibility to raw materials, adequacy of transportation facilities, adequacy of electric power, availability and quality of water supply are still important.

But there are other more important cost factors from the standpoint of their effect on the long-term success of the new plant. These are the factors represented by the attitudes, actions, morals, prejudices, and political behavior of the people in the community, region, or State being evaluated.

Therefore, whenever our company seeks a location in which to expand, we make two surveys. First, our real estate staff studies a community, using the orthodox criteria. Then our community relations staff at headquarters surveys it from the standpoint of its business climate.

BUSINESS CLIMATE

Now what is business climate? It is a composite of a number of important factors which are controllable by the citizens and employers in a prospective location. Among these are:

1. A progressive attitude on the part of political and civic leaders toward sound community growth and city planning.

2. Citizen understanding of community and business problems.

3. Honest, efficient government, supported by a safe majority of alert, intelligent voters who have the balanced best interests of the community at heart.

4. An absence of unreasonable restrictive regulations and discriminatory taxes imposed on business by the local and State governments.

5. A sound working relationship between employers and employees as evidenced by an absence of unwarranted strikes and slowdowns over a number of years and, wherever collective bargaining contracts are in effect, a constructive and responsible union leadership which acts as the servant rather than the master of its membership.

6. An adequate supply of people to fill employment needs, people with good work attitudes, with required educational levels, and preferably, people who have some understanding of how our business system operates and their stake in its success.

7. Prevailing wage and salary rates which are fair to employees, but which, at the same time, enable employers to compete profitably.

8. Adequate community services and facilities such as utilities, banks, hotels, shops, health facilities, and the required commercial services needed in operating a business.

9. A social and cultural atmosphere that will attract and hold good professional employees. This would include adequate schools, museums, libraries, little theaters, an enlightened press, radio and TV and an abundance of healthful recreational opportunities.

10. A serious-minded assumption of business citizenship responsibilities on the part of all employers in the community as evidenced by consistently good employee relations and courageous leadership in civic and political affairs.

Business climate, in other words, might be defined as: "The total result of all external conditions affecting the cost and ease of operating a business in a community, region, or State."

COMMUNITY ATTITUDE

Many of these factors are intangible, as you can see, and many of them stem from the community's attitude toward business. Speaking of attitudes, let me quote the managing director of one of the many so-called industrial parks springing up around the country—as reported in the November 10 issue of the Providence Journal:

"Community attitude has become an exceptionally important factor to industry. Companies today do not want to be the panacea of the ills incurred by many communities, due to heavily increased residential building and population. Most firms want to settle in an area that has shown foresight and progressiveness in solving its problems, that has carefully and logically zoned its areas to have adequate space for balanced residential, commercial, and industrial growth. New industry is not seeking to burden itself with the problems of communities.

"No businessman or industrialist is going to take a superficial glance at a State or community, admire its fine residences, picturesque resorts, gardens, and parks, and decide here is the perfect location for his facilities. He will cut deep below the veneer and probe into the political background, tax records, the productivity of the people, the courage of the civic leadership, and the attitude of law-enforcement agencies. He will also seek counsel of the established companies to determine how they have fared under the policies and practices of local and State governments."

DISCOURAGING FACTORS

Attitudes are reflected in many ways. For example, an unfavorable record of strikes and slowdowns over the years is probably one of the most discouraging factors of all to a prospective employer.

The physical condition of housing, shops, and neighborhoods is one of the most dependable attitude-indicators. What prospective employer wants to settle in a community where people appear to be shiftless—where no one seems interested in cleaning up, in painting his house and properly maintaining his personal property—or where slums and neighborhood blight, like termites, keep eating away at the heart of the city? Such things indicate public apathy.

Productivity is a reflection of work attitudes. Direct comparisons of turnover rates, safety records, plant absentee records, and on-the-spot observations tell much about work attitudes.

Basically, the way a community measures up depends upon good understanding by the workers in that community of the simple economic facts of life and their individual stake in prosperous, expanding industry. We particularly like a town where a serious attempt is being made both in the schools and in adult education to explain the basis of our high economic standard of living.

TWO-WAY STREET

Right here I should like to emphasize that measuring up is a two-way street and that employers have a prime responsibility for earning favorable community attitudes. At places where General Electric plants are located, we try continuously to deserve, and then to get, the warm understanding and approval and support of the community. We strive for this by doing right voluntarily in the area of employee pay and benefits; being a good taxpayer with no special bargains asked; purchasing materials and supplies locally, where possible; and giving proportionately proper support to the needs of worthwhile charities. Of course, the mere doing of these things is only one part of the job. The other important part is to communicate continuously with all members of the community to make sure they understand what is being done. Be discriminating as to the employers you attract to your town. One bad apple employer can affect the whole barrel.

WHAT INDUSTRY SEEKS

Now with this general philosophy as a backdrop, let me tell you quickly what we look for when we survey a community. I have a sample report here with me. Let's call it Newtown. Let's see what's in it:

First, what kind of people live here, how fast is the population growing, what is the size of the reserve labor force? Is skilled labor available or will it have to be trained? If so, are there adequate vocational training facilities? In other words, what are the basic vital statistics and other information about the community that will affect the operation of the plant.

Labor turnover rates, absenteeism, and good work habits are always much better in the more stable, conservative, and better educated communities and, as you know, these are very important to a business enterprise.

The next item is industrial makeup. Obviously, there is an advantage in having a community with an industrial background that is compatible with the type of product we wish to manufacture. It is also important, of course, that a community's economy be diversified in order to insure economic stability. We believe it is bad for both the community and the company when a community is too dependent on one company. Accordingly, we try never to employ more than 6 percent of the total population or 15 percent of the working population.

BUSINESS FACILITIES

The next series of consideration has to do with business facilities. These include such important items as transportation, utilities, banks, hotel facilities, and other specific services important to the operation of our plant. Speaking of hotels, we find that a first-class hotel is, indeed, a wonderful asset for a community. It is a source of pride for the citizens of all ranks and a focal point for most of the leadership activities. Unfortunately, very few fine new hotels are being built because of the high initial cost per room, and the competition from motels and the uneven load factor. Perhaps our planners should be planning community hotels for the future that will contain a minimum of bedrooms and a maximum of meeting rooms and feeding facilities. These latter facilities seem to be in the greatest demand by business.

In addition to business facilities, it is important that we also have adequate community services both from the standpoint of operating a plant and in order to attract and hold good employees. Here we make a careful check on such things as hospitals, churches, organizations, recreational facilities, and cultural opportunities.

SCHOOLS

One of the really important items in any business climate survey nowadays is the adequacy and quality of schools. What is the average teacher compensation? What is the expense per pupil? What is the teacher-pupil ratio? In several of our recent plant locations, the adequacy and quality of schools was considered to be at or near the top of the list by the department manager and his staff. This is not only important from the standpoint of providing us with the best type of employees, but with our current shortage of technical personnel, it is difficult to attract key people to a community unless there are good educational opportunities for their children. Another aspect of this school item is the fact that in some cases, it is almost mandatory that the operation be close enough to work on a day-to-day basis with a technical university.

The progressiveness, fairness, and courage of the local newspapers, radio and TV are a very important factor in our evaluation. Are they courageous? Do they provide community leadership? Are they espousing local self-reliance and do it yourself or are they for increasing Government subsidies and regulation?

GOVERNMENT COSTS

Certainly one of the important cost factors in operating a plant is cost of operating the local and State government. For instance, Newtown has a great many fine assets and would make an excellent location for certain types of operations; but perhaps one of its weaknesses is its debt position. At the present time its bonded indebtedness is $24 million which amounts to more than $200 per capita. On the other hand, in Newtown this may not be serious since it is a fast growing city and much of the debt will be absorbed by the expanding population. But then there is still another side to this financial picture of Newtown. Forty percent of the property within the city limits is either Government owned or tax free because it is owned by schools and churches. This places an unusually heavy burden on individuals and companies, who, in effect, help support the nontaxable property.

But the financial position of the community is only one part of the Government picture. There are many important Governmental considerations such as outright corruption, inefficient administration, outdated codes, lack of law enforcement, unreasonable ordinances. The worst liability by far is a dual standard of law enforcement. In the recent McClellan investigations, the city police were reluctant to prosecute the offenders. Speaking of codes, I read with interest this morning of Alexandria's new minimum housing code, the sole purpose of which, said Mayor Bendheim, is to eliminate what can truly be considered slums.

TAX RATE IMPORTANT

Time permits mentioning only one additional of the more than 60 factors surveyed in Newtown. It is the tax rate. And here I'd like to quote your own Jerome Pickard, research director of the economic development committee:

"Though the real-estate tax rate and income taxes are most often quoted, actually, the significant tax factors are:

"1. Total taxation (excepting Federal): State, county, and local, all taxes.

"2. Community services provided in return for the taxes. "Many communities and counties which loudly proclaim the virtue of low taxes are speaking of today, not tomorrow. Others are speaking merely of local tax rates. Communities which do not advertise low tax rates, may, in fact, offer the greatest bargains to prospective industry if their existing capital improvements are substantial and services offered for industry and its personnel represent a good return for the taxpayment."

To that I say, amen.

THE HOUSING SITUATION

Now another factor which cannot be passed over lightly is the housing situation. This, of course, is especially true where large numbers of people would have to be transferred to the new plant location. Taking Newtown again as an example, here we have a very attractive situation, with a large supply of fine homes at very reasonable prices and a wide selection of homes and apartments for rent at low rates. More importantly for tomorrow, each neighborhood is vigilantly protecting itself against that great killer—urban blight.

Labor attitudes, although an intangible, have a vital bearing on the success of the prospective plant. Sure, the type of management in a plant has a great deal to do with the productivity of people. On the other hand, anyone who travels around from one part of the country to another knows there are differences in productivity and dependability of people from one place to another. In some cases, this increased productivity amounts to as much as 60 to 80 percent. No sensible employer is interested in putting a new plant in a community where poor labor attitudes result in continual lost time, labor-management arguments, feather-bedding, jurisdictional disputes, and so on.

CREATING JOBS

So much for what we look for in a community. Now, to my second point, let me make a few hesitant suggestions as to what this region might do to bring in more jobs that quantitatively and qualitatively can help satisfy the ever-expanding population. First, I would not carry on a mail-order business by sending out expensive brochures or investing heavily in advertising the region.

Having formerly been advertising manager for our company, I fully understand the power of advertising—but I have grave skepticism as to the value of much of the economic development advertising and promotion I have been seeing.

The Federal Reserve Bank of Boston conducted a study about industrial development programs in New England which brought out some interesting revelations on the use of advertising and promotional materials. Depth interview techniques were employed to sound out the attitudes of nearly 100 men who are responsible for selecting industrial locations for their companies.

ADVERTISING SURVEY

Three of the conclusions of the survey are of particular interest to many in this group because you are representative of smaller communities, and I assume do not have unlimited funds at your disposal for

your development activities. These findings showed that:

1. Media advertising is generally the most questionable use of industrial development funds. The great majority of executives who make location decisions reported that they were not at all interested or affected by the great amounts of competitive advertising of various industrial areas which appear in the newspapers or periodicals.

2. Most promotional brochures are a waste of money. There seem to be only two occasions when a brochure might be helpful. First, if it contains factual material which can help the company appraise the location, and second, if the company just happens to be looking for a site in a particular area when a brochure about that area arrives.

3. Personal contact and service is the most effective industrial promotion technique. The executives clearly emphasized their feeling that direct solicitation made the greatest impression.

MAKE HONEST APPRAISAL

A far better investment of your time and funds is to make a completely honest and objective appraisal of your liabilities and then to embark on a program to correct them.

The New York Journal of Commerce conducted a survey last spring to determine what mistakes development groups make in their efforts to induce industry to locate in their towns and States. Three-fourths of the areas replying ranked failure to analyze their own qualifications as the most serious mistake. One of my associates, who has surveyed hundreds of towns as possible plant locations, tells me the best impression was made by a community which had not only analyzed its situation thoroughly, but had a listing of weak conditions as well as the strong ones, along with a program for improving the weak ones. Communities that seek to attract industry with promotional programs which attempt to sweep shortcomings under the rug are making a grave error. They fool no one but themselves.

There are a number of survey forms available to analyze the strengths and weaknesses of a community. We have developed our own Guide to Making a Business Climate Appraisal which contains 167 questions. These questions are considered in determining a new plant location. The guide is also used by operating management at our present plant locations to pinpoint outside conditions affecting their business operation and to determine what constructive action they can take for their improvement. The United States Chamber also offers a very useful appraisal guide.

FOUR STEPS TO TAKE

The appraisal is part of a better business climate plan which we recommend to all of our local operating managers. It has four recommended steps:

1. Make the business climate appraisal.

2. Determine short and long-range goals for improving poor or deteriorating elements in the business climate.

3. Schedule company and employee activities which will help to achieve these goals.

4. Work cooperatively with other employers and civic leaders who are interested in taking the same approach to business climate improvement.

You see, not all of our managers can operate plants in communities where employees and community neighbors eagerly cooperate on a something-for-something basis to make their business enterprises successful. Many of our managers must continue to operate in communities where poor business climate practices eat up most of the gains in new technology and improved management practices.

To them we say, don't curse the darkness—light a candle. Don't complain about the climate, do something about it.

GAINING COOPERATION

It is amazing to me to see how eagerly and effectively employees and civic leaders will cooperate if we will but show them the relationship between our goals and their goals and explain how they can be helpful.

With America industrializing so rapidly, the day is coming when there will be no new frontiers where business can move to start life anew.

The challenge now, particularly for large parts of the eastern seaboard which are farthest removed from industry's frontiers, is to plan for tomorrow as well as today and to make no little plans. Your planning should include a vigorous attack on such problems as urban decay, new approaches to mass transportation, industrial parks or other provision for business expansion, 19th century building codes, taxation that inhibits rather than encourages the providing of new jobs for an expanding population; local and State legislation and law enforcement that steadily creates abuse of power by either unions or management.

WISEST PLANNING

The wisest planners will give particular attention to individual and community attitudes and morals. Through the help of schools, churches, and the press they can make it fashionable once more to give an honest day's work for a good day's pay; to make something for nothing unfashionable; to obey the moral manmade laws when no policeman is around; to explain the great role of private business in creating ever higher standards of living for a free people.

Just one more suggestion. As a starter, why not make a survey of 50 of your present employees. Ask them to name three things that will help them grow and prosper most. Ask them if they are planning to expand in this area, and why. Ask them if they would advise other manufacturers to locate in this area. If they say, as one respondent down east said, "Yes, my competitors," then you better conduct a depth interview with them.

Gentlemen, I know of few efforts on your part that would make a more favorable impression on new-plant-site shoppers than such a realistic search for your real problems as a basis for your future planning.

In closing I salute you for this day's vigorous attack on your problem.

Unfair Penalty on Circulation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STYLES BRIDGES

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 6, 1958

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article written by David Lawrence entitled "Unfair Penalty on Circulation," which appeared in the Washington Evening Star of March 5, 1958.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNFAIR PENALTY ON CIRCULATION

(By David Lawrence)

DISCRIMINATION SEEN IN MAIL RATE PLAN BASED ON NUMBER OF READERS

Only 22 years ago the Supreme Court of the United States, in a unanimous opinion, ruled that governmental authority in America must never be used under the guise of the taxing power to penalize publications of large circulation as against those of smaller circulation. To do this was held to be a violation of the first amendment to the Constitution, which forbids the enactment of any law that abridges the freedom of the press.

Yet last week in the United States Senate, 28 Democrats and 5 Republicans voted to do that very thing when they demanded higher postal rates be imposed on publications of larger circulation than on publications of smaller circulation. Fortunately, 39 Republicans and 18 Democrats combined to defeat the attempt. But there still remains a provision of the same kind in the bill originally passed by the House of Representatives and which soon will be considered by a conference committee of both Houses.

This correspondent remembers well the 1936 decision of the Supreme Court because it was a big news story at the time. The State of Louisiana, under the pressure of its Governor, the late Huey Long, had enacted as a reprisal against the larger newspapers of the State a law dividing all newspapers into two classes—those with less than and those with more than 20,000 circulation. A special tax of 2 percent was levied on the gross receipts on all advertisements published in the newspapers of larger circulation, but this was not applied to the newspapers of smaller circulation.

The Supreme Court of the United States said the effect of the tax would be to curtail the amount of revenue realized from advertising and would involve a direct tendency to restrict circulation and then added: "It might well result in destroying both advertising and circulation."

What is most interesting to note about this form of censorship is that it has been tried many times before, in fact as early as 1712 when the British Parliament imposed a special tax on all newspapers and upon advertisements. Justice Sutherland, who wrote the Supreme Court's opinion in 1936 reviewed the history of such laws in England and said that these taxes constituted one of the factors that aroused the American colonists to protest, and that the American Revolution "really began when, in 1765, the British Government sent stamps for newspaper duties to the American colonies."

Justice Sutherland referred to such imposts as "taxes on knowledge." Speaking of the Louisiana law's attempt to classify newspapers by circulation and to put a special tax on advertising, the Supreme Court opinion says:

"It is seen to be a deliberate and calculated device in the guise of a tax to limit the circulation of information to which the public is entitled by virtue of the constitutional guaranties. A free press stands as one of the great interpreters between the government and the people. To allow it to be fettered is to fetter ourselves."

Senator MIKE MONRONEY, of Oklahoma, Democrat, said bluntly to the Senate last week that the imposition of higher postal rates on large-circulation magazines than on smaller ones would penalize a magazine because it had a large circulation. He added:

"If a publishing firm is able to build up a circulation of one of its own magazines to 3 million or 5 million copies, should we penalize it because the public wants to buy the magazine? * * * I do not believe Congress should legislate in that way."

Publishing companies of all kinds, of course, must pay the same general taxes as any other profitmaking enterprises. There is no doubt that the Post Office Department needs more money, and certainly the newspapers and magazines should pay the increased costs for transportation of their issues in the mails when it is conclusively ascertained by an impartial commission of accountants, authorized by Congress, just what such costs actually involve. But discrimination in postal rates as between publications of the same kind is a violation of

the Constitution, not only because it deprives them of equal protection of the laws under the fifth amendment, but because it is also an infringement on the first amendment.

The weight per copy—and not the total circulation—says Senator MONRONEY, is the only sound way to measure the rates that should be paid for postage by publishers.

It is significant that in the debate last week there were various references made by Senators to the editorial views held by publications which they dislike, and the inference was left that some Senators were voting in reprisal against certain publications of larger circulation of whose content they disapprove for political reasons. Thus is the Bill of Rights trampled upon by some of the very men who take pride in calling themselves liberals.

Oil Imports

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES W. VURSELL
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 6, 1958

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Speaker, with leave to extend my remarks, I desire to include the testimony of Mr. C. E. Brehm, of Mount Vernon, Ill., before the Ways and Means Committee of the House of Representatives on Tuesday, March 4.

Mr. Brehm, president of the Tri-State Independent Oil Producers and Land Owners Association, in his testimony before the Ways and Means Committee was representing the independent oil producers of Illinois, Indiana, and Kentucky.

In his testimony, Mr. Brehm urged more positive and stricter limitations of excess oil imports:

My name is C. E. Brehm. I live in Mount Vernon, Ill. I am an independent producer of crude oil and president of the Tri-State Independent Oil Producers and Land Owners Association. Our organization represents the small independent producers operating in Illinois, Indiana, and Kentucky.

By way of background I would like you to know that in 1956 in Illinois, independents drilled 80 percent of the total 3,650 oil wells drilled, in Indiana we drilled 97 percent of the 606 wells drilled, and in Kentucky, also, independents accounted for 97 percent of the total 1,866 wells drilled.

We want to continue to do this important job and, in so doing, we are helping the economies and tax revenues of these three States. For example, our county records show that during the year 1956, Henderson County alone produced 3,168,112 barrels of oil, therefore returning to the county over $92,274.88 in road funds and to the State almost twice this amount. This being in addition to the annual ad valorem taxes. The total 1956 assessed value of oil properties in Henderson County was $9,041,625. This oil property paid a total county tax in 1956 of $185,353.31, this in addition to the road-fund tax and State tax. We also feel that we are making an important contribution to the National Government and to national security.

But cheap-to-produce foreign oil imports are supplanting domestic production with increasingly serious effects in our area. This brief tabulation will show what I mean.

Total number of wells drilled and rigs active in the tristate area

	1956	1957	Percent increase or decrease
Total number wells drilled:			
Illinois	3,808	2,708	−28
Indiana	741	699	−6
Kentucky	1,936	1,531	−21
Total	6,485	4,938	−24
Average number rotary rigs active:			
Illinois	75	50	−33
Indiana	9	6	−33
Kentucky	10	9	−10
Total	94	65	−31

You can see that total number of wells drilled is down an average of 24 percent from 1956 to 1957. The average number of active drilling rigs is down 31 percent.

On a personal basis I have averaged drilling 90 wells per year from 1947 through 1956. In 1957 I drilled only 68 and in the first 5 months of my fiscal year, September 1, 1957, to February 1, 1958, only 26 wells. Further, all our equipment has been shut down since the first of January 1958 except for the drilling of 3 wells made necessary by prior commitment. Our company has not yet turned to secondary recovery oil to keep our production rate up, but if we and others must do so, it will not be very long before exploration is completely halted and no new production will be found to replace that being used up at present.

The chairman of the board of one of the major purchasing companies of this area recently stated his company intended to spend fifteen to twenty million dollars constructing a pipeline extension which will bring foreign oil from the eastern seaboard to the company's Kentucky refinery. This, in spite of statements from the same oil purchaser that there is an oversupply of crude oil. It is obvious that there is to be a severe and increasing curtailment of drilling and exploration here at home.

Another example of what is happening in our area as a direct result of foreign oil imports is the situation explained recently by the assistant treasurer of the Farm Bureau Oil Co., Inc., the largest supplier of petroleum products in Indiana. He stated that east coast refineries at one time were supplied by domestic crude, chiefly from the gulf coast, but as Middle East crude began moving into the east coast this domestic crude had to find another market. As a result a large part of this gulf coast crude is now moving into Middle West refining areas and thus reducing the demand for Illinois Basin crude.

An editorial appearing December 19, 1957, in our local area paper titled "A Crises in Local Economy," states in part as follows:

"Few people recognize this problem. Locally it is of vital interest because a recent reduction in the price of crude oil has an adverse effect on the economy of the area. The fear harbored is that the independent producer will cease developing new fields unfair market and that foreign oil will take its place. The effect will be felt in Henderson and surrounding area."

This situation has created a great amount of serious economic instability in our area and has been caused directly by unreliable Middle East crude oil imports.

Men responsible for discovering crude oil reserves cannot afford to spend their money in this hazardous business of looking for new oil reserves unless they can sell their product already discovered. Unless you find this oil you do not have an oil reserve, and that is where national security comes in. It is only the oil that we know is there that can be counted on in times of national emergency.

In conclusion it is our belief that when Congress recognized this problem and set forth a provision for relief in the 1955 Trade Agreements Act it intended this law to be used. It has not been used yet. It is our hope that the Congress will now take more positive action and thus prevent our domestic industry from being drowned in a flood of imports.

13th Anniversary of the Communist Takeover of Rumania

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALVIN M. BENTLEY
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 6, 1958

Mr. BENTLEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to call the attention of the House to the fact that today, March 6, marks the 13th anniversary of the Communist takeover of Rumania. In that connection, I would like to read the text of a letter dated March 4 which I have received from Mr. Mihail Farcasanu, president of the League of Free Rumanians, 1056 Fifth Avenue, New York 28, N. Y.:

I take the liberty of drawing your attention to the date of March 6, which marks the tragic anniversary of the Soviet Communist enslavement of Rumania 13 years ago.

It is important, we believe, that notwithstanding the official expediency veil of a status quo technical recognition, the real situation of Russian enslavement and the denial of human rights should be recalled.

The Russians had hardly put their signature on the Yalta declaration, when by the use of overwhelming military force, they replaced the legal Rumanian Government of General Radescu with a Moscow-sponsored Communist puppet regime. This took place at a time when the whole Rumanian Army was fighting on the front, alongside the Allies. The field thus being free, Vishinsky and Malinovski, with the help of the Russian tanks, were able to perform this coup in Bucharest by occupying the Government buildings and key institutions and exercising the whole gamut of their terror tactics on the helpless population.

Nevertheless, this Communist stooge Government has been recognized by the Western Powers and later even elected to membership in the United Nations. The peace treaty concluded with this nonrepresentative Communist Government has been totally disregarded by them. They proceeded during this entire period with the Kremlin-planned sovietization and exploitation of the country.

The Russians took control of the vast oil resources of Rumania and all other industrial enterprises. Political and religious persecution, deportations, confiscation of property, and total denial of the most elementary human rights have been as elsewhere the methods of Communist oppressive rule. Forced labor has been utilized on a large scale, culminating in the Danube-Black Sea project with its thousands of dead and now in the Danube Delta camp other thousands are doomed to a similar fate. Yet the strong pro-American feelings of the Rumanian people have not been shaken and a deep-rooted passive resistance constantly harasses the Communist government and disrupts its Kremlin-directed schemes.

It is the potentialities of such situations behind the Iron Curtain on which is based Moscow's concern with the United States attitude toward the occupied East Europe. It would help enormously the Soviets to consolidate their rule over a hostile population looking with hope to the West, if she could bring the United States to officially sidetrack the issue of central and eastern Europe.

May I add that the longing for freedom of the millions behind the Iron Curtain is a powerful latent ally, to whom in these times of crises moral support should be given whenever possible.

We would be deeply grateful if you could mention in some way in Congress this sad occasion of the Soviet seizure of Rumania on the 6th of March 13 years ago.

I think, Mr. Speaker, that it is appropriate to recall to the enslaved people of Rumania as well as all other captive peoples behind the Iron Curtain the fact that the great majority of the peoples of the free world are hoping and praying for the day of their liberation and have the utmost confidence that that day will surely and inevitably come to pass. Further, I think they should also be reminded that this Government has repeatedly and recently made it crystal clear that it believes in the freely exercised right of self-determination for the captive peoples of Eastern Europe and still adheres to the position that such a topic properly belongs on the agenda of any future so-called summit conference, in the event this ever comes to pass. I hope the observance of this sad occasion will help to keep alive the spirit of freedom and independence in the hearts of the people of Rumania.

The American's Creed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EMMET F. BYRNE
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 6, 1958

Mr. BYRNE of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I would like consent to insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD's Appendix some important words that we need to remember always. I refer to the American's Creed. Reference was made to this in the American Legion magazine on page 9 of the March issue.

There is nothing that I can add to these beautifully simple words but I can and do express the wish that every American could have a copy of this creed to be placed in a prominent spot in his home, office or school. The author of this creed is that noted patriot, William Tyler Page.

One of my lawyer friends and comrades, John E. Devereux, of Chicago, called this to my attention in a recent letter to me. Mr. Devereux is well known for his activities in the interest of America in behalf of the American Legion.

THE AMERICAN'S CREED

I believe in the United States of America as a government of the people, by the people, for the people; whose just powers are derived from the consent of the governed; a democracy in a republic; a sovereign Nation of many sovereign States; a perfect union, one and inseparable; established upon those principles of freedom, equality, justice, and humanity for which American patriots sacrificed their lives and fortunes.

I therefore believe it is my duty to my country to love it; to support its Constitution; to obey its laws; to respect its flag; and to defend it against all enemies.

WILLIAM TYLER PAGE.

A Sign of the Times

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLARENCE CANNON
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 6, 1958

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted me to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I am including a page advertisement in the Mexico Ledger, of Mexico, Mo., by the Citizen's Committee for a Strong America Based on a Sound Economy, and also append a related editorial from the Ledger by Robert L. White, one of the ablest editorial writers in America:

Hon. DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER,
President of the United States, The White House, Washington, D. C.
Hon. JAMES T. BLAIR, JR.,
Governor of Missouri, The Executive Office, Jefferson City, Mo.
Hon. THOMAS C. HENNINGS, JR.,
Senator from Missouri, Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.
Hon. STUART SYMINGTON,
Senator from Missouri, Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.
Hon. CLARENCE CANNON,
Missouri Representative, Ninth Congressional District, House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

GENTLEMEN: We are deeply concerned about the future of our Nation, and we feel it imperative that you take immediate action to safeguard our country from without and our economy from within.

The very life of our Nation and the freedom of generations to come may well depend on the wisdom and unselfish courage of our present leaders who must solve the most vital problems that have ever confronted America.

The additional billions of dollars required for national security in this atomic-space age will be spent because the American people demand that America be strong and that national defense be given top priority.

On the other hand, we are seriously concerned at the tendency of some people to demand greatly increased spending on nonessential Government programs at a time when the Nation's safety and economy are threatened. Nonessential Government expenditures should be postponed or eliminated, or in any event greatly curtailed during this critical period.

We know that we are facing years of Communist threats requiring an American economy which must continue sound and strong in order to survive.

Actions that yield only temporary results or fleeting benefits may, in the long run, tend to undermine our economy as a whole and weaken our ability to maintain a continuing strong national defense and a sound national economy.

We are alarmed at the reports of continued waste, duplication, and inefficiency in many Government operations. To correct these conditions is a big job but it must be done now when the fate of our national economy, the basis of our national defense, is at stake.

In the face of reduced business activity, the public is indignant and alarmed at the continuing rise in the cost of living, the decreased purchasing power of the dollar and the increasing costs of doing business—and they want Congress to do something about it now.

In view of the present critical circumstances we insist that our leaders in Government approach these problems and decisions on a nonpartisan, unselfish, and entirely constructive basis, that will assure maximum results for national security and business recovery.

The great majority of the people are willing to make the necessary sacrifices and to put forth the extra effort for the safety and strength of our country.

We feel that this crucial period is no time for self-interest pressure groups to promote selfish advantage through actions that will inflate living costs. All groups and individual citizens must be prepared to make sacrifices and cancel, postpone or modify actions that create inflationary pressures and force higher prices.

These pressures must be restrained lest they do serious and continuing damage to our economy and add greatly to the dollar cost of national defense due to higher production costs.

We will do our part and we expect business industry, labor, and our public officials to do the same.

The success and leadership of the United States, in peace and in war, has been due to a large degree, to the preeminence of American production. An attitude of helpful and constructive understanding by government toward this basic fact will be most important in building stronger confidence and stimulating all segments of the economy. This is the proven method of helping to bring an upturn in business conditions and an increase in employment.

This confidence on the part of the American people in business is essential to build and maintain the strong economy necessary to support the cost of enlarged national defense and an expanded economy.

A united effort by the people and their representatives can solve these problems.

Respectfully,

Mexico, Mo., Citizens' Committee for a Strong America, Based on a Sound Economy: J. B. Arthur, Judge George Adams, Arthur D. Bond, Bradford Brett, Ray B. Carroll, Alan Coatsworth, W. R. Courtney, Dr. Thomas L. Dwyer, Frank Edwards, Paul Ekern, John Erdel, Lowell Hagan, L. B. Hawthorne, Maurice Kemp, William S. Lowe, Elmer MaGee, Herbert Morris, Mize Morris, Edward P. O'Brien, Herbert B. Plunkett, George Stahl, Walter G. Staley, Hollis Stolte, Col. C. R. Stribling.

ABOUT SPENDING FOR YOU, AND AGAINST YOU

There are two kinds of sputnik spending. One is for you; and one is for Russia.

The sputnik spending that is for you has to do with the defense of your Nation.

Your Nation is challenged today, perhaps more seriously than at any time since the British burned Washington in the War of 1812.

The Russian sputnik was the key. It proved to all people that the Russians have applied themselves fully to the ultimate weapon—the intercontinental ballistic missile.

Their 1,126 pound Sputnik II—the one now circling this earth with a dead dog inside it—proved the Russians have developed the propulsion for all the range needed, and all the explosive-head weight needed to—to threaten this Nation.

The two missing components needed to wrap their steel fingers about the neck of the free American—your neck—is guidance and reentry.

Both are sure to come from the top scientific minds already plowing day-and-night this fantastic Red battlefield.

So, one kind of sputnik spending is for you—to defend you against this Russian progress; to help our Nation catch up, pass, and plunge ahead of the Reds to establish, God willing, this Nation for generations to come as the unassailable citadel of freedom and decency on earth.

The other kind of sputnik spending is against you—for Russia.

It is for nonessential United States Government spending. It is for waste, duplication, inefficiency in your Government. It is against this kind of spending that 24 Mexicoans run a full-page ad in today's Ledger, reproducing their letter to the President, the Missouri Senators, and to Mr. CANNON.

Unessential sputnik spending drains the lifeblood from our greatest weapon—the American free-enterprise system. Weaken that system with higher and higher costs, higher and higher prices for the wherewithall of day-to-day living, slashing the value of our dollar—and you have helped Russia.

Perhaps, you have helped Russia to the world.

This second, needless sputnik spending must be prevented.

It can be.

All we have to do is insist on it, back up our leaders in Government when they rise above pressure groups, rise above special-interest groups, rise above all but the needed—absolutely imperative—spending of your tax money for the defense of the Nation.

Resolution Urging Increase in President's Budget for Reclamation in Kansas, for Fiscal Year 1959

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. FLOYD BREEDING

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 6, 1958

Mr. BREEDING. Mr. Speaker, President Eisenhower's fiscal 1959 budget, presumably reflecting the administration's rigid economic policy designed to "balance the budget or bust," called for no new reclamation project starts, among other domestic program cutbacks.

Approximately 1 month after the President presented his January budget message to the Congress, the press reported that the White House was "considering a new program of reclamation projects that may be launched as part of the administration's overall effort to reverse the current business decline."

I can only hope that the administration is better equipped to handle the economic remedy than it is the diagnosis. In so hoping, I should like to join with and lend my support to, more than 200 Kansans, from many sections of the State, who have signed the following resolution urging increases in President Eisenhower's budget for reclamation in Kansas for 1959:

RESOLUTION URGING INCREASE IN PRESIDENT'S BUDGET FOR RECLAMATION IN KANSAS, FOR FISCAL YEAR 1959

Whereas it is our belief that the economic progress and development of our region is dependent upon our being freed from the recurring ravages of drought and flood, and we strongly feel that continued construction of reclamation projects is necessary to our long-term economic prosperity; and

Whereas our respective communities are suffering severe economic reverses, caused by a succession of years of drought, superimposed on the generally low state of the agricultural economy, and therefore are greatly in need of the stimulus of sustained or increased public works programs; and

Whereas irrigation offers relief of farm problems in the plains area by providing for adjustments in farming practices, since islands of irrigation can support an increase in livestock operations by assuring a stable local feed supply; and

Whereas in view of the current national recession, going public works programs should not be curtailed, and additional projects should be readied for construction in order that, if the economic picture becomes worse, a pronounced upturn in worthwhile public-works expenditures could be instituted rather than resorting to leaf-raking projects; and

Whereas, in our preoccupation with the race with the Soviet Union into space, we are losing the race in the field of water resources development, a concern which has caused a resolution to be introduced in Congress to conduct hearings on a memorandum of the chairman of the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular affairs, entitled, "Relationships of River and Related Water Resources Development Programs of United States, Soviet Russia, and (Red) China"; and

Whereas going construction programs can be stopped and restarted, or slowed down only with increased costs to the Government and the water users; and

Whereas the various segments of the reclamation program in the Kansas River Basin are inadequately provided for in the President's budget request for fiscal year 1959, specifically as follows:

(a) Bostwick division. The proposed budget allows no funds for construction of block III of the Kansas-Bostwick Irrigation District, which will entail at least a year's delay in completing the district's system. This stretchout of construction places an additional financial burden on the district on two counts: (1) Uneconomical rate of construction increases costs of the distribution system to be repaid by the district and (2) compels the district to maintain a system not yet delivering water to its designed capacity. Such increased costs threaten the limit of the repayment ability of the water users as estimated in negotiating the repayment contract. An appropriation for fiscal year 1959 of $2,136,000 would be required to carry out an orderly program of construction without undue delay in final delivery of water to the entire unit.

(b) Webster unit. The storage facility for this project was completed in 1956, the irrigation pool was filled last year, so that water can be applied to farm lands as soon as canals and laterals are constructed. A repayment contract between the Webster Irrigation District and the Government has been executed and confirmed by the district court. The proposed budget will finance for fiscal year 1959 only one-half of the program required for most economical rate of construction. An economical rate of construction, without undue delay in final full utilization of the water supply for irrigation, would require an appropriation of $2,218,000 for fiscal year 1959.

(c) Cedar Bluff unit. Cedar Bluff Dam and Reservoir was completed in 1951. The reservoir was filled that year and the irrigation pool has been maintained at near capacity ever since. The dam served notably in curbing flood damages in 1951 and again in 1957, but full use of the reservoir will not be made until the canals and laterals are built to deliver water to the project lands. All necessary work has been done by the Bureau of Reclamation for immediate completion of this unit which is already 75 percent complete. A petition for organization of Cedar Bluff Irrigation District No. 6 has been signed by a substantial majority of the landowners. Hearing on such petition will be held by the chief engineer of the Kansas State Board of Agriculture on April 24, 1958. No funds are included in the proposed fiscal year 1959 budget to construct the required irrigation facilities. These facilities are seriously needed to improve and stabilize the economy of the area. An amount of $700,000 would be required to initiate an orderly program of construction in fiscal year 1959.

(d) Almena unit. All required steps have been met to start construction on this project. A definite plan report has been approved by the commissioner and an irrigation district has been formed. Norton Dam and Reservoir, the principle feature of the project, will give essentially complete flood protection to the city of Norton and other communities and farm lands from above Norton to the mouth of Prairie Dog Creek. This area has suffered repeated flood damage and remains under constant threat from the highly erratic flows of Prairie Dog Creek. The city of Norton is badly in need of the municipal water supply from Norton Reservoir, since the present supply does not meet minimum standards to provide for health and fire protection of the community. The city of Norton has agreed to terms of a contract with the Government for repaying the allocated cost of the water supply. The Almena Irrigation District has passed a resolution agreeing to the repayment provisions asked of them. The district is collecting taxes to meet predevelopment expenses, and farmers are at a disadvantage in planning their operations, while waiting to see when Congress will initiate the construction. It is estimated that an appropriation of $1 million is required in fiscal year 1959 for the initial year's construction.

(e) Kanopolis unit. This is an authorized unit of the Missouri River Basin project on which a definite plan report is being prepared. Local interests are active in urging the early completion of such a report with a view to initiating construction in fiscal year 1960. A water supply for the unit has already been developed through regulation of the Smoky Hill River by Cedar Bluff and Kanopolis Reservoirs. The water has been available since 1951 and is not being used. The early utilization of the water supply will hasten the economic stabilization of the community by the irrigation of 18,500 acres of productive land. The Government has already spent a considerable amount of money in advance planning. The sponsoring committee is circulating a petition for irrigation district organization and the local sentiment is such that the organization should be complete this summer. It is urged that $100,000 be made available for fiscal year 1959 to hasten completion of the definite plan so that construction funds can be appropriated for fiscal year 1960.

(f) Glen Elder unit: This unit has been authorized as a part of the Missouri River Basin project. Funds are required to complete a definite plan report in fiscal year 1959 to permit a start of construction in fiscal year 1960. Some 20,000 to 25,000 acres of land can

be developed through regulation of Solomon River flows by construction of Glen Elder Dam and Reservoir. In addition to the irrigation development, the reservoir will meet important requirements in flood control and municipal water supply. The reservoir is a major component in the comprehensive flood-control plan for the entire Kansas River Basin as well as for the more immediate protection of the Solomon Valley. Severe local flood damages were incurred as late as last summer. The city of Beloit, as well as some of the smaller communities in the valley, has a critical municipal water supply problem which could be met by construction of the reservoir. From both a short- and long-time view, the area is greatly in need of an economic boost. Loss of population and sharp decline of economic activity are giving great concern to residents of Beloit and Mitchell County. Local sponsors of the Glen Elder unit have organized a group known as citizens for Glen Elder Dam. They report very favorable sentiment among farmers for organization of an irrigation district. A sum of $200.00 should be provided to insure completion of a definite plan report in fiscal year 1959.

(g) Potential but unauthorized units: To provide a continuing program of water resource development in the Kansas River Basin, some attention must be given to potential but as yet unauthorized additions to the Missouri River Basin project. Such projects include, but are not limited to the Nelson Buck unit on Beaver Creek, the Ellis unit on Big Creek, and irrigation potential in connection with some eight tributary reservoirs in the lower Kaw Basin, currently under study by the Corps of Engineers as part of the basin's comprehensive flood-control requirements: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Congress of the United States be asked to insure orderly progress on the Bureau of Reclamation's program in the Kansas River Basin, by making available appropriations for fiscal year 1959, as follows:

(a) Bostwick division, $2,136,000 or $1,000,000 in addition to the provision in the President's budget.

(b) Webster unit, $2,218,000 or $1,000,000 in addition to the provision in the President's budget.

(c) Cedar Bluff unit, $700,000 in lieu of no provision in the President's budget.

(d) Almena unit, $1,000,000 in lieu of no provision in the President's budget.

(e) Kanopolis unit, $100,000.

(f) Glen Elder unit, $200,000.

(g) Potential but unauthorized units, $100,000; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be sent to each member of the Kansas delegation in the Congress of the United States with the petition that every effort be made to induce Congress to make the provisions stated herein.

Recession in America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PETER F. MACK, JR.

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 6, 1958

Mr. MACK of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, the distinguished Associated Press economics writer, Mr. Sterling F. Green of AP's Washington bureau, is writing a series of reports on the economic state of the Nation. This series is based on interviews by AP men throughout the country with persons in various walks of life, from jobless janitors to chamber of commerce executives. I include here the first of Mr. Green's articles from the March 2 issue of the Washington Evening Star:

DOWNTRENDS PUT CHILL ON ECONOMIC OUTLOOK

(By Sterling F. Green)

How's business? Not bad, really; lots of dollars changing hands. But not good, either, because the trends are wrong.

Unemployment is going uphill, production downhill. Signs of the promised summer recovery are not yet visible.

There is neither pessimism nor panic in the land. But an Associated Press survey in every State and major city suggests that the personal problems of 4.5 million jobless breadwinners—probably approaching 5 million by now—are sending chill ripples throughout the economy.

For this series of reports on the economic state of the Nation, AP men interviewed a cross-section—bankers and jobless janitors, chamber of commerce boosters and corner storekeepers.

HERE'S CROSS SECTION

Here's a sampling of what they heard:

"They don't look scared, just a little surprised that getting another job is tougher than it used to be."—An employment office director, Little Rock, Ark.

"The hospital bills are killing us. I don't know if I can save the house. Last month I had a tough time meeting the payments."—A former $9,000-a-year aircraft worker, laid off in Los Angeles.

This is a recession, in short, which has many facets. Factory output is down, but profits haven't skidded badly. The banking and insurance industries have seldom had it so good. Total consumer income is high, retail sales are holding up well.

The utilities are still expanding even while the railroads are depositing pools of jobless men at every division point from Portland to Portland.

CONTRAST MARKED

By contrast with the hardest-hit towns, there are cities and a few whole States where the recession is mostly something you read about in the newspapers. The streets are full, stores are busy; the auto dealer is about the only man in town who is complaining.

No region has widespread hardship. The bulk of unemployment is clotted in a few great industrial States and in a handful of depressed industries. But the latter reach deep into the mill towns, mountain hamlets and backwoods.

At a recent estimation, New York had 426,000 jobless. Pennsylvania had 435,000, California 312,000. Michigan had 325,000, or 11 percent of its whole working force.

HAVE SOME INCOME

Probably 2 out of 3 of the idle had some income; they were getting unemployment compensation. Almost 3 million Americans were drawing jobless pay in February. An uncounted number had exhausted their benefits and, still without work, had gone on relief. In steel and autos, supplemental employer-paid benefits have prolonged income.

It is not just a big-city phenomenon. From Maine to the Deep South, the eastern seaboard is dotted with closed textile mills and apparel factories working part time or not at all.

Similar trouble in the sawmills and logging camps can be traced from the Carolinas to the Pacific Northwest.

Slack demand and falling prices for copper, lead, and zinc have hit the Mountain States—and spilled over into Canada, where unemployment is at its worst since the 1930's.

RAIL EMPLOYMENT DIPS

Railroad employment has dropped to the lowest level since 1899. Coal mining, the erstwhile sick industry which perked up during the big boom of 1955–57, is ailing again.

But the big job trouble is in the hard goods manufacturing industries, backbone of American industrial might. Somewhere, somehow, nearly 1¼ million factory jobs have evaporated in 13 months.

It would be easy, but inaccurate, to make the auto industry out to be the prime villain of the piece. This is the overwhelmingly dominant job producer—and so far its fancy-finned, slightly higher priced 1958 models haven't sold well.

When Detroit suffers, a lot of other places have more than sympathetic pains. The problem of auto employment fluctuation, once a Detroit specialty, has been exported to Buffalo, Los Angeles, Cleveland—wherever the industry has spotted its enormously efficient new plants.

Five new tires go unsold with every new car that isn't built. Akron feels the pinch, and so does Miami, Okla. Synthetic fiber goes into cars as well as stockings—Du Pont has laid off hundreds in the South. Toolmakers in Cleveland, steelworkers in Pennsylvania, iron miners in Minnesota, glassmakers in several cities, all feel the pinch of a disappointing auto year.

The housing slump spread similar widening circles of joblessness. When new home starts in 1957 dropped below 1 million for the first time in years, thousands of men who make refrigerators, home laundries, garbage disposals, and furniture stopped getting paychecks.

But if housing and autos are villains, so is Uncle Sam. When Washington clamped an economy lid on military spending last summer, the mighty aircraft industry nosed into a steep dive and its farflung suppliers did ground loops.

LID IS NOW OFF

The lid is now off in that area, thanks mainly to Russia's sputniks. But how soon can the new contracts be translated into actual jobs on factory floors?

"Not until next fall, for the most part," says a California plane builder.

After the recent announcement that total joblessness jumped 1 million in January, the greatest 1-month increase since the depression, President Eisenhower issued a chins-up economic statement predicting unemployment will decline in March.

TWO MILLION IS KEYNOTE

It was a fairly safe forecast. Never since World War II has joblessness failed to drop when the weather opened up for farm, construction, and road work.

But the improvement must be substantial or it won't mean a thing. The average February-to-March decline in job hunters has been 200,000. In other words, unemployment must drop by 200,000 next month just to stay even with the seasonable ebb and flow within the working force.

If the March figures—which won't be known until April—show a substantially smaller improvement than that, and if April fails to better the situation, then watch the fur start flying in Washington.

Crucial School Test

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS G. ABERNETHY

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 6, 1958

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include an editorial which appeared in the Wash-

ington Evening Star on February 5, as follows:

CRUCIAL SCHOOL TEST

Prince Edward is a small and largely rural Virginia county situated some 60 miles southwest of Richmond. But it is a place to watch. For Prince Edward apparently is destined to provide the first really crucial test of the feasibility of enforcing school integration in the face of united and determined white resistance.

The Prince Edward case has run its course through the courts. Some months ago Federal District Judge Sterling Hutcheson refused to set a time limit within which the county must comply with an earlier order forbidding compulsory segregation. This ruling was appealed to the fourth circuit court and that tribunal directed Judge Hutcheson to enter a decree ordering the Prince Edward School Board to make a prompt and reasonable start toward compliance with the no-discrimination order. The Supreme Court now has refused to review this order, the effect being to sustain the circuit court. So the stage is set, or seems to be set, for a head-on collision between the law and public opinion in Prince Edward County. Furthermore, the outcome of this clash in Prince Edward probably will foreshadow the results of similar clashes in countless other communities in the South.

The school population in Prince Edward is about 54 percent colored and 46 percent white. The schools for colored, according to Judge Hutcheson's findings, are equal, if not superior, to those for white children in terms of curriculum and physical equipment. There is every reason to believe, however, that both white and colored schools are going to be shut down. This, in Judge Hutcheson's words, "would be highly and permanently injurious to children of both races." The judge did not say so, but it is obvious that the greater injury will fall on the Negro children.

This is true because the white adults in the county, numbering about 4,500, have banded together against integration. They have raised money, obtained teachers and arranged for makeshift housing for a private school system for their own children. They say they are prepared to abandon their public school system rather than integrate, and there is every indication that they mean it. No comparable arrangements have been made by the Negro parents or for the Negro children.

This is a tragic outlook. For Prince Edward is not ready for school integration. Those who are forcing the issue at this time are making a deplorable mistake, the penalties for which will be visited upon the children. This is the more true in light of the testimony of most of the Negro parents named as plaintiffs in the desegregation suit, a suit brought in their behalf without cost by lawyers for the NAACP. These Negro parents told the Thomson committee of the Virginia Legislature that they thought the purpose of the suit was to obtain better schools for their children and that they did not know it was designed to bring about integration.

Neither side can hope for any victory in Prince Edward. And the losses in store for both sides are incalculable.

The Curtis Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWIN B. DOOLEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 6, 1958

Mr. DOOLEY. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include a speech made by Mr. August Ihlefeld, president, Savings Banks Trust Co., before the savings banks of Westchester County, at the Roger Smith Hotel, White Plains, N. Y., on February 18, 1958.

The savings banks of Westchester County have served that community well over the years and to jeopardize their future status by legislation designed to restrict their interest rate and their reserve balances seems to me to be unwise. It appears inequitable to me to base a tax—as with the Curtis bill—upon the excess rate of return that one class of savings institution, namely, savings banks, pays over that paid by a less efficient competitor.

Mr. Ihlefeld's speech is a trenchant one and I feel that it should be reprinted in the RECORD:

THE CURTIS BILL: A MISUSE OF TAXATION TO STIFLE COMPETITION

(Address by August Ihlefeld, president, Savings Banks Trust Co., before the savings banks of Westchester County at the Roger Smith Hotel, White Plains, N. Y., February 18, 1958)

A healthy, growing economy needs an adequate flow of savings to finance business, home ownership and Government. Only if new capital is provided mainly by savings rather than by commercial bank credit expansion can we achieve growth without inflation.

The favored savings medium of the American people is the savings account. Last year, about $12 billion was added to savings accounts. This was more than half the total increase in liquid personal savings during 1957.

Our laws recognize the vital economic role of the savings account by actively fostering the development of institutions to provide such service to the American people. First savings banks, and later savings and loan associations, were chartered as mutual institutions. Stockholder-owned commercial banks were empowered to pay interest on savings deposits. Credit unions also entered the field. The Postal Savings System, a public agency, was created to provide a similar service.

Competition is the mainspring of a free enterprise economy. Public policy in this country has favored active competition between mutual and stock institutions, and even a Federal agency, to attract and hold savings. These institutions, by competing vigorously with each other, have greatly stimulated saving. Our highly developed, keenly competitive savings system explains why per capita personal savings are far higher in the United States than in any other country of the world.

STIFLING COMPETITION

Adequate competition has been assured in rendering savings account service by the keen rivalry between mutual and stock institutions to serve the saver. Great as has been the contribution of competition to our well being, it is constantly threatened by those who prefer a less rigorous way of economic life.

Attempts to stifle competition, in violation of the basic principles of a free-enterprise system, assume many forms. A particularly effective way to destroy competition is to use the taxing power of Government to wipe out the advantage that a more efficient competitor possesses over a less efficient rival.

Mutual thrift institutions are threatened today by a cunning attempt to use a Federal tax bill to stifle the competition they give commercial banks in savings account service.

The bill designed to achieve this result is deceptively brief and simple. But legislative history contains very few, if any, examples of so brazen a proposal to use the taxing power to undermine and eventually destroy more efficient competitors for the benefit of the less efficient.

THE CURTIS BILL

This bill, introduced by Representative THOMAS B. CURTIS, of Missouri, is officially called the Savings and Loan Association and Mutual Savings Bank Tax Act of 1957. More accurate and descriptive titles would be the "Destruction of Competition for Savings Act," or the "Act To Discourage Savings."

The novel and most significant part of the bill is its section 3, which would tax up to 52 percent the return credited by a mutual savings institution on savings accounts in excess of 3 percent per annum.

Under this section, a mutual savings bank which now pays its depositors 3¼ percent would have to pay an income tax of 52 percent on the ¼ of 1 percent distributed in excess of 3 percent. The depositor receiving 3¼ percent on his savings, in turn, would have to pay personal income tax on the whole amount credited to him, so that payments to him in excess of 3 percent would be doubly taxed. Such double taxation of the return paid on savings violates every canon of sound taxation and sound economics.

However, and this of course is the purpose of the bill, it is very doubtful that mutual savings institutions would be able to pay more than 3 percent on savings if this bill were to become law. In effect, all earnings of mutual savings institutions above 3 percent, whether paid out or retained, would be taxed at 52 percent by direct levy on these organizations, regardless of their need for adequate rserves and surplus to protect depositors. To make even small additions to reserves and surplus to safeguard the additional savings that will be entrusted to them in the future, mutual thrift institutions would as a practical matter be limited to paying a 3-percent rate under the Curtis bill.

It is true that commercial banks are now limited by Federal Reserve regulation to paying 3 percent on savings deposits. But that limitation is imposed because the supervisory authorities do not feel that commercial banks, with the higher costs and added risks they incur as department stores of finance, can safely pay more. It is precisely because mutual savings institutions specialize exclusively in savings service and are barred by law from entering such profitable but uncertain fields as risk loans to business and consumer credit loans that they can pay a higher rate of return upon savings.

THE PURPOSE OF TAXATION

The purpose of taxation is to raise revenue for Government without imposing an undue or unfair burden upon taxpayers or the economy as a whole. To base a tax upon the excess rate of return that one class of savings institutions pays over that paid by a less efficient competitor is a crude perversion of the taxing process.

This principle of taxation, once adopted and upheld in the courts, would set a most unwholesome precedent. It could be used, for example, to impose an added tax upon mutual insurance companies that charge lower premium rates than their competitors. Applied generally, this principle calls for a surtax upon more efficient competitors in all branches of commerce and industry based on the lower prices they charge as compared with less efficient rivals.

WHY THE CURTIS BILL?

Stripped of pretense, the Curtis bill would use the taxing power of the Federal Government to force mutual savings institutions, the greater number of which are State chartered, to reduce the rate of return they pay the saver. This is so improper and unsound a proposal that one inevitably wonders why it is being pushed so vigorously, I might even say feverishly, by its advocates, organ-

ized groups of national and State commercial banks.

The reason becomes clear when we review recent banking history.

Commercial banks, the department stores of banking, have shown limited interest in savings deposits during most of their history. They have preferred to concentrate on attracting demand deposits on which no return is paid, since they could not be sure of earning a profit for their stockholders from savings deposits after paying a competitive rate of return to the saver. During the decade ending in 1956, the average rate of return paid on time deposits by commercial banks was less than half that paid by mutual savings institutions. Commercial banks have thus been content to leave to the specialized mutual thrift institutions the major part of the savings account business of the country. As late as 1956, mutual savings banks and savings and loan associations gained $6.8 billion in savings, while commercial banks had an increase of $2.2 billion in savings and other time deposits.

Last year, commercial banks experienced an unprecedented demand for loans of all kinds at the highest interest rates witnessed in decades, while the restrictive credit policy of the Federal Reserve authorities limited their ability to expand loans and demand deposits. Savings deposits seemed highly desirable under such conditions, and commercial banks sought and received permission from the Federal Reserve Board to pay up to 3 percent to compete more actively for such deposits. A vigorous drive to attract savings deposits was launched by commercial banks all over the country, with what looked like impressive initial results.

But the mutual thrift institutions were also benefiting from higher interest rates, since they could invest funds at much higher yields in gilt-edge bonds and quality mortgage loans. A number of mutual savings banks in New York State raised their rate to 3¼ percent. This was quite frustrating to the commercial banks that were hoping to attract a large volume of savings deposits away from the mutual institutions. In fact, commercial bankers soon found that a major part of the extraordinary gain in savings deposits they achieved at such high cost during the past year came out of their own checking accounts rather than from mutual savings institutions. Thus, they found themselves paying 3 percent on the very same funds they previously had for nothing as demand deposits.

Commercial bankers obviously could not ask legisaltures and supervisory authorities to clamp a rigid ceiling upon the rate of return paid on savings by mutual institutions, so that these savings could be diverted to commercial banks. Instead, efforts followed to attain the same result by devious means. One such effort was the proposal in New York State for legislation to authorize commercial banks to absorb mutual savings banks by merger after distributing their surpluses. When Senator Pierce and his joint legislative committee had the good sense to bury this iniquitous proposal, which flies in the face of every economic and moral principle, the persistent foes of competition turned to the equally improper device of a Federal tax law to stifle competition for savings. The Curtis bill has been gleefully endorsed because it aims to compel mutual savings institutions to reduce the rate they pay on savings to that paid by commercial banks. Once it is enacted, commercial banks hope to draw billions of dollars of savings deposits from mutuals because of their many branch offices and their "banking under one roof" promotion appeal.

The real objective of the commercial bank advocates of the Curtis bill is clearly revealed in resolutions adopted by the administrative committee of the American Bankers Association on January 18 and by the New York State Bankers Association at its annual midwinter meeting on January 20. The resolution of the latter association requests that the Curtis bill be amended so as to apply the 52 percent income tax to any return paid by a mutual savings institution on savings in excess of whatever maximum rate of interest the Federal Reserve authorities will permit commercial banks to pay on savings deposits. With the recent downturn in interest rates, commercial banks expect that the maximum rate they may pay on savings will soon be reduced again to 2½ percent. In that event, mutual savings banks and savings and loan associations would also be forced to lower the rate of return they pay because everything in excess of 2½ percent would be taxed at 52 percent.

The specialized mutual savings institutions invest savings in long-term mortgage loans and bonds. Hence, they will continue to receive for many years to come the increased yields obtained on mortgage loans and other investments made during the period of high interest rates. The Curtis bill, if enacted, would tax away these higher returns which could otherwise be paid out to savings depositors and so stimulate the volume of personal savings over the years ahead.

Commercial banks, by contrast, expanded their business and other short-term loans while interest rates were high. Hence, they will be forced to reduce the rate of return paid on savings accounts in many cases now that short-term interest rates are dropping sharply. The American Bankers Association's administrative committee and the New York State Bankers Association hope to see commercial banks escape this basic competitive disadvantage of the department store type of bank by punitive double taxation of any return paid by a mutual savings institution in excess of that permitted a commercial bank.

The ability of commercial banks to stimulate needed new savings in the years ahead will be lessened as the rate of return they pay on savings accounts declines. They propose that the effectiveness of mutual thrift institutions in stimulating new savings be likewise diminished by punitive double taxation of a part of the return they pay to savers.

If our Congress would want to discourage and penalize savings, one could hardly imagine a more effective way to do so than by enacting the Curtis bill.

FROM 12 PERCENT TO 5 PERCENT

The Curtis bill seeks to prevent mutual thrift institutions from serving savers effectively not only by taxing the return they pay in excess of 3 percent per annum, but also by levying a tax on them for all earnings not paid out where their reserves and surplus are in excess of 5 percent of deposit or share accounts, instead of 12 percent as at present.

When mutual thrift institutions were first made subject to the Federal income tax in 1951, Congress recognized that the safety of these institutions should be the first consideration. Hence, it was provided that earnings not paid out should be added to reserves and surplus accumulated by these institutions to absorb possible future losses. Only when this safety margin exceeds 12 percent of current deposits of savings banks, or of share capital of savings and loan associations, are retained earnings taxed. The 12-percent ratio is modest for institutions that hold large portfolios of mortgage loans and that receive a steady flow of new savings.

The Curtis bill would replace the 12 percent with 5 percent and so make it impossible for mutual savings institutions to accumulate adequate additional reserves and surplus to keep pace with the growth of their deposit and share liabilities in the future.

Let us take the case of a mutual savings bank currently earning 3¾ percent on its deposits, after expenses, and having a reserve and surplus ratio of 10 percent of deposits. This bank can pay 3¼ percent to depositors and add one-half of 1 percent to its reserves and surplus. This would margin an annual deposit growth of 5 percent without reducing the ratio of reserves and surplus to deposits. Under the Curtis bill, this savings bank would have to pay a 52-percent income tax on annual earnings in excess of 3 percent of deposits, leaving earnings after taxes of 3.36 percent of deposits. Were this savings bank to continue to pay 3¼ percent to depositors, the balance available for additions to reserves and surplus would be only about one-tenth of 1 percent, enough to margin deposit growth of only 1 percent per annum. Since this savings bank would have a much greater deposit growth annually merely by crediting 3 perecent to its depositors, the rate paid would have to be reduced. Steps to discourage the growth of deposits would also have to be taken to avoid too rapid a decline in the surplus-to-deposit ratio.

SPURIOUS TAX EQUALITY

The commercial bank advocates of the Curtis bill base their endorsement of this unwholesome measure on the alleged principle of equality. They claim it would place taxation of stock and mutual institutions on a comparable basis.

This equality argument is intentionally fallacious reasoning.

Interest paid depositors by commercial banks is deductible in full from their taxable income. Income of regulated investment companies and capital gains paid out in accordance with applicable provisions of the Internal Revenue Code are not taxed at all to these companies because the shareholders pay personal income tax on such receipts. But the Curtis bill would make dividends paid depositors in mutual savings banks and shareholders in savings and loan associations, payments exactly comparable with interest paid on time deposits by commercial banks, deductible only up to 3 percent. Any return paid depositors or shareholders in mutual savings institutions above 3 percent would be taxed to these institutions and also to the depositors and shareholders. This would be blatantly unequal, discriminatory taxation of mutual thrift institutions. To advocate such legislation on the ground of tax equality is worthy of Alice in Wonderland.

Taxation of all retained earnings of mutual thrift insitutions when reserves and surplus exceed 5 percent, rather than 12 percent, is similarly proposed for the alleged purpose of equalizing taxation of stock and mutual insitutions.

But commercial banks, like mutual savings banks and savings and loan associations, are accorded special tax treatment to safeguard their financial strength. One of the cornerstones of a sound national economy is a strong banking and thrift institutional structure. As an aid to preserving a sound banking system, the Bureau of Internal Revenue a decade ago authorized commercial banks to charge against taxable income sums credited to a reserve for loan losses equal to three times the average loss on loans during the worst 20 years of the bank's experience. If a reserve of this size is not adequate for the purpose ,and many commercial banks have argued heatedly that it is not—and I agree—the amount should be liberalized by regulation or legislation.

Moreover, commercial banks, while making unfounded charges that mutual savings institutions enjoy an unduly favored position under our tax laws, are themselves a major beneficiary of special favor in the tax-

tion of capital gains and losses. The Revenue Act provides that banks may deduct in full from taxable income net realized losses on investments without limit as to amount, a privilege not accorded other classes of corporate and individual taxpayers. Net long-term capital gains, on the other hand, as with other taxpayers, are taxed at only 25 percent. By deducting net realized losses on investments from ordinary income, while paying a tax of only 25 percent on net realized long-term gains, the commercial banks have reduced their taxes by hundreds of million of dollars over a period of years.

Thanks to tax-free additions to loss reserves and the deduction of realized net losses on investment in full from taxable income, commercial banks have paid much less than the 52-percent rate of income tax applicable to corporate taxpayers generally, even though they are stock enterprises conducted for the profit of their shareholders.

Let me hasten to add that these extraordinary benefits accorded commercial banks under our tax laws are entirely justified. They are, in fact, a small price to pay for maintaining a strong banking system and saving the country from the scourge of commercial-bank failures which proved so disastrous in the early 1930's. It is far more important to have a strong banking system than to collect a few hundred millions of dollars of added income taxes.

Yet it ill befits commercial bankers, as beneficiaries of these special tax favors, to agitate for unfair and unsound taxes to undermine the strength of mutual-savings institutions on the specious ground of tax equality.

SPECIAL VERSUS THE PUBLIC INTEREST

I have sought to analyze the Curtis bill objectively and dispassionately from the viewpoint of the public interest.

Let me add a personal note of disappointment and frustration over commercial bank endorsement of this bill.

In a dynamic economy, changes are required from time to time in banking laws and regulations. Leaders in commercial and savings banking in the Empire State conferred recently to seek a common program of legislation that would strengthen the ability of all our banking institutions to serve the public adequately and efficiently.

The breakdown of these promising discussions coincided with formal approval of the Curtis bill by the New York State Bankers Association, coupled with its request that the bill be made even more effective as a means to stifle competition between mutual and stock institutions and to reduce the return paid to savers.

The State Bankers Association thus allowed itself to go on record as favoring a bill which, to advance the narrow self-interests of commercial stockholders, would be highly inimical to the public interest and the future welfare of our whole economy.

I cannot believe that the majority of professional commercial bankers in the State are aware that, by this action they have been ranged behind the highly vocal extremists fringe who have openly dedicated their energies and their talents to the extinction of mutual savings institutions because they stand in the way of local commercial bank monopolies.

AN UNSOUND PROPOSAL

The Curtis bill is not a tax measure designed in good faith to raise additional revenue for our Government.

Its primary objective is to prevent mutual thrift institutions from paying higher rates of return on savings than do commercial banks. This is to be done by double taxation of returns paid on savings by these institutions above rates which commercial banks can afford to pay. This is being proposed for the selfish benefit of the stockholders of commercial banks, with contemptuous disregard of the interests of over 25 million Americans who save in mutual thrift institutions and of the welfare of the economy as a whole.

Its second objective is to weaken mutual thrift institutions by preventing them from building up the reserves and surplus required to margin future growth. This is to be done by taxing all additions to reserves and surplus whenever the latter exceed 5 percent of deposit liabilities or share capital. Such a low ratio is obviously inadequate for growing institutions that seek to serve the needs of the economy through investing savings in mortgage loans and other long-term securities involving some measure of risk.

I cannot conceive that our Congress will give serious consideration to so spurious and unsound a proposal.

Remarks by the Honorable Christian A. Herter, Under Secretary of State, Before the Conference of Grand Masters of Masons in North America, Statler Hotel, Washington, D. C., February 20, 1958

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT L. F. SIKES

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 25, 1958

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, the excellent work done by the Honorable Christian A. Herter as a Member of the Congress is well remembered here. Since that time he has served as Governor of his State and now holds a very responsible and important position as Under Secretary of State in which all of his friends in the Congress wish him well.

It is my pleasure to present for inclusion in the Appendix of the RECORD a speech made by Mr. Herter before the conference of the Grand Masters of Masons in North America on February 20, 1958:

Twelve years ago, when World War II ended, we hoped in this country we could return to the type of existence that has been traditionally ours—one of comparative isolation, one of living in peace—of minding our own business in our own homeland, carrying on our peaceful pursuits, untroubled by hostilities elsewhere in the world. Unhappily, it soon become evident that one of the nations which had been our ally during the fighting would not keep the pledges it had made to us in treaties and other agreements dealing with postwar arrangements. By its acts, the U. S. S. R. clearly indicated it was no longer an ally but was determined to pursue the Marxist goal of conquering the whole world either by military means or by subversion.

Within the next 2 years we were faced with a very grave problem. Europe, unable to recover from the ravages of war, was faced with a very serious threat of the growth of communist, a growth that was showing extraordinary and frightening vitality at the polls and in organization within those nations. As a nation which after the war still had very considerable resources, we were called upon to help. We did help. The so-called Marshall plan involved a great bipartisan effort between the administration then in power and the Congress of the United States to carry out what to us then seemed a risky but nonetheless essential experiment if the continuing growth of communism was to be checked. Within the next 5 years, the people of the United States contributed to the economic recovery of Europe about $13½ billion. It was a gigantic effort on our part. We were working at the time with nations, sophisticated from an economic point of view, who had among their peoples skilled technicians and who had a great desire to help in their own organization and to help pull themselves up with this aid that we were offering.

As I say, at that time it was a bold experiment. We didn't know the outcome, we didn't know whether we could save that situation but we made the effort. It was amazingly successful. Actually, estimates were made in the early days of 1948 that a total of $17 billion would be required. We spent 20 percent less than that and as of today those nations of Europe have not only recovered but as a measure of their recovery are spending annually on the defense of the free world alone more than we put in during that entire 4-year period.

That however, did not end our responsibilities. In that period after the war, there were very rapid changes taking place all over the world. In the last 10 years, 20 new nations, totaling roughly 700 millions of peoples, gained their independence. Every one of them had been a part of a colonial system, dependent upon European nations for their administrative skills and for their welfare. They achieved their independence as a result of a great ferment of the kind we experienced 150 years ago, when we determined that we were going to become an independent Nation and were willing to fight for it. Some fought, some achieved independence by peaceful means. But what emerged from the great ferment of the birth of these 20 nations, most of whom had a standard of living so low that it is very difficult for us to visualize?

I had occasion only recently to go to the independence ceremonies of the most recent of these 20 nations to become independent—the Federation of Malaya. That nation is the wealthiest of any of the 20—actually the wealthiest nation in Asia—and its annual per capita income is roughly $300 per year. Many of the other nations who have become free have per capita incomes ranging from $25 per year to $75 per year. They have lived in misery and poverty for centuries. But they are now free nations, terribly proud and jealous of their independence. Moreover, they have learned in recent years that it is not necessary for their peoples to continue in the degree of poverty and misery they have endured over the centuries. So they are determined to find the quickest route by which they can raise the standard of living of their peoples and emulate what they have seen in the Western World, our world, whose prosperity they hope to achieve.

I have recited very briefly what has happened only because it is an essential part of the setting in which we are now living. I needn't recite to this audience our relationship with Soviet Russia over the last ten years. It is a relationship that has been frightening in the sense that a large bloc of nations under the grinding domination of a small clique has achieved a solidarity and an advancement not alone in the scientific field but in the industrial field as well which are a serious challenge to us. During that period the U. S. S. R. has made it clear to the whole world that the doctrines under which its revolutionary government was founded are still in force and that, whether by military means or by subversion, the ultimate objective of conquering the world is being actively pursued.

We were forced to maintain and improve our Defense Establishment because we realized that nation was rapidly increasing its military potential. We thought we had achieved a safe lead. Sputnik suddenly destroyed our complacency and made us realize that not only had the military potential of Russia and its satellites increased far beyond the point we had estimated but that its economy, its industrial strength, was far greater than we had anticipated.

We have also discovered in the last 2 years that the U. S. S. R. is not content with the military threat, which has been capable during the last 12 years of bringing into the Soviet orbit the whole of Continental China and the satellite world, forming a solid bloc of approximately a billion people. It has been able to spare enough from its own economy to begin an economic offensive which, added to its propaganda offensive, is attempting to bring over to its side and into its bloc many uncommitteed nations or nations weakly committed toward the free world in order to strengthen itself and bit by bit, nation by nation, increase its dominance of the world.

In the last 5 years, the U. S. S. R. has achieved no notable successes. But that doesn't minimize the fact that it is trying and that its techniques are flexible. I spoke a moment ago of its economic offensive. That is of comparative recent date. On our side we discovered after the success of the Marshall plan that our task from the point of view of trying to hold the free world together was not finished. Through a series of alliances with some 42 nations stretching around the world we have put togther a free world defensive group with which we hope to match or exceed the strength of the military alliance formed by the Soviet bloc. Within our defensive system there are many nations unable to sustain the military strength required to hold their frontiers against Russia or Communist China. We have had to help them from a military point of view; we have had to help them also from an economic point of view. We have done so through the military part of what has been called our mutual aid program.

But in addition there are many countries in dire poverty whose peoples had never known freedom in the sense that we have known freedom, but whose peoples were fired with this determination to join whatever countries and accept whatever help would bring them the soonest assistance in raising their standards of living. These people had no long-term appreciation of freedom as we have known it. By the same token they didn't know the meaning of communism as we knew it. They were interested only in achieving release from poverty as fast as they could.

Now in those countries we have met what you might call a very severe and very effective competition. It is a competition both of subversion and of economic assistance. The subversion takes an extremely interesting form entirely aside from the propaganda with which we are familiar. It is a constant repetition of the claim that the Communist system can bring assistance faster and can raise their standard of living faster than the free world system. This propaganda constantly hammers on the theme that Russia started as an agrarian nation some 40 years ago and today has becomes a great industrial nation—a nation of tremendous strength that can defy the entire free world.

To prove their point, Soviet bloc emissaries are now offering economic aid and promises of credit with "no strings attached." Technical missions are going into these countries with Soviet experts extraordinarily well trained not only in the language and habits and customs of these countries but trained technically in a very surprising way. We have got to meet this very real challenge.

The military challenge is easy for us to understand. It is something with which we are familiar. We don't have to know the names of countries thousands of miles away from us that we can't find on the map. We can realize the importance of the sputniks, we need no diagrams to bring home the threat of intercontinental missiles. These are tangible and vividly meaningful. But there are intangibles much more difficult to comprehend and I want to bear on those for just a minute.

The intangible threats come first of all in the economic field. We have not only the 20 new nations looking somewhere for help and frankly in many cases indifferent to ideological dangers, but many other nations in the fringe area on whom we are dependent for an essential part of our Military Establishment. The economic aid that we have been giving, and in my opinion must continue to give, through the mutual security program has, I think, already kept a number of countries from going into the Soviet orbit in the last 5 years. It is terribly hard for us, particularly at a time when we have unemployment here at home, to realize that what we are doing abroad is something that is vital to our own survival. It is just as important as our military assistance because the danger of having subversion take over one country, then its neighbor, then another—the old Hitler technique—is just as great as the threat of a great military surprise attack upon us and our allies. In the Far East for instance, if nations like Cambodia, Laos, Vietnam were to fall prey to Communist blandishments, you would soon find Communist China moving straight through Singapore into Indonesia with Japan having great difficulty holding out and the Philippines having serious trouble.

On the other side of the world, if north Africa goes, Europe would be in terrible shape. If north Africa goes, it would mean the Middle East would go or, conversely, if the Middle East were to go, there would be great danger of north Africa going. Furthermore, should north Africa go the same process would take place right through the continent of Africa until by degrees we might well find ourselves alone in this hemisphere, hoping that Canada would stick by us, wondering whether or not the same subversion which has been so successful elsewhere would not take over Central and South America, leaving us isolated against 2½ billion peoples in the world.

This may sound as though I am trying to tell a horror story but it isn't. This is a frank appraisal of what we have to face, and face realistically and with fortitude.

There is a third element that again is difficult for us as a nation to comprehend because of our tradition of going it alone and avoiding all the annoyances of overseas entanglements and troubles. It relates to our foreign-trade policy.

Today, this Nation, and I am quoting now figures recently submitted to the Congress by our brother Sinclair Weeks, Secretary of Commerce, annually exports about $19½ billion worth of goods other than military items. We are importing only about $13 billion. Exports represent about 6 percent of everything that we produce in this country and foreign-trade activities provide the livelihood of about 4½ million of all our people who are working today. It represents a very key segment of our entire economy. It is not easy to keep up foreign trade, particularly in times like these when there is the normal and natural temptation to protect those small industries that are having difficulties surviving because of foreign competition. Yet, in order to continue buying from us the wide range of goods they need, our foreign trading partners must earn the wherewithal by selling to us their products and services. In short, they must be able to compete, on reasonable terms, for a share of the market in this country.

This is a difficult problem but it is one we must face up to directly in our own interest. I know something about it coming from the State of Massachusetts, where a number of small industries feel they are being hurt by foreign competition. But, let us remember also that we have to buy. We are the greatest trading nation of the world. We have to import tremendous amounts of raw materials which we don't possess in sufficient quantity here at home, things like coffee, iron ore, tin, rubber, etc. We have to buy not only these things, but in order that we may export our own produce we have to buy some manufactured goods. Today we export nine times as much in manufactures as we import in manufactures. This again is a part in trying to hold the free world together. We were successful, as I said at the very outset, in trying to pull Europe together beginning in 1948. We put it back on its feet so that it could get into the trading field, and it did. It can only survive by foreign trade. Countries like England and Italy and Germany can't possibly produce enough food to exist. They buy their food in large measure from us. Japan is in the same situation. They won't be able to pay for that food nor can they pay for the essential raw materials for their factories unless they sell their manufactured goods somewhere in the world and that includes us. To repeat, foreign trade is a matter of survival for many of our allies and friends. If they find themselves going under from an economic point of view because of dwindling foreign markets, they will offer an easy target for Communist encroachment and domination.

Thus we are living in a world where a very real threat hangs over our heads. I am not too worried about it if we have the fortitude to hang on. I am not too worried about it because basically our ideals, our convictions, our way of life are infinitely better than what we are opposing. The question is whether we have the discipline and the fortitude to hang on with this threat facing us so that we can outlive that day which Lenin 40 years ago described as the day when either the capitalist system or the Communist system would preside at the wake of the other. I believe we have that fortitude. I am convinced that we can carry it through and I am not worried as to who will be sitting at the wake.

Downgrading Carl Rowan Will Not Change the Facts About the Farm Communities

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. COYA KNUTSON

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 6, 1958

Mrs. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, those who have been worried about the sort of effect on farm communities that Carl Rowan has been talking about in the Minnesota Morning Trib series, have been predicting this and warning against it ever since the inception of this administration's farm policies.

Time magazine tells of a Rumpus Over Rowan on page 57 of the February 24 issue. Carl Rowan's reply to this is a very real challenge. One answer might

be to bury our heads in the sand and think the farm depression "will just go away quietly." Another is to face the facts with strength, wisdom, and imagination, and set about the long, hard job of reversing the deteriorating situation. Merely "cussin' out" the author of a documentary of this sort will not slow down the spread of the farm depression to the farm communities, to the suppliers, and ultimately to the entire national economy.

Under permission heretofore granted, I insert in the RECORD the Time magazine article, together with the final article in Carl Rowan's stark series in the Minneapolis Morning Tribune, this one from the February 14 issue:

[From Time of February 24, 1958]

RUMPUS OVER ROWAN

"You should ship Carl Rowan to Russia," a smalltown attorney angrily urged the Minneapolis Tribune (circulation 212,873). The Tribune's prizewinning Reporter Rowan (Time, March 4) was raising tempers all over Minnesota last week. When somebody invited him to make a speech in one rural community, the town fathers promptly refused use of the school auditorium. Jeered a rural editor: "If Rowan visited a town where a funeral and a wedding were taking place simultaneously, he'd go straight to the funeral."

The rumpus over the Tribune's 32-year-old Negro star arose from an explosive 11-part series reporting that funeral bells are, in fact, tolling for whole communities throughout predominantly agricultural Minnesota. Assigned to look into economic and social conditions in depressed farm towns, Rowan returned from a 90-day tour convinced that scores of communities will have to shift gears or perish. He found that a long-term drop in the State's net farm income (down $97 million since 1949) was aggravated by an agricultural revolution that is eliminating the country town's long-time function of market place and supply center. Yet, he reported, bigwigs in many rural communities are more interested in keeping out unions than bringing in industrial payrolls that would give their towns economic balance.

In the statewide clamor stirred by his series, more than half the 300 readers who had bombarded the paper with letters last week plainly agreed with Rowan. Though rural papers split evenly over Rowan's soul-searching report, none challenged his facts. To one Farm Belt editor who accused him of exaggerating his conclusions, Carl Rowan replied: "Sure, the truth hurts, and if I have spiked some tender toes—well, I'm not sorry. I viewed my job much like that of a doctor diagnosing an ailing patient. It would be a silly doctor who spent 2 hours telling the patient how pretty his teeth are, how strongly his heart beats, how good his reflexes are, only to add a postscript as the patient walks out the door: 'By the way, you may have cancer.'"

[From the Minneapolis Morning Tribune of February 14, 1958]

GROW OR DIE: WHAT IS FUTURE OF SMALL TOWNS?

(By Carl T. Rowan)

(Last of series)

What, then, can we say is the future of our small towns?

The first and obvious fact is that many rural communities will live and grow, for our good farming areas will never become a barren wasteland.

Still, some of our towns will waste away. Part of the agricultural revolution that neither Washington nor our legislature can repeal has decreed that some of our towns belong to a bygone era.

Our speedy, all-weather roads, the trend toward bigness in every area of our economy and the changing tastes of the people have wiped away what once were compelling reasons for the existence of some towns.

Rural sociologists and others have concluded generally that communities of 2,000 or more population have the best chance of prospering and that smaller towns must struggle constantly for survival.

Yet, many very small towns will continue to exist as minor service centers catering to the special needs of a few farmers and others.

Other small towns will become "bedrooms" for growing industrial towns nearby, with smalltown workers commuting to and from work.

Already, small towns near Rochester have been aided in the struggle to survive because their residents have found jobs at International Business Machines and other Rochester firms.

But the experts agree that survival may depend not so much on the current population figures as on the willingness of the people to face this revolution in rural society and ask themselves some soul-searching questions about its painful implications.

The towns that prosper, the experts say, will be those in which the people admit that changes are occurring in our State and area which go to the very heart of rural life.

The impact is great, and it has jarred not only the housewife who struggles with the family budget, but the churches and schools which have been such major factors in rural and small town life.

What is happening in religion? Our churches are becoming more urban as it becomes more and more difficult to fill pulpits in rural parishes.

Dr. Philip Dybvig, home-missions director of the Evangelical Lutheran church, said: "We have 130 to 140 vacancies. These are spread all over—I can think now of one very large church that is vacant. But the large church that can pay a good salary and is located in a nice, convenient place to live usually stays vacant only 2 or 3 months.

"But rural parishes—especially those of three or more congregations—stay vacant a long time because the people have to call several ministers before one accepts.

"Even though there has been no retrogression of our work in rural areas, there definitely is a disproportionately high number of vacancies in small towns."

Dr. Theodore Matson, American missions director of the Augustana Lutheran church, reports 41 vacant churches in 24 parishes in rural Minnesota.

He says there is a general shortage of ministers and an acute shortage of those willing to serve rural areas.

"We have altogether too many places where there is a church structure based on horse and buggy days," said Dr. Dybvig. "We need to consolidate some congregations. But the rearrangement comes slowly because of petty jealousies, animosities, family feuds and the sort.

"Yet all of us must face up to this fact: there now are many communities where farms have been consolidated, leaving many beautiful farmsteads with no one living on them because the land has been rented to a neighboring farmer.

"In a few of these places churches have died out completely simply because of lack of people to support them. The consolidation of farms has made more urgent this need to consolidate some churches."

Small town school authorities are acutely sensitive to any suggestion that the educations they provide are less than the best. I heard many angry jibes at Minneapolis School Superintendent Rufus Putnam, who made such a suggestion a few months ago.

Yet, small town school officials pass out casual bits of information that can lead to only one conclusion: some current developments are jeopardizing the quality of education in our small towns.

The farmer who says he's too broke to buy a new tractor also is too broke to vote in favor of a new school bond issue.

Listen to these comments from the school superintendent in one Minnesota town of more than 5,000 population:

"Every teacher I approach is mighty reluctant to come this far from the big cities.

"We used to have a choice of 3 to 5 teachers for each position. Now we sing hallelujah to have one, and we don't ask that one any questions.

"Now what does that do to the level of education? It's bound to hurt it."

One banker said his small western Minnesota town could not run its schools if the bigger town nearby did not have the somewhat controversial policy of banning married women as teachers.

"We've got 8 or 9 married women commuting from that town to teach here," he said.

"Don't get me wrong," he added. "They're good teachers and we're mighty grateful to them. But from the standpoint of our economy, it means we're sending $40,000 to $50,000 a year to another town."

Since a teacher's contribution to a community ideally does not end with the last class bell, it also means something else: The banker's town and its children lose many of those intangibles that accrue from having resident teachers who influence the cultural and moral level of a town, who provide leadership in many of the extra-curricular activities that go a long way toward the making of men and women.

The medical outlook is no brighter. Trying to get a doctor to set up practice in some rural towns is like trying to get Khrushchev to denounce vodka.

When Wood Lake lost its doctor about 5 years ago, townspeople tried vainly to get another. Finally they built a $12,000 clinic, a most aggressive move for a town of 600 population, but still no doctor. The clinic has been empty for 2 years, except when a doctor from another town comes in.

One prosperous town, where a general practitioner might easily expect to gross $40,000 a year, advertised for a doctor for months without getting a nibble.

According to Dr. Lowry Nelson, professor of rural sociology at the University of Minnesota, there has been a steady increase in the number of physicians in Minnesota during the last 15 years, but—

The number of doctors in towns under 1,000 population has dropped sharply.

There has been a marked overall decrease in the percentage of physicians in communities under 5,000.

The proportion of doctors in towns of from 5,000 to 10,000 population has remained constant.

In communities of 10,000 to 25,000 population there has been a large increase in the percentage of doctors—but even this is due largely to the marked increase in the number of doctors in one town—Rochester, site of the Mayo clinic.

While the number of doctors has increased steadily in the Twin Cities and Duluth, the percentage has risen only slightly.

What do these unhappy situations in religion, commerce, education, and medicine add up to for our small towns?

One conclusion is that these problems interplay on each other. To solve one, a community almost has to solve them all.

Rarely does a gifted young teacher care to go to a community that is in the throes of economic decline, or where the morale of the mass of the people is depressed, or where the sons of poorly paid employees come to school more for the hot lunch than for knowledge of grammar and science.

Nor does a young doctor care to choose as his life site a town beset by economic problems where educational facilities and staff are so poor as to handicap any children he may produce.

Nor is industry (so often regarded in itself as the small town's cure-all) likely to locate in a town that lacks the ability to get a doctor or good teachers or a minister.

What we may have, then, is a problem too big and complicated for any one town to solve alone. It may be necessary, before substantial progress can be made in luring industry, for Minnesotans to attack on a statewide level other problems such as education and health.

Legislatures in some States already have set up sweeping scholarship plans under which the recipient agrees to practice medicine in a small town for a certain period.

It is not inconceivable that our society, on an organized basis, also may have to offer scholarship or other inducements to gifted teachers in order to get them to go back to rural America and refuse some of the raw resources of manpower and brainpower that have been wasted in the past.

Painful as the transition is, one cannot help feeling that smalltown life, with all its benefits, can be preserved on a prosperous basis if the people in these towns see the need for change and for bold action.

Too many places, though, are dominated by the attitude that the golden age will come automatically if only we can find the right secretary of agriculture. Or if one of a dozen other simple moves were made.

The wife of one businessman told me, "Most of this mess would end if the Government would ban wholesale catalog firms. Our busines places just can't compete with these cutrate mail-order places."

Another woman said, "Co-ops are the ruination of the small town," and that to outlaw them would be to restore tranquillity.

Yet few people would say publicly what many said privately, that in too many towns the people with the education, the ability, and the financial resources to promote growth are satisfied.

In many communities the spirit of resigned hopelessness is strong. In three towns in particular I heard waves of talk of economic fear.

No one in any of these towns has ever contacted the State department of business development or the other agencies charged with helping produce economic growth in Minnesota.

There are many indications that although the revolution makes change inevitable, for the great majority of our small towns death can come only by default.

As of now, the bloom is off the boom, and those who feel the pinch for the first time have sensed that all good things do not come to those who merely wait.

Many of our rural residents feel the whip of the revolution upon their backs, pounding relentlessly. Their challenge is to cast off lethargy, to banish pessimism, to grow with change.

When this challenge is met, perhaps a technological revolution that now seems so painful can be harnessed and turned into a giant laborer, the modern Paul Bunyan, of our prosperous countryside.

H. R. 8002

SPEECH

OF

HON. PERKINS BASS

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 5, 1958

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H. R. 8002) to provide for improved methods of stating budget estimates and estimates for deficiency and supplemental appropriations.

Mr. BASS of New Hampshire. Mr. Chairman, I urge the House of Representatives pass H. R. 8002, to provide for annual accrued expenditure budgeting. H. R. 8002 is identical to H. R. 7427 which I introduced, and carries out one of the major recommendations of the second Hoover Commission.

The House should never turn its back on efforts to increase the public's understanding of the Federal budget and costs of government. In my judgment this bill will go a very long way toward making sense for millions of people in this country out of the present budgetary hodgepodge. If this bill did nothing else, its passage would be justified.

However, other real advantages exist. We will have better knowledge and control of dollar expenditures in any 1 year. We will be able to better judge the effects of Government spending on the national economy—a point of vital importance to the country this very day.

The Appropriations Committee and the Congress will retain more practical and effective control over appropriated funds with a year-by-year review of all proposed expenditures. Vast carryover funds will be eliminated or brought under greater control.

The advantages of this bill far outweigh the possible disadvantages, and I urge the House to pass this needed legislation.

Ballyhoo for Foreign Aid Fails To Obscure the Issue

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN E. HENDERSON

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 6, 1958

Mr. HENDERSON. Mr. Speaker, the Eric Johnston party is still very much in the news, and, insofar as the headlines are concerned, there seems to be only one point of view—that of Mr. Johnston and those who favor an increased program of foreign aid. Therefore, it came as a welcome surprise to read an editorial in the Ohio State Journal of Columbus for Friday, February 28, 1958, which asks the very simple question, "Was anybody fooled?"

Copies of this editorial have been sent to me by numerous constituents because the content probably represents their own feeling and also because of the final paragraph, which says:

Any voters who agreed with the speakers will think, of course, that the Conference on Foreign Aspects, etc., was a smash hit. Those who didn't can still write letters to their Congressmen. Their two bits' worth may go a lot farther than did Mr. Johnston's effort to outdo Mr. Todd.

The editorial is as follows:

WAS ANYBODY FOOLED?—BALLYHOO FOR FOREIGN AID FAILS TO OBSCURE THE ISSUE

The promoters of foreign aid have just staged in Washington a propaganda event that challenged at one and the same time the prowess of Mike Todd and of Madison Avenue in New York.

Mike Todd has set something of a record in producing and publicizing Eighty Days Around the World. Madison Avenue is the symbol of smart promotion in today's propaganda-plastered world—the staging of publicity stunts, the creation of a demand for this or that product by pure synthesis.

Eric Johnston, front-office man for the motion-picture industry, just about outdid Todd and all the rest when he staged his amazing production, the Conference on Foreign Aspects of United States National Security, in Washington a few days ago.

Just imagine getting President Eisenhower, Vice President Nixon, Secretary of State Dulles, former President Harry Truman, former Secretary of State Dean Acheson, Adlai Stevenson, Tom Dewey and Bishop Fulton J. Sheen all in one act.

The act played to about 1,200 specially invited men and women from everywhere in the country and, of course, it was broadcast by radio and television and filmed for motion-picture reproduction.

The result was a chorus of accord in promoting President Eisenhower's request to Congress for $3.9 billion in foreign aid, which had not been very happily received on Capitol Hill.

Realizing his request was headed for trouble, the President asked Mr. Johnston, who has been a troubleshooter for the White House in foreign affairs on previous occasions, to do something to rally public support.

Mr. Johnston came up with the idea for The Conference on Foreign Aspects of United States National Security. The White House gave him some office space, a couple of secretaries from the White House pool and some White House stationery.

Using sources of his own, Mr. Johnston made a list of over 1,000 people around the country who mold public opinion, specifically those who could be counted on to build a fire under Congress for foreign aid. From another list he solicited contributions for staging the extravaganza.

The guests for the most part paid their own transportation and hotel bills, flattered at a chance to hobnob with the Washington VIP's. That left only the luncheon and dinner checks to be picked up by the financial backers of the scheme.

There wasn't a sour note in the whole chorus of ayes for the foreign-aid bill—except, of course, some partisan potshots from little Harry Truman who started the postwar giveaway program in the first place.

We recite these events and background lest there were some gullible Americans who viewed the Conference on Foreign Aspects of United States National Security as a great outpouring of coast-to-coast public sentiment for spending precisely $3.9 billion this year for global aid.

It long has been obvious that the two major political parties have become almost indistinguishable in the philosophies backed by their leaders in power. One of the least distinguishable is any difference on foreign aid.

Since World War II, the total cost to American taxpayers of the foreign-aid program has been $60 billion. The end is nowhere in sight.

It is repeatedly urged that "politics must stop at the water's edge," "let's take foreign aid out of politics," and so on. In other words, "Let's not create an issue on which the voters can take a hand."

In the case of the conference on foreign aspects, etc., the idea was to try to overwhelm Congress with the thought that there is unquestioning, universal approval of the proposed $3.9-billion foreign-aid bill.

It almost seems as if the boosters for foreign aid don't want the issue debated. We submit that it ought to be debated. Exchange of views is the essence of representa-

tive government. It is the democratic process at work in a real and effective manner.

After all, isn't representative, democratic government what we are fighting for in this world?

We can't believe the Members of Congress were taken in by Eric Johnston's "dress parade" in Washington. We don't believe they heard anything they didn't know before. They already knew that each of the speakers was for the foreign-aid bill—otherwise they wouldn't have been permitted to speak.

Any voters who agreed with the speakers will think, of course, that the conference on foreign aspect, etc., was a smash hit. Those who didn't can still write letters to their Congressmen. Their 2-bits' worth may go a lot further than did Mr. Johnston's effort to outdo Mr. Todd.

Long Beach Veterans' Administration Hospital Complimented

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CRAIG HOSMER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 6, 1958

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, gratitude if often felt, but less often expressed. It is, therefore, with considerable pleasure that I read a letter to the Vice President from a veteran who is a patient at the Long Beach Veterans' Hospital. Because Dr. V. V. Edwards, the administrator, and each of the fine employees of that hospital give so much of themselves to serve their patients and make their hospitalization period as pleasant as possible, it occurs to me that recognition of their efforts by the publication here of the letter, written by John F. Fitzsimmons, is appropriate:

VETERANS' HOSPITAL,
Long Beach, Calif., March 1, 1958.

VICE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES, HON. RICHARD NIXON:

It is a difficult thing to try to express your appreciation to the Congress, the Senate, and the various organizations who made the veterans' program possible.

I am a patient in the veterans' hospital at Long Beach, Calif. My service was peacetime.

I expect to be released in about a week. May I tell you a fellow couldn't ask for better treatment? I haven't been singled out for any special treatment or attention. There are 49 patients in this ward, and they are constantly coming and going. The doctors and nurses are kind, considerate, and understanding—and the food. So many times I was sure I didn't care to eat but the trays were fixed so appetizingly that I ate in spite of myself.

A year ago my sight failed. The Veterans' Bureau entered me in the hospital last July and removed the back lens from my right eye and last week they removed the back lens from my left eye. Dr. Delgado and Dr. Farr did the work, and I don't think you could find any better surgeons anywhere. It amazes me the way they look out for you. My right eye turned out excellently, and I'm confident the left eye will also.

To see the grass and the coloring of the fruit blossoms again is wonderful. So may I take this way and say I'm deeply grateful to the Government and the Veterans' Bureau for the return of my sight and the pension I've received through the years.

JOHN F. FITZSIMMONS,
La Habra, Calif.

"An Ordinary Guy" Replies to Harry Truman's Speech

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 6, 1958

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following letter to the editor of the Pittsburgh (Pa.) Sun-Telegraph written by Mr. Harold A. Ross, Falls Creek, Pa., which appeared in the February 27, 1958, issue of the Pittsburgh Sun-Telegraph:

"AN ORDINARY GUY" REPLIES TO HARRY TRUMAN'S SPEECH

I am just an ordinary guy, tradesman at Jackson Vitrified China Co., Falls Creek, Pa. I read about Harry Truman's speech in the Sunday Sun-Telegraph. The more I read, the more disgusted I became.

1. He charged the administration with losing the race to the Russians. The biggest race ever lost to the Russians was in the loss of China and North Korea to the Communists during the Roosevelt and Truman administrations.

2. Truman mentioned a Republican recession. The recession during his administration was a dandy—the only time in 20 years that I lost time at work.

3. Truman said the people would not be gullible again. They aren't gullible enough to swallow Truman's absurd expressions any more. Even the Democratic delegates ignored his ravings at their last nominating convention.

4. Harry mentioned smear technique of economic critics. Truman is a master at smearing, an aid to Russian propaganda.

5. He said that the country may be on the brink of a 1929 type of depression. The only thing that lifted us out of that depression was World War II, not the Democrats. The Korean war rescued us from Harry's recession.

6. Truman said, "The people want the truth." You can't get it from Harry.

7. He accused the administration of neglecting the farmer. Should the administration approve the artificial program of storing surplus foods to hold the price up? Much of the food spoiled, and the rest cost the taxpayers millions of dollars for subsidies and storage.

8. Truman talked of price rises. The worst inflation of 20 years came about in the Roosevelt and Truman administration.

9. He called the Democratic Party the party of working men and women. Where did the inflation of Truman's administration leave people with savings, people with pensions and fixed income?

Harry would use Federal aid, a Socialist measure, rather than contracts to private enterprise to cure unemployment.

I believe it is Truman who can no longer bamboozle the people.

HAROLD A. ROSS.

FALLS CREEK.

Inflation Danger Must Be Watched in Taking Steps To Revive Economy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HOWARD W. ROBISON
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 6, 1958

Mr. ROBISON of New York. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following column recently published in the Binghampton (N. Y.) Press of February 23, 1958, by the financial writer, a Mr. J. A. Livingston. Mr. Livingston points up the dangers which must be guarded against in any attempt the Federal Government may make to revive the economy:

READJUSTMENT HELD DOING SOME GOOD
(By J. A. Livingston)

PHILADELPHIA.—In an era in which the slightest touch of unemployment is a cardinal sin, it is reckless for a financial writer to suggest that a recession—a readjustment—has a purpose. He becomes a hair-shirt lover, an unfeeling through-the-wringer guy: "He has a job, so doesn't give a hoot about people walking the streets."

Yet a readjustment has its place. Adversity is not sweet for its own sake, but for what it accomplishes. Americans have been beefing about the high cost of living, about the styles and prices of automobiles, about the expenses of renovating a room or putting up a new house.

How do you get automobile manufacturers to change their styles? Or cut their prices? By not buying cars, by heaping adversity on the manufacturers, and, unfortunately, by causing unemployment.

And how do you get prices of home renovation down? By making contractors a little hungrier for jobs. When work piles up so high that construction firms are far behind commitments, they don't bid close. They don't spend time and effort on getting costs down. They make fast while they can.

But when things get tough, everybody watches pennies—in the home, office and factory. Many a firm, which didn't care about postage costs, decides to reexamine its mailing list, see if it is up to date. Many an executive, no longer worried about placating customers sweating for deliveries, has the time to look around his own shop and see the laxity and waste developed during easy-come, easy-go prosperity.

Right there, then, is the great dilemma of 1958. To stop the recession without starting inflation. The Reserve Board has reduced the discount rate. It has purchased Treasury securities. It has just cut reserve requirements. Commercial banks are borrowing less from the Federal Reserve System and have excess reserves. This enables them to expand investments, seek out borrowers.

President Eisenhower has speeded up defense spending, initiated a program to expand Federal post office and office building, spurred aids to home construction. Blueprints for public works are being hauled out of files for future use. Held in abeyance is tax relief—in case a seasonal pickup in employment doesn't take place in March and April.

Both the President and the members of the Federal Reserve Board are anxious to check unemployment before it gathers such mo-

mentum that a recession becomes unstoppable. And yet, they don't want to initiate another happy-go-lucky period of confidence: "Everything has to go up. Prosperity is underwritten by Uncle Sam."

The President is under great political pressure. The Republicans want to wave the prosperity manner high in September and October. In an election year, no time is too soon for an increase in employment, payrolls, production, and sales. But, economically, too much can be done too soon.

If the sole problem was to invigorate demand, that would be simple. The Reserve could reduce reserve requirements again, buy more Treasury securities, or reduce the rediscount rate, thereby easing credit further. President Eisenhower would call for an immediate tax cut, as some Democratic Congressmen are already urging.

But latent consequences must be considered. To transit immediately into another inflationary whirl would be postponing the unpleasant. The Federal Reserve Board, at a later date, would have to throttle down the expansion, introduce credit constraints, and bring about another readjustment.

Consider the automobile wage negotiations coming up shortly. If automobile production were booming, workers would expect a big boost in wages. Walter Reuther, head of the United Auto Workers, would be forced to demand a big increase. The companies, not willing to interrupt the flow of production and profits, would grant a big increase.

But if sales are slow, auto executives will be fighting to keep down costs. Auto workers will be less anxious to strike. The wage-price-cost spiral will not get an automatic boost.

Both in 1948–49 and 1953–54, the recessions hit hardest in the winter months.

That's because in January and February, unemployment usually makes its seasonal high. But production recovered in the spring and so did employment. It would be foolish to trust history to repeat. It is well for the President to get plans set—in case business doesn't pick up. But it would be equally foolish to move too fast and thus lose the benefits of cost-and-price reducing adversity.

Mississippi Valley Association Favors Reciprocal Trade Agreement Extension

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HALE BOGGS
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 27, 1958

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement by Everett T. Winter, executive vice president of the Mississippi Valley Association before the Committee on Ways and Means of the House:

STATEMENT OF EVERETT T. WINTER, EXECUTIVE VICE PRESIDENT, MISSISSIPPI VALLEY ASSOCIATION, BEFORE THE COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

My name is Everett T. Winter, 1978 Railway Exchange Building, St. Louis, Mo. I am executive vice president of the Mississippi Valley Association.

Our association was organized in 1919, and at our 39th annual convention, held in St. Louis on February 10–11, a number of resolutions that constitute the platform of the organization, were adopted. There were present approximately 1,500 delegates from 31 States. To give you a cross-section of the makeup of the Mississippi Valley Association, our membership (as of last October when last analyzed) consisted of the following:

Number of accounts	Classification	Percent of all income
68	Associations (floods, navigation, chambers of commerce, etc.)	16.7
79	Barge operators (inland waterway)	7.3
48	Metal products (distributors, fabricators, producers)	6.9
11	Merchant marine	5.4
70	Financial institutions (including insurance)	5.3
25	Light and power	5.2
24	Harbors and terminals	4.5
32	Petroleum products	4.2
22	Industrial and farm machinery manufacturers	3.4
92	Individuals, miscellaneous and unclassified	3.3
63	Retail stores	3.2
26	Construction, contractors	3.1
24	Municipalities and government subdivisions	2.8
42	Marine supplies and services	2.7
27	Building material suppliers	2.7
37	Grain-seed-feed	2.6
18	Ship and boat manufacturing	2.5
16	Levee, drainage, and irrigation districts	2.5
14	Public utilities (other than light and power)	2.1
25	Radio and publications	1.7
49	Professions	1.6
9	Beverages	1.3
19	Food products	1.2
16	Drugs and chemicals	1.1
17	Industrial and farm equipment dealers	1.0
6	Coal	1.0
9	Livestock and meat	.8
18	Timber and lumber	.8
13	Real estate	.7
8	Containers	.6
5	Shoe and clothing manufacturers	.5
5	Railroads	.4
4	Airlines	.5
8	Printing and office supplies	.3
3	Trucks	.2

You will note that about every known business and profession is represented in our organization. None is represented to the extent where any one or two industries can determine the policy of the organization.

To get a plank in our platform requires the project or statement to be cleared through a screening committee such as the traffic advisory committee, then by the resolutions committee, which is an elected committee, and then if it passes that committee, it goes to the general convention. The following resolution was passed without a dissenting vote in any committee, and at our general meeting without a single dissenting vote:

"RECIPROCAL TRADE ACT EXTENSION

"We believe that the reciprocal trade agreements program, begun in 1934, has served the United States extremely well, has substantially contributed to expanded and healthy two-way foreign trade, and has put the United States in the lead for liberalization of trade which is a major contribution to world peace. We stand for the indefinite continuation, without hampering amendments, of the program and urge Congress to renew the law for a number of years when it comes up for consideration this year (1958)."

Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, we make no claim that we are experts in the field of tariffs. I am sure that there are any number of experts in this field, perhaps serving on the staff or as members of this committee, who could ask me many questions of a technical nature that I could not answer intelligently. My entire story is contained in the resolution passed by a cross section of American industry and agriculture as recorded at our meeting in St. Louis recently. It seems to me that the thinking of this cross section of America is important.

We hope the Congress will extend the Reciprocal Trade Act.

Thirteen Years of Enslavement in Rumania

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THADDEUS M. MACHROWICZ
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 6, 1958

Mr. MACHROWICZ. Mr. Speaker, this 6th of March is a sad day for the Rumanian people. It marks 13 years since Rumania's enslavement by the Soviets. This occasion should bring to our minds more vividly the tragedy of modern slavery.

Victims of Moscow's aggressive expansionism and of international failures which abandoned the eastern part of Europe to the absolute rule of the Russians, the Rumanians have since then been subjected to merciless Communist oppression.

The starting point for this Rumanian drama was one of the most flagrant and brutal examples of interference and seizure of a free nation by the Soviets. Two weeks after the Yalta declaration, one of the signatories, Soviet Russia, was ruthlessly crushing the independence of the country with a brazen display of brute force. While 19 Rumanian divisions were fighting alongside the Allies, Vishinsky, backed by the Russian tanks, ousted the legal government of General Radescu and imposed a Communist stooge government of Soviet agents.

It is to the honor of the Rumanian people that after 13 years of Communist terrorism, deportations, slave labor camps, religious persecution, and economic bleeding, their spirit of resistance is still alive today. I am informed that a new huge slave labor camp is now functioning with thousands of miserable, prowestern, pro-American prisoners, in the swamps of the Danube Delta. But in spite of all this the nation's spirit is not vanquished.

The pro-American sentiment of the people is shown on every occasion. For instance, the first day the American exhibition of architecture was recently opened in Bucharest, more than 20,000 despite the risks entailed, visited it.

The Rumanians like other East Europeans are deeply attached to Western culture and aspirations. Notwithstanding the long Soviet Communist occupation and the apparent Western acquiescence in this state of affairs, they are obstinately clinging to their beliefs and hopes in the free world. This fact is a major problem for the Kremlin throughout East Europe, because its rule requires the periodic deflating of those expectations and hopes. It is for this reason that Moscow tries to induce the United States to officially drop the issue of the status of the Russian controlled Eastern Europe and is continually pressing for a disengagement which would help consolidate the status quo.

The Rumanian people have undergone these last 13 years untold suffering and disillusionment.

On this sad anniversary of the Soviet seizure of Rumania, I convey to its people our hopes and faith that the future will bring to them freedom and liberation.

National Farm, Business, Organization Leaders To Meet on Rural Development Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 6, 1958

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to comment on the announcement of a most important rural development program conference to be held June 16 and 17, in Memphis, Tenn. We have the opportunity to lend encouragement and offer suggestions to this meeting. The progress of this program in less than 3 years is most encouraging.

It is a program which adds strength to our total Nation as low-income rural families and families on small farms attain more adequate incomes.

For example, the great metropolitan area of St. Louis, which I serve, draws many of its workers and leaders from rural areas where there is underemployment and small farms. These people serve best the cities and industrial centers when they have grown up with adequate medical care and received more education than is now usually the case.

Also, every town, city, and trade area is aware of the fact that the 1.5 million farm families with $1,000 or less of income per year are not very large customers for all the goods and services that most families are able to enjoy.

The private citizens and nongovernmental organization representatives who gather in Memphis will discuss ways in which they can be even more effective in helping move the rural development program forward. Its success depends upon the way in which State and local leaders team up and make a determined effort to get at the problems of underemployment in rural areas.

I serve on the Agricultural Policy Subcommittee of the Joint Economic Committee. We held very extensive hearings this winter. At the conclusion Senator SPARKMAN, our chairman, issued a statement for our committee which, in discussing low-income farm families in agriculture, said in part:

> The third problem is the need to develop local nonfarm resources and otherwise to assist farm-reared people who have poor opportunities in agriculture to earn income in other ways. The need is to assist farm people in making a normal change reaching back to Colonial days. But there is no implication that any program should try to push people out of farming * * *.
>
> Development of local nonfarm resources, vocational training, and improved employment information and assistance are among the means suggested for widening the employment opportunities for farm-reared people.

Missouri is one of the 30 States in which there are pilot or demonstration counties. There are some 1,000 counties in the Nation in which farms are small or land is poor and fine farm families need more income. This is not a new problem. It has existed all down through the years—but now an effective program is underway. All of us have an obligation to lend the rural development program support and encouragement. We should applaud especially private citizens and organizations for the fine work they are doing.

NATIONAL FARM, BUSINESS, ORGANIZATION LEADERS TO MEET ON RURAL DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM

National farm, business and organization leaders will meet in Memphis, Tenn., June 16 and 17 to review progress in the rural development program, and the contribution private groups are making to the work now going forward on a demonstration basis in 30 States.

The conference is being called by the Committee for Rural Development Program, which includes Under Secretaries of five Federal departments, the Administrator of the Small Business Administration and a member of the President's Council of Economic Advisers. The chairman, True D. Morse, Under Secretary of Agriculture, issued the announcement on behalf of the committee.

It is expected that all major national organizations working in such fields as agriculture, business, labor, education, conservation, health, welfare, youth programs, and religious affairs will be represented at the Memphis conference.

During the 2-day meeting, individual speakers and panel members will appraise the importance to the Nation of increased incomes and opportunities for families in rural areas of underemployment and small farms. They will also suggest ways in which private citizens and nongovernmental organizations can help on rural development programs.

Speaking for the Committee for Rural Development Program, Under Secretary Morse said the following would be among the main topics of discussion at the meeting:

Social and economic effects of underemployment among farm families.

Industrial development in rural areas.

Education beyond the high school for rural youth.

Contribution of service and civic clubs to rural development.

Role of churches and religious organizations.

Participation in rural development programs by private banks and businesses and their organizations.

Importance of participation by youth organizations.

Communications media as means of encouraging interest in local programs.

The rural development program is a cooperative Federal, State and private effort to promote balanced economic development in rural areas with substantial numbers of underemployed people. On January 1, 1958, some 100 counties in 30 States were participating on a demonstration or pilot basis. Planning and program organization are going forward in many other rural counties as well.

The forthcoming meeting will be held at the Peabody Hotel in Memphis.

Committee for Rural Development Program, Washington, D. C., is made up of:

O. Hatfield Chilson, Under Secretary, Department of Interior.

True D. Morse, Under Secretary, Department of Agriculture (chairman).

Walter Williams, Under Secretary, Department of Commerce.

James T. O'Connell, Under Secretary, Department of Labor.

Dr. John A. Perkins, Under Secretary, Department of Health, Education and Welfare.

Wendell Barnes, Administrator, Small Business Administration.

Dr. Joseph S. Davis, Member, Council of Economic Advisers.

Mail Rates on Weekly Newspapers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EMMET F. BYRNE
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 6, 1958

Mr. BYRNE of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I would appreciate permission to insert a letter from a high-caliber publication, the Columbian, the official newspaper for Chicago and Cook County in matters relating to activities of the Knights of Columbus and other fraternal, religious, and educational subjects.

As a reader of this publication, and a member of the Queen of Martyrs Council of the Knights of Columbus, I am interested in their views on matters proposed which may jeopardize their publication.

There are many other publications which are similar in that the material printed relates to religious, educational, and fraternal matters of the city in which it is printed.

The letter follows:

THE COLUMBIAN PUBLISHING CO.,
Chicago, Ill., March 1, 1958.

Congressman EMMET F. BYRNE,
United States House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN BYRNE: Indicated reports regarding second-class mail increase, as such, can severely jeopardize many medium-sized weekly newspapers.

Particular references are intended regarding proposed increase from charge now on one-eighth cent per copy minimum basis to one-half cent per copy minimum cost. This increase in itself, according to my calculations, represents an increase of 300 percent—not a good way to avoid inflation, but a darn good way to create great depression because of the inability of publishers to assume such increases.

A 100-percent increase would be a terrific boost by any analysis, but would be agreeable to most. What do you think?

The Columbian weekly post-office bill is now approximately $45 per week. The new rate, without considering the increase in reader and advertising zone changes, means $135 increase or total minimum charge of $180 per issue.

The Columbian, with 35,000 circulation, as you know, is the official weekly Knights of Columbus paper for Chicago and Cook County—fraternal, religious, educational. We have never earned in any one year the amount of this proposed increase, and, after 50 years, dislike being forced out of our chosen profession.

Anything you can do to reduce this contemplated uncalled-for postage increase will merit my sincere appreciation.

Sincerely yours,

FRANK J. QUINN, *Publisher.*

The Omnibus Rivers and Harbors and Flood-Control Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN F. BALDWIN, JR.
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 6, 1958

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. Speaker, considerable opposition has developed to section 205 of S. 497, the omnibus rivers and harbors and flood-control bill, which will be considered by the House of Representatives next week. Serious objections to this section have been voiced by the American Farm Bureau Federation and by many States. Section 205 deals with water law. The major objections to section 205 have resulted from its broad and loose general approach to the problem. In order to give recognition to some of the objections which have been raised to this section, it is my intention to offer an amendment to section 205 when this bill is under consideration by the House of Representatives.

The language of my amendment is much preferable to the language in S. 497, since this revised language provides for the establishment of definite standards and guides for the Corps of Engineers and the Secretary of the Army to follow in connection with development of water supplies in Federal reservoirs on such important matters as consultation with the States and the Public Health Service, repayment periods, interest rates, provision for future needs, and modification of authorized projects to provide for water-supply storage. The need for these provisions to be spelled out in legislation is self-evident. The adoption of the generalities contained in section 205 (b) and (c) of S. 497 could result in administratively established standards which could set up a program far different from that contemplated by the Congress as being necessary to meet the Nation's need in the future; a program which could be in direct conflict with the standards of section 9 of the Reclamation Project Act of 1939 which governs the development of water supplies in connection with Federal reclamation projects, and which could touch off another round of competition between the Corps of Engineers and the Bureau of Reclamation over which agency will construct water-supply projects. The language in my amendment will minimize conflicts, and establish a program which will permit Federal participation in the development of water supplies on a sound basis.

The wording of my amendment is as follows:

On page 102 of S. 497, beginning with line 13, strike out all of section 205, ending on line 20, page 103, and substitute in lieu thereof the following new section:

"SEC. 206. (a) It is hereby declared to be the policy of the Congress to recognize the primary responsibilities of the States and local interests in developing water supplies for domestic, municipal, industrial, and other purposes and that the Federal Government should participate and cooperate with States and local interests in developing such water supplies in connection with the construction, maintenance, and operation of Federal navigation, flood control, or multiple-purpose projects.

"(b) In carrying out any authorized navigation or flood-control survey, or review investigation, involving improvements which may be useful in developing water supplies, the Corps of Engineers shall consult with the State or States affected and the United States Public Health Service, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, with a view to including in the reports thereon submitted to Congress, plans for the development of water supplies for domestic, municipal, industrial, and other purposes, and such reports shall include the views and recommendations of the States and the United States Public Health Service on the plans for water supply. Features for providing water supply storage capacity, facilities, or services may be included in any navigation, flood control, or multiple-purpose project recommended for construction by the Corps of Engineers, subject to the following provisions of this section.

"(c) Before construction of any project including water-supply provisions is completed, State or local interests shall agree to pay the costs allocated to water supply. Such costs shall be determined by the Chief of Engineers in such manner that all authorized purposes served by the project shall share equitably in the benefits of multiple-purpose construction. The schedule of payments by States or local interests of such costs may provide either for paying the share of the construction expenditures during construction of the project, plus annual payments for operation, maintenance, and replacement costs as incurred; or for equal annual payments for the construction costs, and interest on the unpaid balance, plus annual payments for operation, maintenance, and replacement costs as incurred: *Provided*, That the entire amount of the construction costs, including interest during construction, allocated to water supply shall be repaid within the economic life of the project, but in no event to exceed 50 years after the project is first available for the storage of water for any purpose. The interest rate used for purposes of computing interest during construction and interest on the unpaid balance shall be determined by the Secretary of the Treasury, as of the beginning of the fiscal year in which construction is initiated, on the basis of the computed average interest rate payable by the Treasury upon its outstanding marketable public obligations, which are neither due nor callable for redemption for 15 years from date of issue.

"(d) The plans for any authorized navigation, flood control, or multiple purpose project on which construction has not been initiated, or any existing project, may be modified or its operation changed by the Secretary of the Army to provide additional storage capacity, facilities, or services for water supply as he considers reasonable: *Provided*, That before construction is completed, or in the case of projects under construction or completed, before changes for the benefit of water supply are made in the project, or before operation is modified in the interest of water supply, State or local interests shall agree to pay the costs allocated thereto as provided in subsection c of this section: *Provided further*, That such modifications which would seriously affect the purposes for which the project was authorized or constructed or which involve major structural or operational changes shall be made only upon the specific authority of Congress.

"(e) The plans for any authorized navigation, flood control or multiple purpose project on which construction has not been initiated may be modified to include provisions for future water supply when directed by resolution by the Public Works Committee of the Senate or of the House of Representatives, or when approved by the Secretary of the Army upon recommendation of the Chief of Engineers: *Provided*, That the cost of such provisions for future water supply shall not be more than 30 per centum of the total estimated cost of the project and reasonable assurance is given by States or local interests that the use of the future water supply provided for will begin within not more than 10 years after the time the project is first available for the storage of water for water supply purposes, and that necessary water rights for such use have been or can be obtained: *Provided further*, That States or local interests indicate a willingness to pay for such water supply in accordance with subsection c above, beginning when the water supply is used, and costs allocated to water supply shall be repaid within the economic life of the project, but not to exceed 50 years after the time the project is first available for the storage of water for water supply purposes: *And provided further*, That in arriving at the costs to be repaid, the interest charges on the initial cost of provisions for future water supply during the period until the water supply storage is used will not be included, but in no case will the interest-free period exceed 10 years.

"(f) Responsibility for complying with any applicable State law relating to water supply or water use shall rest with the State or local interests contracting to pay the costs allocated to water supply or utilizing the water supply services.

"(g) That part of the second proviso of the first paragraph of section 5 of the Flood Control Act of June 22, 1936, as amended (33 U. S. C. 701h), pertaining to modification of reservoir projects is hereby repealed, except as to contracts and agreements in force at the date of this act."

Trade and Labor Assembly in Heart of Family Farm Community Suffering From Depression Farmers Have Felt Since 1952

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. COYA KNUTSON
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 6, 1958

Mrs. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, I have received a letter from the central labor council in Fergus Falls, in the heart of Otter Tail County, which has the largest number of family farms in the State of Minnesota. The letter minces no words in explaining how the members are being hit by the economic recession that has affected our farmers since 1952. I ask permission to insert this letter from the Trade and Labor Assembly of Fergus Falls, Minn.

FERGUS FALLS, MINN., *March 3, 1958.*
WILLIAM SCHNITZLER,
Secretary-Treasurer, AFL–CIO Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SECRETARY SCHNITZLER: The notification from your office calling a national AFL–CIO economic legislative conference for March 11, 12, 13, 1958, has been received and presented to our membership. Being located in an agricultural area in Minnesota, we have seen the economic recession that has affected our farmers since 1952, and now

working people and small business are feeling the effects of this economic squeeze.

Unemployment is becoming serious even in this area. Small family farmers are being forced to bolster their incomes by seeking employment in the towns and cities, adding more people to the already overloaded labor forces in our communities. Our newly organized central body is not financially able to send delegates to this important legislative conference, but want to go on record supporting a program to put the people of America back to work.

Therefore, the Fergus Falls AFL-CIO Trades and Labor Assembly took this action at their regular meeting held in Fergus Falls, Minn., on February 25, 1958, speaking for organized labor in the Fergus Falls area; do hereby state that this serve as a petition to the Congress of the United States, asking them to take immediate steps with constructive work programs to bolster the purchasing power in our sagging economy.

Respectfully submitted.

HAROLD SCHMIDT, *Secretary.*

Copies to:
Senators HUMPHREY and THYE
Congresswoman KNUTSON
Fergus Falls Journal
Radio station KGDE

Deaths on Road Actually Murder

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 4, 1958

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include a most interesting statement made by one of our former colleagues in the House, but now Governor of Connecticut, the Honorable Abraham Ribicoff.

The chief executive of that State has endeavored since taking office to reduce the numberless automobile accidents by a strict "no-fix" enforcement of the motor vehicle laws to prevent accidents, many of them resulting in fatalities. He is to be commended on his concentrated drive for the protection of all the people driving in and through his State.

The statement, which appeared in the Boston Daily Globe on March 4, 1958, follows:

DEATHS ON ROAD ACTUALLY MURDER
(By Abraham Ribicoff, Governor of Connecticut)

Two years ago I made one of the most important discoveries of my life. It was December 1955, and I was puzzled. It had been a bloody year on our Connecticut highways.

Now, it was holiday time—the season when men wish each other good health and long life—and December was the worst month of all. In that month 44 people in Connecticut started out for a Christmas party or a family reunion and ended up in the morgue.

I was puzzled because people accepted these deaths as normal—even natural. If a little girl is clubbed to death on her way home from school, it's front-page news in every city in the country. But, if that same little girl had been killed by a speeding car, the story wouldn't have been given 2 inches on page 16 anywhere but in her own town.

The difference I think is just that killing by automobile has become so common it has lost its power to appall us. But when God told us not to kill, he meant for us not to do our killing with a club or an automobile. I think the one is murder just as surely as the other.

I called it murder, but I didn't know what one puzzled individual could do about it. This killing was a violation of God's law as well as man's. I decided that I need not be afraid to act, simply because I could never save all the lives that were being taken. What, if through my efforts, I was able to save just one life?

I decided to try.

Next morning I called to my office the State commissioner of police and the State commissioner of motor vehicles.

"What," I asked them, "is the one greatest cause of fatal automobile accidents?"

Their answer was simple. It can be told in one word: "Speed."

If speed was our killer, the next question was, how could we get people to slow down?

And then, we had an idea. How about telling the driver that speeding will cost him—not his life—but his driver's license?

It was a new idea, a bold idea, and, as far as my political career was concerned, a risky one.

I talked it over with my wife before I made my decision. "I'd like to save one life," I told her. "If I never hold another political office again as long as I live, but save that life, I think it will be worth it." She did too. I decided to try my idea for exactly 1 year.

Two days before Christmas, 1955, I announced to the people of Connecticut that anyone who was convicted of speeding would have his license suspended for 30 days.

There were two keys to the program.

First, punishment would start with the very first offense—30 days for the first conviction, 60 for the second, indefinitely for the third. The second key was just as important—enforcement was going to be strictly "no fix."

We summed it up in 7 words, which we posted on enormous 8-foot signs on every major highway leading into Connecticut: "Don't speed. Conviction means loss of license."

Overnight the cry of outrage went up. My advisers were horrified. They told me I'd committed political suicide. Maybe I had.

During the first month of the drive, I refused to take care of a suspension for one of the bigwigs in my own party—a man I've worked with for years.

He paused as he was leaving my office, looked back at me, and said, "I'll never vote for you again as long as I live."

One of my oldest personal friends lost his license, too. His wife had to drive him to work for a month. He doesn't speak to me now when we meet on the street.

And as the test year entered its second month, along with the gripes and protests and angry letters, we began to get letters from people who felt differently about the new ruling.

I shall never forget the one from a widow whose husband was killed in an automobile accident the day before the program started.

"Don't relax the campaign," she wrote, "even though it came one day too late for us. I have an answer for those who speak of the unbearable hardship that a suspension imposes. The violent way my husband died and the pain he suffered was unbearable. I also find it hard to make a living without my husband. My two boys and I didn't get a 30-day suspension. Ours is a lifetime sentence."

But the support that's been especially heartening happened toward the end of the year.

In October, a group of 22 ministers, priests, and rabbis in the town of Greenwich launched a month-long churches' crusade for safety, based on the clear directives of the commandment: Thou Shalt Not Kill.

At the end of the year we had suspended 10,346 licenses for speeding. Had we saved that one life?

Nineteen hundred and fifty-six was the worst year ever on American highways. The death rate for the Nation rose 5 percent over 1955.

What happened in Connecticut? In our State there were 50,000 more vehicles registered in 1956 than in 1955. There were 95,000 more operator's licenses issued, and 390 million more miles driven on our roads.

But in spite of these facts, the death rate in Connecticut did not rise, as the national rate did. Instead our rate dropped 11.7 percent.

In terms of human life, this means not just 1, but 38 people are alive today who were "supposed" to appear in the death columns of Connecticut's annual traffic report.

But there are even more startling statistics than these.

Safety experts who have studied the Connecticut program assure me that if every State in the Nation were to adopt a similar program right now, we would save, during the coming year alone, a minimum of 10,000 lives.

God's laws for the world don't change. The commandment speaks to us today as surely as it ever did. And today it speaks especially to those of us who have in our garages the deadliest weapon ever invented. Let's make it the commandment of the highway.

Central Valley Project

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUBERT B. SCUDDER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 24, 1958

Mr. SCUDDER. Mr. Speaker, I am in receipt of a letter from the President of the California Farm Bureau Federation, Mr. Louis A. Rozzoni, in response to a letter I wrote to him asking for an approximation of the membership of their organization who are farmers in the Central Valley of California and are pumping water for irrigation.

I made this inquiry on account of certain testimony that developed during the hearing on my bill, H. R. 6997, to provide for the partnership program in the construction of the power facilities on the Trinity River. I am definitely informed through this letter that the Central Valley Project was authorized by the Congress, "for the purposes of improving navigation, regulating the flow of the San Joaquin River and the Sacramento River, controlling floods, providing for storage and for the delivery of the stored waters thereof, for the reclamation of arid and semi-arid lands and lands of Indian reservations, and other beneficial uses, and for the generation and sale of electric energy as a means of financially aiding and assisting such undertakings."

In other words, power was to be used to assist the farmer.

Now, it so happens that at least one-half of the consumers of power for irrigation purposes are members of the California Farm Bureau Federation who wholeheartedly endorse the partnership

program. It would seem to me that the Congress should give favorable consideration to a program which is so well-supported by practically all of the newspapers and various other organizations in Northern California.

The letter addressed to me from Mr. Rozzoni is as follows:

CALIFORNIA FARM BUREAU FEDERATION,
Berkeley, Calif., February 21, 1958.

Hon. HUBERT B. SCUDDER,
United States Representative,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE SCUDDER: This will acknowledge your letter of February 7, in which you inquire as to the agricultural power load in the Sacramento Valley. As I understand it, this information is sought more clearly to highlight the fact that the Central Valley project was authorized by Congress "for the purposes of improving navigation, regulating the flow of the San Joaquin River and the Sacramento River, controlling floods, providing for storage and for the delivery of the stored waters thereof, for the reclamation of arid and semiarid lands and lands of Indian reservations, and other beneficial uses, and for the generation and sale of electric energy as a means of financially aiding and assisting such undertakings * * *." In other words, revenue from power was to be used in part at least to reduce the cost of Central Valley water to irrigators.

It should be noted that this is the only authorization ever emanating from Congress. It might also be noted that electric power since 1906 under reclamation statutes was always to be handled so as not to impair the efficiency of the irrigation project. There is no question that the statutory language clearly means that power revenues were to be used to reduce the cost of water to irrigators.

I think it is a fair statement to say that virtually one-half of the rural-electric load of the Pacific Gas & Electric Co. in the areas to which the Central Valley project delivers water is supplied by customers affiliated with the California Farm Bureau Federation. The sale of a large portion of the Central Valley electric energy at less than cost, which is the case now, disregards the will of Congress and prejudices the irrigators, whom Congress specifically made preference beneficiaries. If the electric power developed by the Trinity Division is turned over to the Bureau of Reclamation, the present practice will be continued and power sales will be made below cost to the present favored few. Thus, if the partnership proposal is rejected, the Government will be faced with tremendous additional capital investments from which it will derive substantially less revenue to the prejudice of the Government, the irrigators and the will of Congress.

Another feature of the unjust treatment accorded the pumping irrigators is that while they pay the rates fixed on a fair and reasonable basis by the California Public Utilities Commission, approximately 23 cents of every dollar they pay is transmitted by the power company to various tax collectors, one of whom is the Federal Governemnt. On the other hand those who are now being favored with below-cost energy, as electric customers, pay nothing in taxes and their share in the tax bill is paid by others.

Sincerely yours,

LOUIS A. ROZZONI, *President.*

Is There Anything Wrong With the Financial Institutions Act, S. 1451 and H. R. 7026?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 4, 1958

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, the following item came to me, unsolicited, from Robert S. Burns, of New York City. He is only one of many persons who were denied the opportunity of presenting their views to the House Banking and Currency Committee in connection with the Financial Institutions Act, S. 1451 and H. R. 7026.

Mr. Burns is an investment analyst of many years experience. He has no ax to grind. As a matter of fact, his livelihood is based on trading in stocks, and more particularly bank stocks.

Mr. Burns' article is as follows:

By way of introduction, I should like to point out that however otherwise equipped to write on the subject of bank stocks I may or may not be, thirty-odd years of hard work on the subject lie behind my opinions. As an analyst of practical rather than theoretical experience, I have lived with my subject during most waking hours since that wild bull market of the twenties.

As bank analyst for one of the biggest trading houses in Wall Street, I was, for years, in daily contact with the actual trading of these issues on a large scale. Also, on a much smaller one, as investor, too, I am familiar with the market that may be said to exist over the counter. Believe me, many, many years of face-to-face meeting with the subject lie behind my statements. They are those of a professional analyst without any ax to grind.

Should the reader go no further than here, let me state that the whole of this article is summed up on these few words: "The capital shares of our large banking institutions should be listed on a stock exchange just as soon as possible."

There are some 1,075 common stock issues now listed on the New York Stock Exchange. They include the shares of a wide range of corporate endeavor, from the giant General Motors Corp. down.

For instance, there are 116 different machinery and metals companies shares, 113 utilities, 69 chemicals, 81 railroad and railroad equipment stocks, 64 automobile companies, 43 textiles, 37 steel and iron stocks, 31 aircrafts, and 38 financial issues. The list is a long one, embracing some 25 different kinds of American companies. The share total exceeds 4½ billion and their year-end, 1957, market value total was $185,401,000,000.

In view of this, doesn't it seem just a little strange that there is not even one solitary bank stock listed on the big stock exchange in New York? (None on American Stock Exchange, either.)

Why, then, is none listed? And the answer to that is that bank managements just refuse to have their shares go on the exchange. They do not want them listed, period. For many years, until October 1954, when it merged with the Chemical Bank & Trust Co., the 750,000 shares of stock of the Corn Exchange Bank Trust Co. was listed on NYSE, the only such issue thereon. Since that time, there has been no bank stock "on the Board" and bank managements seem in no hurry to list any, it is observed.

I was of the opinion, at the time, that Chemical Bank stock should have gone on the exchange; I am still of that opinion and feel that the capital stocks of all the major commercial banks should be listed. Narrowing it down a little, I should say that any big bank with a million or more shares or a total market value of say $100 million should be on the Exchange. (In New York City this would still exempt Bank of New York, Empire Trust, United States Trust, and even J. P. Morgan & Co.)

This would mean that at least eight big New York City banks would have to list a total of some 55,645,000 shares, having a total market value in excess of $2,750,000,000. These banks reported a total of over 344,800 shareowners at the close of 1957 (an average holding of 162 shares). A rather important segment of the economy, it would seem, almost by any standard. Listing, then, must be good for most other types of corporation stocks but not for bank shares—there are even two big insurance companies' shares listed on NYSE.

It should be pointed out here that in cities outside New York there are probably another 15 big banks falling into such a category—that is, with either a million shares or with $100 million of market value.

There are 15 such banks, to my knowledge, having a total share capital of about $60 million and a total market value of $2,800,000,000 or more. These, along with the 8 located within New York City, make a total of at least 23 big commercial banks with about 115,650,000 common shares and with a combined market evaluation of $5,550,000,000. (At the year-end 1957 bid price.)

Now, I am certain that when a banker takes in common stock in a collateral loan, he likes to have stocks that are listed on the Exchange where he can obtain quickly such data as the last sale, high, low, and volume. But, he is willing, even glad, to let the owners of his business go fumbling around in the disorganized unlisted market looking for a quote on his stock. Sure, a stock exchange member firm will handle a bank stock order but they, in turn, have to go to the specialist in an over-the-counter house to get the market. Bank stocks just cannot be traded on the floor of the stock exchange.

To me, this just means that shareowners in big banks are being deprived of access to one of our greatest real market places when they wish to purchase or sell a piece of valuable property. Here again, all right for auto stocks, steel shares, aircrafts, mining stock, shipbuilding, paper, foods, the rubbers, tobacco, textiles, utilities, or what have you but—no good for bank stocks.

Now, how much longer are the people who own bank stocks going to stand for this obvious mistreatment at the hands of their elected directors and the officers employed by those directors? Actually, one of the mysteries of the century is that they haven't already raised a rumpus about it. It is just unbelievable, in this day of corporate democracy and its accent upon shareowner relations, that these stocks are left to what

seems to be a rudderless voyage around the Sargasso of approximate quotations and mumbo-jumbo.

Bank shares should be listed on an exchange where, like other stocks, the last sale of a round-lot will be printed upon the tape for all concerned to see, and the open, high, low and close will be a matter of public record, instead of the flimsy bid and asked quotes printed in the daily newspapers now. Such quotations are, for the most part, unreliable and are more often than not, mere guesses on the part of the trader giving them out to the paper. I have taken these quotes over the wire for publication in a newspaper and, therefore, am well aware of how sketchy and unreliable such figures are.

Although not generally realized today, it is a fact that up until about 1928, many bank stocks were listed upon the New York Stock Exchange. Along about that time, the security affiliate was a most important adjunct to many of our banks. These affiliates were trading organizations, dealing in stocks and bonds and underwriting large issues of both. It was only natural that they should make a market in the stock of their own bank and they did. Consequently, to better control the market and to do away with that tell-tale print on the ticker tape, the banks had their stocks delisted or stricken from the stock exchange. What happened is, of course, history and needs no repeating here. However, I will say that I think it extremely doubtful if National City Bank's stock would have sold even anywhere near 580 or 480 if it had been left on the stock exchange during 1929.

For the record, I am listing here the stocks that were listed years ago and the date when they were delisted.

Name of Bank	*Date stricken or suspended because of merger*
Bank of New York & Trust	Dec. 31, 1935.
Chatham & Phenix	Apr. 12, 1928.
Bank of Manhattan	Oct. 25, 1928.
Bank of America	Apr. 12, 1928.
Chase	Jan. 12, 1928.
Commonwealth Bank	Sept. 18, 1929.
Continental Bank of New York	Dec. 16,1929.
Continental Bank & Trust Company of New York	Jan. 22, 1930.
Greenwich Bank	July 28, 1927.
National City	Jan. 12, 1928.
Farmers Loan & Trust	June 29, 1928.
Chemical	Feb. 8, 1929.
National Bank of Commerce	Jan. 29, 1929.
Equitable Trust Company of New York	Nov. 7, 1929.
First National Bank	May 31, 1929.
National Park	Do.
United States Trust Co	Oct. 11, 1934.
Hanover National	May 16, 1929.

Yes, bank stocks were listed for many years on the New York and other stock exchanges. It is true that a great deal of the trading in them was done off the exchange and I have no doubt that there would be such offboard trading in them today were they listed. The point is that they were then listed and they should be listed today, despite how little or how great the volume might or might not be thereon.

Back in 1792, when the earliest form of stock exchange was first organized, shares of Hamilton's First United States Bank, Bank of North America, and those of the Bank of New York were traded. By 1827, we are advised in the booklet called "Understanding the New York Stock Exchange," the stocks of 12 banks were being traded on the exchange.

Today, it must seem strange indeed, to a visitor from afar to visit our great New York Stock Exchange and to learn that no single bank stock is listed or traded on that exchange. Puzzling indeed. And perhaps of great satisfaction to the medicine-men at the Kremlin?

(I am reliably informed that all of the London "big five" banks have their stocks listed on the London Stock Exchange.)

Well, why is it there is none listed, then? There are probably a number of reasons, best known to the bankers themselves. But, one of the answers may be found on page 25 of the little booklet previously referred to and published by the stock exchange. It states: "the SEC requires officers, directors and principal stock holders of companies with securities listed on the exchange to report, within 10 days after the month in which it took place, any transaction by them in the stock of their company. These reports are made public by the SEC and by the exchange with which they are filed."

Then, too, there are other SEC rules and regulations that would have to be obeyed and the bankers just do not want to have to do it. As it is now, they feel nice and safe behind that part of the law which specifically exempts banks from the provisions of the securities acts. But, if they were to put their stock issues on the exchange, then they would become subject to certain of the SEC regulations having to do wtih proxy statements, reports, etc. This would be all very well and good if they were mutual associations, but they are not; they are capital-stock companies and their shareowners are entitled, I think, to a fair and open market for their stock whenever they please to find out what it is bid for and what the last actual sale was per share.

I do not know whether you already know it or not, but there is no law now that says a commercial bank has to give a shareowner any information about earnings or any other phase of its operations. The display statements of condition and the annual reports they do issue are entirely voluntary on their part. They do not have to tell you anything unless they please to. And, you cannot go to the Federal Reserve, Comptroller's Office, or New York State Banking Department and examine any reports of any kind on an individual bank. They are confidential documents, mind you. On the other hand, the very complete annual statements filed with the State Insurance Department are public documents and can be examined by any citizen, whether shareholder in the company or not. But, a shareholder in a banking institution cannot see the last examination report on his bank.

Several times during each year, the Federal and State banking authorities will send out to all banks a call for statements of condition as of some certain date. Such call statements do have to be published in a newspaper of general circulation in the area in which the bank is located. These are usually buried away in a trade paper or local neighborhood paper under legal notices and are seldom read by any save bank analysts and bankers themselves. Such statements give little actual information, and in most cases, include, for instance, only deposits in the bank's domestic branches. As of last December 31, this made a difference in the case of First National City Bank, in New York, of $881,913,000 between its legal call statement total deposits and those in its display statement. A State bank, Bankers Trust Co., had a difference of $53 million between the two types of statement as of the same date. The point here is that publication of these legal statements by banks does not do the shareowner a bit of good. They are not mailed out to the shareholders; even if they were sent, he would know no more than he already did about his bank. The statement does not even tell the par value per share, or state how many shares are outstanding. Suffice it to say here and now that there is much room for improvement in such published information.

Returning to the subject of the purchase or sale of shares of a bank stock: How does one ascertain the last sale price? Is there a central agency where it is recorded and printed for the record? No, there is not. You take a dealer's word for it as to what his last sale was or go without it. Don't bother to call the bank; they don't know and care less. The newspaper that quotes the stock? The National Association of Security Dealers? The SEC? No, don't bother to call any one of them; you might just as well call the fire department or Mr. Hoover's FBI. And, if you call the stock exchange, they will be polite and sympathetic, I am sure, but bank stocks are not listed there, remember?

So, you call your broker or dealer. What's the best bank stock to buy? Why, the one the house has the biggest position in, if any. Why should he waste time trying to sell you a good bank stock, the market for which he doesn't even know, when he can sell you a nice uranium stock on which there is a long profit? Now, these things are exaggerated here only a little bit, I assure you.

It all adds up to the fact that the recent unpopularity of bank shares can be traced to just this sort of thing. The dealers are not doing as good a job in making markets as they should be doing. Few houses are actually making real primary markets; they do not want to get loaded up with them either; this just attests to how utterly bad the markets are in these issues. Only when they are reasonably certain of selling them will a trading house load up with a block of bank stock.

In the Wall Street of today, there is missing from the scene that old bank stock specialist of former years, like Clinton Gilbert and Gilbert Elliot, to name a couple. Today, big houses operate bank stock departments only as adjuncts to their larger businesses. Trading profit margins are too small to allow of payment of a commission to salesmen to go out and sell bank shares, as a steady diet.

To be sure, bank stocks are in the doldrums, as some newspaper writers say. Many have unusually good values behind them at current levels, where they are selling around 11 times last year's net, to yield 5 percent or better. It is my feeling that they will stay within a very narrow range from now on, unless something is done. The situation is not likely to better itself and it very well may worsen.

I suppose that bankers do not like analysts like myself who delve too far into the works of their clocks. Several have shown resentment to things I have said and written about them, I know. They would like us to remain mute while these things go on and they continue to kid their shareowners with a lot of doubletalk. And, how easily they get away with it. I have sat in many shareholder meetings and marveled at the glibness of their sidestepping in reply to questions. Year after year, the same old "blarney" is dished out to the long-suffering owners of the enterprise, as it were.

Although by now quite bored with their antics, I always get a great lift from that part of the production wherein the banker sanctimoniously defends the fact that his stock is not listed by saying that they don't want the stock on the board because of violent price changes that might possibly be construed to cast doubt on the financial stability of the bank. Of all the "goop" I have ever heard, that one really takes the cake for sheer idiocy.

What they forget is the fact that bank share prices had their very worst price gyrations after they were removed from the stock exchange. And, to my knowledge, any banks of any consequence that failed from 1929 on were not listed upon any stock exchange, either. The boys have the proverbial cart before the proverbial horse, again.

Within the last year or so, the stock price of one of our very finest Wall Street banks fell out of bed to the tune of about 15 points, a record far worse than that of its neighbors. It was a mighty serious drop when measured in dollars, about 163 million of them, and percentagewise it was also large, being 20 percent. It was so bad they sold some more stock for about $120 million to fill in the dollar gap, as it might be termed. Yet, at the annual meeting last month, not one shareowner asked one question about it. It was ignored, just as if it hadn't ever happened. And, the head of this great bank is one of those fellows most worried about what might happen to the price of his stock were it listed.

Does our press pick up and report on such trivia? Of course not. Don't you know that it is against some law or other to say anything unbullish about a bank whose deposits are guaranteed by the FDIC? Well, I guess I'll just sit here and await a call from John E. Hoover's men.

Whether we agree with Mr. Burns or not about compelling the listing of bank stocks on any of the national exchanges is unimportant. What is important is that under the Financial Institutions Act, S. 1451 and H. R. 7026, as presented to us, bank officers and directors, the insiders, will be permitted to deal with themselves and their institutions in connection with bank stocks and options for bank stocks, without being required to publicly disclose the information which they would be required to disclose if their stocks were listed on any of the exchanges.

The real reason why most bank stocks were delisted is because bank management dared not make public disclosure of the vital facts about management and operation of the banks, without which disclosure they could not continue to be listed.

I do not agree with Mr. Burns that the way to solve the problem is to require the stocks to be listed. I do believe the solution of the problem would be attained by requiring all banks to publicly disclose the same information that the Securities and Exchange Commission and the stock exchanges require of all institutions whose stock is publicly held.

The Financial Institutions Act, instead of correcting the evil, compounds it.

Sound Argument for Scholarships and Loans for Higher Education

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. COYA KNUTSON
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 6, 1958

Mrs. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, in a letter to the editor of the Warroad Pioneer, Warroad, Minn., February 26, a correspondent gives very sound reasons for scholarships and loans for higher education. People who are financially unable to attend colleges, or sometimes even complete high school benefit from such aids. And there is no question, our country needs these trained minds which might otherwise be unable to make their full contribution to the country. I ask permission to insert the letter in the RECORD and call attention to my Student Loan bill, H. R. 5479, first introduced 3 years ago, and just as necessary today as the day it was first introduced:

To the EDITOR:

A short time ago it was stated that Government scholarships encouraged laziness among students who didn't need financial aid. I think this example is irrelevant. First, the Government as of yet does not give scholarships to individuals, although Congress is contemplating it. Scholarships are provided through industries, private funds, alumni associations, foundations, etc. Secondly, in applying for a scholarship a student must prove his financial need except in cases of exceptionally gifted persons, and the aid given is based on the student's need. Thirdly, it must be proven the student is a sound investment and exhibits certain personal qualifications.

In the United States, money guarantees a college education more than intelligence does. Scholarships help to equalize opportunity.

Without some scholarship aid, persons who could do excellent college work find their energies channeled into outside work.

PAT HICKMAN.

World Law To Protect World Investment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES O. PORTER
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 3, 1958

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent I include the full text of "World Law To Protect World Investment, an address delivered by Charles S. Rhyne, president of the American Bar Association, before the midwinter trust conference of the American Banker's Association on February 12, 1958, at the Waldorf-Astoria in New York City.

Mr. Rhyne, a Washington lawyer, is a personal friend of mine. He has dedicated his year as president of the American bar to promoting world law as the promising way to world peace. I commend him and his words for your close attention:

Ever since I first received your invitation back in early September of 1957, I have been looking forward to this meeting. I am extremely pleased to be your guest on this occasion and attest to the fact that our professions now enjoy a fruitful and harmonious relationship due to the excellent work of the National Conference of Lawyers and representatives of this trust division of the American Bankers Association. Ours has been a most happy experience in cooperative solution of mutual problems. The major credit for these achievements belongs to my dear friends the chairman of our respective committees Bob Griswold and Ed Otterbourg.

I now suggest that we should go beyond this ironing out of domestic frictions and make a contribution to the ironing out of international frictions through a combination of our talents in a field where we often work separately, but where we have made no concentrated joint effort in the past. I believe we can best serve the public—the service to which both of our professions are dedicated—by lifting our minds from domestic to international affairs at this critical turning point in the history of mankind. I believe we can make a great contribution to world peace by developing world law to govern world investment. If we are as successful in the new joint field of endeavor as we have been in our other joint efforts the public benefits will be incalculable.

I welcome this opportunity to present to you bankers some personal views on this area of great common concern to both of our professions. I sincerely believe that development of world law to protect world investment can enable the export of the genius of our great free enterprise creative know-how and open a new avenue paved with such stable elements as to offer a new route to world peace. Such could be the end results of the commercial interlocking and friendships created by the plan I am here to propose.

ECONOMIC PATH TO PEACE UNDER LAW

We of our professions are conservative in our approach to nearly every problem. We like to base new plans on the wisdom of experience. And the plan I now discuss with you is not an abandonment of that approach, it is merely an expansion of the old and enduring concept of the rule of law to new frontiers so as to live up to our duties and responsibilities in this shrunken world. This plan of an economic path to peace under law has the great virtue that work on it can only lead to constructive rather than destructive achievements. No bombs or missiles or satellites are involved. Unlike the ever-accelerating arms race this plan can never end in the holocaust of world war but only in such economic advancement as to bring increased good will and happiness and a greater well-being in areas of the world that participate therein. The plan is admittedly designed not only to serve those peoples of other lands where present poverty and discontent creates one of the causes of war but our own self-interests, our own desire to increase world investment and trade and to make a profit on that trade and investment. To me there is nothing wrong in such objectives.

As background for this presentation I ask you to pause a moment to focus upon the world in which we now live. The satellites have forcefully focused worldwide attention upon the almost miraculous technological achievements of our day. We are faced with unprecedented peril from abroad and unprecedented change and growth at home. Rapid transportation and communications have made ours a physically indivisible world. Distance is almost meaningless.

Recent census reports and forecasts clearly indicate that the earth's population will double and triple in the near future. To meet the increased material and economic burdens of this expanding populace, combined with the increased needs resulting from higher living standards, every means must be used to assure that the ultimate in productivity is realized from all available resources. This means that hundreds of backward areas of the world must be developed so that they may carry their share of this production.

Economic development of the less advanced countries of the world calls for a continually increasing measure of assistance on the part of the Western industrial nations. These less advanced countries, regardless of their own good intentions and ambitions, are not able to provide, either through private capital or tax revenues, the funds necessary for their own development. Unless adequate capital is made available to these areas so that their natural resources may be developed to contribute to the earth's overall productivity, their inefficiency will become a drain on the advanced nations. Today in our shrunken world all peoples are

acutely aware of the standards of living that exist elsewhere. And peoples of underdeveloped countries naturally yearn for the higher standards of living that exist in, for example, our own Nation. The best way for us to serve that yearning is to export the genius of our great free-enterprise system.

INTERLACING OF ECONOMIC INTERESTS BUILDS CONFIDENCE

In addition, the need for increased world investment exists in highly developed countries. Capital can and does serve to compensate imbalances in international payments. The interlacing of economic interests builds up confidence and nurtures the vitally needed cooperation and trust among nations. Major economic projects clearly can best be realized by coordinating the economic resources of countries giving and countries receiving.

Thus, the great need for increased world investment is evident. The logical question then arises as to how this need should be met. Let us consider for a moment the merit of the two alternative methods: (1) government loans or gifts, and (2) meeting the needs that exist through private investments.

VALUE OF GOVERNMENT LOANS AND GIFTS

Let us examine, first, government loans and gifts and their value in meeting world needs in this field. Frankly, the usual stimulus for this type of aid is political advantage, and generally there is no serious intention of requiring repayment. Although this sort of grant, made at the expense of the grantor's taxpayers, may be necessary in emergency situations, it cannot satisfy the long-range needs of development countries. In addition the overtones of charity which exist often breed ill feelings among the people of the nations involved. Waste and political administration are often present as this money filters out and down through political channels.

Few persons will contend that government-to-government aid can compare in efficiency and productivity with private investment through private enterprise. Aid from and through government officials is seldom creative in result.

PRIVATE INVESTMENT SYSTEM IS BEST

Under the second method, private investors supply the capital and the local persons put it to use, and working hand in hand for their mutual benefit, a feeling of partner rather than master-beggar is thereby created. In the many underdeveloped nations where newly won independence is so precious and jealously guarded this method may offer a more appealing approach then government aid or loans which so often carry a political label. Certain it is that a system of free enterprise usually offers a better chance to more people of underdeveloped countries to get ahead personally. It develops the necessary reservoir of technicians, skilled workers and entrepreneurs so that the working people of these development areas, can truly begin to carry their own weight and take pride in their accomplishments. Such a program offers such peoples their best opportunity to develop with human dignity and fulfill their aspirations for a higher standard of living. Let us show them our private investment system is best for them—it is certainly best for us. Individual incentive with its creative urge through economic freedom of a private enterprise system offers more hope than governmental aid or control.

The people-to-people programs and all other means whereby the people of the world can know and work with each other are tremendous contributions to world peace. If the people of the world are doing business together the holocaust of war is less apt to explode. This route of private investments brings people into close working relationships and offers an excellent opportunity to further this objective.

GOVERNMENT AID AND PRIVATE INVESTMENT BOTH NEEDED

My personal opinion, on which I know that I do not stand alone, is that state aid should be restricted wherever possible, perhaps to emergency situations or to financing projects which are inaccessible to private investment. I realize, of course, that this cannot always be our national policy, because the protective guaranties essential for private investment in many underdeveloped countries do not now exist. The so-called foreign-aid program is not one I oppose. In fact my only feeling is that it may be too little and too late. We must use it to defeat Soviet economic penetration into underdeveloped countries. The economic development fund requires expansion not contraction. The point I make is that private investment offers a better method and that we should use both methods to meet the needs that exist. Government aid must continue and the proper mechanism must be developed for private capital to play a greater role in underdeveloped Nations.

We should never forget that our own great Nation was aided in the development of the resources of our virgin North America by the private capital of investors of European nations. Through our integrity as a debtor, and our respect for private property, we were able to secure permanent foreign investors. Then, through our initiative we have so developed our resources that today we stand among all the nations on the earth in the best position to help others. Further, we are today the world's greatest trader and we need to expand that trade to meet the needs of our Nation.

PROTECTION OF PRIVATE CAPITAL NECESSARY

Where a nation offers effective legal guaranties that the rights of private outside investors will be respected and protected, there is little difficulty. Our own history and that of Canada are excellent examples. And western capital is readily available for other nations. Unfortunately, however, many of the development areas cannot or do not offer any such security. In fact, their past records of nationalization and confiscation often force the opposite conclusion. Some of these countries have clearly demonstrated a tendency to expropriate outside capital once it has operated for a short period or at least to restrict its use and movement considerably. Examples exist behind and on our side of the Iron Curtain. In Czechoslovakia, coal mines, certain sections of industry, banks, and insurance companies were nationalized by law in October 1945. Important industrial areas in Poland were nationalized in January 1946, the government taking all of the assets but only portions of the liabilities. Two major Argentina power companies, controlled almost exclusively by Swiss and Belgian interests, were deprived of their licenses on July 23, 1957. While the picture is still unclear, it is apparent that Indonesia has recently taken over the property of Dutch investors and owners and so far no payment has been made or offered. These are only a few illustrations of the great barriers which must be overcome in order to encourage the substitution of private world investment for direct aid by governments. This brings me to conclude that in the context of current history bankers and lawyers should pool their resources to develop a mechanism to provide the universal security for private export capital which is requisite to a healthy system of world investment. I believe that such mechanism can be created under the rule of law.

Writers and scholars in the field of international law have long drawn a distinction between expropriation and confiscation. The basis for this distinction is compensation. As a general rule, expropriation is not prohibited for, obviously, under certain conditions the public interest may demand it, as where private land is taken for a new expressway, airport, or other essential public use. And where adequate compensation is granted equally to all private interests in return, this is acceptable in our country as well as in others. The constitutions and expropriation laws of most western nations conform to those principles. It is further agreed that under general international law all nations have the right to impose indirect sanctions on private property without compensation such as taxes, licenses, or property restrictions. Here, the line may be fine indeed between measures in the public interest and concealed confiscation, as in the Argentina case cited. Further complications arise in determining exactly what represents a just definition of adequate compensation and in assuring that no unjust discrimination exists between nationals and nonnationals where private capital is involved. This discrimination is not a new or novel problem as in our own country, States and cities have often sought advantage for their residents against outsiders, and our courts have quickly invalidated such discriminations.

LAWYERS AND BANKERS MUST MEET RESPONSIBILITIES

Just as scientists, doctors, and engineers have an obligation to meet the challenge of the changing times and keep abreast of their fields, we lawyers and you bankers must meet our responsibility in these times and provide the means by which world investment and export capital is guaranteed security. This can never be done until there is universay regard for the rights of private property whether under domestic or foreign control.

The rules and ideas which govern world investment today are grossly inadequate to meet the needs of the era in which we live. In a world where rapid communications and transportation have shrunk nations to neighborhoods we must be able to do business with our neighbors under legal rules that will allow us to develop to the full the potentials of a new and closer and potentially more fruitful relationship. We lawyers, directed by the advice and experience of your bankers and others in the fields of economics and commerce, must create new legal machinery under which the rights of export capital will be absolutely guaranteed so as to encourage world investment so as to achieve essential development for underdeveloped countries.

INTERNATIONAL TREATY WOULD CONSTITUTE CODE OF HONOR

The surest way to reach this goal is through an international treaty which would clearly set forth standards enabling world development through private capital. Such a treaty would constitute an effective code of honor among participating nations by creating protections so guaranteeing the safety of foreign investment that no person will hesitate to risk his funds in a participating country for fear of adverse governmental action. Such a treaty should provide for adequate compensation for all taking of private property, concretely define adequate compensation, and outlaw all discriminations between domestic and foreign interests.

Any participating country which nationalizes export capital without adequate compensation or adopts other repressive discriminatory economic legislation against foreign investors would by such action automatically subject itself to the jurisdiction of an international court and consent to have any disputes arising from the nationalization or repressive legislation decided by that court. Subsequent failure to comply with the decision would result in the imposition of one or more of a number of rather powerful sanctions such as: (1) All other participating parties would withhold public and private loans from the noncomplying na-

tion; (2) governmental guaranties against political risks to exporters and investors of the noncomplying nation would be denied by all other parties; (3) governments of all participating parties would recommend banks not grant credit or loans to enterprises wishing to invest in interests within the noncomplying nation; (4) most-favored-nation clauses which may be embodied in agreements with the offending nation would be revoked; (5) all governmental assets of the violator located in all nations who are participating members in the plan would be frozen when so ordered by the court in cases where this is necessary to bring about enforcement of its judgment. Few nations would risk their good name by incurring such sanctions.

Few nations indeed would care to flout the court's decree and thus stand alone economically. And, what nation desiring private investors from abroad is worth investing in if it refuses to agree to abide by such a code of honorable dealing herein proposed? I have no doubt that an international convention incorporating the principles of honor, justice, and equality set out earlier would be well received by friendly nations, truly desirous of cooperative action which will promote world investment.

INTERNATIONAL CONVENTION NOT A NEW IDEA

Such an international convention or code of honor is far from a new idea. It has received support from several significant quarters. As early as 1931 a resolution of the International Chamber of Commerce suggested that this sort of code be drawn up under general international law. This resolution further embodied the idea of an international court to decide disputes arising thereunder. Following World War II the need to secure the rights of foreign capital received renewed emphasis. The United Nations Conference on Trade and Employment recognized that world investment was essential to economic development and made an attempt to promote it by suggesting the protection of export capital. In 1949 the International Chamber of Commerce drafted a code directed toward achieving fair treatment for foreign investments.

The background has been laid. The time has come to take concrete action and the first big step toward positive establishment of the rights of foreign investors.

The international court itself is of vital importance to the success of this program. It must be readily accessible to all nations and must be so designed that it is capable of sitting at any one of a number of strategic locations. Since the entire plan rests heavily on the voluntary support of its participants, we must assure the worldwide favorable reputation of the tribunal by appointing our most eminent and capable jurists with excellent compensation and lifetime tenure to insure independence of judgment. This is the plan for the just created court which will decide disputes under the treaty creating the new European economic community.

SECURING PROTECTION WOULD BE CONTRIBUTION TO MANKIND

Securing protection for private world investment would be, in itself, a magnificent contribution to mankind. Private world investment offers in my view the best way to bring the full capacity of the financial and technical resources of the "have" nations in the Western World to the aid of Latin America, Africa, the Middle East, and Asia. But, in addition, I firmly believe that the legal machinery proposed for this program and the public opinion which can be harnessed in support of it can furnish a testing ground from which we can move along to the point where all international disputes will be settled in tribunals of justice under the rule of law rather than by the bloodshed of war. To prevent the holocaust of atomic-missile-satellite warfare, law must replace weapons as the ultimate decider of disputes between nations. The precedents created by decisions of an international court in the world investment field could well lay the foundation for decision of all disputes between nations. Such precedents may have a usefulness extending to the broader needs of the international community.

MUST LEARN TO LIVE TOGETHER

As we listen to the roar of current history, it is absolutely clear that we must learn to live together or see our civilization go up in the senseless devastation of war. The atomic and hydrogen bombs, the sputniks, and the ICBM's have attuned the people of the world to an overwhelming desire for peace which is probably stronger than any such desire in all history. There is a common realization that under present conditions every man, woman, and child will be in the frontline trenches if the holocaust of world war explodes. This most urgent desire to prevent war thus offers a unique and unparalleled opportunity to grow from the protection of world investment under the rule of law to the use of the same law as the decider of all international disputes. As such law grows so will, also, a lasting world peace. Here we have a field where bankers and lawyers can promote such growth by cooperative effort in so developing a mechanism of world law to govern world investment as to make it possible to use the genius of free enterprise to pave the road to peace under law.

Chemicals in Our Food—The Consumer Is Not Protected

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 4, 1958

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, in 1906 the Food and Drugs Act was passed by the Congress to safeguard the consumer. Despite several amendments to the law since then, overwhelming evidence indicates that full protection still does not exist. With the increase in the use of chemicals in all phases of food production it is entirely possible that the consumer today enjoys less protection than 50 years ago.

I submit that Congress has been remiss in fulfilling its obligations in this area. I am convinced that most consumers eat their food with complete confidence, assuming the Government has provided for the necessary protection. The days are long gone when the individual consumer was qualified or in a position to assess the purity of the food he consumed. With the present complex and farflung system of food production and distribution the Government must assume the responsibility of assuring the safety and purity of the food which goes to the Nation's dinner tables. New laws are required for the Government to discharge this vital task.

Two articles in the January and February issues of Consumer Reports tell the story. The 1938 Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetics Act did not solve the problem. I am sure that we are all shocked to know that of the 700 or so chemicals now used in our daily food, more than 150 have not been adequately tested for safety. The problem lies in the fact that the law forbids only the addition to food of a chemical known to be poisonous or harmful, but it does nothing to prohibit the addition of chemicals whose safety is unknown. The urgent need is for legislation requiring pretesting of chemicals before they are introduced into the food supply. Cancer experts have repeatedly emphasized that the absence of incriminating evidence is not a guarantee that a suspected chemical is safe. The danger is in the insidious, long-time toxic and cancer-inciting effect of small, daily amounts of food chemicals consumed over years.

I will not here go into this in any greater detail. I assure you that many of the details are quite alarming.

There is a bill before the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce which will provide the needed protection. I refer to the bill introduced by our good friend and colleague, the Honorable JAMES C. DELANEY, of New York.

Congressman DELANEY has performed an outstanding service in making the public and the Congress aware of this problem. As chairman of the House Select Committee to Investigate the Use of Chemicals in Foods and Cosmetics, 1950–52, Mr. DELANEY became the leading expert in Congress on this subject. He has introduced his bill in every Congress since the 83d. It is a good bill and I urge the committee to give the House an opportunity to vote on the Delaney bill and provide the necessary protection for the consumers of the country.

Extension of the Reciprocal Trade Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM B. WIDNALL
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 6, 1958

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Speaker, one of the most important programs being considered by the Congress is extension of the Reciprocal Trade Act.

Karl H. Helfrich, president of the American Tariff League, presented the views of his organization on February 21, 1958, to the House Ways and Means Committee.

Under leave to extend my remarks the views of the American Tariff League, Inc., follow:

My name is Karl H. Helfrich, and I appear here as president of the American Tariff League, Inc., 19 West 44th Street, New York City.

We all realize, I believe, that 1958 is a year of basic decision in the foreign trade and tariff policies of the United States. Those whom I represent sincerely hope that the issues involved will be settled on the true facts of economic well-being and national security, and not through attempts to win the argument before it starts by invoking misleading definitions. Terms such as "high protectionist," isolationist," "reactionary," "free trader," and "visionary" merely tend to confuse our thinking. Nor should any man's patriotism be questioned because he may differ as to the most effec-

tive methods of achieving the objectives that we all desire.

During the past year the American Tariff League has been engaged in preparing the most complete, factual study of our country's foreign-trade problems and policies that we have ever attempted in the 73 years of our existence. This publication, entitled "the United States in World Trade—A Contemporary Analysis and a Program for the Future," is now completed and has been made available to the members of the Ways and Means Committee. It represents the hard work of many people, both lay and professional. We have had the benefit of the resource files and staff assistance of numerous organizations and corporations with long experience in this general field. We believe it to be the first time that data of this scope have been brought together at one point.

On the basis of this study, certain conclusions emerged which led to 13 specific recommendations that were adopted in principle by the members of the American Tariff League at their annual meeting in New York on October 30 last. This study will likewise serve as authority for the statements I make here today.

Those who favor H. R. 10368, calling for a 5-year extension of the Trade Agreements Act, including further tariff cutting powers in the hands of the administration, rely principally on four major arguments: (1) The administration needs these further powers to bargain for reduction in the restrictions levied against American exports abroad; (2) we must buy more from abroad so they can buy more from us; (3) more American jobs are created by our exports than are destroyed by our imports; and (4) increased trade with friendly foreign natios is necessary to win the economic phase of the cold war with Russia and her satellite countries. I would like to comment briefly on each of these four points.

1. Restrictions levied against American exports abroad. Ever since 1934, it has always been a principal objective of the Trade Agreements Act that other nations remove their barriers against United States goods. The act was specifically for the purpose of exanding foreign markets for the products of the United States. Yet the record shows that the barriers foreign nations raise against our goods have increased on a vast scale, computed either by numbers of countries or by types of restrictive practices used. It is very difficult indeed to secure complete statistical data on this subject, but the following table is a partial listing of the 16 principal restrictions found abroad and the number of countries identified as using them.

Major nontariff impediments to the flow of trade and capital imposed by 89 foreign nations (a partial list)

	Countries
Advance deposit for imports	13
Exchange licenses	33
Exchange tax	9
Existence of blocked nonresident accounts	10
Export licenses	46
Forced exchange of payments received in foreign currency	47
Import licenses	62
Import quotas (agricultural)	9
Import quotas (other than agricultural)	8
Multiple exchange rates	23
Preferential exchange systems	16
Preferential trade systems	21
Restrictions on incoming capital movement	28
Restrictions on outgoing capital movement	36
Restrictions on Payments for Invisible imports	45
State trading	13

In addition to the above, we have found 20 other restrictive practices the use of which has been documented in the case of one or more countries.

These latter restrictions, and those listed in the table, are frequently used in combination.

The growth of these practices has been occasioned by various factors; the creation of new nations that never before existed and their desire to secure economic as well as political independence, the shifts taking place in many parts of the world from an agrarian to an industrial economy, and the upheavals and destruction caused by the fighting of a world war. We have no quarrel with these reasons.

The important point today, however, is the fact that the operation of the Trade Agreements Act has not lowered these barriers; they have increased in spite of it. Nor have we basis for believing that the act would be any more successful if extended again.

While tariffs are perhaps the least important of the restrictions which foreign nations impose on United States exports, the facts reveal that even the tariffs are not established on a reciprocal basis. The following table shows the ratio of customs duties collected to the value of imports for the United States and some of her industrial competitors.

Duties-to-imports ratios, selected countries, year 1955

	Percent
United States	5.4
Germany	7.4
Italy	9.0
France	25.3
United Kingdom	30.4

Additional comparative data show that United States' tariffs are already lower than those of any other major industrial nation in the world, with the exception of Japan.

In 1955, a comparison of the average tariff rates of 36 countries of the world showed only seven nations, accounting for only 13 percent of United States' total foreign trade, with tariffs lower than ours, while 28 had higher rates.

The average ratio of customs collected to the value of imports for all 36 countries was 15; for the United States it was 5.4. The average ratio of those countries with higher tariffs than the United States was 18.1—235 percent above the figure for the United States—while the average of those countries with lower tariffs was 3.9—only 28 percent below the United States figure.

What has been the general trend of tariff rates during the past existence of the Trade Agreements Act? We have computed the relative tariff levels in 36 countries for 1937 and 1955. The figures show that a majority of the countries studied reduced their tariff levels in this 18-year interval, but the United States reducted its duty level appreciably more than did most of the others. The United Kingdom and France actually increased their levels by 43 percent and 37 percent, respectively. Canada reduced hers by 13 percent, Italy by 24 percent, Switzerland by 34 percent, and Japan by 39 percent, but the United States reduced hers by 66 percent. During this period only Venezuela, West Germany, Argentina, Sweden, and Brazil cut their levels to a greater degree, and all of these countries had much higher levels than ours to start with in 1937.

The Trade Agreements Act has not achieved true reciprocity in its avowed purpose of reducing tariff levels, nor is there cause to think that it would do so in the future.

There is much current discussion about the rapid development of the common market movement abroad, as it will be set up by the six countries comprising the European Economic Community. This European Common Market is to be formed on a gradual basis, the end result being the elimination of tariffs among the six member nations (Belgium, France, Italy, Luxembourg, Netherlands, and West Germany). But retention of tariffs and other regulatory measures against non-European economic community nations is the premise upon which the market is founded. Member countries having individual tariffs higher than the average for the community would correspondingly lower such rates toward outside countries, but member countries with individual rates lower than the average for the community would raise such rates toward outside nations. A question difficult to resolve is whether such discrimination will, in practice, militate chiefly against the commerce of the United States.

As our league's study states: "Insofar as the movement strengthens the economies and defense potentialities of these European countries, the United States will benefit. If it results in raising the living standards of the European peoples, the United States can only applaud.

"Side-by-side with these possible long-range benefits, the common market trend creates immediate, disturbing problems for the United States. Such a market is inherently discriminatory against United States trade, not necessarily by design, certainly not from malice, but because of the economic forces it unleashes."

Its earliest likely effect for the United States will be a loss of a substantial portion of the European market for many American exports, particularly manufactured products. idly—at an average rate of more than 4 percent a year between 1950 and 1955. This is much faster than any previous European growth rate, and faster even than the 3-percent average annual growth, long term, of United States industrial productivity. Western Europe's booming industrial plant already poses a serious challenge to United States supremacy in world trade. This challenge will mount in the years just ahead.

Moreover, the European Common Market concept is stimulating similar proposals in other areas of the world, namely South America, Central America, Northern European (Finland, Sweden, Norway, and Denmark) and the Far East. The basic principle behind such common markets is to place a common barrier against goods from outside the geographical area. As Dr. F. Mikesell, professor of economics at the Univesity of Oregon has commented, "First of all it must be recognized that by their very nature these arrangements will result in increased discrimination against United States exports."

We submit that on the basis of the past performance of our trade agreements procedure, and in the face of the tremendously powerful economic forces referred to above, it is not logical to place our faith in a further renewal of the Trade Agreements Act, nor in the further drastic cutting of our tariffs.

2. We must buy more abroad so they can buy more from us. This is the old, familiar story of the dollar gap. It is our contention that foreign nations will buy from us when they have need of the goods in question and when our quality, prices, and terms are competitively attractive, just as we will import those goods that we want and which are not otherwise available here. This is just good, common business sense. But returning to the dollar gap, permit me to quote from a recent speech given by Dr. Lewis E. Lloyd, economist of the Dow Chemical Co., before the Hardwood Plywood Institute in Washington.

Examination shows that those who become alarmed about the dollar gap are looking at only part of the picture—they are ignoring some important facts. The so-called dollar gap refers only to the balance between exported goods and imported goods. It ignores the dollars which foreigners get from services which they sell to us, such as shipping,

from tourism, from foreign investments and from our foreign aid program.

"When these other factors are taken itno account, the balance of payments between the United States and other countries shows that foreign nationals have been increasing their dollar credits by 1 to to billion dollars a year for the past 10 years.

"The problem is not that there is a shortage of dollars abroad, but rather that most countries prefer to use the dollars they have for other uses than the purchases of United States merchandise. Foreign nations hoard dollars to stabilize their own currency or for use as exchange with other nations. For example, Brazil, which earns huge dollar credits through sales of coffee in this country, prefers to spend them in Europe where manufactured goods can be bought more cheaply.

"In the past 10 years foreign nations have increased their dollar holdings until they now have claims on more than two-thirds of our total gold reserve. As a result, we are now in a very vulnerable position with respect to our money credit system."

In the light of these statements, it would not appear necessary to renew the Trade Agreements Act so that other nations could sell more to us and hence buy more from us.

3. More American jobs are created by our exports than are destroyed by our imports.

Various figures have been published, and some of them already presented to this committee, regarding the number of American jobs dependent upon our foreign trade, and the number of jobs lost through the competition of imports. We know from experience and considerable effort how difficult it is to develop reliable statistics in this field.

For example, the Committee for a National Trade Policy estimates that if all our tariffs were eliminated, only about 200,000 workers would have to be relocated in other industries. But the American working farm population, which numbers about 7.2 million, operates in a domestic market which for the most part is protected against imports. If this market were opened to foreign competition, it is reasonable to expect that a substantial drop in farm employment would result. Add to this the lists of those who have lost jobs because of the competition of lower foreign labor costs in the fields of textiles, ceramics, textile machinery, plywood, cordage, heavy electrical equipment, commercial fishing, to name but a few. These considerations make the quoted figure of 200,000 jobs at stake look highly debatable.

Administration spokesmen have stated that 4,500,000 American jobs are dependent on foreign trade. We recall that the Randall Commission set the figure at 4.3 million in terms of 1952 foreign trade. The current 4.5 figure is presumably linked to 1956 foreign-trade volume. But we know that in that period the total volume of our foreign trade increased from $26 billion to an estimated $32 billion. Thus a 23 percent rise in foreign trade apparently produced less than a 5 percent rise in jobs.

The American Tariff League, in its study, freely admits that many of our workers depend on exports for their employment, and that conversely, many jobs can be and have been lost here due to the inroads of imports produced with cheap-foreign labor. But the point at issue is what would H. R. 10368 do to improve this overall situation? Our economy is not strengthened in any real sense by the creation of a job at one point through the destruction of a job at another. Furthermore, it is our fear that the proposed measure would destroy more jobs than it would create, and at a time when employment in general is on the decline.

4. Increased trade with friendly nations is necessary to win the economic phase of the cold war. We recognize the great importance of a strong, healthy economy among the friendly nations of the free world. Such strength is necessary not only to enable these countries to help shoulder their fair share of the armament burden, but also to avoid those conditions of living which tend to nourish the seeds of communism from within. One of our major, positive proposals, referred to later in this statement, is specifically intended to encourage our friends abroad to strengthen their internal buying power, and to increase the scope and depth of their own markets.

But the most important stone in the economic arch of the free world is the economic well-being of the United States. If our economy seriously falters, if our strength is unduly sapped, the cold war will be lost.

Production is basically more important than foreign trade as such. Nevertheless foreign trade should be encouraged—the kind of foreign trade that arises naturally between a willing buyer and a willing seller—the kind of trade that benefits both and injures neither. We should continue to import those articles of commerce that we want and that we neither grow nor produce here. As our need increases, the volume will rise. Such articles primarily enter our country duty free. Conversely, and with all the salesmanship for which our businessmen are noted, we will endeavor to dramatize the advantages of our products to our foreign customers, and if the advantages exist, they will buy. If the advantages are nonexistent, or if our customers desire to develop their own productive plant, they won't buy. It is not necessary to renew the Trade Agreements Act to promote business of this mutually advantageous nature.

But if we import products which are comparably produced in ample abundance here, and American workmen are displaced, not because they are inefficient, not because the quality of their work is poorer, but merely because their foreign counterparts have a lower standard of living and receive lower wages, then we are weakening our economy at a most critical time in our history. In our zest to export goods, let us make sure that we do not export jobs. And in our rightful zeal to combat communism outside our borders, let us make sure that we do not induce unemployment here, which nurtures communism within.

Up to this point, my testimony has primarily been directed to reasons why the Trade Agreements Act, with its further tariff cutting powers, should not be renewed. You have a right to ask, and I shall now endeavor to set forth, what in the way of positive action do the members of the American Tariff League favor.

In our Tariff League factual study, completed during the past year and to which I have referred, there is a section entitled "Conclusions and Recommendations," covering pages 105 through 111 inclusive. It is my purpose now to briefly highlight these recommendations, but I respectfully ask permission of the chairman to include these 7 pages as part of the official record of this hearing at the conclusion of this statement.

As I have previously said, there are 13 recommendations in all, but I intend to comment on 6, and of these, to emphasize 3.

Recommendation No. 1. The Tariff Commission, properly augmented with adequate staff, should prepare a comprehensive revision of our entire tariff and foreign trade regulatory structure. Since such a task was last undertaken in 1930, whole new industries have been born and hundreds of new products have been perfected. Our tariff classifications and definitions are sadly out of line. It is encouraging to know that this huge but important task is being undertaken by the Commission. Such a modernization could be of far greater benefit to many other countries than a continuation of our present rates and classifications. Our present policy is to apply each United States tariff rate to the pertinent product from a particular, friendly country. A rate reduced by such agreement is then applied by the most favored nation clause to all other friendly nations, whether or not they have made reciprocal concessions on our exports. Such a generalized reduction accentuates the advantage which a low-wage-cost country has over a higher-wage-cost country in entering the American market.

Recommendation No. 2: We recommend that, in furtherance of a fair tariff structure, consideration should be given to the institution by the United States of an incentive, or sliding scale, tariff system which would recognize and reward any foreign country which improves its living standards or wages for its workers.

In practice, such a system would permit the reduction of United States duties below our basic rates, for any item originating in a country in which the workers producing the item have been paid increased wages. For countries contiguous to the United States, such as Canada, this system, over a period of time, could result in a North American common market. The time might come when a common border, now free of troops, would also be free of customs men.

Recommendation No. 4: The Tariff Commission, as an agent of Congress, should have the task of classifying and defining items, and assigning them to the dutiable and free lists, and designating rates of duty, or quotas for them, all in accordance with basic standards set by Congress. Such determinations, which could be announced in a series of major groupings over a period of time, could become effective, group by group, after the running of a 90-day period, unless Congress directed otherwise as to the group, or to any individual item, on its own initiative or on request from the President.

These, gentlemen, are our principal recommendations. I would like to refer in passing to three more, which are definitely a part of the program.

Recommendation No. 7: We suggest that provision should be made for the use of the tariff to meet special situations:

(a) To prevent dumping.

(b) To offset the use of foreign bounty or subsidy on exports to the United States.

(c) As a penalty for other unfair import practices.

Recommendation No. 8: We recommend that, when tariffs are not an adequate or effective mechanism for regulating our foreign commerce, quotas of a suitable nature should be employed to cover the following situations:

(a) A general or emergency situation in which the tariff rate, or a modification of a tariff rate, would be ineffective or inappropriate.

(b) The furtherance of governmental programs for agricultural products.

(c) To safeguard producers' organizations, research programs, and workers' skills immediately or potentially important to national defense or security.

(d) To counter effectively unfair practices of a particular country.

Recommendation No. 13: Because of a rapidly changing economic world picture for which insufficient data exist, we propose that there be created a special United States commission to prepare a report on foreign restrictions against American exports or investments abroad, and problems likely to arise from the common market areas. Such a commission should have the form and stature of the Hoover Commission, and a principal objective should also be to study how our tariff and foreign trade laws can be administered so as to raise the standard of living and improve the economic climate throughout the world.

We are sincerely convinced that such a program, administered within the framework set by Congress and under the ultimate control of Congress, would provide us with a body of tariff rates and foreign trade regu-

lations that would be attuned to modern industrial and technological development; it would be fair to those nations who stand with us in the cold war because it would be flexibly adjusted to encourage and reward their own efforts to raise their levels of wages, improve their standards of living, and broaden their own internal markets; and most important of all, it would prevent the deterioration of our own national economy, which is fundamental to the success of the whole free world. It would not protect inefficiency, indolence, or lack of imagination, because these should not be protected. It would merely compensate for the difference between higher labor costs here and lower labor costs abroad in the production, with equal efficiency, of comparable articles.

Improved Methods of Stating Budget Estimates

SPEECH
OF
HON. JOHN F. SHELLEY
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 5, 1958

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H. R. 8002) to provide for improved methods of stating budget estimates and estimates for deficiency and supplemental appropriations.

Mr. SHELLEY. Mr. Chairman, I rise to associate myself in opposition to this measure, H. R. 8002, and join with my distinguished and honored colleagues, the Chairman of the House Committee on Appropriations [Mr. CANNON] and the respected ranking minority Member from the State of New York [Mr. TABER] I believe that there is general agreement that in these two distinguished Members of Congress, the House has a great wealth of knowledge and past experience in the problem, and a vexing problem, of appropriating funds for the operation of the United States Government.

My purpose in opposing this measure is one of not only simple opposition, but also of offering some suggestions and proposals that have been on my mind since I first served in the House and particularly over the past several years I have been serving as a member of the Committee on Appropriations. First, let us take a look at this bill that is before us for consideration. The bill will require a return to the use of contract authority, which is a form of installment buying and installment appropriation. We tried this method of contract authority for years and found that it was more costly to the taxpayers, easier to get approved and subsequently abandoned its use. Another point that is made is one of savings—savings of $4 billion a year. Even the Budget Director admitted this was a phony argument and said he could not point to a single dollar of savings under this system. This bill will not save a single penny, it will not reduce unexpended carryover balances by a single cent, it will not secure closer scrutiny of these carryovers and it will not strengthen control of the purse, and in fact it will weaken control, because it is too late to stop raids on the Treasury after the obligation has been made.

This then is the measure that is before us today. Working on the Appropriations Committee, Mr. Chairman, affords one a magnificent opportunity to look into every facet of the Federal Government and to admire the effective and efficient work of the Departments and their year around budget officials, who work with, develop and promote the budget requests of their particular agency, department, bureau or what-have you. Throughout the Government there are hundreds of these officials working endless hours on justifications for their special responsibility. In fact, just today, there was delivered in my office the 1959 budget justification data for the Department of Commerce. These documents are contained in two large looseleaf volumes and run some hundreds of pages in length. Now, this is the kind of work that the members of the committee should have from our staff. The staff of the Committee on Appropriations is one of the hardest working, most dedicated group of professional people working for the Congress of the United States. They put in hours of overtime, and grind out a fabulous amount of work and information, but still cannot compete with the executive departments with their masses of material and data which are presented to the committee during our hearings. What we need is a system similar in nature to that which exists in the State of California and acts as a direct arm of the California Legislature. I refer to the joint legislative budget committee and the office of legislative auditor. If I may, I would like to give you a brief history of the foundation and development of this office in our State capital in Sacramento. In 1941 an impasse developed between the California Legislature and the Governor over the furnishing of fiscal information to the legislature. As a result, the legislature created a joint legislative budget committee with a staff headed by a legislative auditor. The first responsibility and primary job assigned to this staff was fiscal review and reporting on the administration of the State government. Each year, the staff of the committee, prepares a report on the annual budget bill and presents this report and recommendations of the senate finance committee and the assembly ways and means committee. The legislative auditor is required to analyze all items of appropriations, express or implied.

Since the time the joint budget committee was set up, many extra responsibilities have been added by the legislature. The staff has been given the task of performing reference services at the request of any member of the legislature or any legislative committee. This work has been extended to include frequently the task of outlining research programs for committees and the preparation of special reports on the operations of various branches of the State government. The State auditor himself has the duties of reporting on the estimated cost of all proposed appropriation bills, express or implied. This involves the analysis of approximately 1,000 bills. He recommends on all items of appropriation. The legislative auditor is instructed to make a recommendation for or against all items of appropriation. These recommendations are those of the legislative auditor and not the budget committee.

The auditor is instructed, following each session of the legislature, to prepare a summary of the effect of the legislative program on the financial situation of the State. He reports to the committee instances where the auditor feels that the administration is failing to carry out expressed legislative intent, and he also prepares an estimate of the ultimate cost of each new or expanded service proposed in the budget or in appropriation bills. He proposes changes in law to effect economies in operation or more effective administration and also recommends methods by which research studies designed to secure efficiency and economy should be made.

Another important function of the legislative auditor is to serve as a watchdog for the legislature in the executive departments of the State. His staff continuously and constantly looks into the operations of each of the various agencies and departments and oversees their operations by supervising these departments and making sure they carry out the legislative policy as set down by the senate and the assembly. This is what is necessary here at the Federal level by making sure that the Federal departments are closely observed on a continuous basis by the staff of the Committee on Appropriations.

So, Mr. Chairman, you can see that the post of legislative auditor is one of sweeping and powerful responsibilities. Over the years this position has become one of great stature in the structure of government in the State of California and has been of outstanding assistance and help to the members of the State legislature. It has been my feeling for a long time that if such a post was established at the Federal level, by the two bodies of the Congress, each operating either as a single unit or as a joint body, we would all benefit greatly by such a service and would find that our operations and effectiveness as a deliberative and legislative body would be improved.

Mr. Chairman, we as members of the Committee on Appropriations have been assisted in our deliberations by the GAO and by their staff people. But, if we are going to carry out the ideas that I have expressed here during this debate, we should have a full staff of people from GAO, at least 100 on the other side of Congress and possibly 200 here on the House side, so that we can do a job of really investigating and supervising the functions and operations of the executive branch of Government.

This will be a long program, I know, to have such a change made in the structure of the operations of the Committee on Appropriations, but I feel that during the discussion of this particular bill, we have been given an opportunity to fully talk about and consider all the ramifi-

cations of our present budgeting and appropriation procedures. It has been an especially opportune time for a discussion of improvements that could be made a part of the present system and it seems to me that the establishment of a congressional auditor working for the Committee on Appropriations would be a significant step in the right direction of improving our present method of budget and fiscal appropriation procedures.

And I would like to close by saying that if we don't do something like I have recommended today to the House which will adopt procedures and methods which will give us more information from our employees under control of the Committee on Appropriations, then such proposals as this bill, H. R. 8002, will be proposed again and again and more authority will be shifted to the executive branch and on that day I say, God help the taxpayers of the United States.

Propaganda Advertising Not Tax Deductible

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES W. VURSELL
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 6, 1958

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Speaker, with leave to extend my remarks, I desire to include the following in the RECORD:

PROPAGANDA ADVERTISING NOT TAX DEDUCTIBLE

Mr. Speaker, for many months past, there has been publicity by private power organizations in the press and in magazines throughout the country, large and expensive ads, by the American Independent Electric Light and Power Companies, practically all of which appear to me to misrepresent the facts, with the result that these ads cannot be justified on the grounds of rendering a public service.

Such ads appear in the October 1957 issue of Redbook and the Reader's Digest, and in the October 1, 1957, issue of Look magazine.

Mr. Speaker, these ads appear to be a series of propaganda ads sponsored by a national group of electric utility companies, and, of course, paid for by the customers of these companies. I understand that the space for the ads in these three magazines alone cost about $56,000.

Mr. Speaker, it seems clear that the purpose of these ads is to prejudice the people against the Electric Power Cooperatives—hoping to gain favor for the private power industry.

I think there's plenty of room in this country for both the private power industry and the REA network cooperatives of the Nation who have been doing such a splendid job in bringing light and power to rural America.

Mr. Speaker, some of these ads complain that, whereas taxes allegedly constitute 23 cents of every revenue dollar paid to private utility companies, "People who get electricity from Federal Government electric systems * * * are privileged people."

The ads claim that "electric cooperatives pay a far smaller tax—only a fraction of the taxes paid by private power customers" because, the ad concludes, "a strange twist in Federal law exempts them (meaning the cooperatives) from paying most of the taxes in electric bills * * * because they get their electricity from Federal electric systems," meaning the REA.

The facts are that the REA is a nonprofit organization and, like all other nonprofit organizations, is exempt from income taxes. Of course, the private utilities' organization publishing the ads knew this quite well, but left the misleading inference to the contrary. The private utilities pay income taxes because they are in the business for profit, and income taxes to corporations and individuals alike are assessed on profits.

Despite the claims of the advertisement, there is no law which exempts anyone from paying taxes merely because he is a purchaser of Federal power. If that were true, the very power companies which sponsor the ads, and which purchase much more Federal power than do the nonprofit cooperatives, would themselves be exempt from the taxes about which they most complain.

These advertisements are designed not to build good will, not to sell electricity, not to render a public service, but solely and exclusively to destroy whatever small competitive influence exists in the electric utility business. Their motivation is the destruction of the Federal power program which in many areas has made possible rural electrification, and which helps to make feasible the irrigation of arid lands, the abatement of floods, and the deepening of navigation channels in our major rivers.

Mr. Speaker, the Federal Power Commission, I understand, about a year ago set a precedent prohibiting such propaganda ads from being classified as an "operating-expense deduction before taxes." This action should reduce such propaganda advertising activities.

Jobs After 40—Resolution

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KENNETH J. GRAY
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, January 8, 1958

Mr. GRAY. Mr. Speaker, one of the most serious problems facing this Nation today is the plight of our unemployed. Particularly those over 40 years of age. My congressional district of southern Illinois is one of those classed by the United States Department of Labor as having a very substantial labor surplus. I have repeatedly urged the Congress and the administration to help distressed areas. In this connection the Fraternal Order of Eagles has started a campaign to aid the jobless and have titled their crusade "jobs after 40." I join them in this effort and have introduced legislation designed to help provide jobs. Under leave granted I wish to include the following resolution unanimously passed by the Herrin, Ill., Aerie of the Fraternal Order of Eagles:

Whereas the Fraternal Order of Eagles is engaged in a nationwide jobs-after-40 campaign to eliminate age discrimination in employment as an unwarranted practice which is depriving many thousands of physically sound, skilled, and experienced workers of the means of a livelihood, and which is resulting in a tragic waste of manpower in the American economy; and

Whereas there is now pending in the United States Senate bill S. 3188, introduced by Senator RICHARD L. NEUBERGER, and cosponsored by nine other Senators, to prohibit discrimination because of age in the hiring and employment of persons by Government contractors; and

Whereas enactment of such proposed legislation would provide employment for many competent workers now barred by age discrimination, and would set an inspiring example by Government for all industry for the adoption of similar policies: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That Herrin Aerie of the Fraternal Order of Eagles hereby goes on record for support of bill S. 3188, and urges enactment of this pending legislation into law.

Adopted by Herrin Aerie, Fraternal Order of Eagles, on February 13, 1958.

Giant of History

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS M. PELLY
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 13, 1958

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent I include a most worthy speech which points up George Washington as a great liberal.

A careful reading of the text of this timely and ably presented analysis of our first President will prove most rewarding, I am sure, to the contemporary leadership of our beloved Republic.

The address follows:

GEORGE WASHINGTON, THE GREAT LIBERAL

(Address by Charley F. Embree)

Back in the 1920's while Calvin Coolidge was President, one of his visitors went to some length to play down the great importance of George Washington. President Coolidge listened with the patience for which he was noted until the visitor had finished his remarks. Then, Mr. Coolidge, who was the master of the succinct expression, stepped to the window of his White House study and observing the towering obelisk 555 feet 5⅛ inches high, dryly remarked: "I see his monument still stands."

While the obelisk which was the object of President Coolidge's pithy remark will always be identified in our minds as the Washington Monument, there are many others. Our Capital City in which the obelisk stands is a monument to his memory and it is only appropriate that it should be named Washington. It is also fitting that nearly every State in our great Republic has a city or town named in his honor. Thirty counties are so identified in his memory. Lakes, islands, parks, squares, rivers, and mountains have been honored with his name.

Our own great State of Washington is one of the most important monuments to his memory and it is only fitting that his picture should be the central feature of our State flag.

Some half a dozen colleges and universities have adopted his name and have been inspired by his example of research and respect for disciplined knowledge. It is most fitting that Washington's two hundred twenty-sixth birthday should be honored on the campus of the greatest of all of these schools to bear his name. It is a distinct tribute to this great university and to the patriotic societies sponsoring this ceremony that the date of his birth is honored here.

No other man in our history better deserves this outstanding recognition. He was a monumental person. Whether it was on the battlefield of our revolution, in the council chamber of our Constitutional Con-

vention or as the first President of a struggling young Republic, he was the monument of strength, inspiration and of leadership around which lesser figures rallied. His name and his influence are such a vital part of the founding years of our Republic that whether one looks at our Constitution, our Revolutionary War or the steps leading up to the great decision to seek our freedom—wherever one looks in those wonderful years of decision, there is the monumental George Washington providing the strength, the vision, inspiration and leadership without which the issue of our independence might well have remained in doubt.

Other nations have had their revolutionary leaders who have served bravely to lead their nations through bloody struggles to freedom but have not had the necessary qualities to stabilize the newly won freedom in terms of enduring government. It is significant that Washington did. Not only did he lead us through the Revolutionary War to victory but he also led our new Republic to a position where its sovereignty was respected among nations.

Even more significant is the fact that this Republic, which he first led, has proved to have the most stable and enduring Government in the world today. No other nation worthy of recognition as a power can point to such a long history without a fundamental change in its constitutional government. The very fact of our own revolution was perhaps the deciding factor leading England to change from the absolutism of George the Third to the liberalism of a limited, constitutional monarchy.

We are accustomed to other nations referring to us as young and immature. These are relevant terms. Certainly in the matter of years of governmental stability and the ability of a nation to withstand crisis, war, and the many other trials of history, our Republic holds seniority over all nations. We have proved in the crucible of experience that George Washington and the stalwarts he led, built solid foundations indeed. Our Constitution and the Republic which he helped form have proved the lasting value of his judgment. They are the greatest monuments to his genius for leadership.

In the face of such impressive facts, it is amazing that there are those who would adopt the role of the iconoclast and attempt to downgrade this great leadership and the monuments to it. Unfortunately it is true.

They would even attack the idea of the Republic which he helped found. It is significant that our Founding Fathers agreed on one thing and that was the absolute necessity for every possible protection of the rights of the individual against the totalitarian state. The Constitution, therefore, contains every conceivable check against every conceivable potential for dictatorship. For this reason, it establishes a Federal Government which is a Republic of delegated powers at the Federal level and not a democracy subject to direct vote of the people.

George Washington and others who framed our Constitution were true liberals who believed in and fought for the absolute integrity of the freedom of the individual as opposed to the collectivist regimentation of the totalitarian state. They recognized full well the dangers inherent in a system which would permit final decisions to be entrusted to a single vote of the masses of a nation's people who might be swayed by a demagog of the moment.

At this point all of us should be reminded that Hitler became a dictator through a democratic process. It took but one vote of the people of Germany to make the power of Hitler absolute and final to the extent that only a bloody world war could undo the tragic decision of one hasty vote. Similarly, Caesar, Napoleon, and Mussolini became absolute dictators in response to a shouting mob of people swayed for the moment to will away their freedom.

Our Constitution, which reflects Washington's leadership in so many ways, slows up the final decision and subjects it to the checks and balances of repeated examination and the maturity of delayed judgment before becoming final.

Those who speak glibly of democracy at the level of our Federal Government would do well to weigh these facts of the Republic which have been responsible for making this most stable Government and the greatest guarantor of individual liberty in the world today.

On the other hand, our Constitution provides the maximum of democracy at the lower level of government where all can know the candidates for office and be in a position to weigh their day-to-day decisions after election in the light of election-day promises and contemporary developments. At this level, the direct will and voice of the people is of fundamental importance. At this level, the people themselves can and should exercise the maximum of democracy which means the exercise of direct control by the people where they are in a position to know every detail of government and exercise their sovereign judgment in seeing to it that their will is carried out.

It is most significant, however, that there are many in our land today who would reverse these conditions and it is regrettable that they have identified themselves as liberals. These people would destroy democracy at the level where the people are in a position to exercise it effectively and would concentrate the powers, reserved by our Constitution to the States, in the Federal Government.

If anyone questions this, it is suggested that he but look at the many functions of government formerly committed entirely to the State, county, and local governments and school districts which have been either transferred to or are under the regimented, centralized control of the Federal Government today.

Each step in this direction has represented a loss of democracy although it has resulted from democratic process. This is the sad feature of free democracy: Like the free individual, it can commit suicide.

Even more alarming is the fact that these same people who have so unrightly identified themselves as liberals work determinedly to destroy democracy at the lower levels and to transfer the concept of democracy to the Federal level.

Having been so successful in influencing the people to transfer their democratic functions to a level of government where direct support of the people is compulsory but direct supervision by the people is an utter impossibility, these same individuals would now ask the people to forgo all aspects of the Republic which guarantees that supervision.

Should this be accomplished in fact, all that would be required would be a single vote of the people which could result in the same mistake which the German, French and Latin peoples have made after the functions of government had all been concentrated at top level in a collectivist state. From collectivism to dictatorship requires but one mistaken vote in a democracy at the federal level as Germany's experience with Hitler proved.

In this connection, there are many signs:

Dr. E. Merrill Root of Earlham University has made an intensive study of this and I have his written permission to quote his findings as published in Mercury magazine, December 1957 issue. Professor Root has analyzed 12 leading textbooks of American history now being used in our schools and he has this to say and I am quoting him directly: "In not one of these 12 histories that I studied is there any mention in the index of the word 'republic'. On the other hand, 'democracy' is in every index and mostly at great length.".

It should be of interest to note that not a single President of the United States ever referred to this great country of ours as a democracy until 1913. Every President prior to 1913 had uniformly referred to our country as a republic which was the intent of our Founding Fathers. Since that time, the meaning of the word "democracy" like the meaning of the word "liberal" has been abused and distorted. It is important that we pay more respect to and take fewer liberties with semantics.

George Washington was a true liberal and it is only right that we should refer to him as "the great liberal." Today, he undoubtedly would be identified as a libertarian.

One of the outstanding qualities of Washington was his integrity and the consistency with which he pursued a course of action. Dr. Homer Cunningham; professor of history at Whitworth College has pointed to these qualities which in themselves made Washington a standout success over the abject failure of Benedict Arnold who, though probably possessing considerably more ability than did Washington, yet failed because he lacked the essentials of integrity and consistent dedication to a course of action. Washington became the hero-patriot while Arnold became the villain-traitor.

But those who would downgrade our governmental system which Washington led in establishing would also downgrade Washington. As long as the memory of the founder stands out in monumental and heroic proportions he would continue to inspire the kind of individual freedom which is anathema to those advocating collectivist regimentation under the abused term "democracy."

The same authors of the American history textbooks referred to above as having been analyzed by Dr. E. Merrill Root have contributed wittingly or unwittingly to the downgrading of Washington. Again, I am quoting directly from Dr. Root as published in the same issue of American Mercury magazine: "If you will read these histories, you will learn that George Washington was a dreadful fellow for he belonged to 'the gentry'; he owned 'property'; he was an 'aristocrat'; he was against 'the common people'; he was a 'reactionary.'"

This is the man referred to as "of the gentry" who served his country without cost to the Nation—and so won freedom for all the people. This is the man of "property" who stubbornly presided over our constitutional convention and helped provide the basis for the greatest protection of private property with more people enjoying the blessings of ownership on a more equitable and broader basis than in any other nation of the world. This is the "aristocrat" who fought to destroy the right to inherit rank or title and helped establish a government where titles of nobility are constitutionally forbidden. This is the man who stands head and shoulders above all others for what he did for the common people. If he were a "reactionary" he led the most revolutionary movement which resulted in the most progressive government known to the world up to that time.

In the light of the criticism from the pygmies of today it might be well to see what the giants among our founding fathers thought of this man whose birthday we honor today. Patrick Henry, referring to the members of the Continental Congress, said "Colonel Washington * * * is a man of more solid judgment and information than any man on the floor."

Edmund Randolph described him in unglamorous terms but as "possessing a fund of qualities which had no specific direction to any particular calling, but were instruments for any crisis." As farmer, surveyor, soldier, statesman, Washington's talents provided leadership when leadership was vital.

John Adams was asked who nominated Washington to the chief command of our Revolutionary forces and he pointed out that "it might be affirmed that he (Washington) most unconsciously nominated himself." Washington was simply the only choice and everyone at the time knew it. To demonstrate the true bigness of Washington, he realized that he was the logical man to head the Revolutionary Army and he knew that whoever undertook this responsibility would have to do so at great sacrifice. In order to avoid having to be entreated to undertake the responsibility, he merely reported to the Congress in uniform and this act of acquiescence made further discussion unnecessary.

Adams once described Washington thus: "There is something charming to me in the conduct of Washington. A gentleman of one of the first fortunes upon the continent, leaving his delicious retirement, his family and friends, sacrificing his ease, and hazarding all in the cause of his country. His views are noble and disinterested. He declared when he accepted the mighty trust that he would lay before us an exact account of his expenses, and not accept a shilling for pay."

In our own day, Rupert Hughes has very well evaluated this giant of our history with these words: "George Washington is infinitely more appealing, pitiful, heartbroken, tragic, gay, witty, tender, gracious, tactful, fearless, ferocious, heroic, and at his loftiest, sublime than the dull gray bore manufactured by stupid dullards, stodgy politicians and mongers of untruisms."

There are many lessons which we can learn from a review of George Washington's true story and one of these is the value of prayer in time of crisis because Washington was a man of prayer. He was a Christian who recognized the brotherhood of man under Almighty God. In problems affecting men he sought the guidance of God.

On opening the Constitutional Convention there was a short debate as to whether the meetings should be opened with prayer. Alexander Hamilton led those opposed and acidly remarked that he felt the delegates were equal to any exigency and saw no reason for calling "in foreign aid." Washington led in rebuking Hamilton with a look that was more eloquent than words. Without further debate all the other delegates followed suit and a chaplain was appointed and the precedent established of seeking God's guidance over our Nation's business. What a contrast to the opening of the United Nations conferences in San Francisco. Who knows how much the course of history could have been changed had a leader with Washington's spiritual stature been there to rebuke those who arranged for the United Nations sessions to be opened without prayer and so destined that organization's deliberations to be conducted without first seeking divine guidance.

Those who would ignore the tremendous significance of this Republic's struggle for freedom and Washington's vital role of leadership in that conflict should be reminded of one of George Santayana's wisest sayings: "Those who cannot remember the past are condemned to repeat it."

On this heroic day, let all of us remember that past and the man, George Washington, who led us through those days of revolutionary crisis to the freedom of the Republic with which we are blessed today and thank Almighty God that, like Calvin Coolidge, we too can see his monument still standing.

Economic Outlook for United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ANTONI N. SADLAK
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 6, 1958

Mr. SADLAK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, it gives me great pleasure to include the syndicated article by the noted and esteemed columnist and magazine writer, Mr. David Lawrence. The article appeared in over 275 newspapers, 1 of them being the Evening Star, Washington, D. C., Thursday, March 6, 1958.

The article follows:

PROPOSED 5-YEAR GRADUATED TAX PLAN HELD KEY TO NEW ERA OF PROSPERITY

(By David Lawrence)

The business situation in America has become the most important news story in the world today. It is more important than any summit conference or the launching of satellites. All Europe is anxiously watching the business trends here. For if America's economic strength is sapped by a deep depression, the Communists would be given an opportunity for victories in many parts of the globe without firing a shot.

Which way will business go? Here are 3 directions in which the economic curve in America may be charted in the next 12 months:

1. The declines could go deeper. The psychological effect of this might cause a mood of hesitation and reluctance to go ahead even in businesses that are fundamentally sound.

2. There could be an upturn this summer or this autumn. A steady recovery would then ensue throughout next year.

3. There might be a sidewise movement as business bumps along the bottom for a while, with no sign as to just when in 1958 the upturn would start.

The most important information that businessmen are eager to get now is in the answer to the question "When will the bottom be reached?"

If businessmen were convinced, for instance, that the bottom already had been reached—as a few observers seem to think—planning could begin now with real confidence. But it takes a little while to determine whether a bottom mark has actually been recorded. Too often the weekly or monthly figures are changed by statistics the following week or month. There must be signs of a continuous trend in order to be sure of what is happening. The February unemployment figures will become available about March 12, but the truly important figures are those for the month of March, which will not be ready for disclosure until the middle of April. If those figures show a decline in unemployment, the news will be heartening to the Nation.

Unfortunately, there has been an overemphasis on unemployment figures as the sole indicator of business conditions.

For the truth is there were only 340,000 fewer persons at work in January 1958 than in January 1957. There were, however, more than 900,000 workers added to the Nation's labor force in 1957, and these, together with the usual number out of jobs for personal or other reasons, brought the total of unemployed up to 4.5 million in January.

What can be done to create 900,000 more jobs a year and to absorb more and more workers from the normally unemployed total? There is only one answer—incentives to business enterprises.

Lots of talk has been heard lately about how the Soviets give incentives and stimulate their scientists by special treatment. But the principle is even more significant in a free economy. Tax revision of the right kind is perhaps the most important stimulus that could be given American business of all kinds. It's the policy that performed a miracle in West Germany, just as the lack of incentives has retarded Britain's postwar recovery.

What ought to be done in America probably will not be done because there isn't as yet a majority in Congress willing to take a long look ahead and plan not just for the few months of 1958 but for several years.

Prosperity—bigger than any the United States has ever experienced—would, for example, follow the passage of a measure like the bill sponsored by Representative SADLAK, of Connecticut, Republican, and Representative HERLONG, of Florida, Democrat. It would revise the whole income tax structure, to take effect over a 5-year period, so that eventually the country would have a rate schedule ranging from 15 to 42 percent for individual incomes and an overall rate of 42 percent for corporations. Referring to this bill, the First National City Bank Letter, which is noted among businessmen for its down-to-earth analyses of the business situation, says:

"It is doubtful if any action Congress could take would so brighten the economic outlook and revitalize efforts to produce and sell and go ahead."

This is echoed by Dr. Charles F. Phillips, an economist and president of Bates College. He says a plan of this kind would bring in enough revenue to keep the budget balanced.

For, by making the tax rates productive instead of restrictive, America would get more and more tax receipts from business. The new rates would encourage persons of high income to invest their savings in new enterprises. It would help all companies to build up surpluses so that they would have the money available to modernize plant and equipment.

The best way to get more tax revenues for the Federal Government is to give business—which has the major task of creating jobs—a tax rate that provides a real incentive to progress and expansion. It is the road to full employment.

This is sound economics, and it could be sound politics, too. But the majority in Congress will hesitate to favor such a plan until it is backed by an overwhelming public opinion.

Anniversary of the Birth of Thomas G. Masaryk

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 6, 1958

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, tomorrow is the anniversary of the birth of Thomas G. Masaryk, the founder and first President of the Czechoslovak Republic. It is fitting that we commemorate this anniversary, not only because he was one of the great statesmen and democratic leaders of the century, but also because of his many close ties with this country.

Thomas Masaryk was a close friend of one of our greatest leaders, Woodrow

Wilson. Indeed, it was in part through President Wilson's policy of self-determination that the Czechoslovak Republic came into being. The Constitution of the Republic which Thomas Masaryk helped to frame was based in large part on the Constitution of the United States. In many other ways this great man helped bring our two democracies together.

A strong spirit and bond of friendship exist to this day between the peoples of the United States and Czechoslovakia. Unfortunately, the ruthless, aggressive actions of the Soviets have ended free communication with Czechoslovakia. We look forward to that happy day when the undying resistance of this brave nation will triumph over the oppressive domination of the Soviet tyrants.

Trinity River

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. A. L. MILLER
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 6, 1958

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I sent a letter to the senior Member of the other body from California relative to the Trinity River project in that State. It seems certain that reclamation in California will be struck a deadly blow unless the partnership plan is adopted in which the power revenues would aid and assist reclamation in the Central Valley project.

The irrigators of the Central Valley project should be keenly aware that unless this partnership plan is adopted that there will be less money to assist them in the payoff on reclamation. If the Government develops the Trinity River power project, it will be selling power for less than the cost of production. The partnership plan would help reclamation in California.

The letter follows:

FEBRUARY 19, 1958.

The Honorable WILLIAM F. KNOWLAND,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR KNOWLAND: It was with a great deal of satisfaction that I read your recent statement expressing emphatic approval of the partnership plan of joint development of the power facilities at the Trinity River project in California.

This indicates your usual sound and courageous thinking on matters of this kind. You have again demonstrated to my mind that you reflect the views of the majority of sound thinking people, not only in California but in the rest of the Nation.

In this connection, I would like to call your attention to an excellent factual study of the Trinity case which has just reached my desk. I refer to the last bill analysis, dated February 18, 1958, which has been issued by one of the Nation's leading nonpartisan economic research organizations, the American Enterprise Association of Washington, D. C. These are the same bill analyses which deal with the pros and cons of current legislation and which are regularly circulated among a large number of the Members of Congress.

Though there are points which can be stated on both sides, the bill analysis shows clearly that the only sound course is to pass legislation which will permit joint developments of the power features of the Trinity project. I might say that I was particularly impressed with this document on the views favorable to joint development by professors at Harvard University and University of Chicago—two of our top-ranking institutes of higher learning.

There is one feature of the bill analysis which was pointed up very forcefully and which disturbs me greatly. It is the simple fact that under all-Federal development the power feature at Trinity would actually be a drain on the California Central Valley project. The document shows that if this procedure is followed in California and other parts of the West, reclamation would receive a body blow.

You realize, of course, that historically power has been regarded as the paying partner of reclamation. As you know, the very act authorizing the Central Valley project provides specifically that power revenues shall aid and assist the water features of the project. I am also pleased to add that the Secretary of the Interior was specific on this same point when he appeared before our committee on February 3, 1958.

It is important for all of us who are truly interested in reclamation to recognize that an all-Federal project at Trinity would reverse this historical pattern and thus hit reclamation a deadly blow. I might illustrate in terms of a proposal now before our committee, which concerns the San Luis project in your State. This project, as you know, would require substantial financial assistance from the Central Valley project. If this assistance is jeopardized by an all-Federal Trinity development, the prospect at San Luis would be bleak indeed.

On the other hand, joint development would provide substantial additional revenues to the Central Valley project which, together with Federal tax payments, would assist materially other projects in California and the West.

This question of assistance to reclamation is no small one. For example, testimony by the Secretary of the Interior and others before our committee (the same matter is clearly analyzed in the bill analysis to which I referred before) emphasized the fact that Federal power at Trinity would be sold at an average of 4.6 mills per kilowatt hour which is only slightly above half its production cost of 8.9 mills. This is equivalent to a loss to the Federal Government of about $4 million annually which would be just the reverse of the intended function of power facilities.

Each of us is vitally interested in reclamation in his area. In my general territory, there are many projects contemplated in the Missouri Basin, the Upper Colorado River and so on. If the unsound principle of selling power from reclamation projects at less than Government cost is applied to other projects in the West, there can be only one result: Our water needs will go unfilled, and our States' economic growth will be stunted. That would be a terrible price to pay for a mistaken power policy. Let me add that the bill analysis already mentioned supports about the same conclusion.

Similarly, may I call your attention to the way in which joint development at Trinity would help meet the Nation's temporary unemployment problem. We have a huge national debt. This cannot be allowed to rise without limit. Joint development at Trinity would save the Government $60 million, which means that employment-generating reclamation projects now held back for lack of funds could get the go-ahead again to the extent of $60 million if Congress approves the partnership plan advocated by the Secretary. Some of the presently excluded reclamation projects are in my territory, and some are in your State. You know, for example, of the problems connected with California's Sacramento Valley canals. These canals were authorized by our committee, but I can't help wondering how the funds for the canals would be obtained when the appropriation committees of Congress realize that $60 million in reclamation funds were unnecessarily diverted to Trinity power facilities, especially when such division actually results in such power being sold at less than cost thereby draining off some of the financial assistance required for the canals unit.

Again, I want to express my appreciaton of your generous interest in reclamation and water conservation. I am sure your State and the West will be in much better position to secure needed reclamation funds if your counsel is heeded. I am sure that many thoughtful people in your State and throughout the West will applaud your forthright stand in the interest of reclamation and needed water resources development.

Sincerely yours,

A. L. MILLER,
Member of Congress,
Fourth District, Nebraska.

The Significance of the Bill of Rights Today—A Winning Essay by Junior High School Student, Compton, Calif.: To Wit, Miss Diane Olsen

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLYDE DOYLE
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, January 8, 1958

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, by reason of unanimous consent heretofore granted me so to do, I have great pleasure in presenting to the attention of your own distinguished self and that of all my colleagues in this great legislative body, a brief, but very pertinent, essay by the winning junior high school student at Roosevelt Junior High School, Compton, Calif., to wit: Miss Diane Olsen, 16723 South Muriel Avenue, Compton, Calif.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to further inform you that a considerable number of junior and senior high schools in the great 23d District of California emphasize in their daily classes the importance of a knowledge of the Constitution of the United States and the Declaration of Independence to the education and daily experience of their students.

The essay here set forth was the winning essay as third place winner which brought a $50 savings bond award to the author in the Los Angeles County-wide Bill of Rights essay contest for junior high school students; the population of Los Angeles County being approximately 6 million people.

The distinguished instructor of the English class at Roosevelt Junior High School, Mr. Edwin Burk, has so thoroughly imbued his students with desiring a thorough knowledge of the Constitution of the United States and the Bill

of Rights portion thereof, that I am informed his class also produced first place and third place winners in the Los Angeles Examiner Bill of Rights contest in 1957.

Miss Olsen's essay follows:

THE SIGNIFICANCE OF THE BILL OF RIGHTS TODAY

These first 10 amendments continue to survive through the years because they symbolize and insure our democratic way of life. These 10 simple inalienable rights are also known as 1 to 10, inclusive, which represent an ironbound guaranty of freedom that has endured for many years. They provide a frame of government, offer a pattern for human society, a specific program for the present, a blueprint for the future, and they also represent the whole abiding truth.

The men that constructed the most trusted rights of the United States were men who planned for the future and who sought to find words that would express the rights of the citizens of the United States.

These 10 amendments really mean something to each loyal American, in the way that they express our freedom of religion, of speech, of the press, of assembly, and of petition to the Government. They were adopted to guide us in our time and to be used by our posterity in the future years.

If these rights should be misused they would come crashing down upon us like a scientific atomic bombardment. With the help of God, and these rights, we may maintain our standard of living to be a greater and more joyous world than it is now.

Manufacturer, 80, Trusts God, Sees Firm Grow

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WATKINS M. ABBITT

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 6, 1958

Mr. ABBITT. Mr. Speaker, in these times of large stock-holding corporations and industrial empires, I think it would be fitting and proper for us to pay our respects to the family owned companies that still do abound in our country and particularly in the Fourth Congressional District of Virginia. At this time, I am specifically thinking of the Titmus Optical Co., Inc., of Petersburg, Va., and its chairman of the board and founder, Mr. Edward Hutson Titmus.

This year, Mr. Titmus and his company are celebrating their golden anniversary in the optical business. The success of this business is indeed an inspiration to similarly determined men and a glowing example of America's free enterprise system. In the past 50 years, the Titmus Optical Co. grew from a three-man operation to the largest independent manufacturer of ophthalmic lenses in the world and today employs over 1,300 people. But even today, just as in its inception, the company is owned and controlled by the Titmus family. Mr. E. H. Titmus, Jr., company president and son of the founder, has demonstrated the same business acumen, the same high ideals, the same respect for his fellow man, and the same deep reverence for God as his Father. I am proud to say I can claim both of these men as personal friends of mine.

The growth of this concern demonstrates the soundness of the private enterprise system that has been the foundation stone of the republican form of government. Individual initiative and determination to apply one's capabilities has made America great. We must not forget that even today individuals must and can take care of themselves and forge ahead without depending upon a paternalistic government.

On Monday, February 10, 1958, there appeared in the Richmond News Leader, Richmond, Va., a very fine article by Mr. John Lee giving the high spots of the life of Mr. Edward Hutson Titmus and some of the background and development of the Titmus Optical Co. It is a most interesting article and one that should give encouragement to our young people and to those men and women who are struggling to maintain the private enterprise system in America.

Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the article which is as follows:

MANUFACTURER, 80, TRUSTS GOD, SEES FIRM GROW

(By John Lee)

"I, Edward Hutson Titmus, was born March 27, 1877, on Cross Street, Petersburg, Va. I do not know the exact tenement, but it was either No. 437 or No. 439."

So begins a thin, blue-bound volume of recollections written by the founder of Titmus Optical Co. of Petersburg. The title of the book is "Looking Through the Lens."

"You want to know why I wrote it?" Titmus said matter-of-factly. He rested in an old swivel chair in his plain, unassuming office in the main building of the sprawling plant in downtown Petersburg.

The office floor was highly polished hardwood. Over the door were mounted a half dozen or so fish, all bass. Family portraits crowded onto a bric-a-brac shelf in the corner.

Beneath a large piece of glass which covered the desk, was a card bearing the words, "Keep Smiling."

WANTED TO WRITE

Titmus looked at the card, smiled and said, "I just had it in my mind that I wanted to write a book for my children and my grandchildren."

He reached across the desk, took a copy of his autobiography off a pile of the books and thumbed the pages. His round face brightened and his keen eyes flashed as he warmed to his subject. He set the book down emphatically.

"I also wanted to give testimony on what a man can do," he said, "if he trusts God and stands fast in his faith and his labors."

Titmus, a compact man of 80, spry and good humored, has let religion play a great part in his life. He is extremely modest of his own achievements and prefers to point to the success of his company as an example of what one man and the Lord can do.

BOARD CHAIRMAN

He is now chairman of the board of the company that calls itself the world's largest independent manufacturer of ophthalmic lenses.

Titmus still goes to the office for a few hours every day, if the weather permits. But he has relinquished most of the executive duties to his son, Hutson Titmus, Jr., 44, who succeeded his father as president several years ago.

It was the elder Titmus who firmly established a small jewelry store 50 years ago and then built it into one of the country's leading manufacturing optical companies.

Titmus was 14 when he left school to go to work. He got a job in a jewelry and watch repair business and was paid $1.50 for a 60-hour week. Times were hard, but after a few years he managed to go to Philadelphia Horological College to study watchmaking, engraving, and optics.

He returned to Petersburg late in 1898, and continued his work for someone else until 1902. In that year—"with $35 in cash, my watchmaker's tools and some knowledge of the business," as he writes in his book—Titmus opened his own shop.

BUMPY MOMENTS

The business had some bumpy moments, but it survived. In 1908, Titmus—believing that there was an opportunity for a wholesale and prescription optical business in Petersburg—organized the Titmus Optical Co.

The firm began experimenting with the manufacture of lenses for glasses in the rear of the jewelry shop. Despite a disastrous fire that wiped out the stock, despite financial adversity and rugged competition, the company began to grow.

But there were some difficult times.

After World War I, for example the two largest optical companies in the country were buying up the independent jobbers, many of them Titmus customers. Business conditions were bad, and it was common gossip that Titmus was about to lose all that he had.

"During the darkest days of that period," Titmus recalled, with the air of a man reliving one of the significant events of his life, "I was one day in Mr. Ashby Hardy's barber shop.

SCRIPTURE VERSE

"I was lying in one of his barber chairs just wondering what would happen next, when, like a bolt of lightning out of a clear sky, the following verse of Scripture came into my mind:

"'In all thy ways acknowledge Him, and He will direct thy paths.'

"This passage gave me assurance," Titmus went on, "that if my friends would continue to have faith in me, everything would come out all right in time and it made me realize that for God to do His part, it is necessary for us to do all that we can."

Titmus said that event has brought him great peace of mind.

At one point during his business career, he was having labor troubles. But when he went home at night, he would go to bed and sleep soundly, not worrying about a thing. He was confident he had done all he could and nothing else could be expected.

It's such an attitude, Titmus feels, that has enabled him to build his business. He feels also that success carries with it obligations.

Now, when his days are quiet and he finds himself with a little time, he likes to visit friends in the hospital. His charity, however, also takes more material form through the Titmus Foundation, Inc., which he set up in 1950.

FINANCIAL AID

The foundation gives financial assistance to a wide range of religious, charitable, scientific, and educational organizations.

It is responsible for a cottage at Baptist Children's Home in Salem, and for the Titmus Eye Foundation which is doing basic eye research at Medical College of Virginia.

One of the major recipients of funds is Petersburg General Hospital. One of his gifts resulted in a nursing educational building which is named in honor of his first wife, the late Maud Huddleston Titmus.

Charity and business now are the two prime elements in Titmus' activities. He and his wife, the former Cecile Mayton of Petersburg, live only 2 blocks from the Titmus plant.

The company's founder, although phasing out of active management, still casts his shadow over activities there. Many of the employees have been with the company almost as long as it has existed and the almost paternalistic spirit that prevails is the way Titmus wants it.

But the days of individualism and the personal business are passing. In recent years, outside experts in optics have been brought in and the company now operates as a team.

LOOKING AHEAD

Titmus realizes that those are the methods which must be followed in today's business world and he is proud that the company is looking ahead.

Titmus Optical Co., now celebrating its golden anniversary, employs 1,300 persons and has 260,000 square feet of manufacturing space in its complex of red brick buildings.

It ranks fourth nationally in the overall optical business. In addition to its ophthalmic lens department, it has departments for the manufacture of frames and a full line of sun wear.

It now is entering the instrument field and is producing a vision tester for industrial use. Its manufacture of optical products for industry is growing.

And the first of the year it concluded an agreement with Polarizers International for the manufacture of Titmus products in Sydney, Australia.

It is more than 9,000 miles from Petersburg to Sydney.

Excessive Imports of Crude Oil Create Widespread Unemployment in Our Domestic Industry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD H. REES
OF KANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 5, 1958

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent I am including a copy of a resolution adopted by the Independent Oil Producers' Association of Kansas.

The resolution concerns a serious condition in the oil-producing business that has come about largely because of excessive imports of foreign oil into the United States.

Whereas due to decreased domestic consumption and continued excessive and unjustified imports of foreign oil, the supply of domestic oil substantially exceeds domestic demand, which has resulted in pipeline proration and sporadic price cuts, which will spread unless supply and demand are brought into balance; and

Whereas a general cut in the price of crude oil, coming at a time when the industry is weakened by constantly mounting costs which have not been offset by any increase in the price of crude oil would necessarily result in drastic curtailment of exploratory activities, with accompanying widespread unemployment within the industry and damage to the economy of the State as a whole: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, by the Board of Directors of Kansas Independent Oil and Gas Association:

1. That this association recommends to the State Corporation Commission, Conservation Division, that the daily allowable production for the month of March 1958, be reduced 10 percent below the daily allowable for the month of February 1958.

2. That this association deplores the continued excessive imports of foreign oil and urges the Federal authorities to take such action forthwith as is necessary to enforce a like reduction in the amount of imports.

3. That a copy of this resolution be sent to each Senator and Representative from Kansas.

Plywood Industry Needs Protection From Japanese Plywood Imports

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RUSSELL V. MACK
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 6, 1958

Mr. MACK of Washington. Mr. Speaker, the Portland Oregonian, of Portland, Oreg., one of the largest newspapers in the Pacific Northwest, carried a top-of-the-column front page news story last Friday which said, "widespread plywood plant shutdowns will idle thousands of Oregon, Washington, and northern California workers."

The Oregonian news story went on to say that some of these plywood plants are closing for an indefinite period and that others have announced a shutdown of 1 week to 10 days. Other plywood plants, says the Oregonian, are working on a curtailed workweek basis.

Reason for the shutdowns, says the Oregonian, is that the price of plywood—one-fourth inch AD grade—dropped from $80 last fall to $72 by January 1, 1958, and by March 1, 1958, to $64. The price of plywood today is the lowest in 20 years and plywood mills no longer can be operated at a profit. When a plant is down and idle its expenses, in some instances—taxes, management, watchmen, interest on loans, maintenance, and so forth—still continue. The management finds that it costs less to be closed down than to operate and so are closing their plants.

What has brought the plywood industry to this low level in employment and prosperity? One of the main reasons is too heavy imports of plywood produced by Japanese labor which is paid only 11½ cents an hour compared to a wage of $1.85 an hour in the plywood industry of the United States.

The Oregonian in its news story on plywood plant closures which are idling thousands of Oregon, Washington, and northern California workers, gave a list of the plants which have closed for indefinite periods and for 1 week to 10 days. This list includes the following plants scattered in widely scattered areas:

Oregon: Pacific Plywood, Dillard; Grants Pass Plywood, Grants Pass; Coquille Valley Lumber Co. plywood plant at Milwaukie; Coquille Valley Lumber Co. plywood plant at Swisshome; Medford Valley Plywood, Medford; Oregon Veneer, Medford; Custom Plywood, Grants Pass; Industrial Plywood, Coos Bay; Brookings Plywood, Brookings; Cascades Plywood, Cascades; and Western States Plywood, Bandon. Most of these plants employ 100 to 400 workers each. The idled Cascades plant is the largest plywood plant in the world and employs about 1,000.

Washington: Centralia Plywood, Centralia; Mount Baker Plywood, Bellingham; Hoquiam Plywood, Hoquiam; Elma Plywood, Elma; Hardel Plywood, Olympia; and Totem Plywood, Olympia.

Northern California: Interstate Container, Red Bluff; Durable Plywood, Arcata; Lund Plywood, Crescent City; and Northern California Plywood, Crescent City.

American plywood producers obviously cannot compete with the low-wage rates of Japan.

Japan last year shipped $60 million of plywood into the United States. These shipments were the equivalent of the output of 12 large American plywood plants employing 150 to 400 workers each. The Japanese plywood imports took away the jobs of 5,000 American plywood plant workers and also the jobs in those allied industries such as the loggers who supply the plywood mills with logs.

This breakdown in employment in the American plywood industry can be speedily corrected if the Democrat majority which now controls both Houses of Congress only will act and report to the floor of Congress a bill to limit imports of foreign hardwood plywood to 15 to 20 percent of the American consumption.

Foreign plywood last year supplied 54 percent of the domestic demand for hardwood plywood. Limit this to 15 to 20 percent of that demand, and Japan still can sell $20 million a year of her plywood in the United States which will be more plywood than Japan ever sold in the United States prior to World War II.

By limiting Japanese imports of plywood to 15 or 20 percent of the domestic hardwood plywood market, jobs for some 3,500 American plywood workers will be restored immediately, domestic production will be brought into balance with domestic demand, and plants that are idle will go back into production.

Oversupply of Domestic Oil Plus Huge Imports Has Created Unemployment and Damage to the Economy of Kansas

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD H. REES
OF KANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 5, 1958

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I am including a copy of a resolution approved by the Eastern Kansas Oil and Gas Association, Inc., protesting excessive importation of foreign oil into the United States:

Whereas the supply of domestic oil exceeds domestic demand by a substantial margin; and

Whereas foreign oil continues to be imported into the United States at an excessive and unjustified rate; and

Whereas the oversupply of domestic oil, plus the huge imports of foreign oil has resulted in pro ration and price reduction on domestic oil; and

Whereas any general reduction in the price of crude oil, coming at the time when the oil industry is paying higher prices for material and labor, would result in drastic and immediate curtailment of oil exploration which will obviously result in widespread unemployment and damage to the economy of the State of Kansas: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Board of Directors of the Eastern Kansas Oil and Gas Association—

1. That this association regrets that the importation of foreign oil should require any reduction in the daily allowable production.

2. That this association deplores and condemns the continued excessive and unjustified imports of foreign oil and urges the Federal authorities and in particular the Kansas Members of Congress to take immediate action to enforce a reduction in foreign-oil imports.

3. That a copy of this resolution be sent to each Senator and Representative from Kansas in the United States Congress.

J. O. COUCH,
President, Eastern Kansas Oil and Gas Association.
CHANUTE, KANS.

Peace Conferences or War Corpses—Which?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAROLD D. COOLEY
OF NORTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 6, 1958

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, Dr. Clarence Poe, of Raleigh, N. C., who was editor of the Progressive Farmer for 50 years and who is now senior editor and board chairman and one of the most distinguished citizens of the congressional district which I have the honor to represent, wrote an article entitled "Peace Conferences or War Corpses—Which?" which appeared in the February edition of the Progressive Farmer. The article contains much food for thought. I have obtained permission to have it inserted in the RECORD to the end that it might be read and considered by men and women throughout the Nation.

Dr. Poe's life is a blessing and a benediction to our people. He is dedicated and devoted to the cause of peace, and as a distinguished editor he is known throughout the Nation. He regards the question of war and peace as paramount to all the perplexing questions of the day and generation in which we live. Here, Mr. Speaker, I present the article by Dr. Poe:

PEACE CONFERENCES OR WAR CORPSES—WHICH?

As 1958 gets underway, there is nothing more important than the question of war or peace. Our readers, like other citizens, are asking many questions. I should like to give my best judgment about eight of them. What are your views?

I. What is the outlook for world peace as 1958 begins? War may not be a probability this year. But under present conditions it will continue to be a threat until the United States, the United Nations, and a more truly united Christianity work more zealously for world peace. This may be a year of destiny for you or your son or brother or husband. Equally, it may be a year of destiny for your wife, or sister or daughter. This is true because nuclear warfare would show no distinction between men and women, children and adults, combatants and noncombatants.

Yesterday two men were talking about the possibilities of world peace. One said, "The question of world peace may be decided either by peace conferences or war corpses." That is to say, it may be decided either by conferences or agreements among nations that will insure disarmament and save us from world war III. Or it may be settled by the numbers of men, women, and children slain in battle or by intercontinental ballistic missiles.

II. What was accomplished at the recent NATO Conference, and what leadership for peace did America display? First of all, it is plain that America and its allies were divided not in their desire for peace, but in their opinion as to how to insure peace. One group would depend almost entirely on military preparedness. The other group does not oppose increased military preparedness, but declares we should first make every possible effort to work out with Russia some plan for peaceful coexistence.

At times President Eisenhower has seemed to take one side and then the other. He appointed Harold Stassen to help work out a great program of disarmament, and then placed Stassen under Secretary Dulles whose hostility or indifference seemingly drove Stassen from office. Just before the NATO Conference, two men of worldwide influence spoke out vigorously and hopefully about the possibility of at least making a start toward some sound disarmament agreement with Russia. One of these men, George Kennen, had long experience as an able American Ambassador in Moscow, and probably knows more about Russian conditions and attitudes than any other American. Taking the same viewpoint was Lester B. Pearson, long Minister of Canada and who recently received the 1957 Nobel peace prize for having done more than anyone else to promote world peace.

III. What is the general feeling of other nations and their leaders about the year ahead?" Many fear, if Mr. Dulles has his way, that America will push military programs wholeheartedly and negotiate peace programs halfheartedly or not at all. "We push war programs like giants but peace programs like pygmies," says Mr. Pearson. We hope more American leaders in politics and religion will protest against such a course.

IV. How will war change with the use of nuclear missiles and weapons? War has become almost incredibly more disastrous than at any time in the past. In a recent appearance before a congressional committee, it was said that one all-out bomb attack on America might kill 82 million people. There has always been danger of war when two hostile nations of almost equal power faced each other. These countries could make war and hope to survive—at least the stronger of them have such a hope. But now the nature of war has changed. As Gen. Omar Bradley and other great military experts agree, "There can be no victors in modern war—only mutual suicide by both contestants." This fact is now not only accepted in the United States, but in Russia also. Russian leaders have used virtually this same identical language.

It is this change in the ruinousness of war which makes necessary a change in methods of settling disputes between nations. Not a mere layman, but the great scientist Arthur Compton tells us: "Science has created a world in which the Christian spirit is an imperative." In other words, science has given the world's military leadership colossal new powers which may destroy mankind unless we turn to a Christian spirit to save it.

V. Has dependence on military might saved other nations in the past when two nations of almost equal power have faced each other in war? No greater truth was ever uttered by Christ than His declaration, "They that take the sword shall perish with the sword." Certainly it would seem that this has been proved abundantly in our own time. Christ did not even modify His statement by saying that nations that will take the sword wil perish by the sword unless they are strong. The strong also perish. Let us consider what has happened to so-called strong nations since 1900. England was supposed to have won a great victory in World War I and again in World War II—and yet was virtually ruined. France underwent losses which have ruined it as a world power—the billions on the so-called Maginot line, by which it had thought to make itself unconquerable, wholly wasted. Highly armed Germany, Austria, Japan, and Italy were almost or quite ruined by war. The United States, in spite of only shorter participation, registered such losses in men, materials, and in its national debt as may burden us for generations.

VI. "Suppose war should come—might not America prove itself so much more powerful than Russia in men, missiles, and weapons as to insure us a quick victory?" This is what Secretary Dulles and others have seemed to be believing for several years—while our position in nearly all foreign countries has grown progressively worse. If we fail to convince other nations that we are sincerely anxious and determined to avoid war, we may lose the wholehearted support of our European allies. Millions of people in Asia and Africa may join Russia in the struggle against us.

We too often think of Russia and America as having around 180 to 200 million people each, and that therefore the balance is about equal. But two colossal facts make the risk of war with Russia so dangerous. One is that Communist Russia's 200 million people might immediately be joined by Communist China with over 600 million people. Second, the 2 form 1 solid united block, whereas the United States and its allies are separated both by oceans and vast distances and varying governments with varying opinions.

VII. "Secretary Dulles says in effect that we cannot trust the Russians, therefore there is no use or hope in trying to deal with them." Several answers may be made to this position. One is that we would certainly not act except after thought and study by the wisest leaders of our Western World nor have to agree to anything in advance. We could simply explore the possibilities of any program and then decide about it.

But, what is more important, is it not to the self-interest of Russia as well as our own self-interest to keep our two countries from being devastated by war, with possibly half their peoples killed and their industry and progress set back for a generation? With its vast area and great population, Russia can become for centuries a country of great prosperity and power if it does not commit suicide by war. Why should it wish to do so? Certainly there would seem to be a possibility that it might agree on some carefully thought out and wisely safeguarded formula that would start us toward peace and disarmament. In any case, who would say that it is not worth while for us to try it and find out?

VIII. "What about the costs of trying to find peace by (1) negotiations and disarmament, as compared with (2) the costs of depending on military weapons?" Any effort to win safety by military might is a desperate gamble. Of course, we should stay strong militarily and try to get other nations to join us in all sound military programs, but we in the South at least know that an all-out war effort is no guaranty of victory. Furthermore, with the enormous

multi-billion-dollar cost of nuclear weapons, is there not reason to ask whether ever-increasing military expenditures and Federal taxes may spend our Nation into bankruptcy and reduce our people to comparative poverty? Of course we may agree that if necessary this would not be too great a price to pay for freedom. What we are saying is this: "Is it not folly to neglect the possibilities of conference and arbitration to see if we cannot save our freedom without resorting to either war or poverty?" And if our people resolutely decide to try for peace through disarmament, America may indeed set an example not only of freedom but of the peace, progress, and prosperity for which America confidently voted in 1956. That would make both the backward nations of the world and the captive peoples of Russia likely to follow our example. They certainly will not follow us if they believe that we have no hope or plans for anything but war.

It is indeed a gruesome thing to say that the issue of war and peace is likely to be settled by conferences or corpses. But is it not folly to ignore the fact that nearly all scientists proclaim that nuclear warfare could make America one ghastly ruin and continental graveyard? In such a situation, is it not the very least we should consider to try to "agree with thine adversary quickly" (to use Christ's own phrase) by efforts at peace and disarmament, no matter how much patience may be required? And may we not try for disarmament and peace with some hope of success because peace will be equally good for ourselves and our opponents? The only alternative to coexistence may be no existence.

Unjust Criticism of Ike

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN J. RHODES
OF ARIZONA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 27, 1958

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, under leave previously granted, I would like to include the following editorial from the Arizona Daily Star of February 25 in the RECORD:

UNJUST CRITICISM OF IKE

It is time that Americans pulled themselves up short and asked whether they are showing proper respect for good people in high office.

These offices impose great responsibility and make great demands. Even people who do not like the incumbents should show understanding for them, and respect for their offices.

A sad example of the reverse occurred over the weekend, and concerned the President's use of the *Columbine* to fly Mamie and two of her friends to Phoenix so that she could spend a few days at Elizabeth Arden's Maine Chance Farm.

Some newspapers have tried to find out how much that trip actually cost the taxpayers.

President Roosevelt wasn't thus criticized for his frequent use of airplanes, warships, and other modes of transportation—including travel of his family. Nor should he have been.

President Truman underwent no such criticism for his similar use of a yacht-type vessel for cruises down the Potomac, nor should he have been.

One could go back into history even further. Several Presidents, including the frugal Calvin Coolidge, did the same thing, particularly during the years when the presidential yacht *Mayflower* was commissioned.

The public needs to remember that the President and his wife are both on duty every hour of every day. This is no mere figure of speech. The Presidency, and the First Ladyship, are jobs which observe no 8-hour day or 40-hour week.

Mamie evidently wanted to get out of the cold East and come to a place where it was warm and the sun shines and where the top-flight hospitality of Elizabeth Arden is available.

If Ike insisted on accompanying his wife to Arizona, and playing a round of golf before he returned to the East, no one should criticize him. He should be praised for the gallantry he showed his wife and for his wisdom in coming to a spot where there is real sunshine. The trip shouldn't be treated as something Ike and Mamie shouldn't have made or the taxpayers couldn't afford.

Rumanian Independence—Russian Destruction

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KENNETH B. KEATING
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 25, 1958

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, we commemorate today another in the tragically long list of Soviet power-grabs. Thirteen years ago today the Kremlin reached out the clutching claw of Communist despotism and enslaved the people of Rumania.

Few acts of history can be more truly described as a stab in the back. Although forced in the earlier stages of World War II to fight at the side of the Nazis, from September 1944 until the end of the war the Rumanian armed forces turned on their oppressors and fought gallantly with the Allies. No more fitting tribute to their ability can be found than the statement by the London Times that, despite the small size of their forces, they were the fourth most important force in the allied camp.

Despite this, despite the fact that Rumania was spending its blood and treasure to destroy the forces that had beseiged Moscow and Leningrad and Stalingrad, the Soviets took advantage of this very fact to crush the newly won independence of the Rumanian nation. Stripped of their defenses by reason of the army's absence at the front the people were overwhelmed by the masses of the Red army. By any standard this was pure, unadulterated treachery.

Even for a regime with a history so replete with deceit, deception, and hypocrisy as the Kremlin's this was unbelievably callous. Only 2 weeks before at the Yalta Conference Stalin had made pious pledges of support for democracy and free elections in all of liberated Europe. In cynical disregard of these pledges the hoards of the Red army moved in to create their own special brand of terror.

The years of occupation have more than lived up to the portent of this rape of Rumanian sovereignty. Systematic regimentation has been established by a rule of terror. The Rumanian people live in constant dread of the tramp of booted feet, the sharp knock on the door, the sudden trip to the grim walls of the concentration camp. Thousands have been torn from the arms of their loved ones for no more than an uncautious word; torn away to become human fuel for the Communist industrial machine.

Mr. Speaker, we live today in a time of strange contrasts. Our knowledge of ourselves and our physical world is growing by leaps and bounds. We have begun to tap the unknown of space. Soon the human race will soar from this planet, no longer earth bound. Yet at the very time that the human body is being unleashed there are vast areas of the world where the human spirit is being systematically crushed, brought to the level of the basest animals. The very knowledge that has been employed to free man has been perverted to debase him.

Despite the inroads made through this diabolic use of modern knowledge, the people of Rumania remain dedicated to democracy. Enslaved as they are, their minds still hold the bright hope of freedom. Many, in the face of death, have retaliated. Through sabotage and espionage they have kept alive the glimmer of resistance that perpetuates their faith in life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.

We must be ever mindful of the tragedy of these fine people and of others like them around the world. So long as they remain entombed in the marble mausoleum of atheistic communism our own freedom is in jeopardy. So long as tyranny remains extant anywhere in the world, the cause of freedom is threatened. The virulent disease of despotism must be ruthlessly stamped out, wherever it is found, before the liberty we all prize so highly will be secure.

I join with all freedom-loving peoples everywhere in the fervent hope that the day may not be far off when the torch of liberty will burn away the ropes that bind the Rumanian people, and all peoples now caught in the net of tyranny.

Gen. Casimir Pulaski

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALBERT H. BOSCH
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 18, 1958

Mr. BOSCH. Mr. Speaker, March 4, 1958, marks the 211th anniversary of the birth of Count Casimir Pulaski, who left his homeland to fight in the cause of our independence during the Revolutionary War.

I want to join with patriots everywhere in paying tribute to the memory of the "Father of American Cavalry," who died at the age of 31 when he received a mortal wound at the head of the Pulaski Legion of Cavalry in its valiant assault upon the city of Savannah.

In our preoccupation with the problems of the present, let us not forget

those courageous men who fought that we might have the right to "life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness."

Curbing the High Court

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WATKINS M. ABBITT
OF VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 6, 1958

Mr. ABBITT. Mr. Speaker, many of us who are interested in preserving our form of government realize that if we are to retain constitutional government in America we must curb the United States Supreme Court from its all-out effort to usurp power and authority it does not have. The Court is determined to remake and remold our country and take from the people rights and privileges that they have had since the founding of our Nation.

There is now pending in the Judiciary Committee of the Senate a bill introduced by Senator JENNER, which is Senate bill 2646, which has for its purpose the curtailment of the authority of the Supreme Court of the United States in certain fields of activities. This bill does not go far enough nor cover all of the fields in which the Court should be restrained but if enacted into law it will be a long step in the right direction toward curtailing the Court in some of its attempts at usurpation and return to the people, the States and the legislative branch of the Federal Government some of the rights that have been taken from them by the so-called Supreme Court.

On March 3, 1958, there appeared in the Richmond News Leader, Richmond, Va., an editorial entitled "Curbing the High Court." This is a splended editorial and points out the dangers confronting our people as a result of the Supreme Court's activities and the necessity of curbing its powers.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include this editorial which is as follows:

CURBING THE HIGH COURT

It has been nearly 90 years since the Congress of the United States, attempting to preserve a Federal statute from the probably unsympathetic hands of the Supreme Court, designedly invoked its constitutional power to limit the Court's appellate jurisdiction. Now, to the consternation of liberals and left-wingers across the country, this almost forgotten power is being revived. The Senate Judiciary Committee is giving serious consideration to a bill sponsored by Senator JENNER that would clip the wings of the highflying Justices. It is a good bill and we hope it passes.

The provisions of article III of the Constitution on which the bill is based, are little known. Most persons, if they think upon such matters at all, may imagine that the Supreme Court of the United States has some inherent or automatic power to hear all appeals from lower Federal courts and from the highest State courts. In practice, it often seems to work this way, for there are few significant cases in State courts where a Federal or constitutional question cannot be alleged.

But the fact is, of course, that the Constitution does not convey any sweeping appellate jurisdiction on the Supreme Court. What the Constitution says is that the Federal judicial power shall extend to 12 different classes of cases or controversies. In four of these clauses (cases affecting ambassadors, public ministers, and consul, and controversies in which a State may be party), the Court is to have original jurisdiction. But in all cases arising in the other eight fields, "the Supreme Court shall have appellate jurisdiction both as to law and fact, with such exceptions, and under such regulations, as the Congress shall make."

"What such exceptions and regulations should be," the first Mr. Justice Harlan once observed, "it is for Congress, in its wisdom, to establish, having of course due regard to all the provisions of the Constitution."

Generally, the exceptions and regulations established by Congress have been of a technical or procedural nature. For example, Congress in 1889 gave the Supreme Court direct appellate jurisdiction from Federal district courts in criminal cases in which the death sentence could be imposed. But in 1891, such direct appellate jurisdiction was knocked out. For another example, Congress in 1891 permitted direct appeals to the Supreme Court from district courts in cases involving the construction or application of some provision of the Constitution, but in 1925 this regulation was revised.

The one time in which Congress deliberately invoked its regulatory powers against the Court was in the spring of 1868, just 90 years ago this month. Then a Mississippi editor by the name of McCardle filed a petition for a writ of habeas corpus to compel his release from custody of military authorities acting under the Reconstruction Acts. His appeal was argued before the Supreme Court on March 9. The Congress, apprehensive that the Court would throw out all the Reconstruction Acts if it got its hands on any part of them, rushed into action. Within 18 days it passed, over Johnson's veto, an act specifically withdrawing the Court's appellate jurisdiction in such habeas corpus proceedings. The Court tamely submitted. "Without jurisdiction," said Chase, "the Court cannot proceed at all in any cause. Jurisdiction is the power to declare the law and when it ceases to exist, the only function remaining to the Court is that of announcing the fact and dismissing the case."

The broad principles acknowledged by Chase in the McCardle case, and emphasized by Harlan in the 1908 opinion quoted above, remain unquestionably the law of the land. Thus, Senator JENNER's pending bill is wholly within the power of Congress to enact. He would deny appellate jurisdiction to the Supreme Court in these 5 fields: (1) The investigative functions of Congress or congressional contempt cases; (2) the Federal employee-security program; (3) State anti-subversion laws; (4) State regulations relating to subversive activities by teachers, and (5) State laws governing the admission of persons to practice law.

Obviously, these five fields were chosen with an eye toward rebuking the Court for some of its more outrageous opinions of recent months. And just as plainly, the Court richly deserves such a rebuke. Under the leadership of Earl Warren, the Court has usurped the powers of Congress, transgressed the reserved rights of the States, emasculated laws relating to internal security, and warped the Constitution beyond recognition. It is high time the Court were disciplined.

Yet it is worth emphasizing that the Jenner bill would deny justice to no one; it would infringe no constitutional rights. Defendants in State courts in these cases simply would stop at the highest State level; defendants in Federal proceedings could go no farther than a Federal circuit court. "The constitutional requirements are all satisfied," Chief Justice Waite once commented, "if one opportunity is had for the trial of all parts of a case. Everything beyond that is a matter of legislative discretion, not of constitutional right." If as a result of the Jenner bill, constitutional questions arising from these cases were decided differently in different States or circuits, there would be no grievous national loss; in any event, there would be no judicial anarchy, as some critics have charged, to match the chaos the Supreme Court itself has created.

The significant thing about the Jenner bill is that it represents a vigorous attempt to restore a governmental balance the Warren court has arrogantly upset. Opinions of the Supreme Court, contrary to the bland assumptions of that body, do not constitute the supreme law of the land. It is the Constitution itself, and the laws and treaties of the United States made pursuant thereto, that comprise the supreme law of the land. By failing to assert its rightful powers in the past, the Congress has invited the very sort of judicial despotism from which the Republic now suffers. The assertiveness of the Jenner bill is a counterstroke against judicial tyranny, and as such it merits warm support.

Statement by Hon. John Lesinski, of Michigan, Upon Introduction of the Bill To Provide That Only 32 Hours of Service Need Be Performed by Postal Employees During Any Week in Which a Holiday Falls

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN LESINSKI
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 24, 1958

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I introduce, for appropriate reference a bill which would provide that no more than 32 hours of service would be required from postal employees during any week in which a holiday falls.

Mr. Speaker, on February 5, the Comptroller General of the United States ruled that employees who rendered service on a Saturady which also is a holiday are entitled to compensatory time and also to holiday benefits.

Under this ruling the Post Office Department has held that the benefits of the ruling could be applied only to those people actually scheduled for duty on the holiday. The Post Office Department has informed employees that the law does not grant Saturday holidays, and that accordingly the day cannot be treated as it would were it to fall between Monday and Friday. At the same time, the Comptroller General has said that to deny holiday benefits to employees working on holidays is contrary to the basic concept of the law.

In the postal field service, the handling of the mail on a 24-hour around-the-clock basis frequently disrupts what otherwise would be a holiday schedule. Employees who work on "swing" and "graveyard" shifts find it difficult to understand that just because they may be scheduled off on a holiday which also is a Saturday, they should be required under the Comptroller General's decision of February 5, to perform an additional period of service.

Accordingly, I have introduced today a bill which would make sure that holidays would be granted equally to all postal employees, regardless of the day of the week upon which they happen to fall. This would be accomplished through the simple expediency of requiring that no more than 32 hours of service would be required during any such week. In the event that more than 32 hours of service were to be required, compensatory time would be granted within the benefits and provisions of existing law.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that the idea embodied in my proposed amendment is necessary to the smooth functioning of the postal service. I hope that early action can be taken.

Aircraft Nuclear Propulsion

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MELVIN PRICE
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 3, 1958

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, the apparent decision by the administration once again to throw the ANP program into the jaws of indecision and confusion is a major blow to the prospects for this Nation to place the world's first nuclear-propelled aircraft in the skies.

Before the entry of the Killian committee into the matter, many of us on the joint committee had considerable hope that the ANP program was, at long last, being placed on a definite course of action with the concrete objective of achieving a useful nuclear flight capability at the earliest moment.

It is generally agreed by those who are actually working in the program that the achievement of such a capability is vitally important not only from the point of view of national security but in terms of world confidence in America's scientific abilities. It is this latter point which I believe the Killian committee completely overlooked in its deliberations, such as they were. It seems to me that the Killian committee, instead of expediting scientific advancement in this country as I understand it was supposed to do, is actually serving to "unexpedite" matters.

The net effect is that we are right back where we started from before sputnik. It is questionable how long the Nation can afford the luxury of such vacillation and inaction. It is high time that we faced up to the realities of the Soviet challenge and proceed on a vigorous program to insure that the United States, not the Soviet Union, achieves the first nuclear-powered aircraft.

Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include herewith an editorial which appeared in the St. Louis (Mo.) Post-Dispatch on March 5, 1958, entitled "Why Not Beat Moscow to It?"

Until a manned station in outer space becomes reality, the nearest approach to it would be an atomic-powered airplane. Not having to refuel for weeks, the atomic plane should be able to cruise the skies of the world at will just as our atomic submarines now cruise the seven seas.

Yet, the Administration, after months of consideration, is reported to have abandoned a "fly early" plan in favor of what might be called a "fly later but 100 percent militarily" plan. This means a delay of at least a year, maybe three.

Congressman Melvin Price of East St. Louis warned after a visit to Russia last fall that Moscow was pressing ahead with development of an atomic plane. And United States military agencies have received a Soviet technical book Nuclear Engines for Aircraft, which they admit shows a high degree of competence in the field. Moscow already may be close to flying the first atomic plane.

Does the Administration really want to lose this race, too? Has it so soon forgotten the bruises inflicted by the two sputniks? Somebody decided that it wouldn't matter if America lost the satellite race, either; but once the race was lost, it mattered a great deal. Is the same process at work on the atomic plane?

Auto Excise Tax Repeal Should Be Made Retroactive

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES E. CHAMBERLAIN
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 6, 1958

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I would like to call the attention of my colleagues to an editorial entitled "No Quick Action on Auto Tax Cuts," which appeared in the Flint Journal of March 3, 1958.

The editorial points out that the efforts being made by several Members of Congress for the repeal or reduction of the excise tax on vehicles may possibly have the effect of slowing down automobile sales because people may postpone buying new cars in the belief that prices will go down in the coming months. This point has been made by a number of automotive writers as well.

This concern is, in fact, a measure of the encouraging outlook for some kind of action on the automotive excise tax this session. However, I share the concern of the Flint Journal over the possibility of a slowdown in automotive sales which in turn would aggravate the already serious problem of unemployment.

Because I am anxious to do all I can to avoid giving rise to this possibility, I am urging that any action on reduction or repeal of the excise tax during this session be made retroactive to March 1 of this year and that the manfacturers refund to purchasers the taxes collected subsequent to that date. My purpose in urging the repeal of this tax is to stimulate sales and help unemployed automobile workers, not to retard the activities of this important industry.

The Flint Journal's editorial expresses very well the reasons why motorists should not put off buying cars now in the hopes of an eventual price reduction, and I include it with my remarks in the RECORD:

NO QUICK ACTION ON AUTO TAX CUT

In an effort to stimulate the sale of automobiles, some Members of Congress are working for the reduction or removal of the excise tax on cars.

The removal or reduction of this tax, providing the savings were passed on to the buying public, would lower the sales prices and thus, undoubtedly, stimulate sales.

But the efforts to bring this about have had a rather odd effect, according to information from Washington. Some people, in the hope that the excise tax will be removed or reduced, have postponed buying new cars in the belief that prices will go down shortly.

The desire to take advantage of any tax reduction is understandable. However, postponing the buying of a new car for this reason reveals a lack of knowledge of legislative processes.

Even if the tax proposal were to meet with immediate acceptance in Congress, it would be a long time before the tax reduction would have any effect on the price of automobiles.

At present, the proposal is still in the talking stage in a House committee. Probably the proposal, even if accepted, would be part of a general tax bill. That means that all phases of the bill would require detailed study by the committee. Then it would have to be considered by the House, and more time would elapse while all aspects of the bill were being studied and debated there.

A similar process would take place in the Senate which last week began hearings on the general tax picture. Undoubtedly there would be differences in Senate and House treatment of the proposed legislation. This would require further study and rewriting of the bill as a compromise in conference committees. Then there would have to be acceptance by both Houses. Next, the bill would go to the President for his approval or veto and, if the latter, another vote would be required to override.

Thus, even if the proposal to eliminate or reduce the excise tax met with no opposition at all, the fact that it probably will be part of a general tax bill will result in delay, because other aspects of the general bill certainly will encounter some obstacles.

At best, several months probably will pass before the proposed legislation, passed by both Houses of Congress, will reach the President.

So anyone who has postponed buying a car for this reason can expect to keep right on driving his old car for a long, long time.

Address by Bishop Sheil

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES ROOSEVELT
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 6, 1958

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, in the press of work I am sure that we all have on occasion fallen behind the backlog of reading that we would like to do. The following address by Bishop Bernard Sheil before the fund raising banquet of the University of Jerusalem in Chicago last December 10 was one of those things that I had overlooked in the opening days of the session. His words are so obviously worthwhile both in their statement of philosophy and the correctness

of their approach that I include them for the pleasure of my colleagues:

ADDRESS BY THE MOST REVEREND BERNARD J. SHEIL, D.D., AUXILIARY BISHOP OF CHICAGO, AT THE FUND-RAISING BANQUET OF THE UNIVERSITY OF JERUSALEM AT THE COVENANT CLUB, DECEMBER 10, 1957, CHICAGO, ILL.

It was the great Irish poet, Yeats, who once wrote:

"Things fall apart; the centre cannot hold;
Mere anarchy is loosed upon the world."

These words have a special meaning for us today in this age of what may be called anxious inertia. For, these are days in which man is acutely conscious of a strange inner conflict between his sense of power and his feeling of insecurity. Seeking security, he wanders in a wasteland of universal insecurity, a prey to an anxiety he can neither define nor mitigate. Possessed of power undreamed of in humanity's past, he, the contemporary heir of all the ages, lives out his daze in a nightmare of uncertainty. Never has human ambivalence found expression in such a contradictory equation as, "the greater the power, the greater the insecurity."

The Russian satellite is the perfect symbol of this inner conflict in man. Hailed as the beginning of man's conquest of outer space, its appearance lacked the expected note of triumph and exultation. And why? Because deep within us is the feeling that the satellite is not a herald of a fuller life but of death. Its scientific shape does not conceal that it is the Pale Rider in the sky, banding earth with the circlet of death. Its light shines eerily on countless gravestones bearing the one inscription, carved in Russian, Polish, German, and Jewish: Here died human freedom. The message that it beams across the world is not a call to liberty but to slavery, not to truth but to falsehood, not to hope but to despair. Pridefully it carries within itself Nietsche's proclamation of the death of God, which is also the prophecy of the death of man. For all the free world the satellite is at once a symbol and a challenge.

It is a symbol because it externalizes in dramatic fashion the possible causal link between man's conflicting sense of power and insecurity. The scientific and technological achievements of modern man have hurtled us away from the past with the speed of a jet. We stand on the threshold of a new ago, a new era. The wondrous book of creation, page by page, is being reinterpreted in a language, symbolic and difficult, which testified to both the unfathomable power of God and the capacity of the human mind. Steadily our horizons are being forced back. Soon man shall make his entry into outer space, a new Adam, come to measure out a claim in a virtually new universe.

Nor has this wonderfully creative work of man remained only a theory and an abstraction. It has not been confined to the laboratory or the experimental center. It has poured out a flood of instruments and techniques capable of recreating the entire earth. And the earth itself awaits patiently, even joyously, the touch of man's fashioning hand. For it is his hand which can render the barren soil fertile and make the whole earth a fit and fruitful place for man to work, to dream, to weave his destiny as child of God, as citizen of both time and eternity.

Given the sureness of his knowledge and his amazing scientific resources one may ask: Why is modern man still the victim of a haunting anxiety? The answer, I believe, is that man himself is acutely conscious of the link that joins his power and his insecurity.

Modern man is guiltily aware of a deep moral failure. Charged with the awesome responsibility of making the choice between using his power for either constructive or destructive purposes, man has made his decision. The nuclear weapons are the expression of that crucial choice. But the decision has proved a boomerang. The very symbol of his creative power is now the instrument of man's possible destruction. Thus, we find man, poised at the abyss of annihilation, holding in his frail hands the very weapon which can hurl him into that abyss.

After much philosophical discussion and literary posturing, man, the alleged master of his destiny, the lord of the world, stands in terror before his own creation. No longer is there possibility of flight or evasion. Stripped of all the comforting support of self-excusing, man is faced with another historical decision. Nothing now intervenes between himself and annihilation except his own moral sense. But it is precisely this moral sense about which man has the deepest misgivings. He is no longer sure that it will sustain him in this, his hour of truth, that it will provide him with the strength necessary to choose existence rather than destruction.

This I believe to be an accurate and realistic picture of the present predicament of man. If it be true, I also believe that it has a very particular relevancy for America. For, it is here that the tension between power and moral responsibility has been progressively heightened and tautened. One senses in the knowledge of our vast technological achievement the rather nostalgic awareness of a traditional obligation to use this achievement for a moral purpose. And this purpose is, and ever remains, to give an example to all the world of a social system which would best provide for the free development of the free person in a free society.

This is the genesis and meaning of the American experiment. For, democracy here not only draws inspiration from liberal philosophy; it also reflects the biblical doctrine of the dignity of man, of the sacredness of the human person. Hence, its insistence on personal freedom and integrity, on the inalienable right of every person who dwells within its borders to seek freely all those things which answer his profound human aspirations. Any doctrine, any regional or personal tenet, any philosophy of a group or organization that denies or mutilates this basic democratic principle is un-American in the fullest sense of that term. Nor do any external trappings of legalism, or sentimental recalls of a faded feudalism, or emotional resurgings of discredited racial theories, hide this taint of un-Americanism.

The image of such a society of free men was the ideal and the hope of those who set the patterns and laid the foundations of this country. They were not fanatical visionaries, obsessed with utopian dreams. They were balanced and practical men. In a word, they were courageous intellectuals, who sensed the significance of America for the future of the world, and who grasped the meaning of that moment in a Nation's life which is surcharged with historical consequences. The eyes of many, friendly, and hostile, were upon that early America.

Today, the eyes of the entire free, and thus far uncommitted, world are fixed upon America. But the eyes are sharper, more knowing, more questioning, even more sophisticated. The minds behind the eyes are quite capable of penetrating to the realities that lie below the surface. They are not moved by the pious word that cloaks the unjust deed. To them, Little Rock is not an unfortunate incident. It is the revelation of a spiritual failure, and a serious one. To these minds, no semantic twist can turn moral surrenders into patriotic deeds. To them, McCarthyism still remains a dangerous symptom of an irrational fear of rational freedom.

Above all, these people are conscious of the fact that the conflict between power and moral responsibility which is present in America today is of crucial importance. The solution which this country finds to the modern dilemma will set the course of history for centuries to come. These people are not interested in military adventures, nor in armament races endlessly prolonged and leading only to destruction. Rather, they are looking for moral leadership, for that leadership which can be most helpful in their quest for a satisfying and humane way of life.

Many of these people are emerging from the darkness of centuries—old oppression into the disconcerting daylight of freedom. They are searching for a political and social doctrine which, while preserving the spirit of their varied cultures, will best insure and fructify this new freedom. Thus far, the alternatives presented to them are totalitarianism, as represented by Russia, and democracy, as portrayed by America. Behind the eversharpening struggle for military superiority, the peoples of the world see the more important conflict of ideologies, the continuing debate as to which system can more quickly and efficiently provide a better way of life. I may add that the present status of the debate allows for no complacency nor assurance of ultimate success on our part. Nor do I think that people, whose aim is focused on the immediate means to economic and social betterment, are too interested in confusing and endless talk about military pacts and alliances. This is especially true when there may be suspicion that these are judged desirable and necessary solely by the standard of our own security.

Amid the conflict and debate, one thing is certain. There shall be no return to the past. These people are determined that the future, under whichever system they choose, shall bring to them the long-deferred opportunity for a place in the sun, for a reasonable share of those good things of life which are indispensable to a truly human existence. Any doctrine or policy which ignores this fact, shall certainly meet with failure.

It is at this point that the real challenge of the symbolic satellite becomes clear. The traditional task of America is to help the peoples of the world make their historical decision in favor of man, his dignity, his freedom, his rights, his responsible participation in government. But America can fulfill her historic role only if she continues to create and enlarge her own system. It is one which has been dedicated to the common good, in which every political institution and social structure shall be so fashioned that the benefits of these shall be shared by all.

In our response to the challenge of the satellite two dangers must be avoided. The first is that America, intent on equaling or surpassing Russian strength in certain fields, would be tempted to suspend or even depart from her historical task. The second is that America, in an effort to make freedom secure, would be tempted to limit or curtail the basic rights and freedoms of her people. Nothing could better serve the purposes of communism than to yield to either or both of these temptations. For, one of the more subtle strategies of communism is to force its opponents to take on its own coloration, to adopt its own techniques, or to use its own weapons.

This is a grave hour for America. It is also an opportunity for greatness, even for imaginative boldness. It is the moment for America to take the lead in turning power to peaceful purposes, to rededicate herself to the task of helping to make this world a more fitting dwelling place for man. This is not an impractical dream, a utopian vision. It is an attainable goal. We have the knowledge and the techniques. We could have the

cooperation of awakened people everywhere who sense the dramatic significance of this moment in history, which is nothing more nor less than the struggle for man.

A decision, motivated by moral responsibility, to make power the servant of man and his needs could shift the Soviet challenge to another level, namely that of concern for human betterment. This level, and not that of military prowess, is the only one on which the debate as to the superiority of the two conflicting ideologies and systems can ultimately be resolved. Military supremacy of itself proves nothing. In fact, it is irrelevant to the fundamental issue involved in the present struggle between totalitarianism and freedom.

Behind the admittedly impressive facade of Soviet scientific and technological achievement, there lies a vast and gloomy prison of the human spirit, in which every human right, including that to existence, is at the mercy of a monstrous and monolithic bureaucracy. Slavery remains slavery, even when it is euphemistically called discipline and order. There is no doubt that the uncommitted peoples of the world have been impressed by the Communist accomplishments.

One reason for this reaction may be that the alternative of a free society, in the terms of human values, has not been adequately presented to these people. Western culture has much more to offer man than gadgets and gimmicks, the pseudopsychology of the hidden persuaders, or the depressing genealogy of the organization man. It possesses an inclusive philosophy of man, based on reason and inspired by faith. Its point of departure is the dignity of man as image and child of God. It is a dynamic philosophy which opens out, beyond merely human horizons, into the timeless realm of eternal values. Human freedom is the very breath of this philosophy, because fulfillment and freedom are the indispensable terms of the human equation. This is the reason that western culture, during its long historical test of trial and error, has always envisioned a free society as the only one that can provide made with the possibility of fulfillment. This is also the reason that totalitarianism, whatever be its form, and even if it attempts to clothe itself in pseudoreligious garb, is both alien and destructive to our culture.

If we have failed to create such a society in which all men might have equal opportunity for fulfillment, then the fault lies not in our inherited philosophy. It lies within our own hearts, which we have allowed to become the silenced victims of greed, hatred, indifference, selfishness, and arrogance. We have given but lipservice to the ideal of human opportunity. We have failed to translate it for all peoples into the tangible and simple terms of food and shelter, education, health, participation, even the sense of belonging. These things are what man, all men, need if they are to fulfil their nature as men.

Instead we have erected a society in which a majority of our fellowmen are forced to live out their lives in an atmosphere of crippling frustration, of destitution, both physical and spiritual, which does violence to the free spirit of man. It is an illuminating commentary, I think, on the sensibility of our times, that those who advocate and dedicate themselves to the cause of human betterment and solidarity generally merit the epithet of do-gooders, bleeding-heart, idealist, and visionary. My only observation would be: That, if this present age of conflict and disorder, or alienation and despair, be the result of compromise, expediency, and the substitution of know-how for intellectuality—then the world is badly in need of idealists. For, idealists are primarily concerned with spiritual values, and these are indispensable, if man is to live at all on a truly human level.

I repeat: This is an hour of crisis for us Americans. Upon our response to the challenge depends our future as a free people. But we can only respond if we are fully aware of the real nature of the present danger. An uninformed America could be an impotent America. It is the inescapable obligation of our political leadership to speak the facts, no matter how harsh or difficult of acceptance they may be. The American people are looking for truth, not tranquilizers. They know that truth alone can furnish the foothold necessary for whatever common effort must be made in defense of their common heritage and for the cause of human freedom in the world.

It is neither my task nor my desire to specify what this common effort shall require of Americans. Perhaps I may be permitted to touch upon one quality that must infuse this effort, and that quality is seriousness.

We are no longer mere spectators at a game of theoretical dialectics, a contest in which, I fear, we showed but little interest. We have been for too long a time much more concerned with the furnishings of our homes than with those of our heads. Our attention has been centered too much on pink Americans and too little on red Russians. Now, however, we are forced to become active participants in a battle, if not for survival, at least for survival on our own terms and within the framework of our traditional beliefs.

This lack of seriousness has led, I believe, to two grave mistakes in our immediate past. The first is that we have underestimated the ability, the intellectual toughness, and the passionate dedication of our opponents. They possess seriousness to an almost inhuman degree. Nothing, no person, doctrine, nor event, has ever swerved them from the path to their announced objective. They will use every resource and every human potentiality to reach their goal. They are strong and confident. For us, they are no longer merely a challenge; they have become a very real threat. Their seriousness must be met with an equal seriousness on our part.

Our second mistake has been our attempt to put a price tag on freedom, to think complacently that freedom is ours, fully and irrevocably, because we have purchased it. The truth is that freedom, like a human being, can never be bought, never completely possessed. The best we can do is to give freedom a blank check, which is never filled in. For freedom must be continuously sought for, even fought for; otherwise it disappears. It may be even true to say that freedom never completely is. Rather, it is endlesaly reborn in the spirit of each generation. For its survival, vigilance is not enough; tyranny can also be vigilant. Each generation must pay it whatever tribute of mind or heart or even blood that it requires for life and growth.

At this point we might well ask ourselves two questions: How seriously have we valued our freedom? What personal sacrifices have we made to nourish and extend it? An honest answer to these questions may well serve as a partial explanation of why our childish complacency and our assumed superiority have been so completely shaken by recent events.

It is the voice of freedom itself which now urges us Americans to a new seriousness, a new awarness of what is really at stake in our world today. I have said that the conflict represents a struggle for man. For us that can only mean a struggle for those religious, spiritual, and human values which alone give meaning and purpose to human life. Among those values is a belief in God as our common father, in all men as our common brothers. This is a belief which demands of us the lived response of faith and justice and love.

These values are part of the soul of America. She must now rediscover her soul. If she does, then I am confident that the center will hold, that things shall not fall apart; and that in place of more anarchy man may look forward, with hope, to a world in which power has become the servant of man, bringing to him that measure of peace and security and leisure, without which the spirit of man shrivels. Then, and only then, could man raise his eyes to the heavens, without fear, and see there a thousand satellites, circling the earth, and breaking the stillness of outer space with man's hymn of praise to God, Who has made man to be not only His creature, but His cocreator.

Cleveland News Raises Important Questions on Mutual Security Program Which Should Bring About Better Legislation

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANCES P. BOLTON

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 3, 1958

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, Jack Kennon, asssociate editor of the Cleveland News, has written a series of articles bringing out certain questions and criticisms of our mutual security program. I would like to take this opportunity to commend the News for raising these questions in the public interest, although I am concerned lest undue emphasis may have been given the negative aspects of the program. However this may be, a sounder and more effective program should evolve as a result.

We on the House Foreign Affairs Committee have been making every effort to dig out the facts around such charges. We are especially gratified this year to have clear and concise presentations from the administration.

Acting Chairman MORGAN has requested Director Smith, of the International Cooperation Administration, to furnish the committee with definitive answers to a list of 85 criticisms which have been compiled by the committee staff under his direction. In open session this week Mr. Smith touched on several of the criticisms and arranged to appear again for the purpose of giving all the answers in open session at 2:30 p. m., Wednesday, March 12. These should be of widespread public interest.

Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include a number of questions raised in the News articles, and the answers given by Mr. Smith:

Mr. SMITH. Sir, we have had a variety of criticisms, some of which are fundamental and some dealing with specific items. I would talk more about the specific items which have come up a number of times in the press. Such a situation is the question asked, "Have we provided dress suits for Grecian undertakers under the foreign-aid program?"

This question has been asked a dozen times. We have not done any such thing. The only clothing we have ever furnished to Greece under this program is footwear for the Grecian army, and civilian clothing has been specifically ineligible from aid financing in Greece.

We have been asked, are we financing the planting of wild grass along public highways in Lebanon.

Now, the manner in which the question is asked makes it look as though it is a ridiculous process. The fact is in the United States, in the arid areas, not only here, but all over the world, grasses are planted to stop soil erosion and we are doing this in Lebanon and we are doing it in a number of countries and this is a perfectly proper program to engage in.

You will find every agriculturist in the world, every soil conservationist, fully in support of it.

We have been asked, "Have we financed public baths for Egyptian camel drivers?"

Now, someone has enough time to develop this kind of a question. The fact is that we were engaged in a health and sanitation program to try to eliminate a disease in Egypt called bilharzia, which is a form of hookworm, and we have set up sanitary baths in that country.

Now, naturally, camel drivers and everybody else is eligible to use those baths and I see nothing improper about it at all.

It was an excellent health program we were undertaking at the time.

Free Rumania

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RAY J. MADDEN
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 6, 1958

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, March 6, 1958, marks the 13th anniversary of Soviet aggression which ultimately enslaved the nation of Rumania.

These heroic people have constantly fought for independence and self-government against powerful conquerers for over a thousand years. Their determination for liberty and freedom will continue in spite of the powerful Soviet secret police and military pressure until Rumania's independence is won.

As a member of the Committee To Investigate Communist Aggression in the 83d Congress, we took the testimony of over 200 witnesses recording the duplicity, treachery, and military pressure of the Communists to enslave Rumania.

The following communication from Mr. Mihail Farcasanu, president of the League of Free Romanians, reveals further facts which will be of interest to the Members recalling this enslavement:

THE LEAGUE OF FREE ROMANIANS,
New York, N. Y., March 4, 1958.

Hon. RAY J. MADDEN,
United States Representative from Indiana.

DEAR MR. MADDEN: The 13 years which have elapsed since the brutal seizure of Rumania on March 6, 1945, have meant an atrocious ordeal for the Rumanian people. These years mark also the long duration of Soviet occupation and tyranny in Eastern Europe.

The events which characterized Rumania's subjugation constitute an example of ruthless Soviet interference. An independent and prosperous country of nearly 20 million Latins—geographically isolated—has been seized and incarcerated behind the Iron Curtain by the Soviet Union. And this but 2 weeks after they had put their signature to the Yalta agreement.

The procedure of Soviet seizure in Eastern Europe is essentially the same for each victim country, although differing somewhat in detail. In the case of Rumania, who had put her army at the disposal of the allies, while all her military forces were fighting on the front side by side with them, the Red army took control of the country and installed through violence a Communist puppet government. They attempted to assassinate the legal Prime Minister, Gen. Niculae Radescu, who courageously opposed to the last minute the Russian takeover.

Since that moment the sovietization and despoiling of Rumania has been pursued without mercy by the Soviet Union. Religious persecution, mass deportations, arrests, and executions are among the methods used for the crushing of a nation. The two biggest slave-labor camps of postwar Europe have been organized in Rumania. One is the famous Danube-Black Sea Canal of a few years ago and the other the Danube Delta camp, where thousands of people are slaving in the swamps of the river at this very moment.

But even such brutal oppression has not deterred the wide resistance through which the will for freedom of this courageous people expresses itself against overwhelming odds.

Their faith in the United States has remained unshaken and their so long disappointed hopes still form the mainspring of their existence. As in the other parts of the subjugated area of Europe the Soviets are aware of the permanent threat which this state of mind engenders for their domination. The formal recognition the Russians have obtained from the West for their puppet regimes has not been sufficient to insure that hopeless resignation of the people, so necessary for their expansionist schemes. This fact explains the eagerness of Moscow to extract from the United States an official abandonment of the East European issue in any future summit talks. The same motivation lies behind the "disengagement" slogans.

Hence, moral and political support for the enslaved peoples could but serve the cause of freedom.

Yours respectfully,
MIHAIL FARCASANU,
President.

Chins Up, America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ARCH A. MOORE, JR.
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 6, 1958

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Speaker, the First Congressional District which I have the privilege to represent, is largely industrial, and like many other manufacturing centers in our country, we are today faced with some unemployment and cutbacks in productive capacity of our plants. I have been following the economic trends in West Virginia and bending my efforts to encourage new industries and opportunities for the people of my district.

While I am concerned with the problems which this recession has created, I refuse to be panicked or to believe that this downturn in business is the forerunner of a serious depression. I believe that it is of utmost importance that everyone "keep a level head" and not resort to histrionics or dire predictions. But, conversely, it is not a time for sitting on one's hands and doing nothing. The economy of our country is a complex mechanism wherein the stock market is subject to great fluctuation by such unrelated happenings as a presidential toothache or a one-quarter percent change in the interest rate charged by the Federal Reserve banks.

Consequently, the economy of our country is a subject which must be under review and consideration 24 hours a day, 7 days a week, 365 days a year. I am convinced that the President and the administration advisers have their fingers firmly on the economic heartbeat of the Nation, and are prepared at a moment's notice to take the necessary action to prevent any undue or prolonged economic loss from occurring. Recent recommendations emanating from the White House for a stepped-up public works program, new housing starts, and more liberal interest rates, are indicative that the public interest is being protected by the men at the helm of the Nation.

In line with my views on this matter, I would like to call the attention of the House to the following editorial entitled "Chins Up, America," which appeared on March 4, 1958, in the Grafton Sentinel, an outstanding daily newspaper in Grafton, W. Va.:

President Eisenhower had landed in Washington at 6:50 a. m. after an overnight flight from Phoenix, Ariz., aboard his special plane, the Columbine III. It was after 7 when he reached the White House. A few minutes after 8, he was at his desk. He had asked Vice President NIXON to take his place and make a speech to the National Food Conference. A little after noon, he dropped in for an off-the-cuff talk. After discussing our foreign affairs, he gave the conferees the kind of "chins up, America" talk we all need to carry us through these uncertain days.

America is strong, America is healthy, the President repeated again and again. Like all healthy individuals, we have our ups and downs. For instance, he had been suffering from a cold. That is no sign of despair. Similarly, America is not at the tip-top of its form. But, he added, "the economy of this country is a lot stronger than the spirit of those people that I see wailing about it and saying that it is not good."

However, the President did not confine himself to dismissing his critics in this manner. Government must do something, it is doing something to help reduce the unemployment of some 4,500,000 people, and will do more if it becomes necessary. But he ruled out any form of boondoggling "that have no useful purpose except that of helping a man exist for the moment." Instead, he proposed to do it with projects that need to be done and that will help the country.

There are today on the shelves of Government all sorts of worthy projects, some of which have already been approved by Congress and have annual or partial appropriations. The President urged that this time of slack employment is the time to start these projects to give the unemployed work. These projects will be under way, he promised, as fast as they are needed.

"But basically, here is the problem: Are we going around with our chins up? Or are we looking at the ground thinking of our own dismal troubles rather than putting our eyes straight forward and pushing in that direction?" the President asked. He answered himself: "This is no time to listen to the people who are men of little faith and of little spirit. Now is the time when courage, commonsense, and soundness will-

prevent a slackness in employment and a dip in the economy from becoming serious."

It is a time for chins up, America. We've survived many more crises. With courage and confidence, we can take this one in stride.

Mack's Resignation Doesn't Solve All

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LESTER HOLTZMAN
OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 6, 1958

Mr. HOLTZMAN. Mr. Speaker, two daily newspapers in my district editorialized on the current hearings by the Subcommittee on Legislative Oversight yesterday.

The Long Island Star-Journal and the Long Island Daily Press, both part of the Newhouse publications, published an editorial entitled "Mack's Resignation Doesn't Solve All." I agree wholeheartedly with the caption, and the conclusions.

Just as the resignations of Secretary of the Air Force Talbott, General Services Administrator Mansure, and others in the administration who resigned "under fire" solved nothing, this current resignation of Federal Communications Commissioner Mack solves nothing.

I like particularly the suggestion therein about establishing a strict code of ethics, and compelling the registration of interested parties before all regulatory agencies.

I commend the short but meaningful editorial to all my colleagues, and urge the committee especially to read it and give it every favorable consideration.

The editorial follows:

MACK'S RESIGNATION DOESN'T SOLVE ALL

The resignation of Federal Communications Commissioner Richard A. Mack, welcome as it is, does not solve everything.

Questions and problems remain.

One question is to find out if others in the Federal regulatory agencies look upon their jobs as Mack did, and who they are.

Mack says he "did no wrong" in accepting loans and free stock in two companies from a long-time friend who was interested in a TV channel case, and that it didn't affect his vote.

Nonetheless he showed poor judgment to say the least.

His actions hardly jibed with what the public expects in the way of personal conduct in high appointive office. The Federal regulatory agencies are quasi-judicial bodies. The public looks upon them much as it looks upon the courts, which it expects always to be beyond reproach.

The problem now is to set up safeguards against situations such as the Mack case illustrates.

One logical step would be for Congress to establish a strict code of ethics, with teeth in it, for the agencies. Another would be enactment of a lobbying law to compel the registration of all parties interested in cases before the commissions, a law similar to the one that applies to lobbyists before Congress.

Both these steps have been proposed by Dr. Bernard Schwartz, the ousted counsel of the House Investigations Committee who got the current investigations off to a flying start.

Favorable Prospect for Action on Food Stamp Plan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEONOR K. SULLIVAN
OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 6, 1958

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, I want to take this opportunity to express my thanks publicly to the distinguished chairman of the House Committee on Agriculture [Mr. COOLEY], for arranging for early consideration by an appropriate subcommittee of the proposal which I have been urging for so many years for establishment of a food-stamp plan for the distribution of some of our vast stores of surplus food to needy Americans.

Congressman COOLEY went on record in the House last year in favor of this legislation at the time I attempted to have it enacted as an amendment to Public Law 480, the law under which we now give away surplus foods here and abroad—particularly abroad. He promised me then he would see to it that the committee took up the bill this year, and he renewed that promise to me in recent weeks.

Now I am very pleased that Chairman COOLEY has turned this matter over to the Consumers Study Subcommittee headed by Representative VICTOR L. ANFUSO, of New York. Mr. COOLEY, Congressman ANFUSO reported to us yesterday, has given that subcommittee "the green light," to proceed on this issue.

And I am also pleased that the subcommittee chairman has demonstrated his personal interest in this matter by introducing a bill based on the measure which I drafted and first introduced 4 years ago last month, and which I have been reintroducing with some modification in each succeeding Congress.

FOOD STAMPS WOULD GO AUTOMATICALLY TO NEEDY

This is the type of food-stamp plan, incidentally, which most of the Democratic Members present on the House floor last year voted for when I submitted it as an amendment to the bill extending Public Law 480. It is the type of plan which I am happy to say the Democratic platform of 1956 promised.

The idea incorporated within the bill is simplicity itself. In each State or political subdivision participating in the program, needy persons meeting eligibility standards would automatically receive food stamps redeemable for specified quantities of whatever surplus foods were available for distribution.

Primarily, the food stamps would be intended for persons and families on various forms of public assistance, but other needy persons would also be included, particularly during periods such as the present recession when many families are in real want but cannot qualify for public assistance if they include employable persons—even if the employables cannot find employment.

PRESENT DISTRIBUTION PROGRAM UNSATISFACTORY

The plan outlined in my bill would replace the present hit-and-miss program now in effect—a very unsatisfactory program—for distribution of some surpluses to the needy in States which have substantial unemployment. The unsatisfactory nature of the existing program has been pointed out time after time by officials of the States and localities which are participating in it. In many instances, it costs the State or city more to distribute occasional packages of free food than the food itself is worth.

A national food stamp plan would not only get the food to more of the people who really need it—and I have some amazing figures covering that point which I intend to present to the subcommittee at the appropriate time—but it would do it a whole lot more efficiently and at less cost than this present hit-and-miss program which is primarily a food dumping program rather than an aid-the-needy program.

The Department of Agriculture seems interested only in finding the quickest way of disposing of as much of its surplus as possible, rather than in having this food used to maximum advantage by the needy here at home. That is apparently why most of the Department's emphasis on surplus distribution has been on shipping huge quantities of it abroad to whatever country will "buy" it with local currency which is then returned to the "customer" in the form of additional foreign aid.

I am not against the Public Law 480 program. But I do think the Congress has up to now been too quick to go along with Mr. Benson's foreign dumping programs without insisting at the same time that he also help feed our own hungry through a sensible food stamp plan.

That may be a little harsh to say, Mr. Speaker, particularly since my purpose in making this statement is to congratulate the fairminded chairman of the House Committee on Agriculture for starting the ball rolling on this and turning it over to a subcommittee for early action.

I hope all Members who are conscious of the large number of needy persons in their districts will take the time and trouble to look into this matter and join in support of legislation to launch a meaningful program of surplus food distribution to our needy.

MUCH BACKGROUND MATERIAL AVAILABLE

There is a lot of material available on this subject for those who care to look into it.

In addition to the many speeches I have made on it in the House since introducing the bill originally on February 12, 1954, including the debate on my amendment last year on the extension of Public Law 480, further information can be found in the testimony which I presented to the Committee on Agriculture during special hearings on this matter in both the 83d and 84th Congresses. Two years ago, furthermore, we had a day of hearings before the Senate Finance Committee on proposals to include this plan as part of the pub-

lic welfare programs under the social-security law. And last year I testified on it before the Humphrey subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Agriculture when that group was holding exploratory hearings on long-range proposals for improving the Public Law 480 set-up.

I am grateful that many Members over these past 4 years have joined me as cosponsors of this legislation, either using the same bill which I drafted in 1954 or the revised version which is H. R. 949 in this Congress, or else using the overall features of my bill but revising it to incorporate additional ideas. Substantially all of these bills are identical, however, in proposing a plan which would give to all of our needy—and there are unfortunately millions of persons in our Nation who could be included in that term—an opportunity to share in our great abundance by receiving regularly on a systematic basis some of the surplus foods we are acquiring under the various Government-aid programs for agriculture.

NEEDY IN ALL STATES COULD SHARE IN PLAN

Every State has many, many persons who would be eligible under my bill. In most States, most such persons are not now receiving surplus food. In some States, distribution is very broad in some localities, but does not include other localities. A national food stamp program would make it possible for all States and all local communities to participate, thus assuring some of this food for each eligible person.

The best way to achieve this distribution, of course, is through the regular channels of trade, although I leave that detail open in my bill. The point is we are trying to get food to people not now getting enough to eat.

Mr. Benson has refused to show any interest in or concern for this type of program. The administration generally opposes it. I am afraid we will have to force it upon them.

Mr. Speaker, because of the growing interest in the food stamp plan in all parts of the country and, I am sure, in every congressional district, as a result of widespread distress in our economy, I include the text of H. R. 949 in these remarks so that it can be seen how the plan would actually operate.

The bill is as follows:

(In the House of Representatives, 85th Cong., 1st sess., January 3, 1957, Mrs. SULLIVAN introduced the following bill; which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture.)

H. R. 949

A bill to provide for the establishment of a food stamp plan for the distribution of $1 billion worth of surplus food commodities a year to needy persons and families in the United States.

Be it enacted, etc., That in order to promote the general welfare, raise the levels of health and of nourishment for needy persons whose incomes prevent them from enjoying adequate diets, and to remove the specter of want, malnutrition, or hunger in the midst of mountains of surplus food now accumulating under Government ownership in warehouses and other storage facilities, the Secretary of Agriculture (hereinafter referred to as the "Secretary") is hereby authorized and directed to promulgate and put into operation, as quickly as possible, a program to distribute to needy persons in the United States through a food stamp system a portion of the surpluses of food commodities acquired and being stored by the Federal Government by reason of its price-support operations or other purchase programs.

SEC. 2. In carying out such program, the Secretary shall—

(1) distribute surplus food made available by the Secretary for distribution under this program only when requested to do so by a State or political subdivision thereof;

(2) issue, or cause to be issued, pursuant to section 3, food stamps redeemable by eligible needy persons for such types and quantities of surplus food as the Secretary shall determine;

(3) distribute surplus food in packaged or other convenient form on the local level at such places as he may determine;

(4) establish standards under which, pursuant to section 3, the welfare authorities of any State or political subdivision thereof may participate in the food stamp plan for the distribution of surplus foods to the needy;

(5) Consult the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, and the Secretary of Labor, in establishing standards for eligibility for surplus foods and in the conduct of the program generally to assure achievement of the goals outlined in the first section of the act; and

(6) make such other rules and regulations as he may deem necessary to carry out the purpose of this act.

SEC. 3. The Secretary shall issue, to each welfare department or equivalent agency of a State or political subdivision requesting the distribution of surplus food under section 2 (1), food stamps for each kind of surplus food to be distributed, in amounts based on the total amount of surplus food to be distributed and on the total number of needy persons in the various States and political subdivisions eligible to receive such food. The food stamps shall be issued by each such welfare department or equivalent agency to needy persons receiving welfare assistance, or in need of welfare assistance but ineligible because of State or local law, and shall be redeemable by such needy persons at local distribution points to be determined by the Secretary under section 2 (3).

SEC. 4. Surplus food distributed under this act shall be in addition to, and not in place of, any welfare assistance (financial or otherwise) granted needy persons by a State or any political subdivision thereof.

SEC. 5. In any one calendar year the Secretary is authorized to distribute surplus food under this act of a value of up to $1 billion based on the cost to the Federal Government of acquiring, storing, and handling such food.

SEC. 6. The distribution of surplus food to needy persons in the United States under this act shall be in place of distribution to such needy persons under section 32 of the act entitled "An act to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act, and for other purposes," approved August 24, 1935 (7 U. S. C., sec. 612c), as amended, and section 416 of the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended: *Provided, however,* That nothing in this act shall affect distribution of surplus food presently provided for in such sections other than to needy persons as defined in section 7 of this act.

SEC. 7. For the purposes of this act, a needy person is anyone receiving welfare assistance (financial or otherwise) from the welfare department or equivalent agency of any State or political subdivision thereof, or who is, in the opinion of such agency or agencies, in need of welfare assistance but is ineligible to receive it because of State or local law.

SEC. 8. The Secretary of Agriculture, in consultation with the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare and the Secretary of Labor, shall make a study of, and shall report to Congress within 6 months after the date of enactment of this act, on the feasibility of, the costs of, and the problems involved in, extending the scope of the food stamp plan established by this act to include persons receiving unemployment compensation, receiving old-age and survivors insurance (social security) pensions, and other low-income groups not eligible to receive food stamps under this act by reason of section 7 of this act.

SEC. 9. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this act.

Cultural Exchange Opposed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALBERT H. BOSCH
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 18, 1958

Mr. BOSCH. Mr. Speaker, it has just come to my attention that the Department of State has invited the Red Banner song and dance ensemble of the Soviet Army to visit the United States in the fourth quarter of 1958 under the cultural exchange program. It is my belief that a majority of the American people care for no part of such a visit.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include a letter which appeared in the February 8, 1958, edition of the New York Times:

CULTURAL EXCHANGE OPPOSED—PROPOSED PROGRAM SEEN AS AFFRONT TO ANTI-COMMUNIST PEOPLES

To the EDITOR OF THE NEW YORK TIMES:

While it is more than doubtful that the United States-U. S. S. R. agreement on cultural exchanges will ever really improve relations between the American people and the peoples oppressed by the Soviet Government, there can be no doubt that it will shatter the last hopes of the anti-Communist peoples in the U. S. S. R. as well as in every satellite country.

If it is our Government's honest view that we should achieve "cultural" peace and coexistence with the Kremlin's butchers at the cost of our spiritual relations to the oppressed millions, it should at least say so. In that case it should discontinue the useless broadcasts to those peoples behind the Iron Curtain who must—after the conclusion of the exchange agreement—feel bitterly offended by even the slightest theoretical hint at liberation.

There is one paragraph in the American-Soviet agreement which must have the most shocking effect on the free as well as on the oppressed peoples of the world. It is paragraph 5 of section VIII, which reads: "The Soviet side will send the Red Banner song and dance ensemble of the Soviet army * * * to the United States in the fourth quarter of 1958."

That provision means a great victory for the Soviets in the cold war—if we can still speak at all of a "cold war." Have we forgotten that it was the same Soviet army now invited to this country, which committed genocide in Hungary, an unprecedented crime in modern history? Have we forgotten the various resolutions adopted by the United Nations condemning in the strongest language possible the Soviet crimes in Hungary?

How could our State Department maintain the rather childish notion that an American invitation of any Red army unit could bring about a better understanding of the Soviet Union? We have seen the Soviet Army at work in Hungary as well as in other places and do not need its visit to our shores. Such visit would only destroy the last vestiges of respect and confidence in American declarations of freedom and liberation.

May I express the hope that a storm of protests will sweep our country and ultimately prevent our Department of State from carrying out paragraph 5 of section VIII of the just-signed agreement?

JULIUS EPSTEIN.

NEW YORK, *January 28, 1958.*

Prize-Winning Oration in American Legion's Contest

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 6, 1958

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following text of the prize-winning oration given by Miss Thea Socha, senior student at Foster Township (Pa.) High School, in the American Legion oratorical contest based on a theme from the United States Constitution or the Bill of Rights:

[From the Hazleton Plain Speaker of February 27, 1958]

TEXT OF THEA SOCHA'S ESSAY WHICH WON TOP HONORS IN LEGION CONTEST

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—"Fulfilling the Aims of the Constitution" is the title of the prize-winning oration delivered by Thea Socha, Foster Township High School senior, in the American Legion oratorical contest based on a theme from the United States Constitution or the Bill of Rights.)

(Miss Socha's oration won her the championship of the Legion's District 12, which embraces Luzerne County. Following is the text of the oration:)

"Man has battled through the ages that we might have peace. He has studied that we might know. He has slaved that we might be free. He has left us the heritage of the ages that we, in our turn, might carry it on to posterity." On to posterity—this was the thought that 55 men entertained that morning in May 1787, when they assembled at Convention Hall in Philadelphia. They had gathered to frame a constitution which would govern their 13 young States. This Constitution was to become the studiest, yet the most flexible, the most criticized, and yet, the most respected governmental document in the history of the world. It was written for America, for posterity, forever.

Their's were conflicting ideas and conflicting desires; nevertheless, after 115 days of bitter deliberation, they drafted and signed what has been the most controversial constitution in history. The fundamentals were laid down; they are as changeless as the fundamentals of mathematics; but their application was then to be, has been, and will continue to be extended.

During a period of less than 200 years, the United States has forged ahead more fantastically than any democracy known to man. Americans are the best fed, best dressed, and most comfortable people in the world today; but, more important, they are the freest and the most willing to defend their freedom. This liberty has given us a stimulation of thought, and as a result, initiative and ingenuity have been released. From our forefathers, we have inherited the right and the duty to govern ourselves.

Self-government—from one perspective a blessing, from another, a curse. The fundamental aim of the Constitution was the guarantee of a free, self governing nation which would be strong enough and wise enough to attain the height of prosperity without sacrificing liberty. Thus far, it has been successful. America has become a better place and Americans, better people because of their masterpiece—the Constitution. This Constitution was instituted primarily for posterity and posterity must pledge to preserve, protect, and defend it eternally, as we have.

Surely, this can never be done unless we have at least a working knowledge of the Constitution. Our Constitution is more than just a few words written on parchment; it is a living thing, adapting itself to the constant growth and shifting circumstances caused by progress. Truly, the first duty of every American citizen is to master both the facts and the spirit of the Constitution. The American citizen must realize, deeply and sincerely, the genuine meaning of life in a free nation. Each individual must instill into himself the knowledge that, without our Constitution, we, too, might be the victims of dictatorial machines or frenzied revolutions; he must not risk his liberty on indifference and apathy; his reaction should awaken a sense of responsibility towards his government. He must understand that, if he expects the Constitution to continue blessing him with rights and privileges, he must reciprocate by carrying out his duties as a citizen, and by giving the Constitution his infallible support.

By support I don't mean that he should write long orations dedicated to independence and lay them aside to be forgotten; nor do I mean that he should passively agree that, something must be done about it, the next time his neighbor relates a story about an unfair councilman. I ask for support that is alive, active. Stand up and take notice. Do more than your share. Don't only vote, make sure that everyone you know votes, too. Don't only complain about crooked politicians. Run for office and get rid of them. Unless America stays active and alert, it will soon lose its top notch positions and be trampled by some foreign power.

Our Government guarantees everyone a free education; therefore, it is the responsibility of every individual living in America to utilize his country's resources so that he can learn to think clearly and intelligently. Before one can act, one must think; and, in order to think clearly, one must be able to discern between that which is wise and that which is foolish. Ignorance is not bliss; it creates inertia and dullness. For this reason, one of the foremost responsibilities of every American is to provide a good education for children, today, and in the future. Schools and teachers must be provided so that the intellectual development of our country does not reach a standstill.

The future of America shall be determined by the people and their exercising of constitutional rights in selecting their leaders. The right to vote is among man's most cherished liberties; and yet, how many Americans do not go to the polls on election day just because they're too busy or not interested enough to pay attention to the candidates. Yes, most people do vote; but those who do not comprise a weak timber in the foundation of Americansim. Should our country become weak in a few spots from neglect and corruption caused by careless voters, it wouldn't take long until the very walls of its structure would begin to collapse.

Another element essential to the well being of our Government is listed under the distasteful title, "taxes." This particular duty causes more complaining and more arguing than any that can be named; and yet, when Mr. Average Citizen finds his conscience beginning to quirk, this is the duty that he uses to rationalize. "I've done my share, I've paid my taxes." This familiar echo is as true a sign of the guilt felt by the poor little man who wants to do good, but doesn't take the time or trouble. Nobody likes to have his money taken away from him, especially by one who doesn't appear to need it; nevertheless, taxes should be paid in a spirit of good feeling and loyalty. Without them, it would be impossible for our Government to operate efficiently. They finance such projects and services as investigations, superhighways, defense, industrial development, research. Of all the things that could be mentioned here I believe that research, especially in the fields of atomic energy and missile development, would be the most timely. The free world must be assured that American supremacy in science and defense stands incontestable.

Today, more than ever before, the cause of liberty needs strong defenders prepared to combat aggressively all forces that seek to destroy it, forces that are at work within the very gates of America. These forces have no allegiance other than to Moscow; their creed is in the writings of Marx and Lenin, not Jefferson and Lincoln; their goal is the destruction of God and our belief in God; they do not rely on men and their human frailties; their power lives as automatons, cold and unfeeling, in the forms of satellites and missiles. This is what modern America must learn to recognize—hatred, greed, violence, fear. Not only destruction, annihilation will result from a weakening of American influence caused by indifference and apathy within our country's boundaries. America must be alert, ready, and willing to defend this freedom. As free Americans, it is our solemn duty to extend to the world an inspired ideology to guide other freedom-loving nations to democracy. This has been the aim of America since its very beginning. It is our wish to share it with the entire world.

The aims of the Constitution—universal peace, prosperity, and liberty—can be fulfilled simply by knowing the Constitution and adhering to the fundamentals that it sets down for us. It is our duty, and our privilege to preserve the heritage which is ours. But we must remember that liberty cannot be written ready made into a charter; it must be written in our hearts, and sent on by us, as a living force to the next generation, so that hundreds of years from now, our countrymen can repeat, as proudly and as reverently as we have, "I am an American."

National Library Week

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHESTER E. MERROW
OF NEW HAMPSHIRE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 3, 1958

Mr. MERROW. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include therein an editorial from the Rochester Courier, Rochester, N. H., on Thursday, February 27, 1958, entitled "National Library Week."

The editorial follows:

NATIONAL LIBRARY WEEK

With television presenting a stiff challenge to reading as a source of entertainment and information, the observance of National Library Week is of special significance.

Perhaps one of the prime reasons that the Soviet Union has surpassed the United States in many fields of endeavor is the fact that its peoples are only recently becoming aware of the deep social importance of extensive reading and are finding the answer to their hunger for knowledge.

To us in America where the ability to read and understand is a part of our national heritage, there has been an increasing neglect of the free public library system. As a nation we are becoming mentally lazy, while less fortunate people are discovering with delight and profit the companionship and profit in a good book.

Anything which can be done to encourage the more general use of our libraries ought to be done as an answer to the great questions which face modern society.

Start of the New Deal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KATHRYN E. GRANAHAN
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 6, 1958

Mrs. GRANAHAN. Mr. Speaker, 25 years ago the New Deal was born when Franklin D. Roosevelt became President of the United States.

We remember those days as a time when our country was literally flat on its back, when commerce and industry had come to a standstill and unemployment was of such vast proportions as to constitute a national calamity.

We did not have television in those days to enable those of us living away from Washington to watch the historic moment when Chief Justice Charles Evans Hughes and the President-elect raised their right hands for the swearing in ceremony at the Capitol.

But all of us who could were glued to radios around the country, listening to the ceremony and to the stirring, masterful inaugural address of the man who was to lead our country out of the wilderness of despair into a new day of happiness and prosperity for the American people.

Twenty-five years is a short period of time as history is measured. For all of us who remember those days of 1933, it was one of the most dramatic moments of our lifetimes, and one we shall never forget. We tend to forget, however, that to millions of Americans born shortly before then or after 1933, including many who are now voters, the depression of 1929–33 might have been generations ago—something completely remote from them.

Yet we know that the prosperity we have enjoyed in these last 2 decades could never have occurred if the President who was inaugurated on March 4, 1933, was not determined to end poverty and misery in our midst and was not also determined to act with speed and with wisdom and courage in meeting the problems of depression.

President Franklin D. Roosevelt earned a place in our history among the greatest leaders our country has ever had. And he earned a place in the hearts of the American people that few men have ever matched.

To the extent that we have prospered in this country in the last 25 years—and compared to depression days, today's recession is mild, indeed—we can be thankful for the great leadership and the great humanitarianism demonstrated by one of our greatest Presidents.

To the extent that we are now suffering economic dislocation, which is truly tragic for millions of Americans made jobless by present conditions, I think we can honestly say that we can point to failure on the part of our present national leaders to recognize the danger and to act against it—failure to follow the example set by Franklin D. Roosevelt in launching the New Deal and restoring America's spirit.

Resolution of Board of Directors of Wilkes-Barre General Hospital Concerning Hill-Burton Funds

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 6, 1958

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following resolution adopted by the board of directors of the Wilkes-Barre General Hospital expressing its concern over the possible reduction in appropriations under the Hill-Burton Act:

CERTIFIED COPY OF RESOLUTION OF BOARD OF DIRECTORS OF WILKES-BARRE GENERAL HOSPITAL

I, Charles N. Loveland, secretary of Wilkes-Barre General Hospital, hereby certify that the following is a true and correct copy of a resolution adopted by the board of directors of said hospital at a meeting thereof duly held in the city of Wilkes-Barre, Luzerne County, Pa., on Monday, February 24, 1958:

"Whereas the Wilkes-Barre General Hospital is in the midst of completing plans for an addition to its facilities in the city of Wilkes-Barre, Luzerne County, Pa., in order to provide for the needs of the people of our community; and

"Whereas, from all indications, the anticipated cost to provide such facilities will total approximately $3 million; and

"Whereas preparations have been made for the conduct of a campaign in the area serviced by the Wilkes-Barre General Hospital during the early part of 1959 in order to raise the sum of $2 million, which, together with the sum of $1 million which was anticipated in accordance with the provisions of the Hill-Burton Act, would provide the necessary sum for the construction of such facilities; and

"Whereas the Wilkes-Barre General Hospital is located in a community which is in a depressed economic state and is faced with ever increasing unemployment; and

"Whereas the Wilkes-Barre General Hospital is most desirous of embarking on its contemplated building program, which would thus provide the facilities so urgently needed by our people and likewise provide employment and the means of livelihood for so many of those in our community who are in need thereof; and

"Whereas it has come to the attention of the Wilkes-Barre General Hospital that His Excellency, the President of the United States, has recommended that the appropriation of funds in accordance with the Hill-Burton Act shall be reduced; and

"Whereas the adoption of the recommendation of His Excellency, the President of the United States, with regard to the reduction of such appropriations would be most unfortunate, both from the standpoint of supplying the needs in the area service by the Wilkes-Barre General Hospital and in curtailing the possible employment of so many on the unemployed rolls: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved*, That Wilkes-Barre General Hospital shall convey to the Committee on Appropriations of the United States Government its deep concern over the possibility of the reduction of appropriations in accordance with the provisions of the Hill-Burton Act and its most earnest wish and desire that the appropriations as originally made shall be continued."

Certified from the records of the Wilkes-Barre General Hospital this 4th day of March 1958.

CHARLES N. LOVELAND,
Secretary.

The National Guard

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES P. S. DEVEREUX
OF MARYLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 6, 1958

Mr. DEVEREUX. Mr. Speaker, before the Armed Services Committee of this House, representatives of the Department of the Army are unfolding their plans for a drastic reduction in the Reserve forces of this country to meet the limitations imposed by the budget of the Department of Defense.

The Army National Guard is the principal victim of the proposed force reduction. In April 1957 as the result of intensive efforts to increase the strength of the National Guard, it stood at an all-time high active strength of 434,000 men and officers. The Department of Defense then ordered it reduced to 400,000 by December 31, 1957. It is now to be cut a further 40,000 men and officers during the fiscal year 1959. Thus by June 30, 1959, its strength will be not more than 360,000 and 74,000 trained men and officers will have been turned out of the military service of our country. This means that in these dark days, when our enemies are busily enhancing their military strength, the Department of the Army is proposing that we turn away volunteers for military service to the equivalent in number of almost five full-strength combat divisions, and deny them the opportunity to prepare themselves to defend their country. And mind you, these are men who have come into the National Guard under the urging for the past several years of our national leadership.

Mr. Speaker, the proposals now being made to the Armed Services Committee gravely and irretrievably weaken the ability of our country to defend itself and those portions of the free world upon which our security depends.

Mr. Speaker, 3 years ago—February 1955—General Gruenther told the Armed Services Committee:

In my position as Supreme Allied Commander, Europe, it is my responsibility to study the effectiveness of the reserve systems of the various nations of NATO. It has become increasingly clear to me that the present Reserve system of the United States is one of the weakest in the entire North Atlantic Treaty Organization.

I have studied the national Reserve plan and the choices which it offers. I consider that it is a feasible plan and better than anything we have had before. If I were to offer any criticism of it, it would be that it does not go far enough toward providing combat-ready units soon enough. I, therefore, sincerely hope that if any changes are made in the program by the Congress, they will not be of such a nature as to weaken or dilute the present plan.

Three years ago General Ridgway, then our Army Chief of Staff, told the committee:

The Army's need for effective Reserve forces is greater today than ever before.

General Maxwell Taylor told us in July 1955:

The present weakness of our Reserve forces is the shortage of trained participating enlisted men.

Has the face of things, in your judgment, so changed for the better that the equivalent of five divisions of trained men can be cut from our first line of defense? For the Army National Guard, you must remember, is, under our law, a part of our first line of defense.

Are you satisfied that missiles, still imperfect and no one knows how far away as practical weapons of warfare, can justify the elimination by the end of the coming fiscal year of five combat divisions of trained manpower? Do you believe that we have come to the point where we cannot afford to train our young men to defend their country, and this at a time when the deadly possibilities of strange new weapons makes training a more vital necessity than ever before in history?

Less than one year ago when a controversy over the effect on the strength of the National Guard, of a requirement for 6 months active duty for training for all enlistees, was before our committee, it was agreed that the strength of the Army National Guard would be maintained at 400,000 through the fiscal years of 1957 and 1958 and that thereafter everything possible would be done to maintain the guard at its appropriated strength.

The President of the United States, in a message to the National Guard Association only last year said:

As Commander in Chief I subscribe fully to the statutory declaration that now and in the future we must maintain and assure the strength and organization of the National Guard as an integral part of the first line of defense of the Nation, to the end that your organizations shall be ready to discharge their historic role at the very outset of any national emergency * * *

And when appealed to personally by a delegation of State Adjutants General, including Maj. Gen. Milton A. Reckord of my own State of Maryland, he assured them directly that the National Guard would not be weakened.

No longer ago than last October, Secretary of the Army Brucker told the National Guard Association:

I am determined that the guard shall not be reduced below the 400,000 level at which it is set.

Mr. Speaker, the proposals for reduction in the strength of the Army National Guard break faith with all of these high assurances and shut the door in the faces of thousands of young men who wish to serve their country in the traditional manner of American citizen soldiers. This is unthinkable. It is an action which conveys to young American manhood the understanding that they are not needed for the security of this great Nation. It is an action which is evidenced in a most extreme manner for not only will the National Guard be required to refuse to accept the offered services of fine young men, but it must go further and turn out thousands upon thousands who are already in uniform.

There is every evidence of a purposeful design somewhere in the Department of Defense or in the Department of the Army to weaken the National Guard and to ultimately remove it from its time-honored and lawful place in the military structure of our country in deliberate disregard of the assurances I have quoted to you. I say this because I find that when reductions similar to those proposed for the National Guard are applied to the United States Army Reserve, no existing strength is lost from the Army Reserve. No men now serving will be required to leave the Army Reserve. In fact, it will continue to have room to expand its active drill strength, indeed beyond any such strength achieved in the past, and apparently even beyond the budgetary provisions being made for the Army Reserve in fiscal year 1959.

It is no secret that the Regular Army has been drastically reduced in strength over the past year and is now hard put to fulfill all of the worldwide commitments placed upon it. But it is proposed today to carry this reduction of forces into the Reserve components as well, directly contrary to the hitherto prevailing conception of the relation of the Reserve components to the Regular Establishment.

Gen. Maxwell Taylor, Chief of Staff of the Army, told us a year ago:

Really we should view our Army as a combination of the Active Army and the two Reserve components. As one goes down presumably the other should go up. The world situation changes and the whole aggregate should be adjusted. * * *

Admiral Radford, when he was Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, also said:

The size of the Regular forces, as I tried to say in my message this morning, was geared to the size and composition, organization of the Reserve forces. In other words, if we cannot get an organized Ready Reserve, then we would have to review the size of the Regular forces.

What is it that now justifies this change of front to a proposal to drastically reduce the Reserve components of our Military Establishment at the same time that a reduction is made in the Regular forces?

It has been widely stated in the public press that the proposed slash in the strength of the Army National Guard will be accomplished by complete elimination of some 5 or 6 existing National Guard divisions along with more than a thousand other organized formations throughout the country.

Gentlemen, consider what this means: If the Army puts its proposals into effect many States which, under urging from Washington to build up its National Guard, have made large investments in facilities and have made great contributions toward the building up of a strong National Guard, will suddenly find they have little or no National Guard at all. Many citizens who have served long and loyally in the National Guard and have attained military competence of great value to our country, will be discharged. No statement has yet been made by the Army describing the means by which the planned elimination of units will be accomplished. Reflect, then, if the plan now being placed before the Armed Services Committee receives our approval, any one of you may find your State bereft of most or all of the National Guard which it has supported and of which it has been proud for generations, in many States even back to the beginning of the country.

Mr. Speaker, it is unlawful to make any change in the plans, organization, or allocation of units of the National Guard without approval of the Governor of the State—title 32, United States Code, section 104. To accomplish such a result indirectly by withdrawing Federal funds applied to the support of the National Guard is a violation of the spirit, if not of the letter of the law, and it is an action which no Federal authority should be permitted to take.

I am happy to report that just the other day the subcommittee on which I serve unanimously reported two resolutions which in essence favors the retention for the National Guard strength at 400,000 and further provides for the Army Reserve to build up to 300,000. These resolutions have not yet been considered by the whole Armed Services Committee, but I feel certain that they will be favorably considered, and I trust and hope will be passed by the House of Representatives.

The courage, patriotism, and enthusiasm of the young men of this country, as exemplified by their voluntary participation in the programs of our Reserve forces, must not be dampened for lack of a comparatively small number of dollars. This fundamental resource must be nurtured, whatever the cost. As I have pointed out, the United States Army Reserve faces no problems of strength or funds in fiscal year 1959. On the other hand, the National Guard does face most serious deprivations. I am confident that this House will not permit this segment of our first line of defense, which is so much a part of the history and traditions of our States, to parch amidst the great wealth of this Nation.

And when we have provided the funds which will sustain the National Guard with the strength and vigor it now employs to the obvious benefit of our overall military strength, no destruction of its organizational integrity can be justified, and will not be tolerated by the American people.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the gentlemen of the House to give careful heed to the proposals being made to the Armed Services Committee and consider them in the light of what I have said today. Elimination of a part of the first line of defense of this Nation from whatever design or purpose or considerations it proceeds must not be permitted.

Spending Showdown

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ARCH A. MOORE, JR.
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 6, 1958

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Speaker, since coming to Congress, I have consistently urged and supported legislation which would enact into law many of the recommendations of the Hoover Commission. In supporting this legislation, I have recognized that these recommendations were made only after painstaking study and careful scrutiny of all phases of our governmental operations. The Hoover report recommendations which have been enacted into law have helped reduce Federal expenditures and have eliminated much waste and duplication.

Today, as we have under consideration H. R. 8002, I have great difficulty in understanding the objections which have been raised by a number of the members of the Appropriations Committee to this legislation which would employ sound accounting and managerial principles to Government. It is difficult to be sympathetic to the objections which have been raised, especially in view of the overwhelming support which this legislation has received from fiscal and accounting experts throughout the Nation. The measure also has been urged by the executive departments, the Director of the Budget, the Comptroller General, and the Senate passed this bill last session without a dissenting vote.

I want to urge my colleagues to support H. R. 8002, and enact this measure into law without further delay. In this regard, I would like to call the attention of the House to a most timely editorial, entitled "Spending Showdown," which appeared on March 4, 1958, in the Wheeling Intelligencer, a leading newspaper in my district.

The editorial follows:

SPENDING SHOWDOWN

At long last, it now would appear, the House of Representatives is to be given opportunity to pass on one of the major recommendations of the Hoover Commission Report—year-to-year congressional control of all governmental spending. Agreement has been reached for a vote tomorrow on this vital proposal, terminating a protracted series of behind-the-scenes maneuvering.

Here is an excellent example of how abuse of the committee system is permitted to obstruct the course of legislation and either delay or prevent entirely decision by the main legislative body on important matters of public policy.

The proposal is aimed at the waste inherent in the present system of financing long-term projects. The money is authorized and earmarked for an undertaking, after which Congress virtually loses control. The money is spent by the agency involved substantially as it sees fit. Over the years carryover funds from undertakings of this type have accumulated to the total of some $70 billion, constituting, in the judgment of competent accounting authorities acquainted with the situation, a temptation to waste and representing a serious congressional surrender of the power to control the purse strings.

To correct this condition, the Hoover Commission proposed that year-to-year progress reports be submitted to Congress and the money made available only as the work progressed and as Congress authorized. Thus the agency of Government responsible for taxes and the use of their proceeds would be given an annual look at and control over all long-range programs.

The proposal, reduced to bill form, received immediate approval of the President, of the Budget Director, of the Comptroller General, and of high-ranking Members of Congress in both parties. The Senate version, introduced under bipartisan sponsorship as the Kennedy-Payne-Byrd bill, was passed by the Senate last year without a single dissenting vote. The House version, known as H. R. 8002, was approved by both the House Committee on Government Operations and the powerful Rules Committee. Yet for all these months action on it has been blocked by opposition from within the House Appropriations Committee, led by Chairman CLARENCE CANNON, Democrat, of Missouri, and Congressman JOHN TABER, Republican, of New York, the ranking minority member.

If Messrs. CANNON and TABER and their supporters in Congress have legitimate reasons for opposing this legislation, let them make known their objections on the floor of the House and persuade, if they can, a majority of their associates to go along with them. They do not have, it is submitted, a moral right to block action, as they have succeeding in doing up until now, on any matter of public importance, especially one which has won so large a measure of public and official approval. Procedural rules which make possible obstruction of this sort should be revised. No committee should be permitted to hold back any measure beyond the time required for reasonable study and the formulation of an informed recommendation.

Resolution by Kassab Joseph Veterans' Post of Wilkes-Barre Concerning United States Citizens Held as Prisoners in Communist China

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 6, 1958

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following resolution adopted by the Kassab Joseph Post, No. 1487, Catholic War Veterans, Wilkes-Barre, urging action by the United States Government to accomplish the early release of United States citizens now being held prisoners in Communist China:

RESOLUTION

"Whereas the Kassab Joseph Post, No. 1487, Catholic War Veterans of the United States of America, in the city of Wilkes-Barre, county of Luzerne, Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, has been informed that there are citizens of the United States unlawfully held as prisoners in China by the Communist government of China; and

"Whereas the members of said post strongly believe and urge that it is the responsibility of the United States Government to continually use all proper means to secure the immediate release of such citizens of the United States: Now, therefore, it is hereby

"*Resolved*, That the members of the aforesaid Kassab Joseph Post, No. 1487, of the Catholic War Veterans of the United States of America hereby urge that the proper officials of the United States Government take immediate and continued action to accomplish the early release of the citizens of the United States unlawfully held as prisoners by the Communist government of China, and that a copy of this resolution be forwarded to the President of the United States, United States Senators from Pennsylvania, and the Members of the House of Representatives from Luzerne County."

I hereby certify that the aforesaid resolution was duly adopted at a regular meeting of the Kassab Joseph Post, No. 1487, Catholic War Veterans of the United States of America, on Sunday, February 23, 1958, at Wilkes-Barre, Pa.

LEO GEORGE, *Commander.*

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D. C., at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer plus 50 percent: *Provided*, That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized bookdealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by bookdealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

PRICE OF THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

The Public Printer is authorized to furnish to subscribers the daily RECORD at $1.50 per month, payable in advance.

Remit by money order payable to Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D. C.

PRINTING OF CONGRESSIONAL RECORD EXTRACTS

It shall be lawful for the Public Printer to print and deliver upon the order of any Senator, Representative, or Delegate, extracts from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the person ordering the same paying the cost thereof (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 185, p. 1942).

Appendix

Lincoln and American Foreign Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. WILLIAM F. KNOWLAND

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, March 10, 1958

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the text of the Lincoln Day address delivered by the distinguished senior Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER] at Toledo, Ohio, on February 12, under the title "Lincoln and American Foreign Policy."

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LINCOLN AND AMERICAN FOREIGN POLICY

(Lincoln Day address of Senator JOHN W. BRICKER, Toledo, Ohio, February 12, 1958)

'We live in the midst of alarms; anxiety beclouds the future; we expect some new disaster with each newspaper we read. * * *" These were Lincoln's words in a speech at Bloomington, Ill., on May 29, 1856. Today, 102 years later, the alarms, the anxiety, and the expectancy of disaster have increased manyfold. My remarks here tonight will be more in keeping with the somber background than with this festive occasion.

What should be the response of the Republican Party, the response of the American people, to the looming threat of global annihilation? There is no possibility, of course, of turning back the clock; of pushing back into the bottle the destructive capabilities of human intelligence. To believe that scientific inquiry having military applications can be suppressed is a form of idle daydreaming. It is our destiny to explore the infinitely small recesses of the atom and the infinitely vast distances of outer space and yet somehow avert a catastrophe springing from finite limitations on human wisdom and morality.

I do not know of any better way to keep freedom from going under than by drawing upon the profound wisdom shown by Lincoln during his ordeal. This will not be easy. It will be necessary to separate the real Lincoln from the Lincoln of myth and legend. In addition, analogies between the events of one century and those of another are often imperfect or misleading. As Lincoln himself said:

"The dogmas of the quiet past are inadequate to the stormy present. The occasion is piled high with difficulty, and we must rise with the occasion. As our case is new, so must we think anew, and act anew. We must disenthrall ourselves, and then we shall save the country." (Annual message to Congress, December 1, 1862.)

The perils of the present are also unprecedented. I believe, however, that the world's best hope of peace and freedom lies in a thoughtful, modern adaptation of Lincoln's political philosophy.

Stripped to its fundamentals the survival of the free world hinges on the foreign and defense policies of the United States. The long-term effectiveness of these policies depends in turn, wholly and absolutely, on the quality of American education.

In what President Eisenhower has aptly described as total cold war, a host of domestic issues—Federal spending and taxation, civil rights, internal security, agricultural production, industrial employment—are extremely important in the mortal struggle against international communism. However, an unwise decision on one or more domestic issues is not likely to prove fatal. On the other hand, a basic miscalculation in foreign or defense policy may easily spell the difference between life and death.

Because foreign and defense policies are of such crucial importance many well-meaning people have said they should be taken out of politics; that they should not be subjected to extended political debate. Let me say right here and now that I am in 100 percent disagreement with this curious notion. I am not one who believes that politics must stop either at the water's edge or outside the doors of the Pentagon. The people have a right to know and a duty to decide. Only in a crucible fired by political controversy can we formulate policies which are sound and durable.

Of course, there are all kinds of politics—good, bad, and indifferent. This is true whether the issue is paving a street or testing nuclear weapons. The people of Ohio are smart enough to detect any demagogic handling of political issues.

Ordinarily, there is not much political mileage in crying over spilled milk. But so long as Democrats insist that the Truman-Acheson foreign policy is a model for the future or that their national defense policies were far sighted, we should not hesitate to prove them wrong. We did it in 1952 and we can do it in 1958. However, new issues affecting the next generation are vastly more important than old issues debated in the last election.

In urging that the great issues of our time be settled by political debate, Lincoln is the only witness we need to call. If there was ever a time for a moratorium on politics it was in 1864. The outcome of the war was still in doubt. The North was divided into three hostile groups: the supporters of Lincoln; the forces of appeasement; and the faction demanding unconditional surrender and harsh retribution. Two days after his victory at the polls Lincoln cited the election as convincing proof that a government not too strong for the liberties of its people can be strong enough to maintain its own existence in great emergencies. And then he said, "If the rebellion could force us to forego or postpone a national election, it might fairly claim to have already conquered and ruined us." I see a great difference between conquest by the Confederacy and conquest by communism, but I see little difference between foregoing an election and holding one in which issues intimately related to the survival of the human race cannot be discussed.

No one has suggested that the problems of American education should be taken out of the political arena. In fact, the leftwing of the Democratic Party hopes to capitalize in this year's election on what most people agree is a crisis in education. The solution of these New Deal retreads at least has the virtue of simplicity. They merely take all the proposals of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare and then multiply all the figures by 4 or 6 or 10 depending on the degree of their irresponsibility. However, the most serious weakness of American education is due to an organic illness, what the progressive educators praise as life adjustment but diagnosed by Dr. Arthur Bestor (and by most scientists and scholars) as perilously close to death adjustment for our Nation and our children. How reckless it is to pretend that this illness can be cured by splints of gold or bandages made of greenbacks.

In our justifiable concern about the quality of American education let us never come to regard those who do not go on to college as second-class citizens. Remember Abraham Lincoln. He educated himself with a few classics of history and literature, the Bible, and apprenticeship at the bar. Yet he turned out to be the most profound political thinker in our history. Jefferson was more brilliant and his intellectual range was wider, but there has never been anyone who could reduce a problem to its bare essentials so well as Lincoln, or whose actions correspond so closely to his principles. That such a man appeared on the political scene at the time he did must be accounted the nearest thing to a miracle in American history.

In recent years we have tended to emphasize only a certain side of Lincoln's character. Of course he was inspired by humanitarian impulses, by a hatred of oppression, by confidence in the people, and by faith in God. But, unfortunately, we seem in recent years to have forgotten other characteristics which tempered those mentioned and which were perhaps more important in the preservation of the Union.

We might look first at the matter of passion. If we did not detest communism we could not hope to remain free, nor would Lincoln have returned to politics had he not hated the institution of human slavery. But this is what Lincoln said on the subject: "Passion has helped us but can do so no more. * * * Reason, cold, calculation, unimpassioned reason—must furnish all the materials for our future support and defense. * * *" Lincoln was always ready to negotiate with the South upon one condition. The condition was not unconditional surrender but simply the return of the Southern States to the Union. At the bottom of our policy of unconditional surrender in World War II was passion, not reason. Hitler's atrocities make that passion understandable, but because passion was not restrained by Lincoln's cold and calculating reason we have today a divided Germany, a Red China, and the enslavement of Eastern Europe. As a result, America has never been in greater danger. I am not trying to put all the blame on the Roosevelt administration. The policy of unconditional surrender was generally approved by the American people. What I do want to stress is that we dare not make the same mistake again.

I do not know any man less likely to be consumed by passion than Dwight D. Eisenhower. His temperament is a precious asset for the free world. Moreover, the people of the world know that President Eisenhower, notwithstanding all manner of Soviet provocations, is not going to abandon the quest for peace. Still, there are many Americans who seem to believe that we should negotiate with the Soviet Union only on the terms of its dissolution. The best help we can give

President Eisenhower in his crusade for peace is to stamp out, wherever we find it, the idea that the only alternative to the cold war is the unconditional surrender of the Soviet Union.

Lincoln's confidence in the commonsense of the people was tempered by a profound understanding of the flaws in human nature. His law partner, W. H. Herndon, no doubt exaggerated, but Herndon said that Lincoln always took the negative position in their discussions on the subject of unselfish human actions. We do know that Lincoln advised young lawyers not to take the whole fee in advance as that would put too great a strain upon a natural inclination to be lazy. Also, Lincoln opposed a bank bill solely on the ground that the duty and the self-interest of the custodians of funds did not coincide.

We could use more of Lincoln's skepticism about the innate goodnes of human nature. The man who advised young lawyers always to link duty and self-interest would be quick to see that in any unenforceable agreement banning the production of nuclear weapons the moral duty of the Soviet Union would not coincide with its declared self-interest.

We need, too, in this hour of crisis a greater measure of Lincoln's humility. How strange it must appear to many people today that Lincoln never placed God in the corner of the Union. Instead, in 1862 he conceded that in the present civil war it is quite possible that God's purpose is something different from the purpose of either party. In a letter written in 1864 he suggested that the war was divine retribution on both North and South for their toleration of slavery. And in his second inaugural address he supposed God's will to be to continue the war until every drop of blood drawn with the lash shall be paid by another drawn with the sword. Only with this tremendous perspective is it possible to say with Lincoln: "I shall do nothing in malice. What I deal with is too vast for malicious dealing." This generation deals with something much more vast and the necessity of humility and honest self-appraisal is thus even greater.

There is a very close parallel between a nation half slave and half free in 1858 and a world in that condition a century later. We can learn much from the cool reason and rigorous logic which Lincoln applied to his problem. It was territory, rather than morality or legislation, on which Lincoln built his case. The territory of a nation, Lincoln said, is the enduring part, whereas generations fade away and laws can be repealed or amended. Slavery he regarded as a moral wrong, but knew it to be a legal right. His strategy, therefore, was to confine slavery to the territory it already blighted. Knowing that if slavery could not grow it must wither and die, he would thereby put it in course of ultimate extinction.

Soviet oppression is a moral wrong, but in the present state of international law a legal right. Communism, too, will wither away if it cannot grow. A vital part of the East-West conflict is a dispute over territory, primarily that of Germany. If we concentrate on the territorial problem, rather than on international moral and legal reformation, we may be able to put communism in course of ultimate extinction. As Republicans we can be very proud of the record of the Eisenhower administration in avoiding war while at the same time confining communism to virtually the same territory it held 6 years ago.

In Ida Tarbell's Life of Lincoln there is a moving chapter on the journey of Lincoln's funeral train and this conclusion: "The result was a demonstration which in sincerity and unanimity has never been equaled in the world's history." Ninety-three years ago this April the train carrying Lincoln and his son Willie on their last earthly journey rolled slowly through Ohio, not a bell ringing or whistle sounding. The grandparents of many Ohioans were eyewitnesses. I want to read a few sentences of Ida Tarbell's description of the scene as an indication of how deeply the American people revered a leader who never sacrificed principle for expediency:

"At many points arches were erected over the track; at others the bridges were wreathed from end to end in crape and evergreens and flags. And this was not in the towns alone; every farmhouse by which the train passed became for the time a funeral house; the plow was left in the furrow, crape was on the door, the neighbors were gathered, and those who watched from the trains as it flew by could see groups of weeping women, of men with uncovered heads, sometimes a minister among them, his arms raised in prayer. Night did not hinder them. Great bonfires were built in lonely countrysides, around which the farmers waited patiently to salute their dead. At the towns the length of the train was lit by blazing torches. Storm as well as darkness was unheeded. Much of the journey was made through the rain, in fact, but the people seemed to have forgotten all things but that Abraham Lincoln, the man they loved and trusted, was passing by for the last time." (Tarbell, Life of Lincoln, vol. 2 (1917 ed.), p. 258.)

That was the first Republican President; the man who in life saved the Union; and whose principles long after his death may save the world if we have the courage to act upon them.

Lincoln's Day Address by William J. Tepsic, Commander, Department of Pennsylvania, Veterans of Foreign Wars

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD MARTIN
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, March 10, 1958

Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania. Mr. President, William J. Tepsic, Commander of the Department of Pennsylvania, Veterans of Foreign Wars, delivered a most interesting and instructive address on Lincoln's Day, February 12, 1958, at Beaver Falls, Pa., and I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS BY WILLIAM J. TEPSIC, COMMANDER, DEPARTMENT OF PENNSYLVANIA, VETERANS OF FOREIGN WARS OF THE UNITED STATES, AT THE DINNER OBSERVING THE 149TH ANNIVERSARY OF ABRAHAM LINCOLN'S BIRTH, AT THE LT. COL. J. EDWARD BOYLE POST, VETERANS OF FOREIGN WARS, BEAVER FALLS, PA., FEBRUARY 12, 1958

Comrades and fellow Americans, annually at this time, members of the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States assemble to pay solemn tribute to one of the world's truly great men—Abraham Lincoln.

In every community in our Nation, at every outpost of civilization wherever Americans might be serving their country, or are present as travelers, they too, will pay reverent respect to the memory of this immortal man.

All Americans can pause and reflect upon the great character that Lincoln embodied in that gaunt frame; contemplate the humanity hidden deeply in the recesses of his penetrating mind and wrapped in his soul. He is the symbol of all that is human.

The processes of his thinking and the end product of his thoughts are closely enough related to the supernatural to cause us to wonder how one man could possess all the noble attributes that were his.

All humanity now needs another Lincoln to guide us through these times of great stress and recurring crises brought about by confusion, animosities and deep hatred.

I believe Lincoln could find the solution to our ills if he were alive today for he brought unity where there was disunity; inspired honesty where there was dishonesty; raised superhuman courage in men who despaired, wrought victory out of defeat, and combined all these to preserve our Republic.

No Athenian rose to save Athens and all her glory. No Roman rose to save the Roman Empire from destruction. But Lincoln rose, guided our Nation through the greatest crisis in our history and until then, the greatest crisis of free government in all history, including Greece and Rome.

This is why I believe Lincoln's genius would guide us today. My belief that this is true, is strengthened by his own wisdom expressed in his last public address at Washington, April 11, 1865, when he said: "Important principles may and must be flexible."

Much of today's troubles remain unresolved primarily because of the inflexibility of world leaders in assuming they alone are right.

Lincoln's flexibility, yet keeping his purpose and principle in the forefront was expressed in this penetrating thought about the Civil War: "My paramount object in this struggle is to save the Union, and is not either to save or destroy slavery. If I could save the Union without freeing any slave, I would do it; and if I could save it by freeing all the slaves, I would do it; and if I could save it by freeing some and leaving others alone, I would also do that."

We are confronted with retaining unity in the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, probably the last bulwark against encroaching communism. Yet, this organization is involved with misunderstandings that are magnified through unwillingness by some of its members to compromise—to adjust their difference through application of Lincoln's flexibility to remove frictions that start simply enough in initially minor matters of opinion that accumulate, multiply and are magnified until they become major obstacles to unity so essential to the free world's survival.

We need only to recall the grave differences between Britain, France, and ourselves over the Suez Canal that led to Soviet penetration of the Middle East and just a few days ago to union between Egypt and Syria, with ultimately probably other Arab nations that can spark a third world war. Behind these moves is Soviet Russia.

But let us remember we live in a world confused by two illusions. One is that a world opinion already exists on a given problem and that the problem can be readily solved by an appeal by one disputant nation to the other. This may be true with respect to Britain and ourselves because of common heritages. But, even this assumption failed utterly in the Suez crisis. It fails elsewhere most of the time because different nations, although bound together by a common danger, such as we find ourselves in today, have different national priorities of interests outside the common danger. Unless compromise is found, the appeal fails and the collaboration, such as NATO can be weakened and can possibly be destroyed.

The second illusion is that a common national memory exists among former war allies in a postwar period. All of us in the free world and even the Soviet Union itself, made common cause toward World War II victory. To think since this common unity once ex-

isted it will continue indefinitely is the fallacy that today also threatens the free world.

I believe Lincoln's penetrating mind would probe until he found the applicable compromise and apply it without abandoning the principle that must be retained if unity is to be preserved.

These thoughts came to me a few days ago in Washington where we attended the midwinter conference of the Veterans of Foreign Wars, when I had the opportunity to again stand in reverent respect before the impressive Lincoln Memorial on the banks of the Potomac on the route to Arlington National Cemetery, where lie buried side by side in eternal peace the Nation's heroes—Union and Confederate alike, who fell in the Civil War.

As I stood before the memorial, I read as millions of others have read, part of Lincoln's second inaugural address. I was stirred to deep emotion by these words carved deep in the stone:

"With malice toward none; with charity for all; with firmness in the right as God gave us to see the right, let us strive to finish the work we are in; to bind up the Nation's wounds; to care for him who shall have borne the battle, and for his widow, and his orphan—to do all which may achieve and cherish a just and lasting peace among ourselves and with all nations."

Even in that address, he was thinking of a just and lasting peace among ourselves and with all nations.

Lincoln's phrase, "to care for him who shall have borne the battle, and for his widow, and his orphan," is the basis for the Veterans of Foreign Wars existence. Those immortal words are our constant guide in relations with other veterans, their widows and their orphans. No more noble guide can be found in all the writings of history to point our way through life.

What ideals those words inspire. What noble goals for all men everywhere, and particularly now in our own country after the appalling losses of two world wars and Korea and possibly a third world war approaching. Some are now considering cutting veterans' pensions and benefits.

Think of this proposed abandonment of the veteran in contrast to much of Lincoln's greatness that can be found in six cardinal attributes: his unshakable belief in unity; his love for humanity; his patience; his superior commonsense; his mercy, and his confidence in God.

These qualities sorely tried by poverty; by handicaps; by disappointments, shaped his character and guided the hand and mind that determined our Nation's destiny.

Lincoln is one of the paradoxes of all times. Let us think of the great achievements of this man, who, deprived of his mother, neglected by his father, reared in abject poverty, unschooled and left to his own devices, his was a boyhood in which the records reveal little but struggle and suffering.

Sociologists would say delinquency was knocking at his mind's door. But, from misfortune, from these handicaps, emerged a man who towers above most men of history. There is enough in any one of his deeds and in his profound thinking to bring virtual immortality to any public man.

In the first place, he was chosen for the Presidency on a compromise platform and was a minority victor. In 1862, 3 years before his death, he said he would be commander in chief of a million soldiers and that his steps to the Capitol would be dogged by assassins. Despite this premonition, he went to Washington.

In his first year as President, Lincoln made the most momentous decision any American President ever made, and that was: if necessary to preserve the Union, brother Americans must fight against each other. He took this decision in a mind tormented by the implication of what would occur, but he did it with a fervent appeal to God for a sign of His intention.

Conduct of the early part of the Civil War was a source of dissatisfaction to Lincoln. He looked fervently for a general comparable to the Confederate genius, Robert E. Lee. Eventually he found him in Grant, but despite his ability in the field, Lincoln was urged to remove him both for, as was said in the streets and in high places, being unfit by conduct and temperament for important military command. John Hay, Lincoln's private secretary begged the President to remove him, but Hay later said: "Lincoln remained silent for what seemed a very long time. He then gathered himself up in his chair and said in a tone of earnestness that I shall never forget, 'I can't spare that man; he fights.'" Time has proven his wisdom at this critical juncture in our history.

Amid all the trials, reverses, and the disloyalty of some of his Cabinet, Lincoln sufferd the death of one whom many considered his favorite child, little William. This grief-stricken President worked harder than ever trying to forget his tremendous loss. The cries of dying soldiers and the pleas of widows and orphans were ever in his ears. Yet, with all his sympathy for suffering humanity, there was not the slightest deviation from duty as he carried the tremendous responsibility of the imperiled Republic.

When peace came, and with it, the clamor for the hanging or long imprisonment for southern leaders, Lincoln told his Cabinet on April 14, 1865: "Enough life has been sacrificed, we must extinguish our resentment if we expect harmony and union." To think in this vein would in itself make any man great. The next day he was dead.

Had Lincoln lived, there is little doubt that the difficulties of the reconstruction period after the Civil War, some of which remain with us, would have been minimized if not completely avoided. That this is true is found in the fact that in his inaugural address he said the Union could not be broken by a pretended secession. In a proclamation of August 1861, he said the people of the Confederacy were in rebellion, not the States of the Confederation.

In all his deeds and speeches, Lincoln held this view. His bitterest enemy in his reconstruction plans was not a southerner, but a Vermonter become Pennsylvanian—Thaddeus Stevens, the vindictive invalid who was determined that the Democratic Party would never rise again.

This was the atmosphere in which Lincoln found himself. It was pathetic, for in his heart there was no vindictiveness, only compassion; there was no hatred, but deep love for his fellowman; there was no rancor, but only good will. When he died the course of our history set by him, drifted without his guiding genius.

On Good Friday of 1865, the mortal life of the savior of the Union ended. He never regained consciousness. Some about him on his deathbed said a look of unspeakable peace came over his tired features. Others added, "Now he belongs to the ages."

He was prophetic in his assassination. He did his utmost to finish nobly the task he started. He kept the faith to the end.

This is why we Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States find inspiration in Lincoln's own words to carry on our work among those who have borne the battle, his widow and his orphan, ask you to study and to reflect upon the life of Lincoln—the preeminent advocate of the dignity of man.

As we stand today at the crossroads of history in a world half slave and half free, we can ponder what Abraham Lincoln would think of humanity's plight. He once said, "As I would not be a slave, so I would not be master. This expresses my idea of democracy," he said, and added, "whatever differs from this to the extent of the difference is no democracy."

This is far from the conception of the Communists who are abroad in our land and elsewhere on earth making every effort to destroy the dignity of man. They would destroy us too, given the opportunity, and with our destruction, the last strong citadel of democracy and civilization as God and man has boldly created it would disappear. There are more than 200 Communist organizations operating in the United States ready to help in our destruction.

We can be confident that tolerant Lincoln would commend the Indian members of the Veterans of Foreign Wars who led the rout of the intolerant Ku Klux Klan at their attempted anti-Indian rally near Maxton, N. C., about a month ago. Who, he would say, has the right among us to deny these only real Americans the right to live wherever they wish in their native land?

In World War II, no other combat group won so many individual battle honors than Indians and we are proud this major defeat of the shameless, faceless Klan, was inflicted by Indians who apparently have a deep sense of Americanism that might be emulated by some other Americans.

We are proud we can reflect in the great honor they brought to our great organization by their active opposition to American unity and in defense of all that Lincoln stood for. Pennsylvania on this Lincoln's birthday should suitably cite our Indian comrades whose leader was a North Carolina district commander.

I think you will agree with me, that if Lincoln were with us tonight, he would repeat what he said at Cleveland, February 15, 1861, which is as applicable now as then:

"If we do not have common cause to save the good old ship of the Union on this voyage, nobody will have a chance to pilot her on another voyage."

Corrections and Additions

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ALVIN E. O'KONSKI

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 6, 1958

Mr. O'KONSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask permission to insert at this time corrections and additions to previous speeches appearing in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

In the speech appearing on Thursday, March 18, 1954, I ask that the following sentences be added at the bottom of the speech:

The living conditions of the aged are far worse than living conditions in many parts of the world that our leaders are so concerned about. In fact, many of the countries we are giving billions to have a better old-age pension system than we ourselves have. Where is the heart and conscience of America to treat others better than we treat our very own? Most unfortunately, the majority of Congressmen have toured to other parts of the world, but they have never toured the small communities of our Nation to see the sad conditions under which our aged people are struggling to survive. America would look better in the eyes of the world if we turned our attention to taking care of these people who no longer can care for themselves.

To the speech of Friday, June 23, 1957, I wish to add the following sentences to the end of that speech:

The planes we gave France killed hundreds of innocent women and children in Tunisia. This is just one example of the many where our foreign-aid program has led to murder and has turned the people of the world against us. Yet in the light of this condition, our leaders are urging more and more giveaways of the same type. What a tragedy. Today we are being asked to vote more billions for a foreign giveaway program. I wish to report to the people I represent that I have never voted for this monstrosity, and the more the world sees of it the more my position has been proved right. How can anyone in good conscience justify giving away more than $130 billion of the people's money only to have the world getting worse and worse instead of better and better?

To the remarks of Thursday, Jun 17, 1948, I would like to add this sentence:

Since these figures were compiled, we must add another $5 billion our Government gave away last year. So the amount that we actually gave away since 1941 is $136 billion. This appears to be just one-half of the national debt staring into the faces of our children and our children's children.

Corruption Is Seeping Into All Walks of Life

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE M. RHODES
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 27, 1958

Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following editorial from Labor, official publication of the Railway Labor Unions:

CORRUPTION IS SEEPING INTO ALL WALKS OF LIFE

Is a cynical standard of morality spreading through all walks of life in the United States? That question was raised and answered with a positive "Yes" by two well-known editors of daily papers during the past week—that is, Ralph McGill, of the Atlanta (Ga.) Constitution, and William T. Evjue, of the Madison (Wis.) Capital Times.

Both pointed out editorially that the decline in standards isn't something affecting labor unions alone, though that's been the most publicized.

McGill cites officials who regard their office as a "license to use public moneys as they please and profit thereby where they can"; also, members of Federal commissions who draw "expense money" from the Government "and at the same time from some public source."

Likewise, he points to the fact that many State legislatures "are producing their usual malodorous fare." Also, many county and State officials have secret and lucrative interests in firms selling goods and services to the State.

Among other examples he lists are "gross immorality" in the awarding of State contracts and "shakedown of liquor dealers by threatening loss of license." He refers likewise to public officials who "enter office without means and quitting it well off by reason of having shrewd 'within the law' machinations at the expense of the taxpayers." In the South, he adds, the situation as to "rascality" in public office is "often so utterly cynical as to be preposterous." In other words, "anything goes" so long as it doesn't violate a law.

Summing up, McGill says: "Without much question, there is the greatest cynicism with regard to public money and public morality," and too many people think that "doing wrong" means "merely doing something that causes one to be arrested—if caught."

Evjue, in even stronger terms, declares that "one of the most deplorable aspects of American life today is the deepening indifference of the American people to the low moral standards that prevail and the widespread corruption that prevails in a government that is infested with political opportunism."

He blamed the situation on "rampant materialism that has supplanted the moral values that have given substance to the free way of life throughout our history." The real trouble, he says, is that "the dollar sign, instead of the cross, is the star toward which American eyes turn today."

Clearly, as these noted editors pointed out, what's needed in this country today is a new moral revolution that will sweep through unions, industry, government, the professions, and every other facet of American life. Idealism must replace cynicism, if the vaunted American way of life is to survive.

Is Baseball Big Business?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 19, 1958

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I know that many Members of this body are interested in the future of professional sports. In view of recent decisions of the Supreme Court and later action by a subcommittee of the House Judiciary Committee in this field, I think the Members of the House will be interested in reading the following article, written by Mr. Harold Weissman, which appeared in the February 25, 1958, edition of the New York Daily Mirror:

NATIONAL FOOTBALL LEAGUE BASEBALL'S BEST FRIEND

(By Harold Weissman)

Off the record: Baseball, as even Hilda Chester now reluctantly concedes, is big business, but did it ever occur to you that professional football is a big part of that business? Who said it doesn't figure? Well, go out and bet on this figure: $725,000. That, in round figures, is what National Football League tenants paid to seven major league landlords last year. And that's not a figure of speech.

Keep in mind that the total is confined to rental revenue. The annual bill from concessions accruing to the baseball managements from pro football is conservativly estimated at "a minimum of $300,000" by an authoritative National Football League source. That adds up to a million dollars plus, a year, even if you use your fingers. A nice, tidy sum to finger, at that.

Fact of that matter is the footballers have provided the difference between red and black ink in two big league ledgers: the Pirates and Senators. Pittsburgh received $87,000 last year from the Steelers for the use of Forbes Field, while the Redskins turned over $70,000 to Washington for the privilege of occupying Griffith Stadium on 6 Sundays. Top rental fee was the whopping $203,000 charged the Lions in Briggs Stadium for 7 games—which included the $53,000 payment for the championship pairing.

Second highest contributor was the Giants, with $130,000 to the Messrs. Topping and Webb in Yankee Stadium, followed by the $115,000 with which the Chicago Bears enriched Wrigley Field. The Eagles were taxed $60,000 by the Phillies for Connie Mack Stadium, a figure matched by the Chicago Cardinals for Comiskey Park. The remaining five National Football League teams—Los Angeles, San Francisco, Baltimore, Green Bay, and Cleveland—sell their merchandise in municipally operated arenas, beyond the reach of the diamond magnates.

The moral: Not only is there a foot in football, but football also foots a great part of the bill for baseball. It's just another illustration of the squeeze play.

Telephone Company Executive Opposes Increase in REA Interest Rates

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM E. PROXMIRE
OF WISCONSIN
Monday, March 10, 1958

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, the farmers who have written to me concerning the President's recommendation that REA interest rates be increased have been unanimous in opposition to any such increase. What farm leaders have said about the importance of the REA electric and telephone programs to rural life has been most convincing. It is, therefore, all the more convincing to have an executive of a privately owned telephone utility declare himself in favor of the REA program.

Mr. President, the Badger State Telephone & Telegraph Co., at Neillsville, Wis., is one of the finest independent telephone companies in the Nation. It is a small business concern, and it has made a great effort to provide its custom with adequate telephone service. In my estimation, Mr. President, it is of critical importance to the preservation of our free economic system to maintain and promote small, independent business like this fine telephone utility. Its difficulties in competition with a giant monopoly in this field are great. The difficult of securing adequate financing is one of the most serious.

Mr. Smith has written to me concerning the importance of maintaining the REA program on the present basis, to provide adequate financing at reasonable interest rates. I ask unanimous consent that this extremely significant testimony about REA interest rates be printed in Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BADGER STATE TELEPHONE
AND TELEGRAPH CO.,
Neillsville, Wis., February 24, 1958.

Senator WILLIAM PROXMIRE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR PROXMIRE: Present legislation before Congress proposes a change regarding REA loans for extending and improving power and telephone service.

We have recently taken advantage of REA financing. As a matter of fact, we had no other place to go. The Public Service Commission of Wisconsin holds pretty closely to a 50-50 ratio of equity versus debt limit. A recent Wisconsin Legislature made an exception for REA borrowers by setting a 10-percent equity requirement. We were able under this provision to engineer for and propose to build a completely adequate and modern, dial system. Our present 1,750 subscribers are greatly enthused over this project which will be completed in early 1959.

Small public utilities found long-term financing difficult even before inflation; since inflation we have used up our borrowing capacity merely keeping up with demands for service. A much needed rehabilitation and modernizaiton was only possible through REA borrowing.

If anything to be done will greatly alter present procedure, I would certainly suggest caution and a thorough examination. Large utilities can issue bonds, and so forth, but we small operators have not the facilities to go into the money market on bigtime scale. As for the interest rate—we must pass that on to our subscribers, but if at all possible, I sincerely recommend a continuation of the present rate.

If you have any specific questions, I will do all I can to furnish you the answers.

Sincerely,

H. M. SMITH, *Secretary.*

Commentary by David Lawrence on Unemployment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD MARTIN
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, March 10, 1958

Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania. Mr. President, the commentator, Mr. David Lawrence, has made some very fine observations on the bank crisis of 1932 and 1933. He also has commented on unemployment in our country, and stated that in 1932 there were 12,060,000 unemployed and after 6 years of New Deal pump priming, in 1938, there were still 10,390,000 unemployed, and even after World War II broke out in 1941, there were 5,560,000 unemployed.

The fair way to make comparisons is by percentages. At the depth of the 1930 depression 28.6 percent of the labor force was unemployed, while at the present time only 7.4 percent is unemployed. This should be compared with the postwar high of 7.8 percent in 1950.

I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BANK CRISIS OF 1932–33 COULD HAVE BEEN AVOIDED

(By David Lawrence)

WASHINGTON, March 4.—A quarter of a century has elapsed since the Nation experienced a bank holiday that closed all banks for a week beginning March 6, 1933. It signalized the start of the New Deal—a reform era that continued for many years. To this day, the leadership of the late President Franklin D. Roosevelt in that crisis is often extolled, especially the reassuring words of his inaugural address: "The only thing we have to fear is fear itself."

Little was said then, however, and little has been said since about how the bank crisis could have been avoided. Nor was it learned until many years later that the American banks on the whole were really solvent. Only about 22 percent were forced into liquidation, and even these paid out 85 cents on the depositor's dollar. Persons with less than $5,000 on deposit in these banks actually got 90 cents on the dollar.

The bank holiday should never have occurred, and it would not have been necessary if there had been real leadership on the part of Mr. Roosevelt in the period between the election in November and his inauguration in March. Herbert Hoover, who was the outgoing President, pleaded in vain with the President-elect to cooperate in working out a formula for the transition period that would have established confidence in the financial institutions of the country.

But Mr. Roosevelt, who was poorly advised, was told by his political friends that, if he sat down with the incumbent President, there would be a certain political responsibility attached to his record for the events of that period and that he had better wait until inauguaration day before assuming any responsibility. Although Mr. Roosevelt came to Washington for a perfunctory visit with the outgoing President, it did little good. For the air was filled with rumors about Mr. Roosevelt's intention to revalue gold and to call in all the precious metal for the Government to hold. Gold has not since circulated in this country.

It is difficult to estimate in dollars the damage done by the 1933 bank holiday. The economic and financial machinery of the Nation was paralyzed. Since then a system of Federal insurance of bank deposits has been established; but even before this it would have been easy for the Federal Government, if Congress had approved, to extend promptly the authority of an agency like the Reconstruction Finance Corporation so as to enable the banks to borrow from the Government temporarily to cover their frozen assets.

It will always be a matter of great puzzlement to historians as to why this wasn't done earlier. The only conclusion reached by many of us who witnessed at first hand the events of that period was that partisan politics prevented immediate action. The Democrats who controlled Congress at the time also wanted to wait for the new administration to take over. The politicians fiddled while millions of Americans lost their jobs and for a considerable time were deprived of the use of their savings.

The transition period nowadays between the presidential election in November and inauguration day—January 20, as fixed by constitutional amendment—is somewhat shorter, but the dangers are just the same. An incoming administration does not have the obligation to cooperate with the outgoing administration in an emergency. Incidentally, the British parliamentary system provides for an instantaneous transfer of power after an election.

There can be little doubt that had proper steps been taken in November and December of 1932, with the cooperation of the incoming administration, the Roosevelt depression which followed could have been avoided.

The unemployment figures for those years are significant. The number of persons out of work rose from 1,550,000 in 1929 to 12,060,000 in 1932 during the Hoover depression. But, with Mr. Roosevelt in office, the unemployment figure of 1933 went up to 12,830,000. There were still 10,390,000 unemployment in 1938—after 6 years of the New Deal. It was only when World War II broke out that the figure came down appreciably—to 5,560,000 in 1941 and finally to 670,000 in 1944.

But most people have forgotten that there were 2,270,000 unemployed again in the year after World War II ended and that in early 1950—just before the Korean war—the unemployed total rose to 4,828,000 during the Truman recession.

There are more people now in the total labor force than ever before, so unemployment statistics should really be examined in terms of percentages. About 28.6 percent of the labor force was idle at the bottom of the depression in 1933. Although about 5 million are out of work today, this represents only 7.4 percent of the total labor force as compared with the postwar high of 7.8 percent in 1950 during the Truman administration. Anything below 10 percent is nowadays called a recession, whereas anything above is likely to be termed a depression.

Protection for Small Business

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM E. PROXMIRE
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, March 10, 1958

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, on March 4 there apeared before the Senate Select Committee on Small Business a man whose name has become synonymous with small business in America. I refer, of course, to Mr. George J. Burger, vice president of the National Federation of Independent Business.

As an independent businessman in the rubber tire industry, Mr. Burger learned firsthand how price discrimination can be used to favor one business, as against another, and to make it impossible for the small-business man to compete against the will of the giant enterprise. As an executive officer of an organization of independent businessmen, Mr. Burger has helped to prove the truth of the maxim that the Lord helps him who helps himself.

As a spokesman for small business, Mr. Burger is almost unique among the representatives of private groups who come before the Congress, in that he knows, and can prove, that he is speaking for his organization. The National Federation of Independent Business does not take a position until its members have voted on it directly, through mandate ballots. I think it is significant that small business, which is democracy in the economy, should show how a nationwide organization can conduct its business democratically.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Burger's remarks be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

(Statement by George J. Burger, vice president, National Federation of Independent Business, before the Subcommittee on Retailing, Distribution, and Fair Trade Practices, Senate Small Business Committee, March 3, 1958)

PROTECTION OFFERED BY ANTITRUST STATUTES TO SMALL BUSINESS

I am George J. Burger, vice president, National Federation of Independent Business, 740 Washington Building, Washington, D. C.

Our head office is located at Burlingame, Calif., with division offices in Chicago, Cincinnati, and New York City, and the legislative office here in Washington, D. C.

We are the largest organization of independent business and professional people in the country from the standpoint of directly supporting individual members. The number is growing daily. We are unique because our members themselves determine our position on every issue by their direct vote through mandate ballots. It's safe to say we have our fingers on their pulse.

First of all, Mr. Chairman, at this moment we are not testifying for or against Senate bill 3079, as the procedure of the federation is that the entire membership must be polled on the proposition before any executive officer can appear and give testimony for or against.

It goes without saying that due to the importance of the proposed bill it will be taken up in a nationwide poll of the National Federation of Independent Business and an argument for and against the proposition will be presented to the members.

However, it is very important to note that we are appearing, following out the implicit instructions of our members, to use every power within our means to protect the antitrust laws, and when any weakness comes into the laws through proposed amendments, court decision, etc., further following out the instructions of our members, we will move in and take a definite position to protect the overall good of the antitrust laws because the truth of the matter is, without the antitrust laws there can and will be no future for independent business no matter how efficient and well financed they may be. In fact, this is the keystone of the federation's action to protect our nationwide membership—all independent business and professional men—and more important, through our action to protect the millions of small businesses in our domestic economy.

Our position, by instruction, was carried out to the fullest degree in our appearances before the platform committees of both the Democratic and Republican National Conventions in 1948, 1952, and 1956, where we made our principal recommendation in behalf of small business consistent, vigorous, impartial antitrust enforcement.

When the Robinson-Patman Act was enacted we in small business believed that the time had arrived at last when small business would be afforded protection where deliberate price discrimination was taking place—that small business would have their day in court to bring the necessary relief. Without that help to small business they remain powerless to help themselves. We say this in view of our experience this past decade or more as to the enforcement of the antitrust laws, which, in substance, has not brought immediate relief at the local level.

Well do I know in my private capacity as a member of the rubber tire industry when I advocated the full utilization of that section of the Robinson-Patman Act that would give the necessary relief to injured small business in the rubber tire industry, that I can say without fear of contradiction, directly or indirectly it cost me my position in that industry.

Bear in mind I was not deliberately urging lawsuits but was advising small business what that section of the law meant to them in the way of corrective relief.

Mr. Chairman, let me cite something even more important as to the overall value and protection to small business through the enactment of the Robinson-Patman Act.

The ink wasn't dry on the law (1936) before there was some extensive maneuvering in the cancellation of two major contracts in the rubber tire industry due to the fact that the seller, in both instances stated publicly that they couldn't justify the heretofore price under the Robinson-Patman Act. In other words, special price to a few of their customers and not to all of their customers.

I have to cite the rubber tire industry because the pattern prevailing in that industry is similar to patterns prevailing in many major industries even today. I come to this conclusion from reviewing the correspondence every so often from our nationwide membership in the federation, representing all types of businesses.

At the time of the cancellation of these two major contracts in the rubber tire industry a third major company took up one of the contracts which was cancelled, giving that company 100 percent of that major buyer's requirements of tires and tubes. In fact the action of that company at that time aroused the interest of many other industries as their announced planning was revolutionary—but, at the same time they claimed it was in accordance with the full provisions of the Robinson-Patman Act.

Some industry leaders at that time questioned the good faith of the planning. In fact one leading business publication intimated that in their opinion it was a subterfuge to bypass the Robinson-Patman Act.

At that time, due to my exclusive conference with the heads of that company—even by invitation bringing in a Member of Congress to confer with them (in fact, the coauthor of the Robinson-Patman Act) we gave them the benefit of the doubt and would judge their action on the performance under the new announced planning.

This new arrangement was not in existence over a few months when I found that violations of the Robinson-Patman Act were taking place, and charges were filed accordingly with the Federal Trade Commission. The outcome of these charges was that a cease-and-desist order was issued by the Federal Trade Commission on January 6, 1939, and I quote the communication I received from the trial attorney at that time:

FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION,
Washington, January 6, 1939.

Re docket 3685, United States Rubber Co.

Mr. GEORGE J. BURGER,
National Association of Independent Tire Dealers, Inc., New York, N. Y.

DEAR MR. BURGER: In reply to your telegram of even date, I can now advise you that the Federal Trade Commission has authorized the issuance of a complaint against United States Rubber Co. and United States Tire Dealers Corp. charging violation of the Robinson-Patman Act. The complaint has been issued and served upon said respondents.

Price discrimination in violation of section 2 (a) of the Clayton Act is charged in connection with the sale of special brand tires to Montgomery Ward & Co., Atlas Supply Co. and others; in connection with the granting of large discounts and rebates to oil companies and large distributors which are not available to small tire dealers; and in connection with retail sales by company owned stores. Payment of overriding commissions to certain large oil companies is also charged as a violation of section 2 (d) of the Clayton Act.

I trust that this information will be of interest to you, and hope that your coming trip will be a pleasant and successful one.

Very truly yours,

CYRUS B. AUSTIN,
Trial Attorney.

It was the hope of small business in the rubber tire industry at the time, and I would also say of most of the tire manufacturers, that here was a grand opportunity to start long overdue corrections through the law, but I am sorry to say we could find no evidence that the order was vigorously enforced by the Federal Trade Commission, and I have so charged in repeated appearances before congressional committees this past decade or more. In fact, we still hold the same opinion at this very moment. In other words, this action in itself was the guinea pig as we look upon the Robinson-Patman Act, and it is self-apparent that the failure of the FTC to vigorously follow through on that order of January 6, 1939, has resulted in continual violations of the law by others in that major industry. Through this it has resulted in not alone that industry but other industries as well coming to the conclusion that the Robinson-Patman Act is a dead-letter law.

The Senate Small Business Committee and the House Small Business Committee in their recent investigations through public hearings in the petroleum industry have been advised that deliberate, consistent violations are taking place, and that the Federal Trade Commission is, at this very moment, pursuing investigation against certain major oil and rubber companies as to their secret and special concessions, in violation of the Robinson-Patman Act, and if that section of the order pertaining to override commissions, as the Federal Trade Commission charged in their cease-and-desist order of January 6, 1939, had been enforced there would not now be a continual repetition by others, all in alleged violation of the Robinson-Patman Act.

Finally, Mr. Chairman, citing this case as an example showing evidence of the failure of the antitrust agencies to follow through, definitely discloses a need for the injured party, small business, to be given the privilege to institute civil action so that they may be compensated for the damages they have sustained through the secret pricing methods of their suppliers. To deny this help to small business, and to allow the heretofore policy which has and is existing on antitrust enforcement to protect small business to continue means the ruination of small business of this Nation. On the other hand, if small business has the power to institute civil action this in itself could throw the fear of God into those suppliers who are carrying on a secret pricing system to a few of their customers and not to all of their customers.

What we are saying here is reaffirming our position from the first instance in carrying out the will of our nationwide membership.

Business Balks at Business Regime

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE M. RHODES
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 27, 1958

Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following editorial from the Reading (Pa.) New Era:

BUSINESS BALKS AT BUSINESS REGIME

History has an unhappy faculty for making people eat crow.

This subject came to mind last week when the editor of Business Week magazine appeared in Reading and declared that businessmen are losing confidence in the Eisenhower administration.

You don't have to teach history to remember how Eisenhower condemned the Truman administration for lack of business administration. Eisenhower appointed nine millionaires and a plumber to his Cabinet. Later the plumber quit and that left all millionaires.

All the best business brains in the Nation were recruited for the grand and glorious crusade. Remember?

Then, too, Eisenhower in 1952 attacked the Truman spending spree. Remember how

they were going to bring economy to government and balance the budget?

Well, what's been happening under this Republican business administration? Take a look:

1. Unemployment is skyrocketing past 5 million.

2. Business is screaming for immediate public works and more Government spending.

3. Everybody wants tax cuts.

4. The budget is way out of balance.

5. The national debt limit was just raised at Eisenhower's request by $5 billion.

Is it any wonder that business—and farmers and factory workers and housewives and office help and virtually everyone else—has lost confidence in the Eisenhower administration?

Foreign Aid Scrutiny

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STYLES BRIDGES
OF NEW HAMPSHIRE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, March 10, 1958

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Foreign Aid Security," which appeared in the Concord Daily Monitor, Concord, N. H., on March 4, 1958.

I think this editorial comes right to the point, and deserves to be read by the Members of Congress and the general public.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FOREIGN AID SCRUTINY

Senator BRIDGES has given his support to foreign aid since its inception under the Marshall plan, but he is unhappy over some aspects of Eisenhower's plea for nearly $4 billion for a foreign aid program now being debated in Congress.

New Hampshire's senior Senator is critical of a proposal to give $98 million in foreign aid credits to the Communist regime of Polish Premier Gomulka. He also opposes continuance of foreign aid to the Yugoslav dictatorship.

So far as Poland is concerned, the Senator has some strong arguments to support his stand. The Gomulka regime was set up under an agreement with Moscow that obligated Russia to provide Poland with food, machine tools, and other commodities. Russia has failed to live up to this agreement and Gomulka is looking to the United States for funds over and above those already granted.

Senator BRIDGES opposes aid to Yugoslavia because Tito is friendly to Moscow. He says he can see little difference between what is called a good or bad type of Communist.

In addition to foreign aid, Congress has before it a related program, reciprocal tariff agreements legislation. And despite bipartisan backing, both are in trouble. Many of the difficulties both programs face are the result of the downward trend in the economy of the United States.

Foreign aid is opposed as a giveaway to people in other countries while millions in this country are unemployed. This reciprocal tariff bill is fought on the ground it helps foreign countries sell products in this country while those who could be making these products here are out of work. About $13 billion worth of goods was sent into the United States last year by foreign nations.

Foreign aid is a prime target at this time for Republicans and Democrats in Congress who want a budget cut. In some form, Eisenhower's program eventually will be approved, but not before Senator BRIDGES and others have given it a closer examination than it has had for some time, an examination that may be long overdue.

Case Against Foreign Aid

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HERMAN E. TALMADGE
OF GEORGIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, March 10, 1958

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Case Against Foreign Aid," published in the Griffin, Ga., Daily News of March 3, 1958.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CASE AGAINST FOREIGN AID

The President has again asked for billions in foreign aid for the next fiscal year—$3,942,100,000 altogether. Of this, $2,635 million would go for military assistance and $1,307,100,000 for economic aid. These amounts, added to what has already been appropriated for this purpose, would bring our foreign aid bill up to some $70 billion since the end of the Second World War.

This whole program of foreign aid is completely fallacious and illogical—regardless of the propaganda being grandiloquently shot at us—at our own expense—by political leaders of both parties, by the one-worlders and the do-gooders. Yet we have been brainwashed and scared to such an extent as to what would happen to us if it were discontinued that it is very rare any more that we hear anybody taking the side of the American taxpayer or representing the philosophy of an independent America.

There were two basic misconceptions in the foreign-aid program to begin with: (1) That we could buy friends, and (2) that we could cure the ills of the world with dollars. Neither is possible.

You just cannot go out and buy love of democracy and love of freedom like you can buy a ton of coal or a bushel of wheat. It must first exist in the hearts of the people themselves, and if it does not exist there, no number of our dollars will put it there.

Who is to say that we did not have just as many, if not more, friends at the end of World War II than we have right now? Who is to say that, instead of curing the ills of the world with our dollars, we have not added to them—by aiding communism in many instances, by subsidizing socialism in even more instances, by destroying the independence and self-reliance of many nations, by upsetting the way of life of peoples when they did not want it upset?

This viewpoint has nothing to do with the value of the United Nations; our participation in that organization proves that we are not isolationist. It has nothing to do with military alliances; we should always be ready for military alliances when it seems to our mutual benefit. (It should be pointed out, though, that a nation that is not willing to defend itself against communism by its own efforts is not likely to make a very good ally.) It has nothing to do with foreign trade; we have always been ready throughout our history to trade with foreign nations and should continue to do so.

What we are saying is that it is fundamental folly to continue under the conception that we can solve the problems of the world if we will only spend enough of our money. We have made entirely too many mistakes, both domestic and foreign, under that conception to keep it up any longer. Most of our foreign economic aid should be discontinued immediately; our foreign military aid should be thoroughly reviewed.

We mentioned the American taxpayer and the fact that no one seems to speak for him any more. If he is not too brainwashed and scared by the politicians and the one-worlders, he should speak up for himself. He should advise his Government that at least he is not scared of what Russia might do if our foreign aid is discontinued. Any such fear is all in our minds. Let's wait until Russian foreign aid also totals $70 billion before we begin to worry—then we'll never worry. Neither should the American taxpayer fear any lack of allies against communism if our foreign aid is discontinued. Those who are against communism will still be against it, with or without our aid; those who are not against it will not be changed anyway.

In fact, the greatest safeguard in this world against communism is a strong United States of America—and certainly we would be much stronger if we quit dissipating our material resources over the face of the globe. At least our national debt would have been $70 billion less if we had never started on the program—and it would be hard to prove that the rest of the world would have been in any worse shape than it is now. The chances are the world would have been in much better shape—because nothing destroys like dependence upon someone else to take care of you.

Blacklisted at 40—Discrimination Against Workers on Account of Age

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM E. PROXMIRE
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, March 10, 1958

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, The Machinist, which is published weekly by the International Association of Machinists, recently carried a very fine editorial on the serious problem of discrimination on account of age in employment. This is a very serious problem at all times, and of course it strikes with particular severity during a period of recession as at present.

The International Association of Machinists is one of the finest trade unions in the world. Its president, Mr. A. J. Hayes, is an outstanding labor statesman who has contributed much to the cause of organized labor, as well as to the welfare or unorganized workers and the public generally. Mr. Hayes and the IAM are deserving of high commendation for the interest they are taking in this serious problem.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have the editorial from The Machinist printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Vic Bonaventure was laid off last month at Farmingdale, N. Y., by Republic Aviation Corp.

Vic has a lot to recommend him. He is skilled, reliable and has 30 years of experience in the aircraft industry—since 1926.

But the employers he visits ask first about Vic's age. As soon as they find out that Vic is past 45, it's: "Sorry, no openings."

There are hundreds of thousands of Vic Bonaventures all over North America. Many, like Vic, are union members caught in recent layoffs in aircraft, railroad and other industries. They are healthy, dependable, experienced.

But they are blacklisted by industry because they are over 45, 40, or even 35.

"Why is it," one of them recently wrote the Machinist, "that employers think we are too old to hire but the Government thinks we are too young to retire?"

To help answer this question, the Machinist is publishing this special section on age discrimination.

Here, now, are the facts about age discrimination:

In the years between 46 and 64, a man's chances of getting a job are only half as good as before 45.

Once out of work, the older worker usually stays unemployed longer. Even in good times, most workers over 45 take almost twice as long to find new jobs as younger workers.

Older workers often exhaust their unemployment insurance benefits before they can find jobs. One New York survey showed that those 45 and over made up only one-third of the labor force in the State but two-thirds of those who had exhausted their 26 weeks of jobless benefits.

The problem and consequences of age discrimination are growing as a larger and larger portion of the working population moves into the 45-and-over age group.

During the first half of this century, from 1900 to 1950, the United States population doubled. But during the same period, the number of persons 45 and over tripled. Some experts now predict that in another 30 years, nearly half of the Nation's adults will be 45 and over.

By 1965 alone, the United States labor force is expected to increase by about ten million. Less than 1 million of these additional workers will come from the 25-to-44 age group. But there will be nearly 5 million more in the 45-plus group. In other words, for every increase of 2 workers in the age group considered most eligible for employment, there will be 11 new workers in the 45-plus group.

"We are convinced," said the New York State Joint Legislative Committee on Problems of the Aging recently, "that great strides can be taken if employers will recognize the situation. * * * We doubt that any economy can long survive supporting large numbers of able, still vigorous men and women excluded from production not on the basis of ability but on the basis of age. * * *."

EFFECT OF DEPRESSION

The problem of employment for so-called older workers first attracted serious attention in the depression of the 1930's. During those years, jobs were scarce and the idea became popular that older people should move along and give younger persons a chance to make a living and support their families.

The idea had great appeal, not only to younger workers, but also to many employers who—in the absence of strong union contracts—used the chance to get rid of high seniority employees and hire younger workers at lower wages. Industry's age barriers have been up ever since.

Latest evidence of such blacklisting is contained in a recent survey conducted by the United States Department of Labor. The survey covered seven major cities—Detroit, Los Angeles, Miami, Minneapolis-St. Paul, Philadelphia, Seattle, and Worcester, Mass. Employers in these cities advertised 21,386 job openings with public employment offices during April 1956. The findings:

In 5 of the 7 cities more than half of the jobs advertised with public employment offices contained age restrictions. In three of the cities three-fourths of the job orders specified age barriers.

The most frequent maximum age was 45. It was set for 41 percent of the job orders in the 7 cities. One in five of the requests (20 percent) even included "Don't bother to apply," signs for men and women who had reached their 35th birthday.

The Labor Department research team dug even deeper. After studying the jobs advertised by employers at public employment offices, the team kept records on the actual hiring practices of employers in the seven cities over a full year's period. The pattern was the same.

WASTING HUMAN RESOURCES

During an entire year, so-called older workers made up 40 percent of those actively looking for work. But employers filled only 22 percent of their job openings with men and women 45 and over. To put it another way, there were twice as many 45-plus workers looking for jobs as employers were willing to hire.

A United States trade union official declared recently:

"In this country we have done a great deal to conserve our natural resources. We have launched programs to safeguard our lands, our forests, and our fisheries. If there is a threat to any of these, we have often acted quickly to protect them with conservation programs and emergency measures.

"Yet," he added, "the human resource, one of our most important natural resources, has to a large extent been ignored and wasted because we have failed to come to grips with the problem of age discrimination."

Relief for Senior Citizens

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD L. NEUBERGER
OF OREGON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, March 10, 1958

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, a major injustice has been the fact that social-security annuitants are permitted to earn only up to $1,200 a year. This ceiling stems from 1937, when $1,200 had 2 to 3 times the purchasing power of today.

Representative EDITH GREEN, who ably represents my home district of Portland, Oreg., in the House of Representatives, has urged persistently that the $1,200 limit be removed, and a thoughtful editorial in support of her proposal appeared in the Oregon Daily Journal of Portland some weeks ago.

I concur in the statements of the editorial, and I request unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RELIEF FOR SENIOR CITIZENS

Representative EDITH GREEN has introduced a measure, H. R. 9656, which will interest many senior citizens. The bill proposes to amend the Social Security Act so as to remove the limitation upon the amount of outside income which an individual may earn while receiving benefits thereunder.

It is one of the several proposals to be considered in the current session of Congress along this line. Some bills would raise the limit to $2,000, while others set the maximum at $1,800 or $1,500. Present limit is $1,200. After that the recipient of social-security benefits loses one check for each $80 earned.

Obviously this is most unfair. Monthly checks for many individuals recently pensioned range from $98.50 to $108.50. On these checks no Federal or State taxes are paid. But on the $80 which the recipient gets in lieu of his larger social security check, he must pay both State and Federal taxes and expenses incurred in earning the $80, such as bus fare or gasoline for his car, if any.

When a pensioner obtains a position of some sort to splice out his income—no one can hope to support a home on his social security check—he has to assure his employer he won't walk off the job the day his earnings total $1,200. But he is out of pocket at present if he stays on the job, since each $80 earned costs him perhaps half that sum in difference between his earnings and his Government check, plus the double taxes incurred.

If the reader seeks more specific examples, here is one group: Each year seen tens of thousands of teachers in public schools turned out to grass under retirement plans, generally inadequate to guarantee comfortable living. Many of these teachers are still in full possession of their teaching capacities. There is a shortage of veteran instructors in nearly every level—elementary, secondary and college fields. Their skills and professional capabilities are largely lost at present because naturally schools that wish to hire them must have some guarantee they will finish out the year. Most of these teachers still have the fire of ambition to teach. Some are teaching until they reach the $1,200 mark and then serving free—actually serving free, because it costs them too much to take their pay. Others are reluctantly turning down urgent opportunities to teach because "they can't afford it."

It is to be hoped that Congress doesn't get so much engrossed in bewailing "the shortage of scientists and other teachers" that it does not see in Representative GREEN's bill a genuine opportunity to help relieve this shortage. Besides, it will restore many a person to the Federal (and State) tax roll. Remember that while the bill would present some cost to the social security funds, it would let Uncle Sam reach the pensioner's pocket with his tax fingers.

Maintaining the Values of a Free Society

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. IRVING M. IVES
OF NEW YORK
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, March 10, 1958

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, for more than a year the hearings of the Senate Select Committee on Improper Activities in the Labor or Management Field have drawn attention to wrongdoing in labor-management relations. Sooner or later, the Senate may be called upon to vote on proposed legislation resulting from the select committee investigations.

In the same period of time, and earlier, another important group has been most active in preventing or punishing the sort of wrongdoing exposed by the select committee as it may occur or threaten

to occur within the labor movement. I refer to the AFL–CIO ethical practices committee.

Last February 19, Mr. Al J. Hayes, president of the machinists union, and chairman of the AFL–CIO ethical practices committee, made a speech before the City Club of Rochester, N. Y. I think it is important for all Senators to have the full text of that speech available, and to study it, in the interest of fair play and an objective approach on the part of my colleagues to the issues they will face when new legislation affecting labor-management relations may come before them.

In making this statement, I must note that I personally take exception to a number of Mr. Hayes' inferences and conclusons. In particular, I cannot go along with Mr. Hayes' assertion, near the end of his speech, that the McClellan committee hearings appear to have been designed for the specific purpose of paving the way for legislation that would put organized labor under Government control. I introduced the first resolution calling for an investigation in this field when Victor Riesel was blinded, and the select committee resulted. My purpose then was, and my purpose now is, to expose bad conditons and help labor clean its own house. And I have repeatedly pointed out that the great bulk of American labor leaders are decent, honest, God-fearing men who are just as concerned as is anyone else with ridding the labor movement of gangsters, racketeers, and criminals.

Al Hayes is conspicuous among those in the labor movement, who are doing their utmost to clean labor's house. Thus, even though I cannot subscribe to all that his address contains, I feel that his views should be placed before the Congress. For this reason, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, following these remarks, the full text of Mr. Hayes' February 19, address before the City Club of Rochester, N. Y.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

(Address by A. J. Hayes, international president, International Association of Machinists, at the City Club of Rochester, February 19, 1958)

MAINTAINING THE VALUES OF A FREE SOCIETY

I appreciate the opportunity that your kind invitation gives me to talk to you frankly and informally about problems that face the American labor movement today.

From the information and reports I have received about the City Club of Rochester (you see, I checked up on you, too), I understand that this is the first time you have ever invited a representative of a national labor organization to be your guest.

I am deeply honored. Although your current interest in union affairs may stem from the adverse publicity the organized labor movement has received as a result of the Douglas and McClellan committee investigations—still, I am pleased to be here.

For, the fact that you are willing to listen to our side of the story— indicates that the American people have not lost their sense of fair play—that they still want to hear the other side of any story.

That is what I hope to give you today. But let me make it clear at the start that I have not come here as an apologist—or as a propagandist. Rather, I want to try to set the record straight—to talk about corruption in the labor movement—yes—but also to put it into perspective.

I am told that most of you represent the business, professional, political, and intellectual life of Rochester. Since that is so, it is fair to assume that most of you do not have any direct knowledge of trade unions or trade union activity. (This, of course, does not apply to the labor representatives who are your guests here today.) And it follows that your mental image of organized labor has been formed by newspaper reporters and radio and television commentators.

Without imputing the motives or questioning the integrity of the working reporter or the commentator who brings you the 7 o'clock news—I can still say that such a picture is a distorted one. As Adlai Stevenson told the Gridiron Club of Washington a few years ago:

"It is the habit of journalists * * * to see the world in terms of crisis rather than continuity. The big story is turmoil and disaster, not the quiet spectacle of men working * * *. Bad news sells papers."

Thus the story of organized labor—when it appears on the front page of your newspaper—is likely to be the story of strikes, picket lines and violence—and recently corruption—not the story of men working quietly together as they carry on the normal functions of labor unions.

My own union—the International Association of Machinists—is a large union, in fact, it is the fourth largest in this country and the third largest in Canada. We have almost a million members. About 10 percent of them—almost a hundred thousand in all—live and work in this State. Many are your neighbors in the city of Rochester.

Throughout the entire country we have contracts with more than 14,000 employers—large and small. By actual count made over a 10-year period, our records show that between 98 and 99 percent of those contracts were negotiated or renewed peacefully, without strikes or work stoppages. The workers they cover generally receive fair wages, enjoy decent working conditions and can be sure of equitable treatment in layoffs, promotions and grievances.

It is these workers—and their officers and representatives—who have made a contribution for the betterment of life, and who have set the real pattern of trade union conduct.

But this kind of union activity—and the kind of business agent or international representative or officer who does an honest job day in and day out isn't news. You seldom read about him—even though he is the true rule of trade unionism in America—and the Dios, the Dorias and the Becks are very much the exception to that rule.

Unfortunately, however, because of these exceptions—as they have been ferreted out by congressional committees, and publicized by the channels of mass communication—many Americans today believe that organized labor as a whole is corrupt and undemocratic. If I accomplish nothing else today, I hope that I may at least cause some of you to question the premises on which such a belief is based.

I can think of no better way to do this than to give you the facts—without any sugar-coating—facts which I have yet to see in any newspaper or magazine such as you might receive in your homes.

For example, few people realize that organized labor has been the subject of intensive congressional investigations for more than 5 years. Beginning in 1953, a succession of committees, including the Hoffman committee, the Ives committee and the Douglas committee, and now the McClellan committee, have all taken turns at putting labor through the investigative wringer.

Each of these committees was well financed and well staffed. The McClellan committee alone—at this time—has 86 full-time investigators beating the bushes around the country—investigating almost every situation directed to its attention by disgruntled and dissident members—many of whom have, themselves, been guilty of embezzlement, fraud and improper conduct. And many of whom are openly and admittedly antiunion because they have been disciplined for such activities.

It is interesting to note that though the McClellan committee was established to investigate racketeering in business as well as racketeering in labor, little has been done about that phase of its work. (And what little has been done has received very little coverage in the press and on the air.) In contrast, the investigation of activities of organized labor has been pressed with a vengeance.

In fact, in some instances the committee's investigators have gone so far as to provoke and encourage intraunion strife and bitterness. For example, we know that in Waukegan, Ill., in the investigation of the bakery workers union, a committee investigator drafted a petition and turned it over to dissindent members for circulation and signatures. I am not making these statements out of prejudice. But rather to point out the danger to all segments of our society of congressional investigations which are not objective. The ethical practices committee of the AFL–CIO itself investigated the bakery workers union—and found enough evidence of corruption to warrant expulsion from the federation. But the proper role of a congressional investigator is to investigate, not to instigate.

An even more pointed example of the committee's bias is shown by reports received from rank and file UAW members in Sheboygan, Wis., and its vicinity. At the present time the McClellan committee is investigating the long-drawn-out Kohler strike. That strike has been marked by unusual bitterness, and there has undoubtedly been violence in the locality as the strikers have reacted to the company's efforts to destroy their union.

But the investigators assigned to this case have made it clear to many of the UAW members that they are only interested in incidents that will discredit the union. When workers tried to talk about unfair and unethical practices on the part of management, they were told that the investigator was interested only in the misconduct of union personnel and representatives.

Then, too, not long ago the Textile Workers Union of America presented the committee with fully documented evidence of scores of incidents in the South where labor organizers have been beaten up, jailed, and run out of town by employer-hired goons, where ordinary workers and their families have been intimidated, fired from their jobs, and evicted from their homes because they tried to exercise rights supposedly guaranteed them by the Labor-Management Relations Act. The union asked only that this kind of racketeering, this denial of workers' rights, be investigated and given the same publicity as has been given the other side of the story.

However, there has been no response to this request. And I don't think there is going to be. The committee shows no disposition to investigate employers in the South or elsewhere. And lest I be misunderstood, let me assure that my mention of these incidents does not indicate opposition to objective investigation of corruption or unethical conduct in the labor movement.

In fact, the officers of the AFL–CIO offered support and cooperation to the McClellan committee in an objective investigation.

The further fact is that we have openly acknowledged that many of the corrupt practices exposed by the Douglas and McClellan committees could never have been brought to light by any investigative body within the

labor movement. Insofar as this is true, the McClellan committee has rendered a service to the good elements in organized labor.

But the good the committee has accomplished does not justify the injury which has resulted from the improper conduct of some of its investigators and the open prejudices of some of its members.

In fact the public pronouncements of certain members and staff personnel of the committee have convinced many of the reputable leaders of organized labor that the primary purpose of the investigation is to injure rather than help the membership of all labor unions.

Now what are the facts regarding the extent of corruption and unethical practices in the 140 unions affiliated with the AFL–CIO? What has been the foundation of all the headlines, news stories, editorials and radio commentaries that have succeeded so well in convincing so many of the American people that the labor movement is indeed a honeycomb of corruption and a hiding place for racketeers?

It may surprise you to know that all of these committees together—over a span of five years—have uncovered acts of dishonesty—proven or probable—on the part of less than 40 trade-union officers.

Perhaps even one would be too many. But I ask you to consider that in the 140 unions that are affiliated with the AFL–CIO alone, there are more than 16,000 full-time paid national and international officers—and more than 420,000 local officers.

And even if we assume—as we must—that the McClellan committee will find new cases of corruption and racketeering in the future—I would still contend that such a ratio of dishonesty and unethical practice is no higher in the house of labor—than it is in the world of business, law, medicine, journalism, advertising, or politics. I could cite many examples of corruption in these other groups, but I will cite just a few to support my statement.

Not long ago, I noted an article, in Fortune magazine on thievery in business and industry. According to this source, business and industry lose from $5 million to $3 billion every year because of embezzlement in the ranks of management. In fact, according to FBI estimates, embezzling businessmen steal more money each year than all the Nation's burglars, pickpockets, armed robbers, and auto thieves combined.

Of course, there are many other types of corruption and unethical conduct in business and industry—such as the furnishing of call girls by companies such as General Electric at a recent business convention, the bribery of Government officials and employees, and the scandalous pressure tactics of the oil and gas lobby, and as a general proposition, the policy of caveat emptor (let the purchaser beware) has been considered ethical, rather than unethical, by far too many advertising companies and business and industrial firms.

With such an ethic is it any wonder that expense accounts are known as swindle sheets?—That much of what advertisers tell us must be discounted automatically?—That sincere men in the medical profession are concerned about the increasing number of unnecessary surgical operations that are performed by unethical doctors for the money involved?—That respectable and honored institutions of higher education prostitute themselves by undercover subsidization of semiprofessional football teams?—That most States have had to enact special legislation to protect the widows and orphans of men killed in industrial accidents against shysters in the legal profession who would otherwise take 50 to 60 percent of their workmen's compensation or employer liability awards?

I could go on—giving you further and even more drastic examples of corruption and unethical practices in nonlabor institutions. But I do not want to belabor the point. Neither do I want to defend the trade-union movement on these terms. Two wrongs do not make a right. And though I can get just as indignant as anyone about a union officer who fattens his purse by selling his principles, I object to the hypocrisy of those who pretend that corruption is a phenomenon unique to the labor movement.

In fact, as of this moment, I think organized labor has gone further than any other group in our society to establish and enforce a meaningful code of ethics for itself. As chairman of the AFL–CIO's ethical practices committee, I have helped develop the six codes of ethical practices that establish standards for trade-union practice and policy today. These codes regulate issuance of union charters, conflicts of interests of union officers, democratic practices, fiscal procedures, administration of health and welfare funds, and racketeering. They set high standards—standards that are consistent with the proper objectives and high ideals of the labor movement. These codes are being—and will continue to be—strictly enforced within the framework of the AFL–CIO.

With these codes—with the ethical practices committee acting as a watchdog—and with the help of law enforcement agencies on the Federal, State, and local levels—there is no reason why the labor movement should not be trusted to perform its legitimate functions without being shackled by restrictive and punitive legislation.

However, there is a real and present danger that it is not going to be permitted to do so. The McClellan committee hearings appear to have been designed for the specific purpose of paving the way for legislation that would put organized labor under Government control. No other inference can reasonably be drawn from the legislation that has been proposed over the past few months by the NAM, the chamber of commerce, the administration, and some of the antilabor Senators on the McClellan committee.

The ideas and the philosophy that are summed up in these proposals reflect the kind of thinking that made free trade unions an instrument of the state in Nazi Germany, Fascist Italy, and Peronistic Argentina.

These proposals are not intended merely to rid the labor movement of undesirables (I might say, parenthetically, that existing legislation is quite adequate to do that), but rather seek to install functionaries of the United States Government as overseers and directors of what is now a free institution. Under the proposed legislation, bureaucrats—in no way answerable to the membership—would regulate and control the internal affairs and activities of the Nation's labor organizations.

I can hear the roar of disapproval that would sound from coast to coast in the press, in the pulpits and elsewhere, if such laws as are proposed for trade unions were proposed for the regulation and control of the American Legion, the American Medical Association, the chamber of commerce, the National Association of Real Estate Boards, or similar private organizations.

If such legislation were proposed, it would immediately be recognized and exposed for what it is—a direct assault on the freedom of the people to form, to join and to operate organizations of their own choosing and for their own betterment.

But since it is organized labor that is being assaulted—many business and professional groups are applauding—when they should be quaking in their boots. For when government usurps its power to control the internal affairs of a voluntary organization, it is only one short step away from control of the policies and programs of that organization as well. Today, Government might control only the form of collective bargaining, but tomorrow it could just as well control the substance. And, from regulation and control of wages, hours, and working conditions on the side of labor, it is but another short step to regulation and control of prices, profits, and marketing policies on the side of maangement.

Labor and management may—and often do—disagree on economic matters—particularly on how the fruits of production should be divided, but I think we would all agree that control of both business and labor must be kept out of Government hands—if we are to continue as a free society.

There seem to be many well-meaning people today who are not basically antilabor, but who are nevertheless concerned because—in their opinion—unions have grown too big. These people are nostalgic for simpler days when businesses were small, when farms were family operations and not factories in the field—and when Government did little more than maintain an army and carry the mail. In those days employers had more face-to-face contact with their employees and unions were small because most business and industry was small.

Perhaps we would all like to go back to a simpler kind of life—and a simpler kind of economy. But we can't. We are living in an age, and in an economy, which is marked by rapidly changing technology and which is overshadowed by nuclear energy, automation, and the eminent conquest of space.

The challenge before us is to transplant the freedoms that grew up in the simpler economic system of yesterday, and maintain them in the dynamic, complex economic system of today.

We must have unions—free unions—if we want to retain human values in a push-button, IBM-card industrial system.

But unless we retain human values, democracy and the free-enterprise system will fail.

We must not let that happen. And it will not so long as we maintain and preserve the basic freedoms of all our political, social, and economic institutions.

Chins Up Versus Dividend Cut

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. SPARKMAN

OF ALABAMA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, March 10, 1958

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, in the Washington Sunday Star of yesterday, Sylvia Porter, a well-known writer-economist, had a column which she entitled "Chins Up Versus Dividend Cut."

This article is such good sense that I commend its reading to everyone. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CHINS UP VERSUS DIVIDEND CUT

(By Sylvia Porter)

On Monday, February 24, President Eisenhower arose before the National Food Conference in Washington to appeal to us to keep our chins up and to state that "confidence is what this country needs."

On the same day, George M. Humphrey, former Secretary of the Treasury and now board chairman of National Steel Corp., announced in Pittsburgh that National Steel was cutting its dividend for the first quarter

of 1958 from $1 to 75 cents—the first change in 2 years.

Was it an ironic coincidence that on the same day the President called for chins up confidence, one of his closest friends and advisers cut the dividend of his corporation? Yes, it was an ironic coincidence.

SEQUENCE AMUSING

Was it an amusing sequence that this should occur only hours after Mr. Eisenhower had returned from a quail-hunting vacation at Mr. Humphrey's Georgia estate? Yes, the sequence has caused some deep chuckles in the private luncheon clubs of Wall Street.

Yet, this was more than coincidence and amusing sequence. For it underlines some plain truths about the country, and about the futility of talk as a weapon to create confidence. For instance:

The President is wasting his energy when he tries to bolster confidence among businessmen of America by chins up speeches. They aren't influenced by talk of this sort. They either ignore it, criticize it or laugh at it.

What puts up and keeps up their chins are the practical facts of business and finance—the volume of orders and sales, the feel of the markets, the margin of profits, the figures on the balance sheet.

The last thing Mr. Humphrey wants to do is to embarrass the President. But as he and National Steel's board said, their first obligation is to insure National Steel's strong financial position. The President might have said be confident in 100 different ways but it wouldn't have changed the views of these businessmen on their own company's position, needs and outlook.

The President is also wasting his precious breath when he tells us average folks that confidence is what this country needs.

MANY ARE CONFIDENT

The wage earners and housewives of America are confident when their jobs seem secure, their personal future appears bright and they have money to spend. Talking confidence doesn't breed it. Talk about the need for confidence actually may undermine confidence by causing people who haven't been worrying at all to wonder what the shouting is about.

The President has no basis whatsoever for his implication that we are lacking in courage or commonsense right now.

The fact is that America's businessmen are still laying tens of billions of dollars on the line for plant expansion in 1958—as cold and clear an indication of courage as you could mention. The fact is that American housewives have been storming the stores for small appliances since giant General Electric abandoned the fair-trade policy—as cold and clear an indication of commonsense shopping as you could mention.

What we have run out of, for the moment, are new stimulants and what we have lost, temporarily, is exuberance. We won't get new stimulants or regain exuberance from chins up talk. To paraphrase the old saying, the confident don't need the talk and the frightened won't believe it.

Houston's Need for Missile Defenses

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH W. YARBOROUGH

OF TEXAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, March 10, 1958

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, the city of Houston, Tex., is one of the great metropolitan areas of the Nation, yet up to this point the Department of the Army and Department of Defense have failed to provide this area with adequate modern missile protection.

Many Houstonians and other area residents are deeply concerned about this apparent lack of defense. Among the organizations concerned about this matter is the Houston Junior Chamber of Commerce. The Houston Jaycees recently passed a resolution urging immediate action toward building Houston area defenses.

A copy of this resolution has been sent to me by Mr. Wesley E. Hooper, Jr., Houston Jaycee president, and I ask unanimous consent that the text of the resolution be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESOLUTION

Whereas it has come to the attention of the disaster preparedness committee of the Houston Junior Chamber of Commerce that guided-missile defenses have been installed at numerous cities and locations within the continental United States which have in the opinion of the Department of Defense been classified as critical target areas; and

Whereas it is the understanding of the disaster preparedness committee that the Department of Defense has not so considered the Houston and Harris County areas, and as a result thereof considerable less critical areas of our country have such protection by reason of their classification; and

Whereas the Houston-Harris County industrial complex constitutes tonnagewise the third busiest port in the Nation and has along its banks one of the Nation's largest concentrations of oil refineries and storage facilities, chemical plants, manufacturing concerns, and the United States San Jacinto Ordnance Depot; and

Whereas all of the aforementioned activities along the Houston-Harris County ship channel are active in the furnishing, producing, and manufacturing of material which is necessary for the proper defense of our Nation and as such would be a likely target for enemy attack; and

Whereas in addition to these vast installations of industry, there is also concentrated within the boundaries of Harris County, Tex., in excess of 1,136,000 people; and

Whereas at the present time there is no adequate air defense installation in Harris County for the protection of these industrial installations and port facilities as well as the citizens of this community; and

Whereas the Houston Junior Chamber of Commerce is deeply concerned with the protection and the welfare of the people of Harris County and also concerned with the defense of industrial and petroleum installations of the Texas gulf coast area, such committee desires that its interest in behalf of the defense of this area be known to all concerned, and this committee finds no justification for the apparent low priority given the defense of the industrial complex of the gulf coast area and this committee considers the oil, chemical, and other critical industries within Houston, Beaumont, Port Arthur, Texas City, Freeport, and Galveston, Tex., as being necessary and vital to the defense of our Nation: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Houston Junior Chamber of Commerce calls upon the Department of the Army and the Department of Defense to give immediate consideration to the importance of the Texas gulf coast area and take the necessary steps to provide this critical area with the latest developments in the field of missile protection; be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be placed before the directors of the Houston Chamber of Commerce for their consideration and that a copy be forwarded immediately to all of our governmental representatives, and to those concerned in the Department of the Army and the Department of Defense whose responsibility it is to provide adequate defense of our vital cities and large concentrations of population.

In witness whereof I have hereunto set my hand and caused this resolution to be recorded in the minutes of the Houston Junior Chamber of Commerce.

WESLEY E. HOOPER, Jr.,
President, Houston Junior Chamber of Commerce.

Relationship Between Juvenile Delinquency and Employment Opportunities in Washington, D. C.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FREDERICK G. PAYNE

OF MAINE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, March 10, 1958

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that an excellent article from the March 9 Washington Post and Times Herald by Victor R. Daly on the relationship between juvenile delinquency and employment opportunities in Washington, D. C., may be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SIMPLE, SURE WAY TO END CRIME IN THE STREETS

(By Victor R. Daly)

Violence in the streets is even more indefensible than it is deplorable. Yet much of this crime could be averted by the untried process of putting more of the potential lawbreakers to work. Let's face the facts realistically and let the chips fall where they may.

Unfortunately, an overwhelming majority of the purse snatchings, the yokings and other assaults taking place by night in the streets of Washington are committed by Negroes. The number of these delinquents and criminals is out of all proportion to the nonwhite population of the District.

Take a walk into police court any Monday morning and you will be impressed by two startling actualities: Besides the fact that the overwhelming majority of those charged with street crimes are nonwhites, you will be amazed at the youthfulness of these defendants. Seventeen to twenty-three seems to be the prevailing age.

When a condition of this sort exists in the Capital of the Nation, there is something basically wrong at the heart of the community. The city streets may be broad and clean and well lighted. The buildings may be neat and trim. There may be an abundance of monuments and parks. But the system of handling human relations must be way out of kilter.

The trouble lies with the fact that the job opportunities for Negroes in general, and for Negro youth in particular, have not kept pace with the growth of the metropolitan area and the stream of graduates of the local public high schools.

Too many young men who should be working as apprentices or performing the simple semiskilled tasks are roaming the streets aimlessly, without employment, without funds, without hope. They are not employable in this community because of their race. They turn to crime.

Some progress is being made in opening new job opportunities for Negro youth in the District. Very little, if anything, is happening in this category in nearby Maryland and Virginia. It is not strictly a District problem, for the metropolitan area embraces Prince Georges and Montgomery Counties to the north and Alexandria and Arlington County to the south.

Many industrial plants are moving into these outlying areas, but employment opportunities for minority group workers, with rare exceptions, have been limited strictly to a handful of custodial jobs.

In the District itself, one of the chief bottlenecks to the Negro youth is the building trades—organized labor. Excepting one of the bricklayers' locals, which permits nonwhite members to work on small home and apartment house construction, virtually all of the other skilled building trades are unwilling, under one pretext or another, to permit young Negro apprentices to work with them on major construction projects.

With the possible exception of cement finishers who pave the sidewalks, it is ironical to look at the big construction jobs on the campus of Howard University and see not one skilled Negro workman employed anywhere on the job.

Yet local vocational high schools are graduating scores of well-qualified youngsters year after year who are eager to become journeymen electricians, plumbers, machinists, carpenters, plasterers, tile setters, roofers, and stonemasons. All have had years of basic training in the public schools, following the trades of their choice. The District of Columbia spends millions of dollars annually on their education.

But the apprenticeship training which will qualify them for suitable jobs in this community is barred to them. These young men drift into custodial jobs as porters, handymen, janitors or common laborers on construction work or even go into unskilled restaurant work if they can find it.

This bleak outlook discourages many other boys. The incentive to study and become qualified for a good job is destroyed a-borning. Soon they drop out of school and take to the streets.

A recent survey on school dropouts made for the District Office of the United States Employment Service by the Bureau of Social Science Research uncovered the alarming fact that one-fifth of all boys and girls in the District aged 16 and 17 are not enrolled in school. Of this group, better than half are not employed.

From applicant files of the USES in the District, it is estimated that 90 percent of these unemployed dropouts are nonwhite males. It is entirely safe to estimate that there are currently 3,000 Negro boys in Washington between the ages of 16 and 19 who are out of school and out of work.

This is the malignant source that feeds delinquency and crime in the District. The city is feeling the impact of this social monster which stalks its streets night after night. And it will grow with the mounting unemployment in the area.

The assignment of more policemen to night duty may apprehend more of these young lawbreakers, but it does not remove the basic cause. Only a more enlightened and realistic employment policy throughout the metroplitan area can appreciably improve this situation.

As examples of the employment inequity existing here among minority group members, consider these two cases:

Currently, there is an applicant registered with the District USES office, a young male Negro, who has had 4 years of training and experience on combustion engines in the Air Force. He was honorably discharged as a sergeant. Since his discharge he has had 2 years additional training in a civilian technical school.

He is now washing pots and pans in a local bakery, at $1 an hour. This is his home and he doesn't want to leave the District.

Another case in point is that of a doctor of philosophy in sociology, who works full time as a waiter in a downtown restaurant. He hates the job, but he has a wife and two children to support.

Department stores here frankly admit the difficulty of recruiting satisfactory sales personnel. By liberalizing their employment policies, these stores could help themselves by absorbing a substantial number of nonwhite graduates, particularly young women, from the city high schools each year. Many are unable to continue their education beyond high school. Many of those who go to college are forced to leave after a year or two, chiefly for economic reasons.

This is a tailor-made source of labor supply for local department stores. Up to now, they have failed to take advantage of it, and these young women remain at home—an economic and social liability on the community.

The same observations can be made regarding the failure of local financial institutions to give employment to qualified young Negroes. Yet the Treasury Department and the Internal Revenue Service employ hundreds of minority group workers to keep the records and balance the accounts of millions of Americans.

The local business community, which comprises the bulk of the employers, will eventually have to turn to a wider use of minority group members in the District, because they form a larger and ever-growing share of the available labor supply. Hiring the best-qualified candidate for a job makes good business sense.

As minority group workers obtain higher skills, they become increasingly more desirable as employees. Properly trained and fitted into the work force, nonwhites make good employees. They value their jobs more because they know the difficulty of finding another. Besides, they feel a sense of gratitude and loyalty to their employers for having given them an opportunity so long denied to members of their race.

There are problems, of course, in hiring minority group members, but these problems are not as great as usually imagined or feared.

A recent survey was conducted in a northern State which has a considerable Negro population. One hundred firms were selected—manufacturing companies, storage and warehouse firms, banking and insurance organizations, building and loan associations, department stores, and public utilities. All were known to hire nonwhites not only in traditional jobs, but also in skilled, clerical, professional, or supervisory positions.

The survey was designed to discover what procedures employers used in introducing minority workers into their firms and to evaluate the effectiveness of such programs. Most of the companies talked about precautionary educational campaigns for supervisors, other workers, prospective nonwhite employees, and the community, but few had actually put these plans into practice.

All agreed that the most successful approach is a forthright one—no discrimination in any way. The majority began with a staff meeting of supervisory personnel who were told by the management that they would be held responsible for the success of the program in their respective departments. All of the companies agreed that a firm policy at the top, accompanied by a determination to make the program work, was essential to success.

In the vast majority of companies, the changes took place with absolutely no reaction from the other employees. The general attitude was, so what? In only nine of the hundred was there a major hostile reaction, one in which there were some resignations or the firm was forced to alter its program partially. Union resistance was negligible. Five of the fifty-nine firms that were organized received minor protests from union officials. Twenty-three unions were actively in favor of the company plan.

Nine of the one hundred firms reported community resistance to the employment of minority group workers. Strangely, two of these were in manufacturing plants in small towns. The other seven were among the retail and public utility firms where employees had direct contact with the public. Only three of these companies felt that their operations were in any way hampered by community resistance.

A number of retailers stated that they were surprised at the community acceptance of nonwhite sales personnel. They reported that they expected some unfavorable criticism from their customers but had heard only good comments. The two manufacturing plants in small towns that reported some community disapproval stated that local residents feared the character of the neighborhood might be changed if too many nonwhites went to work in the plants.

There were a number of significant conclusions reached by the survey. Among them was the fact that all of the companies involved considered their merit employment programs to be successful.

They also found that there was no single method of overcoming problems. Employee resistance was expressed mostly in words, rarely in action. Resistance from the community was even more limited than that of the employees.

The survey confirmed the growing belief that companies which hire minority group members on a nondiscriminatory basis have been able to meet successfully, by voluntary action, both the real and imaginary problems of merit employment.

Residents of greater Washington are no different than other Americans who reside elsewhere in this land of equal opportunity. Their own ancestors, like the forebears of all Americans, came to this country in search of equal opportunity. The Nation is founded upon that bedrock.

Few local citizens realize the appalling absence of employment opportunities in this area, outside of Government, for minority group workers.

Nor do the employers here differ in any way from the average American businessman in other parts of the country. Area businessmen cannot fail to realize that they will have to use the available local supply at its maximum capacity if they are to sell their goods and services, attract depositors to their banks and savings associations, and collect their rent and insurance premiums.

The alternative is to see a continual increase in the outlay for public assistance, to watch a steady decline in the purchasing power of the community, and most deplorable of all, to witness a constantly mounting increase in crime and delinquency.

Many forces are at work in the District to blast the roadblocks preventing full employment opportunities for all who live here, without regard to race, religion or national origin.

The President's committee on Government contracts is active and alert in requiring all commercial firms who have business with the

Federal Government to adhere to a strict policy of nondiscriminatory hiring.

The United States Employment Service, with the strong support of the Department of Labor, is conducting a quiet but effective campaign of persuasion with local employers to adopt merit hiring programs by eliminating racial specifications in their job orders.

Other non-Government forces are also busy, among them the Washington Urban League, whose motto is "Equal Opportunity." The league, a biracial group of local citizens, has recently added a new staff member charged with the responsibility of opening new job opportunities for nonwhites in the metropolitan area.

Even more significant, during the past year a group of local business leaders has spontaneously organized a committee with the avowed purpose of obtaining wider opportunities for Negroes in private employment.

This group—the committee for job opportunities—confers with other private employers to create job openings for qualified nonwhites on the basis of merit and skill. Their discussions with their fellow businessmen are along hard, practical lines—backed, of course, by the ethical values of their objective.

The combined efforts of all of these agencies, heroic as they are, have thus far not been sufficient to create a major breakthrough in the curtain of custom and tradition that surrounds the employment of minority group people in this area. It is still one of the worst problems which confront the community.

Everything else has been tried in combating local crime. Perhaps the new approach of equal job opportunities might work where other methods have failed.

The Sad Plight of Southern Agriculture

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERMAN E. TALMADGE

OF GEORGIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, March 10, 1958

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, Drew Pearson, in his column which appeared in the March 8, 1958, issue of the Washington Post and Times Herald, accurately appraised the agricultural situation in a large portion of the Southeast. I ask unanimous consent that his column be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ALABAMA COTTON GROWERS SUFFER

(By Drew Pearson)

Ten grim-faced Alabama State legislators made a pilgrimage to Washington this week to lay before Congress the life-or-death situation confronting cotton farmers in the Southeast.

The picture was a solemn one, summed up in the words of a cotton farmer, E. F. Mauldin, of Leighton, Ala., now serving as a consultant to the State legislators.

"Our farmers are more demoralized than ever before," Mauldin told the House Agriculture Committee. "They find farm labor gone, their tenants vanished or barely existing, their plows rusting, their tractors down, their mules converted into dog meat, their fields vacated and lying idle, their rural communities disappearing, and their country homes, churches, and schools standing vacant like corroded monuments to haunt the memory of what once was a cherished and respected way of life."

The causes are low prices and a gigantic 35 percent slash, since 1953, in the number of acres allowed to be planted in cotton under Secretary Benson's flexible support system. For, as the Nation's cotton surplus mounts, the acres planted to cotton are cut.

Meanwhile, the Southeast—Alabama, Georgia, Mississippi, North Carolina, and South Carolina—has borne the brunt of the decline, while the acreage of such western States as California, Arizona, and New Mexico has fared proportionately better.

INDIVIDUALS IGNORED

This is because a State's share of the national cotton acreage is based upon its average acreage in the preceding 5 years. And with poor cotton farmers in the Southeast abandoning the soil for city jobs, Alabama's allotment has decreased, which has penalized farmers remaining on the soil. For, when their neighbors quit cotton farming, other farmers get their acreage cuts, so that some individual allotments have been cut 70 percent since 1953 in contrast to the national acreage decrease of only 35 percent.

The trouble, says Mauldin, is that Benson's plan reckons in terms of States and counties. The fate of the individual farmer is crassly ignored.

Result: In Alabama 125,000 farmers have signed up with the State employment service for off-farm jobs. One tractor dealer reports that he sold 60 tractors in 1955, only 32 in 1956, and just 14 in 1957. Most of the 14 he sold in 1957 had to be repossessed when farmers couldn't meet their payments.

Ginners, bankers, crushers, farm laborers, fertilizer manufacturers, warehousemen, and cotton merchants are all affected.

CITY JOBS DON'T HELP

According to Maynard Layman, farm editor of the Decatur Daily, the solution is not in moving farmers off the land. What Alabama needs, he says, is more marginal farmers, not fewer. He points out that it doesn't solve anything for farmers to sell out and move to the city. There they merely add to unemployment rolls, and create all kinds of social problems. Moreover, in many cases it's just plain impossible for a man who has been a farmer all his life to make the shift to city life at the age of 45 or 50.

Mauldin, before the House committee, proposed these solutions:

1. An increase in cotton acreage allotments, not across the board by State, but just enough to guarantee every farmer his historic share of the Nation's production.

2. A Brannan plan for cotton, whereby all American cotton would be sold without price supports at the normal level. By letting the price seek its own level, cotton would better compete with nylon, dacron, and other synthetics, instead of price supports, farmers would receive direct production payments to the extent necessary to raise their income to parity with industrial workers.

NOTE.—The soil bank hasn't helped. A total of 70,000 Alabama farmers were frozen out of the soil bank by insufficient soil-bank funds, many of them after they had sold their implements. Even if Congress appropriates more soil-bank funds it won't help the thousands of farm laborers and tenant farmers whose jobs disappear whenever an acre of land goes into the soil bank.

Modern Delusions and God's Design

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. A. WILLIS ROBERTSON

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, March 10, 1958

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the remarks of Mr. John Bolten, of Lawrence, Mass., at the fellowship breakfast during the annual conference of the International Council for Christian Leadership, Inc., held in the Senate District of Columbia committee room, United States Capitol, on February 7, 1958.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MODERN DELUSIONS AND GOD'S DESIGN

Relatively few realize the complexity, the intensity, and the universality of the crisis in which mankind finds itself today. There is nothing comparable to it in history—neither in the days of the Renaissance, nor of the Reformation. If we can compare it at all with any period of upheaval and change, it would be with that of the destruction of the Roman Empire.

At that time, a whole world order collapsed—religion, morals, culture, manners, commerce, science, and a highly developed, world-embracing legal and political system. It was a debacle of such magnitude that we can hardly comprehend it. Nothing remained but ruins.

Without question there is a striking similarity between the time before the fall of the Roman Empire, and our own age. Again all realms of life are shaking, and again all values and traditions are being questioned, whether cultural, religious, political, or economic.

Yet, it is part of western man's credo that he must be irresistibly forward and that the future stretches out before him like a long road flanked with new developments, new progress, and new achievements reaching out to the distant horizon.

But we Christians are most curious about this journey and would like to ask a few questions:

1. Where is modern man going?

2. In what goal does western man really believe?

3. What will happen after he reaches his goal?

4. Is it a goal we can visualize and discuss seriously?

It would seem that the answers to these questions presuppose an industrial millennium or workless paradise far beyond our present state. Unions, industry, and science envision more and more production with less and less work through technical perfection in a pushbutton world.

When this has been accomplished, the end of the road and of their dreams will have been reached. The whole world will be perfect, but with one exception: man—unredeemed man—separated from God, left with his wicked heart and all his sin and guilt in a perfect world.

But what would this unredeemed, godless man do with his "perfect world"? Let us see what we have done with the perfection man has achieved thus far. From a technical point of view, we already have near-perfect products in a number of industries.

The radio has reached a point of practical perfection. Powerful radio stations broadcast across the country and to the farthest corners of the earth. But turn on this perfected radio and what do you hear? Crime stories, soap operas, and syncopated noise that accompanies words, mostly moronic in their utter senselessness.

Television. Is it any better? This modern miracle of technical achievement has certainly reached a high degree of perfection. Yet, Life magazine some time ago reported that an average of 163 murders per week are now committed in TV plays of one kind or another.

We have the most magnificent printing presses and we manufacture the finest paper. But what is man doing with this almost perfect combination? In the hands of man, these have become so debased that sometimes

we wish the radio, the television, the printing press had never been invented.

Some 15 million magazines that we print every month are of such a nature that they are not even permitted to cross our borders. The lurid and immoral material and pictures found in many magazines on our newsstands make one shudder.

How clearly we see that any perfection in the hands of unredeemed man soon becomes a curse. What man would do with a new paradise is perfectly obvious. In fact, the word of God comes right to the heart of the situation: "What shall it profit a man, if he shall gain the whole world, and lose his own soul?" Obviously, the answer is—nothing. Any other answer is nothing but a colossal delusion.

The leisure, comfort, happiness, and peace of mind as man planned actually resulted in a machine age and in dreaded unemployment, as well as wars of fantastic ruthlessness and destruction. Do any of us believe that man is really happy in this world that he, himself, has created? To build his own world, to be master of the world, to be God, has been man's dream since Eden's fall. Here we are now in command of it, and what a world it is.

But why is it that God is so far away from us—God, who should be closer to us than we are to ourselves? Is this our destiny that we have to accept as a matter of fact?

Unredeemed man does not understand that he is guilty before God, that he lives in a fallen world. He is feverishly occupied in seeking a way out of his troubles, seeking an island to which he can flee in order to escape from the engulfing waters of world tragedy.

What, then, is God's plan of redemption? John 3:16 brings before us in one, single verse this plan:

"God so loved the world that He gave His only begotten Son; that whosoever believeth in Him shall not perish, but have everlasting life."

God's word is not progress. God's word, which became flesh, is Christ. Christ is the only word God has to transmit to unredeemed mankind. Take this one word away from God, and God must remain silent. Therefore, Christ is the only possibility of reconstructing man with God.

Perhaps your hearts have never felt the full horror of sin. Then, let me lead you today to a place called Calvary. Here we see the full results of our sinful lives. Often we consider sin just a trifle in the eyes of God as well as our own. But it is He, the Son of the living God, who found out how horrible sin it. He drank the bitter cup for us. He bore our sin for us. If we do not understand the gravity of sin as Jesus did—if we still believes that sin is only a matter we can negotiate with God, then we have not at all entered into the mind of God.

Have you ever thought to prepare yourself to meet God? Have you had hours in which you know what the Lord experienced in Gethesemane where He was burdened with our sin? If not, you have not yet appreciated the love of Jesus nor the work of His suffering death.

Only if my soul was brought there where he suffered for me the wrath and justice of God—only when I have experienced that God's beloved Son, who had no sin, was made sin for me, that God had to smite sin in Him—only if I see Him there at the cross in my stead, in my place—then I will understand that God's justice and holiness could not spare His Son.

And if He could not spare His Son from judgment and death, do you think He will let you escape?

When I look at the cross, at the suffering of our Saviour, the wrath and the curse, can I think that my sins are unimportant or just a trifle? Why did Christ suffer on the cross the wrath of God? Because you and I deserve eternal condemnation.

Churchill said some years ago: "Our problems are beyond us." Look at some of our problems. There is Russia, communism, and atheism. There is the H-bomb. There are the race problems, sex problems, divorces, alcohol, economic problems, and military problems. Must I mention more? How are we going to solve all these matters? Churchill is right. Our problems are beyond us.

But if we want to sum them up—if we want to face the core of the issue—it can be reduced to one word: Sin, sin, sin. And if the question of sin is not answered, nothing is settled.

The only answer is God's answer to the question of man's sin. But we have rejected the One who came to solve our problems. We have put Him on the cross and this cross has stained all the glory of this world because the world became guilty of the murder of the Son of God and because the world nailed our Lord to the tree.

Man has tried almost everything, but he was never able to remove the affect of sin. We often believe: "My sins are in the past. I have developed into a better man." But our sins are not in the past. The deadly thing about our sins is that they are not in the past, but with us today. They are now part of us. They have made us what we are. They are alive and still in us today separating us from God.

Furthermore, sin is ever present and the effects of our sins are very clearly seen in our morals, our psychological makeup, our behavior, and our work, as well as on our face, eyes, health, nervous system, and conscience.

Everyone here knows that our past has left some marks on us. They have gone into the very fiber of our being. But thank God that the Saviour is greater than sin. Thank God that the Son of God, His only Son, has taken our place. Thank God that we do not have to worry about our eternal destiny—that He stepped into the picture—that He has solved all our problems—and that we are accepted in the Beloved, in Christ Jesus.

Christ is the only answer. If any man be in Christ, he is a new creature. Old things have passed. He is a new creation—a child of God. He belongs to a different society with a different faith. Have you experienced that change?

There are magnificent churches with Sunday schools, men's clubs, and missionary meetings, but I sometimes wonder if there is not something missing. Many of these churches could be compared to a ship. The boilers are going, the motors are running, the lights are burning, and everything is in working order, except one thing. The propeller is slipping and does not grip the water. That is what is wrong with our churches and our Christian lives today. Outwardly, everything is fine, but where is the Holy Spirit? Is He still here? Is He in you? Is He grieved—or is He a power in your life? Is the propeller in your life gripping or slipping?

If you heat water to 150° F., you will never generate enough power to drive a steam engine. You may say that if heated long enough, some power will be generated at 150° F. Just try it—for a year or even longer if you will—and see what happens. You need 212° F. to generate effective power—and so it is with your life. Too many Christians generate only 150° F. power in their work. It must be 212° F.

It must be a decision—a total surrender. Fifty-percent surrender will not do—nor 75 percent or 90 percent. You cannot bargain with God. He demands all your life or He will have no part of it. Jesus is not satisfied with less than all. He wants the first place. He is not a consultant for business, family, or private affairs. If He cannot be Lord and Master in your life, what place would you offer Him?

One thing should be clear in our minds. God will never play second fiddle in your life. He will either be Lord and Master or He will not live in you. There is no middle road. We must give all. He has given all—His Son, His only Son.

Oh, how I would plead with you to surrender your life to Christ. One hundred and fifty degrees F. will not create any power, neither will mere religiousness of human nature change your life or produce any power or fruit. It must be full surrender. Nothing else will make you a Christian. It must be a new birth, a new beginning, a new life, a new creation, a new conviction, a new direction: Heaven—a new Master—Jesus Christ.

If our life is totally surrendered, we certainly would not be satisfied to cultivate only the religiousness of human nature for God or to try to introduce sinners into Heaven who have not experienced a new birth and who have not been transformed into a new creation.

We are wrestling against the world, principalities, and powers. However, let us not forget that Christians are on the conquering side knowing that our Lord has already overcome the enemies and triumphed over them on the cross. The Devil is a defeated enemy. Only if we invite him, can he harm us.

In the last book, Revelation, many promises are made to them that overcometh. "To him that overcometh will I grant to come and sit with me here on My throne—even as I also overcame and sat down with My Father on His throne."

We see those in Revelation who overcame by the blood of the Lamb. We hear the triuphant step of God's redeemed. There is no uncertainty—no doubt—but joy everlasting. And from this mountaintop, the valleys of life are no longer visible. But in the distance, separated only by fleecy clouds, we already have a vision of the world above and nearby we hear the thunderous melody of God's redeemed. There will be a new song in which Heaven and earth will join with God's people in praise and adoration of the Crucified One—the risen and glorified Son of God and man—our Lord and Saviour, Jesus Christ.

Robert E. Lee—A Hero Even in Failure

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STROM THURMOND

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, March 10, 1958

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, a great many beautiful things have been written about Robert E. Lee. He is one of the most revered men in our history, fully deserving to be called, as he was, "the greatest gentleman of them all."

New tributes to Lee are being written even today. One of the finest I have seen recently appeared in the January 1958 issue of the Joanna Way published by and for the employees of Joanna Cotton Mills Co. of Joanna, S. C.

I ask unanimous consent that this article, entitled "Robert E. Lee—A Hero Even in Failure," be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ROBERT E. LEE—A HERO EVEN IN FAILURE

In his old age, Robert E. Lee wrote these pathetic words: "Life is indeed gliding away and I have nothing of good to show for mine that is past. I pray I may be spared to accomplish something for the benefit of mankind and the honor of God."

A failure in his own eyes, Lee may be judged by worldly standards as indeed lacking in success, for in his most spectacular undertaking—commanding the Confederate Army during the terrible years of the War Between the States—he was forced to surrender to the enemy, accepting the terms meted out to him. Why then does his memory live on, honored, revered, and loved not only by the southerners whose cause he championed but by freedom-loving people all over America and the world?

His greatness in defeat, his beautiful spirit, his devotion to duty, his kindliness to all—these traits lift him above failure in specific undertakings; they set him up as a worthy example for succeeding generations; they earned for him the title "the greatest gentleman of them all."

One of the guiding rules of his life was set down in a letter to one of his sons: "Duty is the sublimest word in our language. Do your duty in all things."

Another rule for self-government was voiced to a mother who brought her baby to him to be blessed: "Teach him he must deny himself." Great even in failure, Lee clung to the belief that human virtue should be equal to human calamity.

Born to wealth and position, Lee expected more of himself than of people of less opportunity. He felt that he owed unselfish service to the world. Graduating second in his class at West Point, he gave his best to the United States Army while he served there. Loving the Union and abhorring slavery, he still chose to cast his fortune with his home State in defense of States rights and against Federal intervention in local matters, rather than accept the command of the great Army of the United States. Though he was a brilliant leader, Lee found the odds against him, with a dwindling and weakened army, and so he finally surrendered to avoid unnecessary loss of life and suffering. With dignity he gained the best possible terms for his men and then turned his attention to healing the wounds of war and counseling burial of old hates and building anew a unified country.

Jobless after the war, with his fortune swept away and his estate (Arlington) confiscated by the United States Government, Lee nevertheless refused generous offers of cash for use of his name by business concerns. "My name is not for sale" was his firm reply.

Sought by Washington College as its president, his thought was not of its poor pay, but whether his representing a losing cause would hurt its standing. Convinced that he could help this war-weakened institution, he gave his all to build it up and to train its young students to go forward in hope, without bitterness, into life in the new United States. His great achievements there were recognized when his name was added to that of another illustrious American, and the school became Washington and Lee University, which is today one of America's most outstanding and respected institutions of higher learning.

Buried in a mausoleum in the chapel at Washington and Lee University, Lee still inspires not only the students at the university and others who flock to his resting place as if it were a shrine but all those who recognize the great spirit of this general who lost a war but won the battle of life through living up to the highest ideals and principles.

Today his guiding principles in life—devotion to duty, self-denial, modesty, accepting blames for errors, kindliness toward all, love of country, love of God—are beacon lights to lead succeeding generations to a better life. His firm belief in States rights and limiting of Federal power is still sustained, though the battle against Federal encroachment on States rights is becoming more difficult year by year.

On this 151st anniversary of his birth—on January 19, 1807—descendants of the loyal, courageous soldiers who loved him dearly may take new courage in their determination to maintain the sovereignty of States, and their local institutions and customs.

Though loving the United States as did Lee, they can turn their backs on Federal economic security and handout (as did Lee in ending a successful 30-year career with the United States Army) and stand proudly on the belief that the individual States should rule their internal affairs, that the Constitution of the United States is the law of the land (not the decisions of nine men who would put their socialistic judgments and sociological experimentations above the wisdom and purposes of the Founding Fathers of our Republic).

By casting his lot with the South, Lee lost his home—Arlington, now a national cemetery for America's honored war heroes; he gave up security in order to espouse a cause in which he believed; he rose above defeat to live a worthwhile life characterized by influence for good.

Where can we find a nobler example on which to pattern our lives?

Conditions in Schools in Portland, Oreg.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD L. NEUBERGER

OF OREGON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, March 10, 1958

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, my home city of Portland, Oreg., has one of the outstanding school systems in this Nation. On February 28, 1958, an informative and thoughtful address was delivered on educational policy to the City Club of Portland by Mr. Herbert M. Schwab, Portland attorney, who is chairman of the school board of School District No. 1, in Portland.

Mr. Schwab stressed the urgent need for high and enlightened standards of education in America, and he emphasized that we must challenge the intellects and capabilities of our most intelligent and brightest students.

While I do not necessarily agree with every phase of Mr. Schwab's able address, I urge that he be heeded when he stresses that quality as well as quantity must be a goal of the educational systems, public and private alike, in our great democratic and free Nation.

I believe that portions of Mr. Schwab's able address will interest my colleagues, and to make them available, and because many of our committees are already considering education and Federal-aid-to-school bills, and I ask unanimous consent that these portions be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the excerpts from the address were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

I

School District No. 1 is one of several hundred school districts in Oregon and by far the largest; it is a self-governing body governed by seven school directors elected at large by the voters of the district on a nonpartisan ballot to serve on a part-time basis without pay. The district is financed largely by local property taxes which it has the power to levy through its board and in minor part by the State basic school support fund (a matter which I would rather not talk about after a good lunch). There are certain statutory requirements as to curriculum. For the most part the curriculum is the responsibility of the School Board. Actually the board only establishes the policy and leaves detail and day-to-day operation to the superintendent and his staff.

Our mission is established by State law. We must provide classroom education for all children from ages 7 through 18 who can benefit from education, except those who wish to attend private or parochial schools. We are equally responsible for the moron, the genius, and all between those two extremes.

Our job really breaks down into three broad categories—the physical plant, the teaching and professional staff, and the curriculum. I think it fair to say that all three were at a low ebb at the end of World War II so that is a good place to start.

In 1946 about 48,000 children were enrolled in Portland public schools—kindergarten through high school—today there are 72,000. No new buildings had been erected since 1932 and the existing buildings were in a state of disrepair for lack of maintenance. Lighting, flooring and acoustics were almost universally very bad. The tag ends of prewar building bond issues were still outstanding. Since then we have built 25 new full-size elementary schools, 9 primary schools, 3 high schools, 29 major additions to elementary schools, 5 major high school additions, and we have modernized the majority of our pre-depression buildings, all at a total cost to date of $54 million. This has been done on a pay-as-you-go basis. The old bonds have been retired and no new ones issued. We don't owe a dime, a distinction I understand we share with only one other large city system in the country—Cleveland, Ohio. Have we wasted money—building palaces? I think not. We have made some mistakes, of course, but we have profited from them. Square-foot costs are illusory and misleading. The only true measure of building cost is the cost per child capacity of an adequate building. Although building costs have risen over 40 percent since 1946 our cost per child has remained almost constant. A U. S. News & World Report survey places the average cost per child for new school buildings in Oregon at $965—in Washington and California about $1,350. In Portland the cost is a little higher than the Oregon average—this is due in part to a very stiff city building code, and in part to our firm belief that it is poor economy to save $1 in building costs only to spend an additional $5 to $10 in maintenance over the 50 years or so experience tells us we must use our buildings.

What about teachers. At the end of World War II a teacher started at $1,800 and could go to a maximum of $3,300 with a master's degree. Staffing the classrooms each fall was a nip and tuck affair. We gave very little credit salarywise to experience gained teaching in other school districts and for the most part the approximately 400 new teachers we hired each year were without any teaching experience and in many cases only partially trained. Employment of a certain number of beginners each year is not only acceptable; it is desirable—on the other hand, too large a percentage is detrimental. Today a beginner with no experience starts at $3,700 for a 185-day teaching year and a teacher with 14 years experience and a master's degree receives $6,600 a year. We now give full salary credit for teaching experience outside this district—something done by few if any other large city school districts in the United States—and practically without exception we are hiring teachers with a minimum of 4 years of college education. In most categories we have more applicants than vacan-

cies so that our personnel department can pick and choose rather than take anyone who comes along. The almost 400 new teachers we employed as of last September averaged 31 years of age and over 5 years of previous teaching experience, and our recruiting for next year is well ahead of where we were last year at the same time, with no diminution in quality of personnel.

II

Now let's look at the meat of the coconut—the curriculum, what we are teaching, how well are we teaching it; where have we been, why have we been there, and where are we going. In this area I doubt if we were any worse off at the end of World War II than we were at the end of the Civil War. This is a Nation of paradoxes so far as education is concerned. We revere, almost as an article of faith, the proposition that every child is entitled to a formal public school education, yet we have had an anti-intellectual tradition. We have always recognized that some people are fundamentally superior to others in physical abilities, but we have steadfastly refused to accept as equally valid the fact that there is a tremendous variation in mental abilities. In 1913 less than 5 percent graduated from high school in Portland. Now legislation requires that everyone be given a high-school education and there is the common complaint that high-school graduates have deteriorated; they can't read and write. If the concept that all have equal mental abilities were correct, this would be a valid criticism. It isn't correct—education can only develop basic abilities, not create them. Our legislators cannot legislate mental capacity, nor can the medical profession inject it in the arm. The public schools have done a good job, an ever improving one in teaching reading and writing. The United States probably always has led the world in educating the low average and the subnormal child up to his capacity. But we cannot change his capacity.

In terms of educating the top half of our society to a point reasonably approximating capacity, our American educational system, with a few notable exceptions, mostly at the college level, has never been very good; certainly it has lagged far behind European schools. Our educators can be blamed only for following the path of least resistance; for going along with an anti-intellectual tradition, dominant in our society. Things may be changing but we have a long way to go. For example, the newspapers have been full of stories about the gyrations of the Board of Trustees of Texas A. and M. college in trying to fill their football coaching vacancy—a job which pays, including perquisites of office, a sum reported to be as high as $60,000 per year. How many people are equally aware that Princeton University is trying to increase its endowment to the point where it can raise full professors' salaries from $9,200 to $10,000 per year? A tremendous affair was recently held here for the Oregon Rose Bowl team—and don't misunderstand me; I think it was a fine achievement and I think the affair was a god idea. But about the same time it was anounced that a University of Oregon student had won a Rhodes scholarship—if anybody even bought him a hamburger, I haven't heard about it.

Statistics show that Reed College turns out a larger percentage of graduates who go on to get doctor's degrees in science than any other college or university in the United States, that it has produced one Rhodes scholar for every 67 male graduates as against a national average of less than 1 in 3,000. I haven't heard of any dinners in honor of the Reed faculty who coached these winners in the intellectual Rose Bowl, and I am certain that the same holds true for the faculties of other colleges in this area who have made notable achievements in the academic field.

I don't agree with that small group of people who tend to sneer at any organized athletic activity. Human beings have bodies as well as minds and there is room in a good society for the use of both. I do feel, however, that in assessing the worth of an academic institution we should place first things first.

III

Another paradox is our national attitude as to the proper function of schools. On the one hand we hear that schools should cut out frills and get back to fundamentals, and on the other hand every pressure group with a pet project tries to dump it on the schools. We bow our heads in reverence before the altar of family sanctity and responsibility, while with both hands we try to shove more and more of what used to be the responsibilities and functions of the family into the lap of the schools, some of which are cooking, sewing, driver training, dental care (not just examining but the actual filling of teeth), safety in the use of firearms, happy marriage, and so on. I do not mean to say that none of these things is worthwhile or that some of them may not be proper functions of schools and other public agencies in present-day society. I do mean to say by way of quoting Arthur Bestor that the main purpose of schools should be intellectual training, not custodial care. Bestor, incidentally, is professor of history at the University of Illinois.

An interview with him reported in the January 24 issue of U. S. News & World Report is well worth reading.

Our real problem in education in the United States is to improve the quality. Our national obsession with quantity is a detriment in this regard. Last year 43 percent of our Portland high-school graduates enrolled in college. This would be a fine record if all were qualified both as to desire and capacity for 4 years of academic university training but it unfortunately is not so. Some colleges and universities have been complaining about the prepartion of the average high-school graduate they receive from us, but at the same time they enroll as freshmen some students whose records of achievement and capacity clearly show them to be dubious college material at best. To this extent educators at both the high school and college level have been equally guilty in not recognizing that human beings are unequal in capacities and motivation.

Adm. Hyman Rickover has been much in the news lately with regard to his views on our educational system. I think he is going overboard on some of his ideas; nevertheless, I would like to quote from a recent speech of his because, while the language may be extreme, it points up the problem pretty strongly. Here it is: "Everything is grist to the American educational mill. You, too, can have a degree. Every American child has the God-given right to march in a commencement procession, clad in mortarboard and academic gown, the rolled-up parchment degree clutched in his hot little hand. * * *" He went on to say that, "If we fail in our hold upon quality, the cherished American dream of universal education will degenerate into a nightmare. Let us each make a beginning, however small. It takes but the moving of a single pebble to start an avalanche." Now I'd like to come back to Portland. Here things are changing—we have long since made our beginning. We have moved more pebbles than most people realize and I think we are gaining the momentum necessary to move a lot more in the near future.

Here are some of our achievements of the past few years.

Ten years ago we had no counseling program and had never had one. Let me use a friend of mine as an example. In the early thirties he entered a Portland high school as a freshman, having graduated from a Portland grade school. All that preceded him to high school was a form containing some statistical information—name, name of parents, age, name of elementary school from which he graduated. No counselor interviewed him or aided him in selection of courses. There were no counselors. He had no official information or contact with anyone in the school system with regard to what high school had to offer or what it was all about. No information concerning the results of his I. Q. tests, or aptitude, or achievement tests preceded him. The reason was simple—no such tests had ever been made. Over the last 10 years we have developed a testing system whereby every child starting in the fourth grade is repeatedly and carefully tested for I. Q., achievement, and aptitudes, and a careful anecdotal history is maintained. During eighth grade each child and his family receives detailed information about what to expect and look for in high chool. Every eighth grade class is visited by high-school representatives. A folder known as the permanent-record file containing all of the test scores, grades and history precedes each child to his high school. Ten years ago this would have been useless because no one in the high school would have had time to make use of the information. Today we average nine counsellors in each high school, whose jobs are to counsel, guide and encourage each child to take work commensurate with his capacity, interests and aptitudes, and the testing and evaluation procedures continue through high school.

IV

Ten years ago no one in a high school had as his sole duty the job of working with classroom teachers as a watchdog of the curriculum. Today every high school has an additional vice principal whose sole duty is in the field of curriculum. In the past few years we have trebled the number of books in our high-school libraries.

Let's get back to my friend again. He was a good student. He was at the top of his class. When he took fourth year English he took exactly the same English course as did the senior who was at the bottom of his class in interest or ability or both. Only one fourth-year English course was offered. Today things are different. But at the elementary and high-school level we are rapidly expanding a program of separate classes for the mentally retarded. This leads to better education not only for the other pupils but provides a much more satisfactory and less frustrating situation for the retarded. In addition we now have available English courses ranging from what might be termed "bonehead" English for those of mediocre capacity or motivation to courses in English literature and composition designed to challenge the interest and capacities of those who are both bright and desirous of learning. The same is true in mathematics which has a 2-level system running through all 4 years of high school. This is true to a lesser degree in othe subject matter areas and each year more divisions of this nature are being accomplished.

Recently, we had a meeting with the presidents of nine major collegiate institutions of this State to present them with a proposition involving their cooperation in a thorough study of our high-school curriculum and teaching staff in preparing college-bound students for college. Shortly after a story about our intentions in this regard appeared in the newspapers, and even before the invitations to the meeting went out to the college presidents, I met Dr. Morgan Odell, the president of Lewis and Clark College on the street. His enthusiastic acceptance of the idea was indicative of the desire of his as well as other schools in Oregon to improve educational standards. The response from the other colleges and uni-

versities—namely, Reed, Oregon State, Oregon, Pacific, Portland State, University of Portland, Linfield, and Willamette—was equally gratifying. Dr. Meredith Wilson, of the University of Oregon, believes such a study will improve not only high school but college education, too. We are hopeful of great things from this project if we can obtain adequate financing for it from one of the large foundations—and in one way or other we are going to see it through.

With all of this we have only proceeded a short distance on a long climb. We have a long way to go in expanding the various types of classes I have already referred to. In addition, our staff is giving serious consideration to other major changes and innovations. Here are a few, some of which, at least, will probably be put into effect in the near future:

A modified platoon system in the seventh and eighth grades dividing those classes into faster and slower groups with special teachers in English and science.

Algebra classes under special teachers for the more able children in all elementary schools.

More foreign language courses at the elementary school level for those children able to handle them.

Extension of the competitive high school grading system into the seventh and eighth grades.

Elimination of automatic promotion and diplomas in high school, with diplomas to be issued only to those who obtain passing grades in required subjects, and certificates of attendance to the others. Distinctive types of diplomas which will give special recognition to those who do outstanding work and take the stiffer academic courses.

Experimentation with time allotments. For instance, instead of all subjects being allotted 5 periods per week, typing, just for example, might be cut to 3 periods per week and chemistry raised to 7 periods.

Elimination or at least minimizing of activities which remove students or teachers from their classes. By this I mean such things as having choruses sing at luncheon meetings of service clubs, students being excused from math classes to decorate cafeterias for dances, etc.

v

And now lastly a word about the board and the superintendent, who are largely responsible for initiating the improvements that have taken place and those which I am sure are still to come. In the 8 years I have been on the board, almost without exception every member from Dorothy Johannsen and Jim Yeomans, who have also put in 8 years, down to Arno Denecke, our newest valuable acquisition, has been capable, farsighted, hardworking, and remarkably impervious to the pressures to which the holders of public office are often prone to yield. We have no cliques and no personal animosities on the board. Each member invariably speaks up for what he thinks is right regardless of whether he is joined by the entire board or stands alone, and no matter how heated the issue when it is disposed of that's the end of it. As for Jack Edwards, appointing him superintendent has proved to have been a very wise decision. You have heard of President Eisenhower's original cabinet referred to as a bunch of millionaires and a plumber. We are proud of the fact that the National Merit Scholarship Board, in addition to a bunch of millionaires, has as a member one school superintendent; namely, J. W. Edwards.

Moving Against Recession

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN J. SPARKMAN
OF ALABAMA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, March 10, 1958

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, last Saturday there appeared in the Washington Post and Times Herald an editorial entitled "Moving Against Recession." I believe this editorial states the situation as it is, and that it would be good reading for everyone. Accordingly, I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MOVING AGAINST RECESSION

At least part of the need in countering the recession is to renew confidence in an expanding economy. This is in considerable degree a matter of psychological attitude. One important way to encourage confidence is for the Government to convince the public and business groups that it is doing all it can reasonably do quickly to combat unemployment and stimulate an economic upturn.

This, as we understand it, is the principal purpose of the two resolutions introduced by Senate and House Majority Leaders JOHNSON and MCCORMACK which are scheduled for Senate hearings on Monday. These resolutions call upon the administration to expedite urgently needed military and civil construction projects. In present circumstances they would not involve additional net expenditures. All they would require is a speedup in projects that are to be undertaken anyhow.

Such measures are a good kind of economic stimulus, for they tend to have a multiple effect. Make-work projects, or artificial efforts to rescue particular depressed industries, are in many instances an expensive and dubious method. But where military and civil public works needs can be met by moving faster, a double purpose is served. Senator SPARKMAN's housing bill and Senator GORE's plan to accelerate Federal highway construction are expansions on this same idea.

President Eisenhower had a point in saying at his news conference that the largest impetus must come from consumer spending, although we question the wisdom of stressing this rather Hooveresque theme. Despite the President's emphasis, the administration has not been inactive; and clearly it is dedicated to the use of Governmental powers to keep the economy moving forward. It is proper that the administration should be careful in view of the possibility that, if additional expenditures place the budget greatly out of balance, inflation may again be the big problem.

In the meantime, however, there are some temporary stimuli that can safely be applied. The further easing of interest rates by the Federal Reserve Board is probably more symbolic than substantial, because demand for loans has slackened; nevertheless, it is a good move. More important, though, is the use of governmental programs to meet public needs faster.

It comes as something of a shock to learn, for example, that military expenditure ceilings still are in effect and actually are hampering procurement in instances in which production is ahead of schedule. No doubt this is a hangover from the troubles with the unrealistically low debt ceiling recently lifted. In any event, the situation ought to be remedied promptly.

If, beyond such measures, a tax cut seems advisable, we should like to see some attention given to the removal of nuisance excise taxes before there is a general income tax reduction. Taxes on automobiles, on transportation (a relic of wartime when the Government sought to discourage travel), on luggage and the like, might well be lifted. It would be unfortunate if such a move were viewed merely as an excuse to increase prices.

Particularly in the automobile industry, however, it might herald a needed reduction of net prices to customers.

In any new measures adopted, flexibility ought to be the rule. The virtue of the Johnson-McCormack proposal is that construction could be retarded if later conditions warranted it; this is also the principle with the monetary controls exercised by the Federal Reserve Board. For the moment, the very evidence that the Government was moving in determined fashion might turn out to be as important as some of the specific remedies themselves.

The Parker Pen Co.—A Remarkable Business in World Trade

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, March 10, 1958

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I have previously invited the attention of my colleagues to the increasing importance of American business operations throughout the world.

Today, for example, I am citing the important work of the United States Inter-American Council, representing leading American businesses in export-import trade.

Mr. President, we shall soon be discussing on the floor of the Senate the proposed extension of the Reciprocal Trade Act. We have been talking a great deal about unemployment. In evaluating the meaning of the Reciprocal Trade Act, there was brought to my attention a very unusual business in my own State, an outstanding business known throughout the world.

I refer to the Parker Pen Co., of Janesville, Wis.

The name "Parker" stands with other leading brand names as one of the most universally identified symbols of the quality of American products.

In addition to the acceptance on the American scene, the Parker pen has won for itself a unique business niche throughout the world.

The Parker Pen Co. advertises in no less than 1,700 newspapers of the world; in 42 languages. It has 89 distributors in all parts of the globe.

Here, therefore, is a splended example of American free enterprise at work; growing, selling more and more of its products, establishing mutually profitable business relations in country after country.

In each country, in its advertising and public relations program, it has due recognition of local interests, local needs, national cultural patterns, and the like.

I send to the desk two fine articles written by the chairman of the company, Mr. Kenneth Parker. These articles were published in the March 4 and March 5 issues of the Christian Science Monitor. I ask unanimous consent that both articles be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Christian Science Monitor of March 4, 1958]

UNITED STATES FOUNTAIN PENS SELL TO LION'S SHARE OF WORLD MARKETS

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—The Christian Science Monitor invited Kenneth Parker, chairman of the board of the Parker Pen Co., to tell its readers about his firm, one of the oldest and largest producers of fountain pens in the world. Today, in the first of four articles, Mr. Parker outlines the growth in the use of this writing tool.)

(By Kenneth Parker, chairman, Parker Pen Co.)

JANESVILLE, WIS.—In a world that is growing ever more literate, the American pen has made its mark. Just as the people of the world look to France for perfume, Britain for woolens, Switzerland for watches, they look to the United States for sure writing equipment. Estimates place America's share of the world market as high as 75 percent.

Travelers tell us that the brand name "Parker" ranks with Singer, Ford, and Coca-Cola as one of the most seen and universally used of America's commercial terms. It is listed in the dictionary of one Far Eastern country. It is spelled "P.arker" and "Parcher" by imitators in Japan, Italy, and elsewhere. The Soviets have a Parker copy called Leningrad. Our particular experience symbolizes the extent of the dominance of the American pen.

It is improbable that the founder of the Parker Pen Co. envisioned this development when he introduced his first fountain pen 70 years ago. Fountain pens were the special property of the gentry at that time, although steel pens had been introduced into the American scene by one Peregrin Williamson in 1809 and fountain pens made their appearance 80 or 90 years ago.

Till the turn of the century, they had many shortcomings. One of them was that they had to be filled with an eyedropper. As recently as 40 years ago a scant 5 percent of the literate population of the United States owned fountain pens.

PORTABILITY NEEDED

In a dynamic and mobile society, however, the need for a writing instrument with its own portable ink supply persisted. The early fountain pen makers, including my father, George S. Parker, strove ceaselessly to perfect a pen which would: (1) carry a goodly supply of ink and (2) release it only upon the wish of the writer. That is to say, it should not leak.

Early inventions gave fountain pens a degree of reliability. Yet progress was slow; our first year to exceed a million dollars in sales volume came in 1910, 22 years after entering into business.

The use of fountain pens was stimulated during World War I by the letter writing of soldiers away from home. Our company brought out a sturdy little unit which carried small pellet of ink crystals which could be inserted into the pen barrel. By adding water, the soldier-owner could make his own ink even in the trenches. This trench pen won legions of friends. By 1920 annual fountain-pen sales for the industry were about 1 million units.

Many improvements had meanwhile been made on the early fountain pens. An important one was the side-lever-filling method. But it took a rather more dramatic product to bring the American fountain pen forcefully to the attention of the consuming public. Such a product made its appearance in 1921. It was called the Parker Duofold pen.

COLOR INTRODUCED

The Duofold had dash where its predecessors were severe or painfully ornate. It was orange-red in color, formidable in size, and boasted a large, gold point in an era when Spencerian and Palmer penmanship were important to millions. Furthermore, it was virtually unbreakable. United States fountain-pen production rose from a million to 25 million annually in the first half of the twenties.

At the same time, American writing instruments began in earnest to capture the foreign market. We augmented our capability abroad by establishing plants in Canada and England in 1923–24. Now a dozen subsidiary companies—including newly purchased Eversharp Pen Co.—join the parent operation in serving 157 distributors in every free land in the world. More than half of our sales volume derives from overseas sales.

A source of satisfaction in the writing industry is the knowledge that the pen often participates in historical events. President Eisenhower (then general of the Army) completed armistice formalities for the war in Europe with his "51" pen. Gen. Douglas MacArthur used Admiral Nimitz's Parker Duofold pen to sign the armistice with Japan on the deck of the *Missouri*. Gen. Mark W. Clark used a similar model in Korea at Panmunjom. The charter of the newest nation in Asia, the Malayan Federation, was validated by sultans using Parker pens.

Arabs have used fountain pens to sign blood agreements; businessmen to ratify international trade documents; movie stars to autograph boiled shirt fronts; students to complete theses. To each, primary features of the fountain pen were its dependability and ability to provide personalized handwriting.

BALLPOINT BOOM

Outstanding in an industry noted for its competitive zest is the ballpoint pen segment. Ball pens date back to 1888 when the idea of rolling ink on paper was first made known by Inventor J. J. Loud in his United States patent No. 392, 046. Virtually nothing was done about the ball pen by Loud or anyone else in this country until 1945, however. Since then the ball pen has altered the industry's makeup by adding a practical tool for casual notetaking.

From 1940 to 1951 the industry grew in number of participants, unit production, and in dollar value. In 1940 there were approximately 75 companies. By 1951 some 250 concerns manufactured or assembled end products.

In 1939 the industry produced 73,500,000 units. In 1947 this had grown to 149,500,000 units.

Likewise, production value increased from a 1939 figure of $21,744,000 to a 1947 figure of $137,574,000. Starved markets, the rising fountain pen (particularly the 51) and the ball pen combined to cause this growth. The ball pen caused a stir beyond its functional performance and merit at war's end, perhaps because it looked unusual. An old standby, the pen, had supposedly changed. The fact that early ballpoint models hardly wrote did not seem to dampen the ardor of consumers on the hunt for something new.

DEVELOPMENT AWAITED

By 1945 we had been looking into the ballpoint matter in research for a couple of years, but pending development of a genuinely sound product, decided to pass. When buyers put the early postwar models to the writing test, the item skidded, literally and figuratively. The priced moved, it is said from $12.50 to less than 50 cents in 50 months.

Ball points retained an ill repute until new inks, better quality control, and popular pricing entered the picture in the early fifties. In 1954 we had the ball pen we wanted and introduced our Jotter, which featured a choice in point sizes, large capacity, and rotating writing cartridges.

Daniel Parker should be credited with providing the impetus for Parker's ballpoint pen. Recently a textured ball was perfected eliminating the old consumer complaint about ball points skipping on the slick writing surfaces offered by checks, postcards, photos, and hand-soiled paper.

Where the fountain pen offered distinction and a finer kind of handwriting, the ball point offered convenience. Both types will be with us for the forseeable future.

The most significant innovation in fountain pens in the past few years has been the capillary pen, a self-filling, higher-priced product. The Parker 61 capillary pen required 12 years to perfect, startling penmen the world over with its use of the age-old principle of capillary attraction for filling purposes, and a new ink-shedding material which allows it to emerge from ink bottles clean and dry.

Milestones in our progress include: first slip-on cap (1898), clip added to pen for secure carriage (1916), colored pens (1921), desk fountain pen sets (1926), a pen-cleaning ink (1931), dry-writing 51 pen (1941), liquid lead pencil (1955), self-filling 61 pen (1956), and textured ball pen (1957).

PARKER PEN CO. PUSHES SALES ON GLOBAL MARKET FRONT—FOREIGN TRADE IMPACT ON UNITED STATES ECONOMY CITED

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—How the Parker Pen Co.'s foreign marketing program developed and what it has meant in trade and mutual understanding is discussed in the third article of this series written in response to an invitation from the Christian Science Monitor by Kenneth Parker, chairman of the firm's board.)

(By Kenneth Parker, chairman, Parker Pen Co.)

JANESVILLE, WIS.—We are inclined to view the world as a giant market place. We do this without misgivings as we concomitantly hold the view that trade, free and untrammeled, is a key to world peace.

Without existing trade of consumer goods between the United States and its allies, the character of everyday American life would change radically.

We would have to do without such foodstuffs as cocoa, chocolate, mustard, olives, tuna fish, figs, and bananas. Aluminum would be scarce; so would telephones, radios, and television sets. Cars would be hard to come by since they utilize more than 30 different imported materials. In addition, some of the minerals we use to keep our industries running are imported, too. Finally, our national employment and income would suffer seriously.

In fact, two-way trade with other nations, with an advantage and a profit at both ends

is the only really practicable way I can visualize to attain peace on this earth.

Two individuals, or two communities, or two nations, who mutually profit from trading with each other, do not tend to quarrel or go to war. Whether one sells pens, timepieces, or oil pumps on an international scale, the above reasoning is apt to evolve. So, foreign trade has become an integral part of the extensive corporate structure known as Parker Pen. This was not by accident. It came from careful design.

MULTILINGUAL PENS

There's a local aphorism around Parker which runs something like this: "Our pens can write in any language in the world." Word play aside, that is true because Parker pens can be found all over the world in the hands of princes and kings, farmers and mechanics, secretaries and business tycoons, regardless of what language they write. This is the result of a steady, conscientious effort to travel the world in search of customers.

The company founder, George S. Parker, began these Odyssean ventures. He traveled for 30 years into markets then virginal and underdeveloped. Thirty-nine times I have found myself on long trips abroad. Our global sales and advertising vice president, Frank W. Matthay, has in the past 30 years journeyed three times around the world and made over 40 individual trips to Europe and South America.

Even today this policy predominates. In fact, Daniel Parker, executive vice president, spent most of January in Europe, George Parker, another grandson of the founder and also foreign-sales director, has recently made several European trips.

Such examples represent Parker management's acute interest in the foreign-sales system. Parker also sends out travelers from the Janesville, Wis., and London, England, offices who continuously act to service our distributors and report back with their findings.

Janesville, Wis., may appear to be an unlikely location for a foreign-trade center, but it is constantly being fed with accurate, up-to-date information about world-market conditions.

PROVINCIALISM UNLIKELY

In fact, it has been said that some of our people know the streets of Hong Kong, Paris, and Johannesburg better than those of nearby places. We could not be accused, it is safe to say, of making provincial pens.

Speaking of Janesville, Parker has an unpretentious bit of ground there which further helps to dramatize this respect for international trade. We call it our path of nations.

Implanted there, fronting our newly constructad manufacturing plant, are 85 large stones from countries round the world. For each polished stone there is also the appropriate flag of that nation. On each of the national holidays of each country, their respective flag is flown in tribute.

That means, in our own way, we help observe Japan's Adult Day (January 15), Burma's Full Moon of Kasan (May 13), and Rhodesia's Boxing Day (December 26). Even though these holidays may have strange-sounding names, they are just as revered in their own countries as are America's Thanksgiving, Labor Day, or Washington's Birthday.

COHESIVE ORGANIZATION

Too, Parker's administrative organizational structure is arranged to emphasize global cohesiveness rather than separate entities operating autonomously. Seven men—called the international management staff—coordinate and advise the various segments of the Parker business network. Each man is an expert in his field: manufacturing, finance, sales and advertising, law, and so on.

The origin of such a foreign marketing program developed after the turn of the century. Attracted by advertising in American magazines, George S. Parker began receiving queries from overseas distributors. In 1903, Christian Olsen of Denmark was awarded the first foreign distributorship. Today, his son continues an unbroken string of years as Parker's representative in that area.

Such loyalty, spurred by mutually successful business dealings, is recurrent among the other 88 distributors who span the globe. A. William Zecha of the Republic of Indonesia joined in the Parker association in 1916. (His sons have taken on-the-job business training at our offices in Janesville during recent years.) William R. Rikkers, distributor in the Netherlands since 1925, is another example of a long-time Parker representative.

In fact, the average tenure among our 89 distributors is 20 years. This helps illustrate that Parker's relationship with its designated representatives in foreign lands is more than a mere business partnership. It is formed on personal relationships imbued with trust and appreciation of one another.

SALES PROBLEMS VARIED

Unfortunately, there is and was no standard formula for merchandising in these many countries. Each presented its own challenge; each had its own advertising and marketing idiosyncrasies.

In some countries, point-of-purchase materials are the main method of promotion. In others, radio is the dominant force. Print advertising in certain lands cannot contain the heads or faces of drawn characters due to ethnic customs. Language, naturally, is the largest single obstacle to foreign advertising and is therefore employed with extreme care. Advertising agencies and language translation centers are selected for strategic market locations. Naturally, the local distributor is instrumental in developing merchandising policy, too.

The result is that Parker foreign advertising appears in over 1,700 newspapers, in 42 languages, and costs over $2 million each year. Today, Parker competes to hold its position as the world's largest manufacturer of writing instruments. Our market place has been the world, and, for the moment, our pen is mightier than the rest. I say for the moment because ours is a dynamic industry with competition vying for every market and every sale.

Tribute to Citizens of New Hampshire Who Served at Valley Forge

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. NORRIS COTTON

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, March 10, 1958

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, Clayton M. Wallace, executive director of the National Temperance League and a citizen of New Hampshire, represented Gov. Lane Dwinell at the New Hampshire State Sunday service in the Washington Memorial Chapel at Valley Forge on Sunday, March 2. I ask unanimous consent that the thoughtful remarks which Mr. Wallace made at this service be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Scripture reading: Acts 17: 1–9; text, verse 6, "These men who have turned the world upside down."

I am honored to represent Gov. Lane Dwinell, of New Hampshire, here today and to speak in memory of those sons of the Granite State who served their State and their Nation during the rigors of the winter at Valley Forge.

I am honored to speak at this spot made sacred to all Americans by those common soldiers who survived cold and hunger and lack of clothing and shelter as they proved to the world the sincerity of their devotion to the principles for which they fought—freedom from tyranny, and their inalienable right to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.

Most of us are familiar with the story of the Apostle Paul at Athens as told in the 17th chapter of Acts. Paul, speaking in the Areopagus told the Athenians that they were a very religious people, for in addition to the altars for all known gods they had erected one to an unknown God, just to be sure they had overlooked no one. Paul proclaimed that unknown God—the God who made the world and everything in it. In the earlier part of the same chapter is a story with which some of us are less familiar. It tells of Paul and Silas in the Jewish synagogue at Thessalonica, preaching the strange new Christian gospel. After 3 weeks some of the Jews became disturbed and stirred up the rabble against them, attacking the house of Jason where they were staying. And when they could not find Paul and Silas they dragged Jason and some of the brethren before the city authorities saying: "These men who have turned the world upside down have come here also, and Jason has received them; and they are all acting against the decrees of Caesar, saying that there is another king, Jesus."

Paul and Silas, preaching the new gospel, telling the Thessalonians about the Christ who came that all men might have life and might have it more abundantly, who taught that God is our Father and all men are brothers, who taught that the great commandment is to love the Lord our God with all our heart and soul and mind and strength, and our neighbor as ourselves, who came to give his life as the Saviour of the world—Paul and Silas—preaching these things, were to those early Jews "these men who have turned the world upside down." Their whole religious world was upset and overthrown by this revolutionary new gospel. Their religious status quo was threatened. So Paul and Silas found their lives in danger and left the city under cover of darkness to carry the gospel of Beroea and Athens.

"These men who have turned the world upside down." How aptly that phrase describes those who come with new ideas, new truths, new convictions. And always, those who defend the status quo charge them with being "these men who have turned the world upside down."

And now we come to Valley Forge in that rugged winter of 1777–78, a winter as severe as the one we have been experiencing this year. But we have taken it in insulated homes with modern heating and warm clothing and with every creature comfort. They took it with scanty, bad food, and ragged clothing and poor shelter and bare feet and sickness and no pay—for long, cold, weary months. Just stood and took it—an endured. Can these ragged soldiers at Valley Forge be called men who have turned the world upside down? Indeed, they can—for they were the very backbone of the American Revolution. They were the hard core—the fighting heart—and came out from the slush and freeze and hunger of Valley Forge to bring victory for the new Nation. They were the dynamic force of the American Revolution. For what is a revolution if it is not a turning upside down—an overthrow of the status quo—the forceful coming of a new day and a new age. These, too, were

men who turned the world upside down, and brought into being the first great democratic Nation—our own United States.

What a debt of gratitude we Americans owe to those ancestors of ours of 180 years ago for the Nation and the heritage and the blessings which are ours today—these men of the revolution—these men of Valley Forge—these men who turned the world upside down in their time.

And down through these 180 years have come new men who have turned the world upside down—over slavery, in the Civil War—to save democracy in the two World Wars. And our men of science have turned the world upside down, conquering the atom itself. Until today we have the men who with the power of the atom, can literally turn the world upside down—and inside out—into total oblivion. With our scientific minds and our industrial skill and our military might we have piled up enough atomic destructive power to totally destroy our green and lovely planet together with every living thing. We live today in a balance of terror because of the stockpiling of nuclear materials—in the stark fear that as the result of an accident, or the order given by an enraged or drunken dictator, our world may be literally turned upside down—devastated—seared—destroyed by nuclear power in the hands of madmen.

Shortly after the first A-bombs were dropped on Japan, I recall speaking in New Hampshire of the dawn of the atomic age, and of expressing the hope that there would be rapid development of atomic power for peaceful purposes. I remember pointing out that man had reached that period in history where he could go on to total destruction of his world or could harness the power of the atom for peaceful purposes—using it to free all men from poverty and famine. Atomic power could bring us total oblivion or a new era of peace and prosperity and freedom and brotherhood around the world. That was where we stood a dozen years ago.

Where do we find ourselves today? What progress have we made toward peace? We have done some work around the world in promoting atoms for peace. We have made atomic or nuclear materials available and certain countries for power development and for medical and industrial research. But seemingly far more than 90 percent of our money, time, energy, and thought related to atomic matters has gone into military channels. We have stockpiled nuclear bombs and warheads at strategic spots around the world. We have built giant B–52's capable of flying H-bombs to any part of the world. We are keeping dozens of these great jets, loaded with H-bombs, constantly in the air, around the clock, alert against any surprise attack, and ready to carry their megatons of destruction to Russia on instant notice.

We find our newspapers and magazines full of talk about missiles and launching pads and liquid fuels and solid propellants and Thor and Jupiter and Atlas and Polaris missiles in the mad race for the ultimate weapon which can carry its mass of destructive force at meteoric speed straight to the heart and homeland of Russia. We talk of launching sites in England and elsewhere. We push for atomic-powered submarines which can launch Polaris missiles from under water, close to hostile shores. And by the same token, we live in constant fear of the Russian fleet of 400 submarines capable of bringing death-dealing loads of underwater missiles straight to our Atlantic and Pacific coasts.

On February 20, 1958, Senator HERMAN TALMADGE, of Georgia, inserted into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a 2½-page article entitled "Inside the H-Bomb Plant," written by the noted author, reporter, and commentator, Henry J. Taylor, who is presently serving this Nation as Ambassador to Switzerland. Describing the hydrogen-bomb plant in South Carolina as the largest construction achievement ever undertaken in the history of the world, Mr. Taylor says: "Every ounce of thought, every ton of steel or brick or mortar was put there to preserve the peace—peace for mankind everywhere by making the United States so strong that there can be no war."

And yet the threat of war does hang over us, year after year, like Damocles' sword. And we continue in the mad race for more military might, more military money, and more missiles, apparently oblivious to the fact that today nobody can win a nuclear war. How important that we remember what Martin Niemoller said in 1954 about our weapons of mass destruction and our preparations for total war, "the conqueror will not be the heir but in the last minute of that war he will perish with his opponent who was the defeated one. War is no longer good or bad, just or unjust. However you look at it, war under these circumstances is madness. Madness cannot be characterized by good or bad or just or unjust. There is no just madness and no unjust madness, no good madness and no bad madness. Madness is simply madness."

The famous German submarine commander goes on to say: "War is no longer a means of settling disputes. War is heading headlong for destruction. Reason, therefore, says there must not be any war. Unfortunately, while man is a reasoning creature, he is not always a reasonable one, and so war can happen by itself, if we do not watch out. We have to work for peace if we want to prevent war."

Thus we find ourselves today teetering on the edge of massive destruction because of these men who have turned the world upside down through the discovery of atomic and nuclear power and the production in thousands of A- and H-bombs. Where do we go from here? To total oblivion—or into a world of peace and brotherhood and mutual progress and prosperity?

I believe that in the face of the utter futility of our present situation we are coming slowly to realize that the solution of our world's problems lies not in physical but in spiritual force. How encouraging is the recent statement of Dr. Dahlberg, president of the National Council of Churches that "instead of massive retaliation we should have massive reconciliations"—a turning from physical to spiritual force. In these recent days with much talk of the ICBM as the ultimate weapon, it is being said that the ultimate weapon is the mind of man. If this be true, isn't it equally true that the ultimate instrument of peace is the heart of man?

The ultimate instrument of peace is the heart of man—the heart, the soul, that part of our being which is our real self, our attitudes, our intentions, our hopes, our desires—all these are what we mean by the heart of man. The heart of man is the ultimate instrument of peace. It is a matter of getting our hearts right with God—right with our fellowmen, with such patience and understanding and wisdom and tolerance that men will learn at long last to dwell together in unity.

Martin Niemoller, a great war hero as well as a great Christian, has said: "Christianity is not the hope of the world. Christ is the hope of the world. We may even say that Christianity has been a doom to the world for the last 2,000 years, not because of Christ but because of the so-called Christians who quoted Christ but did not follow him.

"Christ has said clearly that the only means of overcoming enmity is by friendliness, that the bad can be overcome only by good and not by retaliation. That was Gandhi's way of renunication of force. He has demonstrated that in a hopeless situation other means than violence can be devised to achieve something for the bettering of this world of ours. I do not see in the New Testament any encouragement for the use of force."

Here is one more significant statement of Niemoller: "The way of Christ is not to demand but to offer peace. And the way to put into action the love of Christ is to love our enemies. That is not just a sentimental matter but that is the way God brings about the good things in his world and development for the better among the human beings on this globe."

A few months ago I read a nine-word sentence from Mazzini, the great Italian leader, which has been going through my mind ever since. Mazzini says: "The man who spiritualizes democracies will save the world." What we need then is to find or raise up not one man but millions of men whose hearts are right, who will work at this all-important task of spiritualizing democracy. Democracy, we are persuaded, is the ideal form of government. Its superiority over dictatorship is evident daily. But democracy can only succeed if it is spiritualized—if it represents the hearts and hopes of mankind. When a democracy becomes mechanical and secular it is doomed. It is therefore so terribly true today that the men who spiritualize democracy—make it live with brotherhood and good will—these are the men who will save the world.

Who are these men who will spiritualize democracy? Are they not the same sort of men as Paul and Silas at Thessalonika, who preached and lived the new way which Jesus brought to earth—and the new Commandment He gave to us—to love the Lord our God with all our heart and soul and mind and strength, and our neighbor as ourselves?

What are some of the specific things which we must do as we work at this task of spiritualizing democracy? We must accept the responsibility of citizenship as Christian responsibilities. We must help the rest of the world understand that at heart we are not a militaristic nation but are working sincerely, in the words of President Eisenhower, to "wage total peace."

We must push forward to end nuclear tests by international agreement, and take further steps toward world disarmament now, instead of spreading nuclear weapons among all our allies. We need to make greater use of the United Nations in the area of inspection of nuclear arms and in the control of space. As we grow out of the atomic age and into the space age let our first steps out into the universe be steps of peaceful exploration—not of military conquest.

Let us use the huge sums which can be saved by banning nuclear tests, for technical assistance in the Middle East and India and the Far East and in Africa where new nations need our democratic experience and technical help. And let us work at this matter of brotherhood by greatly increasing intercultural programs of study and travel by students, farmers, teachers, business people to and from America and all parts of the world.

We need to spend more, not less, for foreign aid. We need to separate our military assistance from our nonmilitary expenditures. We need a bold, imaginative new program of technical assistance—making our agricultural and industrial skills available to all peoples who want and need them—in a spirit of Christian brotherhood. These are some of our great opportunities in the realm of spiritualizing democracy today at the dawn of the space age.

The men who will save our fear-torn world today are the men who will spiritualize democracy—who will turn our world upside down into a new day of peace and brotherhood. The ultimate instrument for peace is the heart of man. I challenge you to believe this and to work with all diligence at the all-important task of spiritualizing democracy. I challenge you to become one of

the men who will turn our world upside down into a new world of massive reconciliation and total peace.

Evils of School Desegregation Costly

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HERMAN E. TALMADGE
OF GEORGIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, March 10, 1958

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "The Evils of School Desegregation Are Proving Increasingly Costly," and published in the Anderson, S. C., Independent and Daily Mail of February 20, 1958.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE EVILS OF SCHOOL DESEGREGATION ARE PROVING INCREASINGLY COSTLY

The spotlight again is briefly focused on Little Rock's unforunate Central High School. One of the nine Negroes attending school there under protection of Federal bayonets has been expelled.

This Negro girl has been involved in several incidents. Because of her several white students have been expelled or have quit school.

Now that the incidents have caught up with her the girl's mother is planning to take the case to the Federal courts. That should prove interesting. If a Federal judge can dictate handling of discipline in a school, then we will have reached the end of liberty in this Republic.

Meanwhile, in the schools of New York City more violence has occurred in the past few weeks than ever threatened in Little Rock. No Federal troops have been sent into New York, however, since desegregation there has the trappings of legality.

New York newspapers, top educators, politicians, and other leaders generally have gingerly skirted mentioning one of the basic causes of the crime and disorder in their schools—this cause being mixing of the races in the classrooms.

A thoroughly developed report on the situation by the Wall Street Journal, however, approaches the issue with more than usual candor. The findings are alarming and the proposed remedies would be startling, indeed, proposed in South Carolina.

First, as to some of the findings. To quote in part:

"For one thing, the highly sensitive race issue is of importance, because many school people say discipline has deteriorated most in areas of Negro concentration. Significantly, the most violent opposition to the New York suspensions (640 school troublemakers have been suspended) has come from New York Negro leaders such as Democratic Congressman ADAM CLAYTON POWELL, who called them a form of nazism." (POWELL supported Eisenhower in 1956.)

At Commerce and other difficult schools, minority groups present a special problem. "There's just no denying that Negroes in particular are our major shoulders," says a Brooklyn principal.

New York school authorities have encountered increasing difficulties in staffing Negro-dominated schools. Several months ago Superintendent of Schools William Jansen sent out out appeals to the city's 40,000 teachers to volunteer to staff difficult schools, many of which are in all-Negro neighborhoods. Some officials say he got 25 replies, some say 40. Says a New York Negro leader: "The failure of Jansen's appeal shows the extent of discrimination in the city." Comments a Harlan teacher: "Word has gotten around just to show how bad things are."

Now for one of the proposed remedies, unheard of in South Carolina or any other segregated State: the expansion of the so-called 600 schools.

These special schools—and there are already 16 in New York City—are set up to serve pupils who are violent, have criminal backgrounds or otherwise demonstrate antisocial behavior; i. e., they are punks and hoodlums.

The 600 school is so-named because the cost per pupil averages about $600 a year as against $400 at the conventional junior high school or $475 at a high school.

The punks and hoodlums infesting New York schools aren't restricted to Negroes, of course. The ratio is high among the whites. The situation is aggravated, however, when the two are mixed in a school—even if the percentage is only 1 percent. That 1 percent, schoolmen say, can prove exceedingly costly in time and effort devoted to trying to keep order.

On the record it is apparent that in the South the segregated-school systems are far more peaceful than New York's mixed schools or the enforced mixed situation in Little Rock. This means that they are more efficient in getting down the real job, which is the education of both races.

At the same time, southern schools are not without their punks and hoodlums and the problem tends to grow. There are instances of youths being sentenced by the courts to attend school. This poses a two-sided problem for school officials and teachers.

On the one hand, some so sentenced may be salvaged. That's the hope. On the other hand, there's always the danger that one bad apple may spread the disease of punkism among other pupils. No one has come up with an answer.

Meanwhile, with bayonet-toting troops standing guard in Little Rock and armed policemen patrolling New York's schools, there is some measure of gratification that in Anderson and elsewhere in South Carolina and the other segregated States the emphasis continues on improved learning and not on how to prevent bloodshed in the classroom.

Journeys To Great Homes—Henry Hastings Sibley, Minnesota Governor Who Built His Own Home

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD J. THYE
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, March 10, 1958

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "This Minnesota Governor Built His Own Home," written by Louise Hubbard and published in the Washington Post and Times Herald on Saturday, March 8, 1958. The article refers to the history of the State of Minnesota.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JOURNEYS TO GREAT HOMES—THIS MINNESOTA GOVERNOR BUILT HIS OWN HOME

(By Louise Hubbard)

Henry Hastings Sibley, son of Chief Justice Solomon Sibley, was only 23 years old when he was made a partner in the American Fur Co., and placed in charge of their Northwest Territorial post at Mendota in 1834. Educated as a lawyer in his birthplace, Detroit, Mich., he found an outdoor life which offered more adventure.

The youth's first year was spent in learning the language of the Sioux Indians with whom he traded, winning their friendship, and establishing his unquestioned authority. The latter was aided by an impressive badge worn as justice of the peace—an appointment received from Governor Chambers, of Iowa.

In 1835 young Sibley built his home, and its magnificence (for the times) was a psychological factor in his business and political success. There were no carpenters in the entire area, so the job had to be done with the help of Canadian voyageurs, trappers, and Indians. These amateurs were an ingenious lot and the finished product, the first stone house erected in Minnesota, is an ambitious piece of architecture.

The men quarried limestone from Pike Island and cemented the blocks together with mud from the river. They cut laths from willows and rushes, weaving them into shape with reeds and grasses. They chopped down great trees for the braces, joists, and beams, joining them with wooden pegs. Floors, windowsills, and doors were handmade, and the roof was covered with split clapboards. The interior was plastered with a combination of mud and clay mixed with straw.

The original building consisted of 6 rooms on 2 floors with a basement and attic. The basement held a long kitchen-dining room with an enormous fireplace, and two smaller rooms with rounded ceilings. These were packed with ice—an early version of a deep freeze for storing food. Drainage of melting water was accomplished by a wooden trough leading to the river below.

Sibley used the front room on the first floor as an office and store. He kept a supply of equipment needed by the settlers, and trinkets which appealed to his Indian customers. The first safe to be built in the northwest stood in one corner, a box made of solid oak planks bound with iron bars.

An outside stairway led to the second floor where Sibley had a storeroom for furs, his own bedroom and a guest room. However, he provided for his friends, the trappers and Indians, by putting in an inside stairs to the third floor so that they could always have shelter any time they desired. The door was never locked.

For 8 years Sibley and his mulatto cook maintained bachelor quarters; but in 1843, Sarah Jane Steele entered the house as a bride. She made the changes seen today. The office was moved to a side addition and its former space furnished as a parlor. This room represented the height of luxury. A Brussels carpet, factory-made furniture, a piano (the first in the region), fine pictures on the walls, and a huge Canadian stove from Quebec dazzled the many visitors.

In 1848 Sibley was sent to Washington as a Delegate to Congress where he successfully defeated Stephen A. Douglas' proposal to name the Territory Itasca instead of Minnesota. He obtained Federal grants for public roads and buildings, two sections of each township for schools, and concessions for Indians whom he considered to have been wronged by the Government. When Minnesota was admitted as a State in 1858, Henry Sibley was elected the first Governor, and designed the State seal—a white man plowing eastward and an Indian riding on horseback toward the West.

It was under General Sibley's command—he had been commissioned commanding offi-

cer of the State military district—that the Sioux Tribes were driven from the State, following a series of horrible massacres which they perpetrated in 1862.

General Sibley's home is now owned by the Minnesota chapter of the DAR, and is open to the public.

Tennessee Valley Authority

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN J. SPARKMAN
OF ALABAMA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, March 10, 1958

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, recently I had a letter from Mr. H. L. Rice, of Florence, Ala. He was writing me from 2640 First Street, Fort Myers, Fla., where he spends the winter each year.

In his letter, Mr. Rice asked me some pertinent questions regarding TVA.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the letter from Mr. Rice and my reply to him.

There being no objection, the letters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. JOHN SPARKMAN,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: My home is at Florence, Ala. I spend 6 months each winter down here.

It seems that everyone down here thinks that the TVA is a gift to that section and they are taxed for it.

I am not posted well enough to argue with them. They say that the TVA borrowed $20 billion and no interest.

I would like what TVA owes Government, what interest they pay, if any, and what amount they paid. And at what rate they are paying this money back.

Yours truly,

H. L. RICE.

FEBRUARY 22, 1958.

Mr. H. L. RICE,
Fort Myers, Fla.

DEAR MR. RICE: A good deal of misinformation has been spread by people who are hostile to TVA. I am glad you took the trouble to write me so that I, through you, may contribute some facts which every citizen should know about this great Federal agency.

Of course, as you and I know, TVA undertakes many programs in the region of its operation which are similar to activities carried out in other areas by different Federal agencies. TVA has made the river navigable. It has provided flood protection. Likewise it has promoted excellent programs in the field of agriculture, forestry, and so on. Such programs are undertaken by the Federal Government in all parts of the country. There should be no misunderstanding about that.

When people talk about the amount they are taxed for TVA, I believe they usually have in mind the TVA power system. In this area the Federal Government, through TVA, owns the facilities for power generation and transmission. The distribution systems, over 150 of them, which purchase power at wholesale from TVA for resale to their consumers are not owned by the Federal Government. They are locally owned and managed. Discussing only the investment in power facilities, therefore, I am amazed that anyone would believe that TVA had borrowed $20 billion. The money provided by the Federal Government for investment in TVA power facilities is not a loan to TVA. The Government is the owner of the properties and the figure of $20 billion as the amount invested by taxpayers is more than 10 times overstated. At the present time about $1,200,000,000 of the total power investment represents the net amount of funds made available through appropriations by the Congress.

You are probably aware that there is pending before the Congress a bill which would permit TVA to issue revenue bonds to provide future investment in power facilities. This means that the power consumers of the area would in the future provide the money for the capacity additions which are required to keep up with the growing loads. The Government would still own the property. Its assets would grow without the appropriation of further funds from the Treasury. As a matter of fact, the consumers of electricity have already provided over $350 million for investment in TVA power facilities, facilities which are operated for purposes and under policies laid out by Congress. And in addition to plowing back proceeds to increase power assets, TVA has made cash payments into the Treasury from power proceeds. To date $240 billion has been paid in cash to the Treasury. Under present law, those cash payments must in 40 years from the time a power facility goes into operation equal the amount made available by the Congress for investment in the facility. Under the pending self-financing legislation the schedule of cash payments into the Treasury will be changed and in the future the amounts will be, at a minimum, large enough to cover the cost to the Government of the remaining appropriation investment. This means that the Government, as owner, will always be kept whole, and that the assets of the Government-owned system will continue to increase by the investment of proceeds from bonds issued against future earnings.

It is important to remember that the benefits to the Nation from TVA power operations are not measured by the direct cash return to the Treasury. They are measured rather in the increasing economic strength of the region which means in turn that the people bear a larger share of the total national tax burden. National benefits can be measured in the stimulation of the economy of other areas as the TVA region becomes a better market for the goods and services of all parts of the country. Few people, for example, stop to realize that TVA itself has spent over $1 billion in States which lie outside the region and that since the end of the war the power consumers of the area have themselves spent over $1½ billion to purchase the electrical appliances which are made in other areas. They do this because Congress directed TVA to make power available to the people at rates which, while covering the cost of power production, would encourage the abundant use of energy on the farms and in the homes of the area. No one can measure the national benefit of this demonstration of the effect of the low rate-high use marketing policies which Congress directed TVA to adopt. Power systems and power consumers everywhere have benefited because TVA and its distributors took the risk involved in selling power at rates lower than people in the Southeast had ever enjoyed it before, depending upon increased volume of sales for adequate revenues.

We can estimate the direct benefit to the Federal Treasury which has resulted because TVA has served Federal installations with power at reasonable cost. The taxpayer pays the power bills of the Army, the Air Force, and the Atomic Energy Commission. The latter particularly uses power in vast amounts. It is reliably estimated that to date the Government has saved over $250 billion in its power bills because of TVA and that savings of $50 million a year will be realized as long as AEC uses power in the quantity it requires today.

These are some of the factors you will wish to keep in mind as you talk about TVA with your friends in Florida. I am enclosing a couple of pamphlets which may be helpful to you, and I hope you will be able to convince those with whom you talk that TVA is an asset to the Nation, that every citizen should be proud of its performance, and that it is contributing and will continue to contribute to regional and national strength.

With best wishes, I am,

Sincerely,

JOHN SPARKMAN.

A Solidification of Atlantic Unity Might Improve Western Hopes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ESTES KEFAUVER
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, March 10, 1958

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article from the Providence Journal discussing the resolution introduced by Senator THEODORE FRANCIS GREEN, calling upon President Eisenhower to appoint American delegates to a citizens' conference composed of delegates from the NATO nations. As the Journal states there is a crying need for new ideas in our relations with the Soviet bloc, and in this atmosphere Senator GREEN's resolution calling for a new approach may be especially valuable.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Providence Journal of February 24, 1958]

A SOLIDIFICATION OF ATLANTIC UNITY MIGHT IMPROVE WESTERN HOPES

(By Barry Brown)

A feeling seems to be general nowadays throughout the Western World that there is a crying need for new ideas in our relations with the Soviet bloc. In this atmosphere, a resolution recently introduced in Congress by Rhode Island's Senator GREEN, calling for a new approach to the improvement of Atlantic unity, may be especially valuable.

In some part, the urge to seek a kind of breakthrough in East-West relations doubtless reflects mere emotional frustration, as the decade-long struggle wears on and the dangers of the nuclear stalemate are increasingly borne in upon us. To this extent, the feeling may even be dangerous, for it is almost certainly a mistake to expect that the cold war can be ended by some sudden and brilliant improvisations.

MEASURE OF MATURITY

The surest measure of the American people's rise to maturity, and of our Nation's claim to greatness, is likely to be our capacity to carry the burdens of world leadership over the long haul. However, much we need right policies and inspiring leadership, we may need even more a popular recognition—which is quite foreign to American experience and temperament—that problems in international relations are often by their very nature insoluble, and that the dangers and sacrifices involved in struggling with them

may be literally endless. A disturbing element of mere impatience and unrealism seems to be present in some of the current enthusiasm for summit negotiations and in some reactions to George Kennan's ideas on disengagement.

Yet the feeling of a need for boldness cannot be dismissed simply because it may involve risks. Another aspect of maturity is understanding that there are no riskless courses of action available to us. In the democracies of the West, it is a plain fact of political life that peoples need to be convinced that their nations are not being allowed to drift helplessly and hopelessly in the face of Communist pressures, that their governments are demonstrating initiative and imagination.

POLITICAL OPPOSITION

The importance of meeting this requirement is evident in the way the summit and disengagement proposals seem to have taken hold of many minds, especially among the opposition parties, in some of the Atlantic nations, notably Britain and West Germany. The Macmillan and Adenauer governments—and the Eisenhower government also—may be deeply convinced they are right in their cautious response to Soviet initiatives in these areas, but their rightness will serve no one's purposes if their own appearance of a lack of vigor and imagination causes the governments to fall and the policies to be changed.

A whole series of by-elections in Britain has suggested a loss of popular confidence in the Conservative government, and we have never faced up to the question of what will happen in Germany when the 82-year-old Chancellor Adenauer leaves the political scene. The American-supported policies of these governments on such vital issues as disengagement may thus be drastically changed at any time, simply because they have been permitted to appear stale and sterile. This prospect, more than any immediate and demonstrable dangers in the policies themselves, is why the conservatism that now dominates the Atlantic alliance so badly needs to be balanced with some elements of boldness and inspiration.

And this, in turn, is why a real and newly conceived effort to revitalize Western unity seems particularly valuable at this time. The NATO alliance was well described by its first secretary-general, Lord Ismay, as "something new and exciting and revolutionary, the most challenging and constructive experiment in international relations ever attempted." Surely we should be able to build on such a foundation a policy initiative that will serve the politically and psychologically imperative function of seizing the minds of people in the West, without incurring the risks of trying to apply new ideas simply for the sake of their newness.

Senator GREEN's resolution approaches this momentous task by calling upon President Eisenhower to appoint American delegates to "a conference composed of leading representative citizens selected on a nonpartisan basis and directed to convene as often as necessary in order to examine exhaustively and to recommend how greater cooperation and unity of purpose, as envisioned by the North Atlantic Treaty, within the Atlantic Community may best be developed." The third annual conference of NATO parliamentarians in Paris last November, where Senator GREEN and several colleagues represented the United States and were impressed with this idea, urged the calling of such a conference on all the NATO governments. Britain, France, and Canada and other countries are now likewise being pressed to name similar representatives to it.

The striking thing about this proposal is its recommendation that members of the conference should, as far as possible, be officially appointed but should sit in accordance with their individual convictions. In other words, the undertaking would be more than another exercise in diplomacy among sovereign nations, and much more, of course, than a private study group. Any findings would not be binding upon the member governments, to be sure, but the high sponsorship of the conference would presumably give its recommendations real weight. And most important of all, the unique composition of the body and of the circumstances of its mission might be expected to lead it to consider a genuine transformation of NATO from a military alliance into some sort of political and economic entity.

PARALLELS WITH 1789

The language of the Green resolution, and of the privately sponsored declaration of Atlantic unity which lies behind it, scrupulously avoids any reference to federalism, which might well be too radical an idea for most of the NATO governments to contemplate. Yet the form of the proposed conference inevitably suggests parallels with the gathering of leading representative citizens from the 13 American nation-states of 1787, from which our Constitution emerged more or less unanticipated as a result of the force of circumstances and the logic of debate.

In the present circumstances, it may scarcely be realistic to think about Atlantic federal union. Again, there is virtue in not expecting too much from radical and untried blueprint solutions to the intractable problems of international affairs, and this effort to rebuild NATO is wise in its modesty. But if the movement is to live up to its potentialities, it is difficult to see how it could avoid a forthright approach to the Atlantic nations' need for political and economic, as well as military, cohesion—and for supranational institutions to embody their lasting unity.

Even ambitious hopes in this direction may not be unrealistic, for there is some evidence that the logic of events and the response of public opinion may have outrun the progress of governments toward understanding the limitations of sovereignty in the nuclear age. Among the American sponsors of the declaration of Atlantic unity now appear the names of ex-President Truman and his ex-Secretary of State Marshall, neither of whom showed any comparable readiness to support such an expansion of NATO when they were in office. Similarly, Secretary of State Dulles, before he took office, gave vigorous support to far-reaching ideas of Atlantic union, which he has since scarcely moved to implement.

COMPELLING APPEAL

This may only prove that the responsibilities of office always have a sobering effect on men, as they doubtlessly should—or it may suggest that the evolution of the Atlantic world toward supernationalism has a compelling force, upon which political timidity hangs like a dead weight. The appeal of the idea to many able and realistic men—Adlai Stevenson is another recent supporter—seems to support the latter estimate. And the gratifying progress the cause of Western unity is now making in official circles, as evidenced by the Green resolution, makes it reasonable to hope that President Eisenhower will soon give a freer rein to the convictions on this subject that he likewise often expressed before he went into politics.

If there is a need for boldness, surely this is the way the President might be expected to meet it. If there is a realistic move America can make to rise to the accumulating demands of world history and world politics, this is it.

Federal Judges Assume a Terrible Responsibility

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STROM THURMOND
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, March 10, 1958

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, if the Federal courts persist in insisting on the racial integration of the public schools in the South, one inevitable result of this policy will be the closing of the public schools in many areas. Several State governments have indicated by legislation that they will refuse to give financial support to school districts where racial integration is attempted.

For these terrible consequences, the courts must assume a major share of the responsibility.

I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD two enlightening commentaries from South Carolina newspapers bearing on this point. One, entitled "Federal Judges Assume a Terrible Responsibility in School Cases," is from the News and Courier of Charleston, S. C., of March 6, 1958, and the other entitled "No Change in Court" appeared in the State, of Columbia, S. C., on the same date.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Charleston (S. C.) News and Courier of March 6, 1958]

FEDERAL JUDGES ASSUME A TERRIBLE RESPONSIBILITY IN SCHOOL CASES

Last November the judges of the United States fourth circuit court of appeals, who are currently hearing cases in Charleston, ordered a Federal district judge in Virginia to fix a deadline for the end of school segregation in Prince Edward County. This week the United States Supreme Court upheld the circuit court's decision.

In its vain appeal of the decision, the Commonwealth of Virginia said: "The Federal courts assume a terrible responsibility when they order the closing of public schools. That is what the circuit court has done and what this court will do if the order appealed from remains in effect."

It is indeed a terrible responsibility. Surely, the judges must understand that they are dealing with the lives of people, not with cold abstractions in attorney's arguments. The school population of Prince Edward County is 54 percent Negro and 46 percent white. Under Virginia law, all financial support would be withdrawn from the county should it attempt to integrate.

But the white people of Prince Edward County have said they have no intention of integrating. The have prepared detailed plans for a privately supported school system for the children of their race. The necessary funds for a year's operation are in the bank.

Perhaps the judges close their eyes to these facts and say to one another: "This is not our concern. We deal only with technical issues of law." This is one point of view. But the United States Supreme Court itself chose in 1954 to enter the field of social realities—the class relationships between people.

The thoughts and emotions of white citizens in Prince Edward County are likewise

social realities. The only way to effect integration in Prince Edward County is to use force—and lots of it. Are the district, circuit, and Supreme Court judges willing to accept the terrible responsibility for bayonets? Are they prepared to jail school officials and fine parents who won't send their children to mixed schools? Are they prepared to direct a Federal school system staffed by Government employees from Washington?

Measures less than these surely will fail in Prince Edward County, a hard-core resisting rural county where the white people believe passionately in the rightness and necessity of racial separation.

We don't believe that Prince Edward County will back down. Outside observers, newspapermen from the North, agree that this Virginia county will do whatever is necessary to prevent integration.

A little prudence—a willingness on the part of the judges to wait to do what they believe is the right thing until conditions are favorable—could prevent a grave and perhaps a bloody crisis. Surely, in order to correct a practice alleged to be unfair to a small group of plaintiffs recruited by the NAACP to bring cases to court it is not necessary to shatter the lives of thousands of people.

[From the State, of Columbia, S. C., March 6, 1958]

NO CHANGE IN COURT

The Supreme Court, by declining to review a fourth circuit court decision that a deadline should be set for beginning of desegregation of Prince Edward County schools, has presented Virginia with a full-blown crisis.

Virginia must now either close the Prince Edward County schools or come up with a new plan designed to maintain segregated schools. And the chances are that no plan would be approved by the Supreme Court, which has consistently—since 1954—been making its own laws on this subject.

After all the trouble in New York, Washington, Kansas City, Chicago, etc., some writers speculated that the Court would hesitate to expand further its controversial direction of local school affairs. It seems this was a false hope.

Perhaps soon, as an NAACP spokesman recently bragged, Negro and white children in Virginia will be getting equal treatment—no education at all. Since the Supreme Court said in 1954 that equality of schools was inherently inequality, this will pose something of a dilemma for the nine young men.

Will they rule that this equality of no schools is also inequality?

Let's Set the Farmer Free

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

Hon. EVERETT McKINLEY DIRKSEN

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, March 10, 1958

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article written by Earl M. Hughes, who is not only a real dirt farmer from northern Illinois, McHenry County, with which I am sure our Presiding Officer is familiar, but he was also a member of the Commodity Credit Corporation.

The article is an excellent farm analysis. I submit it because I think it is worthy of printing in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LET'S SET THE FARMER FREE

(By Earl M. Hughes)

For a quarter of a century Congress has been trying to legislate farm prosperity by bribing the farmer not to produce. Via one futile farm program after another, it has attempted to hold prices up and production down. But the spending of more than 11 billion taxpayers' dollars has only put the farmer deeper in the hole than he would have been without such help, and resulted in inevitable demands for still more billions to bail him out.

Many Congressmen admit privately: "We have a bear by the tail. We cannot let go for fear it will bite us at the polls. Where do we go from here?"

I believe the cure which Congress so desperately seeks is plainly emerging. The solution, I think, is this:

Abandon the impossible job of trying to legislate farm income through direct price supports.

Stop the senseless flow of crops into the Government's bulging bins.

Make it Government's main job to help find new uses and markets for our farm products.

Then turn farmers loose to produce in response to free market prices.

But can we really use what farmers produce? Listen to what Dr. Herrell DeGraff, noted Cornell University food economist, says:

"Over the past 35 years, during which so-called surpluses have been almost chronic, a modest two-percent increase in livestock could have eaten up all of the surpluses. This would have happened had agriculture been free."

Let's take a hard look at where we are today after 25 years of controls on price and production:

Surpluses, caused by attempts to raise farm prices, are in fact depressing farm income (because they knock down the price of farm products) by $2 billion a year, according to Department of Agriculture economists. And because the handling of surpluses is costly, the taxpayer has been hit hard. When I was in Washington I helped sell, trade, barter, and give away $7 billion worth of farm surpluses; but at the same time we moved this out the front door, we had to take in $10½ billion worth of new surpluses at the back door.

Today, as we try to whittle down surplus pile No. 1, a Federal law is all set to build up surplus pile No. 2. To illustrate: If we can get rid of about 800 million bushels of Government corn, the Secretary of Agriculture must immediately raise the support price to 90 percent of parity and boost acreage allotments from 37 million to at least 58 million acres. Higher guaranteed prices and more acres, plus the often overlooked fact that higher prices automatically reduce the size of the market, would soon have corncribs spilling over again.

Federal farm expenditures are getting bigger; they totaled more than $5 billion last year. Borrowings by Commodity Credit, the Government Corporation set up to finance price supports and related programs, cost taxpayers close to a million dollars daily just in interest.

To run this bigger farm program, big government has gotten bigger: 11,412 full-time employees, plus thousands of part-time workers, have been added to the Department of Agriculture payroll since 1953.

The soil bank, our most recent effort to bail out previous bad programs, has many of the same old flaws. It has failed to reduce overall farm production: we had 28 million acres idle in the soil bank last year, yet equaled our biggest harvest in history. It is a nightmare to administer: can you imagine the difficulty of setting normal yields for each farm? It is expensive: it cost about $600 million last year. It masquerades as something it isn't: letting land lie idle doesn't save soil.

Despite the obvious bankruptcy of past policies, dozens of new cures which ignore these failures will be introduced during this session of Congress. There will be arguments for higher price supports—some from organizations which make millions off Government storage—and pleas for the two-price plan, which proposes to sell at a high price at home and dump what we can't sell abroad. The Brannan plan will be dusted off; it would make direct payments to farmers totaling at least $7 to $10 billion a year.

Have we learned anything from the past? I fervently hope so. Here are a few basic facts which I feel should be borne clearly in mind in mapping future legislation.

Free commodities are in a healthier position today than those under controls. Commodities for which Government has tried to do the most (corn, wheat, cotton, tobacco, rice, peanuts) are in the worst trouble today. Yet livestock farmers, unhampered by controls (although hurt by Government meddling in feed grains), are still relatively prosperous.

United States cottongrowers have lost markets both at home and abroad. Today they can plant only 40 percent of the cotton acreage they had in 1930. While the United States moved backward, the world cotton demand jumped 32 percent in the past 7 years. Our farmers got none of these new markets abroad and lost further to synthetics at home.

Meanwhile, soybean producers, with no acreage restrictions, beat the drums for markets at home and abroad. They're now growing 3,400 percent more beans than 12 years ago.

Food consumption can be increased and diet upgraded. Example: At the sharp break in the price of beef in 1953 there were howls that Congress should fix prices on beef cattle. But most cattlemen figured that the real answer was to sell more beef to the housewife, not to the Government larder. They joined with packers, retailers, farm groups, and Government in an intensive promotion effort. The housewife got a bargain, and we ate our way out of the beef glut. In the past 5 years beef consumption has jumped from 62 to 85 pounds per person per year. If the Government had stepped in to fix prices and control production, we would have had a beef scandal to dwarf the $500 million potato fiasco of 1947–51, when millions of bushels were given away or destroyed with kerosene. And we'd have a sick beef industry today.

Animal agriculture is the true ever-normal granary. Livestock gives farmers 54 percent of their income; it's the traditional balance wheel of our national food economy. Half of our total harvested crops are fed to livestock, which convert 5 to 7 pounds of feed into 1 pound of highly nutritious meat, milk, poultry, or dairy products. Our food supply is enormously elastic: we can stretch it by eating more grain and feeding less livestock, or we can shrink it by merely feeding more livestock. So we can use all of our food surpluses if we upgrade our diets to use more meat, poultry, and dairy products.

There is real farm opportunity today in a free market. We can learn something from Clarence Chappell, Jr., the hustling Star Farmer of America for 1958, a young

man of 21 who used this animal-agriculture approach to success. And what success. At 21, he paid income tax on $7,500; his net worth is $71,000.

Living near Belvidere, N. C., Chappell farms 225 acres of the home place with his dad, rents another 360 acres. He has no land in the soil bank—"I can't afford it." He raises hogs, dairy cows and beef cattle, plus the crops to feed them. He farms mainly outside the farm program because, he says, "This leaves me free to make my own management decisions and build a volume of business where we can operate efficiently."

There is no political solution to what is essentially an economic problem. Individual farmers can get more income by improving efficiency and their biggest single means of doing this is to increase their volume. Government can't increase individual farmers' income except by handouts.

When the Government encourages inefficient farmers, by handouts of a few dollars, to continue in poverty on a subsistence farm rather than to seek better opportunity off the farm, it hurts everyone concerned. There are more than a million farmers who gross less than $2,500 a year, and eke out a subsistence living of $15 to $20 a week net. No farm program has helped them, and none will, unless it is a direct cash handout. And then it become not a farm program, but a welfare program. The voluntary movement of such families off the land, or to jobs off the farm, will do more than any law Congress could possibly pass.

For the day of the small horse-and-mule farm is no more. Today's farm must make use of specialized machinery, which is best used on large acreage; the small farm is inevitably inefficient. Yet more than one third of all cotton farmers, for example, have been squeezed down to five acres or less. How can such a farmer afford a $5,000 (the lowest priced) cotton picker?

What, then, should our farm program be? What should Congress do in the present session?

We must quit trying to fix farm prices. It is politically impossible to set price supports low enough to stop the flow of commodities to Government. And Government is not a market. It merely holds the stuff for a while, then disposes of it in competition with farmers and private trade. Let's face it: The only sure way of getting Government out of our business is to get rid of price supports entirely.

We must free the farmer from the shackles of acreage controls and marketing quotas. Turn him loose to build a volume of business which will enable him to operate efficiently. Let him manage his own resources and make adjustments on his farm as the free market dictates.

We must get rid of our surplus hoard gradually, protecting the farmer against the price-depressing effects of this liquidation.

At the same time, the Government can help the farmer to enlarge his markets by action on three fronts:

1. Promotion at home. We claim to be well-fed, yet the United States is ranked 15th among nations in milk consumption, fifth in meat eating (per capita). Even in Iowa, heart of the food belt, Iowa State College nutritionists found that two-thirds of the women over 30 need an extra glass of milk daily to get sufficient calcium. It would take 25,000 gallons of milk per day just to give Iowa school girls the calcium they need.

Can we get people to eat more of the right sort of foods? There are many proofs that we can:

Poultry producers have jumped sales by packaging all white meat, all thighs, no necks. The citrus people have done an equally effective job with high-vitamin frozen juices. An automatic milk-dispensing machine sells 6,000 half-pints of milk monthly in a 450-student high school near my home. Thousands of schools, factories, office buildings are potential milk markets.

Says Dr. Herrell DeGraff: "If we ate half a pound more meat per person per week, it would bring full balance between our production and consumption, and nutritionists agree it would mean better health and more vigor for our people."

2. Promotion abroad. "There is a big opportunity to sell vast amounts of feed grains to many countries that have a rapidly growing livestock population," says Francis C. Daniels, vice president of the Commodity Credit Corp., who has just completed a round-the-world survey.

Here are two examples of how the Government is already using our surpluses to build markets:

It subsidized the export of surplus poultry products to Germany. The Germans like the taste of chicken and have now allocated dollars to buy more.

Japan has a rapidly growing population with little acreage to produce the rice she needs. We're now shipping surplus wheat to convert the Japanese into wheat eaters. It looks as though they may acquire a taste for it.

3. Finance research on new crops and new uses for old crops. Promising research now underway uses corn, for example, to make alcohol which in turn is used to make rubber. If successful, this may consume 200 million bushels of corn per year. Another project now in the development stage aims at taking the starch from millions of bushels of wheat and corn and using it to improve concrete for our highways. New crops—sesame, safflower, bamboo—may replace old ones on thousands of acres.

Industry now takes 5 to 7 percent of our farm production. Research is the key to increasing this volume. Both parties have already introduced bills to Congress to budget $100 million for such research.

No Secretary of Agriculture, no farm leader, can lead us out of the mess we're in. Only courageous leadership from within Congress can do this job. And if we voters don't back up Congress in repudiating price supports and acreage restrictions, we must share the blame for more wasted billions, more useless surpluses and, in the long run, higher food prices and a leveling of family farms to peasantlike mediocrity.

Ochs and Journalism—An Appraisal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ESTES KEFAUVER

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, March 10, 1958

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article from the New York Times of March 9, 1958. Chattanooga is very proud of the fact that Adolph S. Ochs began his distinguished career as a publisher in that city with the Chattanooga Times. He made of that paper an outstanding example of sound and constructive journalism which served as the prototype of the New York Times. Both papers continue their distinguished careers. This article recalls their history on the 100th anniversary of the birth of Mr. Ochs.

Mr. President, I do not believe the article will exceed the limit of two pages. If it does, it will be very slight, and I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD notwithstanding any such extra cost.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OCHS AND JOURNALISM—AN APPRAISAL

(By Robert McLean)

When Adolph Simon Ochs assumed control of the New York Times on August 18, 1896, he published a declaration of principles which contained these lines:

"It will be my earnest aim that the New York Times give the news, all the news, in concise and attractive form * * * and give it as early, if not earlier, than it can be learned through any other reliable medium; to give the news impartially, without fear or favor, regardless of any party, sect, or interest involved; to make the columns of the New York Times a forum for the consideration of all questions of public importance, and to that end to invite intelligent discussion from all shades of opinion."

This is a statement of the creed that Adolph Ochs, born 100 years ago this Wednesday—in Cincinnati on March 12, 1858—was to follow scrupulously from the day he acquired the Times until his death 39 years later on April 8, 1935.

The creed was simplicity itself—yet at the time it appears to have been observed more in the breach than in the fact. Its application year in and out to the daily business of newspapermaking made a striking and lasting contribution to journalism in New York City, in the Nation, and to an extent throughout the world.

That contribution is still a potent influence in newspapermaking. Regardless of the failings of newspapers, there are few who will deny that the press is far better today because of Adolph Ochs' contribution.

Since the standards which he established for the Times have continued in force almost without change for more than half a century, and because they were originally breathed into the product by the genius of Adolph Ochs, it is wholly fitting at this time—a century after his birth and more than a score of years after his death—to examine the abilities which he brought to his task.

To understand how startling, even revolutionary, his announced policy was in New York City in that day, it is necessary to go back and look at the history of the time.

In the 18th century the Colonies wrested from reluctant governors the right to publish both fact and opinion even when hostile to established authority. The newspaper became a force to be feared by arrogant administrators. It thus became a powerful weapon of the American revolutionaries.

The years following the establishing of the young Government were years of violent partisanship and, when intense party strife developed, the newfound power of the press was too often dedicated to the success of a cause or of a party. It became the period of personal journalism all too frequently dedicated to the advancement of the particular interests of the editor.

Improved communications—the railroad, the telegraph, and the cable—enabled such publishers as James Gordon Bennett, founder of the New York Herald, to cut through the partisanship of the period and develop the sensational exploitation of the news. When there were no sensations, he made them. He was accused of bad taste, quackery, and even blasphemy, but he provided spice, enterprise, and aggressive news coverage.

When to the improved communications there were added both better technical methods—the steam-driven press, for example—and ultimately cheaper newsprint, aggressiveness seemed to carry the city away with it. The younger Bennett, who succeeded

his father, was outdistanced by Joseph Pulitzer with the World and William R. Hearst with the Journal in a circulation war of frenzied sensationalism that came to be known as yellow journalism.

News was subordinated to stunts, to special features, to unimportant items exaggerated for the purpose of scoring a scoop over their rivals. Their competition was bitter and personal. But it did get results. The 13 other morning and evening papers trailed far behind in circulation, in advertising, and in revenue.

The World and the Journal had circulations of close to 400,000. At the other end of the scale the Times, greatly diminished in influence and prestige from its heyday decades earlier, printed 18,000 copies a day, of which only 9,000 were sold; by all signs it was a dying paper.

It was at this point that Adolph Ochs entered the picture. But before doing so he had accumulated 24 years of newspaper experience which had been invaluable to him as a testing ground of the principles which he brought to New York.

At the age of 11 he was helping the family finances by delivering a newspaper route. At 14 he left school and for 6 years served an apprenticeship on Knoxville and Louisville newspapers as an office boy, printer's devil and journeyman printer, and in various positions in the circulation and business offices.

At the age of 20 he moved to Chattanooga and bought The Chattanooga Times, with $250 of borrowed capital.

He was immediately successful. He displayed industry and resourcefulness beyond the ordinary but, more important, an understanding of the needs of the community and how constructively to serve them. On the day he became publisher he made a declaration of purpose—the latest news, the freshest news, all the news—and independence of party or sect. Here in Chattanooga he tested—successfully—his beliefs of what a newspaper should be.

Nevertheless, Ochs, when he was negotiating the purchase of the Times, was impressed by the great men he was meeting. "Now for the supreme gall of a country newspaperman burdened with debt," he wrote his wife in early 1896. The reference to debt struck a painful chord. In Chattanooga, Ochs had invested considerable resources in real estate—and had been badly burned. When he came to New York, he had made up his mind to stick to his last—the newspaper trade—and to exclude all other enterprises. Thereafter he adopted an almost monastic policy. He had no outside interests beyond the New York Times and, as his enterprise flourished, he invested surplus earnings in Government bonds—and in a home.

He was, however, confident of success. In 1896 the traits that were to mark that success were already clearly imprinted. He was known as a man of great integrity. His business acumen was marked. He was a man who fixed his goals and drove toward them, scarcely looking to either side until the goal was reached. In the years that were to follow he used the talents of many men in driving for his ideal newspaper. But in a real sense the measure of success that he achieved was the result of his own single-minded purpose and unfaltering drive to give the news impartially.

The story of the rise of the New York Times under Ochs' guidance has been told many times. The application of his formula touched intimately every department of the organization and every person associated with the enterprise. The effects were noticeable almost immediately. Soon after he assumed charge, a trade journal of the era, the Newspapermaker, wrote: "A glance at the New York Times since it has been in the hands of Adolph S. Ochs is like a gleam of sunlight on a cloudy day. The professional sees at once the handiwork of a fellow artist."

The Ochs formula was at work. What was that formula and what made it click?

The Ochs contribution can be described under four major headings: First, the importance of news as a newspaper's major commodity; second, objective and unbiased presentation of the news; third, the responsibility of the newspaper to its readers; and fourth, a prosperous and efficient financial structure to provide immunity from the pressure of commercial and political interests. Now for a look at how these principles were applied.

1. The importance of news. Ochs believed that news—all the news—was the principal commodity of a newspaper. In 1921 he wrote, "The task undertaken * * * was to tell promptly and accurately the happenings and occurrences that were not sensational but of real importance in the affairs of the people. This supplemented the general news of the day intelligently and quietly presented."

He viewed with scorn what he described as "the coarse, vulgar and insane features * * * the muckraking and crusades of his sensational competitors. He eliminated fiction; he refused to print comics. He posted his slogan, "All the news that's fit to print"—a phrase that he often defended against critics—and made his paper the most comprehensive newspaper in the land. Early he branched out into news fields that other papers of the time frequently neglected—financial news, business news, the details of city, State, National, and international governmental affairs. He printed the full texts of important statements, of speeches, of important documents.

He established national and international news-gathering organizations larger than any of his competitors'. He made news the foundation of all departments of the paper, including the Sunday special section he immediately established, the Sunday magazine, the book review and other features. He clearly saw the importance of news about scientific progress and new inventions such as wireless and the airplane. Similarly, his interest in exploration led to a number of exclusive, dramatic stories, notably those of Peary's discovery of the North Pole in 1909, and the Byrd Antarctic expedition two decades later. He experimented in methods to speed the news from its sources to the reader. He was the first user of Marconi's wireless for news transmission and an early promoter of other inventions that shortened the time between the event and its imprint.

2. The importance of unbiased news. A fundamental in the Ochs creed was that the news should be objectively presented. He said in an address to newspapermen in 1891: "The duty of the editor and publisher who serves an intelligent and manly constituency is to give his patrons the facts, and attempt nothing with reference thereto beyond assisting to a clearer understanding of the same * * *. The people as they gain culture, breadth of understanding and independence of thought * * * more and more demand the paper that prints the history of each day without fear of consequences, the favoring of special theories, or the promotion of personal interests."

It was his special concern to keep opinion out of the news columns, to present both sides of every question and to ignore what criticism might come from those whose oxen were gored.

3. Responsibility: Ochs believed that the newspaper's responsibility to its readers was best served by an honest, fair, and intelligent presentation of the news. But he also believed that this presentation should be supplemented by a forthright discussion of this news in the editorial columns.

He had stated: "A journal conducted as a newspaper, being a fearless purveyor and, when needed, an equally fearless interpreter of the news, is, in the intelligent public opinion, the newspaper of the future." His editorial page reflected largely his own thoughts. But he made certain that no one in his employ would ever be forced to write an editorial in which the writer did not fully believe.

Ochs thought also that the readers were entitled to their opportunity to express ideas without regard to the paper's policy and instituted a Letters to the Editor department that printed all shades of view. "The editor," Ochs stated, "should * * * give the thoughts of the best informed man upon the topic under discussion—fairly giving all views with reference to it."

4. A sound financial structure: Ochs was aware that the kind of paper he wanted would require a large measure of support from advertisers. And he was insistent from the outset that advertising requirements should have no bearing on the paper's editorial or news policy. He sought advertising as assiduously as his rivals. And he recognized that advertising—aside from its value in the form of revenue—was news of a special kind in which his readers were keenly interested. He said: "Advertising in the final analysis should be news. If it is not news it is worthless * * *. In advertising truth should abide and be controlling * * *."

He tolerated no hint of interference by the advertiser. To one executive of a company that used the Times' advertising columns extensively, and who sought to influence the Times' editorial policy, Ochs wrote, "You must excuse me from discussing with you the policy of the New York Times. It is a subject we do not care to discuss with an advertiser. * * * If your York Times until you have some assurance other than the paper as it appears every day, as to tahe policy of the publisher, the Times, as long as it is under the present management, will endeavor to get along without your business."

He avoided even the appearance of outside influence. He declined city governmental advertising on the grounds that it would seem to tie his paper to political interests. Similarly, he rejected a South Carolina banker's check for several thousand dollars when the latter sought to have the Times delivered at his own expense to 450 bankers throughout the State.

The strict application of these principles over the years did not always win friends. The attitude of Ochs and his newspaper was well expressed in a book written in 1921 by Elmer Davis, then a member of the editorial board of the Times. He wrote:

"The readers of the Times represent a far wider range of political opinion than the ordinary newspaper constituency. A great many people who cordially despise the political and economic opinions of its editors feel that they have to buy the paper in order to get the news. If any one doubts this, let him observe that the radical weeklies, for example, cite the Times news columns as authority for most of their statements of fact. * * * Similarly, many stalwart Republicans and convinced opponents of the League of Nations have in the past 2 years started the day by hating the Times over the breakfast grapefruit; but they find that they have to have it in preference to papers which might better reflect their own political opinions, and thus start them to the office with a pleasant sense of rightness of the world."

The history of the Times reflects this philosophy. Late in 1898 Ochs dropped the price of the Times from 3 cents to 1 cent. Circulation, then 25,000, jumped to 75,000. In 1901 it passed the 100,000 mark. About the same time Pulitzer and the World ceased the war of sensation with Hearst, and never returned to it. With the Times' increases in circulation came advertising in like proportion.

Thus, Ochs demonstrated that in the most highly competitive market true values are the enduring ones. When the depression of the 30's came, it was further demonstrated that the newspapers that nurtured reader confidence by care and accuracy in the presentation of the news were the ones that held their circulations in the face of a general decline.

Ochs had sensed all this in advance of the event. In 1916 he commented: "I have brought no new journalism to New York City. We have practiced, as best we could, old journalism—the journalism that succeeds in small towns where the high standards of the profession are demanded and practiced by self-respecting men."

The views of many newspapermen are summed up in the words of David Lawrence, who wrote a quarter of a century ago that Adolph Ochs' "contribution to American journalism is inestimable. It represents a point of view which anticipated the development of reader interest in newspapers of serious purpose. * * * For generations to come the work that Mr. Ochs has done to inspire American journalism will endure as well as the achievement of a man who saw clearly that the real motive of a newspaper is to furnish all the news."

William J. Pape has observed: "Newspaper work seemed to be drifting helplessly downhill until Mr. Ochs reached New York. Not only did Mr. Ochs reverse the current, but he also demonstrated to newspapers, by the power of his example, just what the public really wanted. All newspapers are better, cleaner, and sounder in consequence. This is the obligation under which Mr. Ochs has placed both public and press."

William T. Dewart, then president of the Sun in New York City, wrote Ochs in 1926 on the 75th anniversary of the Times and 30th anniversary of Mr. Ochs' management: "You have * * * influenced hundreds of other publishers to plan more soundly and execute more efficiently and wisely."

To these tributes an editorial in the Journal, Milwaukee, added: "* * * More than the success of one newspaper is the influence the Times has had on the newspapers of the whole country. For at one time a great many reasonable men seemed convinced that artificial stimulation of the news had come to stay and were on the verge of jumping into the current and throwing away the ideas that made American newspapers. Principally through the Times they saw that honest, sober newspapermaking was still the way to newspaper success * * *."

But the heritage of the country from Ochs goes beyond his influence on American journalism; it is found in his abiding faith in the essential intelligence of the people and in his belief that only those newspapers and institutions that serve the people well will have their continued support.

Legislation for Nation's Children

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES E. POTTER

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, February 19, 1958

Mr. POTTER. Mr. President, today, when we are assessing our scientific resources in an effort to advance our technology, when we are building our military resources for security, and when we are keeping our financial resources stable for increased prosperity, I wish to call attention to the greatest resource of all—our children. The destiny of this Nation lies in the hands of the boys and girls of today, who will become the men and women of tomorrow. What happens to our country in the future depends on what is happening to our children now.

I wish to insert in the Appendix of the RECORD an article from the January 1958 issue of Parents' Magazine. Mrs. Ada Barnett Stough, executive director of the American Parents Committee, has written an outstanding exposition entitled "The State of the Nation's Underprivileged Children." It outlines the challenge facing us in an area vital to our youthful citizens. Most children in the United States, Mrs. Stough points out, are healthy, happy, and well cared for. Unfortunately, grim statistics reveal that many are underprivileged, and it is this situation which Mrs. Stough ably describes in her story.

The purpose of the American Parents Committee is to work for legislation for children, and many of us have learned to know Mrs. Stough as she goes about that job up here on the Hill. In her work as executive director of the committee, and in her writings for the magazine, she is doing a great service to the Nation by serving and helping our children.

I ask unanimous consent to have this article printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE STATE OF THE NATION'S UNDERPRIVILEGED CHILDREN

(By George J. Hecht, publisher of Parents' Magazine, chairman of the American Parents Committee; and Ada Barnett Stough, executive director of the American Parents Committee)

Nineteen hundred and fifty-eight finds America's nurseries, playgrounds, and schools bulging with the largest family of children the country has ever known—an estimated sixty million. Because of the great advances made in medical research and practice, these children have a much greater chance of living out their natural life span. Our social security system has removed some of the economic uncertainty which once threatened a child on the death of the breadwinning father. Our present high level of prosperity brings showers of material advantages to brighten the lives of most young people.

Today's parents, increasingly aware of the many different elements that comprise their job of rearing children, read quantities of literature on child-rearing, take part in community parent-education groups, and assume leadership in groups and organizations with activities for children.

The children of 1958 reflect all of these advantages. On the whole, they are healthy and happy. But pleased as we are about the overall picture of our Nation's children, we cannot blindfold our eyes to the blotches that mar it.

SOME BABIES WON'T LIVE A YEAR

Even though the infant mortality rate has been reduced sharply since 1935, in 1956 fatalities in the first year of life numbered about 26 out of every 1,000. Deaths of infants during the period just before, during and soon after birth account for 71 percent of all mortality among children under 15.

Over half the babies who die during their first month are those born prematurely. What is causing the increasing number of premature births and what can be done to prevent them are important problems facing doctors, public health officials and society.

NOT ALL OF OUR CHILDREN HAVE PARENTS AND HAPPY HOMES

Many children in this country live in homes torn by emotional or economic strife, where one or both parents are absent or some other misfortune has struck. In 1956 over 2½ million children under 18 had lost one or both parents by death. Of these, 1,450,000 are receiving social security benefits either directly or through their widowed mothers, averaging $38.00 a month per child.

About 1,800,000 orphaned or partially orphaned children are receiving help from their States through the Federal-State Aid for Dependent Children Program. In a State like Connecticut this help averages as high as $43.28 a month per child, but in Mississippi it is as low as $7.50 a month for each child.

Children with families have troubles, too. On a typical day 250,000 children living with parents or relatives are being visited or are receiving casework services from public or voluntary child welfare agencies. Sometimes these are children whose mothers are ill or disabled and homemaker services are needed, at least temporarily, for the home. In other cases the child is the unfortunate victim of divorce, abandonment, neglect or delinquency.

BABIES ARE STILL HANDLED BY BLACK MARKETS

Probably more than 100,000 children will be placed for adoption during the coming year. Will the adoption procedures protect the interests of both the child and the adopting parents, in the light of the black market and the grey market in babies?

The problem of properly supervised adoption is complicated by the fact that 75 percent of the children adopted by nonrelatives are so-called illegitimate babies. In the 84th Congress the Senate passed a bill seeking to curb the black market in babies but no action was taken in the House.

SOME CHILDREN MUST LIVE IN FOSTER HOMES OR INSTITUTIONS

Some children, unfortunately, nobody seems to want. The hard-to-place children are usually non-white or of school age or handicapped. The non-white hard-to-place children alone number over 96,000 a year. Other children are only temporarily homeless because of illness or some family tragedy. Foster homes must be found for all of these nonadoptable children or they must be placed in group homes or institutions. In 72 percent of the cases the child is placed in a foster home licensed and supervised by the local welfare department. However, many children are sent to institutions each year either because no foster home can be found for them or because institutional life is thought best.

It takes adequate child welfare services to treat, place and care for each homeless child in the way best suited to his development, yet half the counties of the United States have no full-time public child welfare workers. Four-fifths of those who do have them find the number insufficient to meet their needs.

TOO MANY CHILDREN HAVE POOR SCHOOLS

1958 finds the total facilities for public education inadequate to educate properly the record high number of school-age children. The total enrollment in public schools for 1958 is over 33½ million. A total school population of 38 million is predicted for 1961. Over 2.3 million children are attending school in overcrowded classrooms or in basements, converted garages or other makeshift classrooms. Approximately 840,000 are going only part time to schools operated on a double or triple shift basis.

The average child forced to attend half-day sessions loses what amounts to about

2 months' schooling a year in the basic subjects of reading, writing and arithmetic. In overcrowded classrooms, gifted children are held back, weak students do not get the special help they need, students drop out and teachers become discouraged and quit. Even though most localities are stretching their budgets to build needed classrooms, the building is not fast enough to meet the need. Between 56,000 and 65,000 new classrooms will be needed each year to take care of increased enrollments and the replacement of obsolete and hazardous buildings. The seriousness of the classroom shortage was effectively presented at the 1st session of the 85th Congress. Despite support from members of both political parties, a bill providing for Federal aid to help States to build schools was defeated, 208 to 203.

The shortage of competent trained teachers for our Nation's youth is even more alarming than the shortage of classrooms. When schools opened last fall, it was estimated that 135,000 classrooms had no qualified teachers in charge. Three-quarters of a million teachers will be needed in the next 3 years to meet the demand. Since the colleges and universities are graduating only about 100,000 trained teachers each year, and only 70 percent of them are going into the teaching profession, the prospect for improvement in the teaching situation is gloomy, indeed.

The effort of our Nation to education its children has not kept pace with its development and expansion. As a result, we are facing a serious shortage of brainpower in every field of endeavor. We are short of engineers, scientists, doctors, research specialists, social workers. Yet a third of our most gifted students do not go on to college and more than a million children have dropped out of school.

The reason for this lack? We are not willing to pay the price. We spend less than 3½ percent of our gross national income on public education, yet we spend over 4 percent on recreation and 3 percent on alcoholic beverages. We spend more for comic books than for all textbooks used in our elementary and high schools.

THERE'S TOO MUCH JUVENILE DELINQUENCY

The rank and file of American youth are youngsters in whom the Nation takes pride, but we cannot ignore the approximate 2 percent between the ages of 10 to 17 who get into such trouble that they are legally classified as juvenile delinquents.

We know that the causes of juvenile delinquency are many and complex. We know that we have not geared ourselves to cope adequately with the problem. Half of our cities over 10,000 in population have no special juvenile police officers. Detention facilities for children are so few that more than 100,000 children must lie in adult jails awaiting court action. Half the counties of the country have no juvenile probation services.

Legislation was considered in the 85th Congress providing for research as to causes, training of workers in the juvenile delinquency field, and help to the States in coordinating their efforts to solve the problem, but no bill was passed.

CHILDREN OF WORKING MOTHERS NEED DAY CARE

Approximately 2 million mothers with children under 6 are employed outside the home. When these mothers work, what happens to their children? During the war the Federal Government made a coordinated effort to assist States and localities in providing suitable day care centers for children of working mothers. This Federal support was withdrawn in 1946 and now the question of where to keep the child while the mother works depends on private plans or whatever public facilities happen to be provided by a particular community. If day care services are unavailable, insufficient or poor in quality, children and their parents suffer.

SOME CHILDREN ARE MIGRANTS

Probably the most neglected children in the land are the 600,000 or more who move from State to State with their parents, following the crops and helping to pick foods and fibers for the Nation's markets. They belong to no community because they do not live in one place long enough.

These migrant children remain almost uneducated because they receive few actual days of schooling and have little continuity in their school work. Residents of no State, they scarcely ever see a doctor or public health nurse or welfare worker. They live in substandard temporary houses or shelters, are hauled from place to place in trucks or crowded cars. Their only playgrounds are the fields where they often work beside their parents.

A small beginning has been made to focus some attention on these children. One program, on which many Government agencies are working together, helps some of the children whose parents work in the 10 States along the east coast. This is but one feeble effort. The problem must be handled community-by-community where migrants work.

Along with the children of migrant workers one should mention the 9.1 million children who in 1955 (the last year for which figures are avaiable) lived in families where the total monetary income was less than $40 a week. Considering the fact that essential expenditures for a family of four in that year cost from $75 to $88 a week (depending on the section of the country), it is easy to understand why many of these children drop out of school to work to help buy groceries for the family. Comparable figures are not yet available for 1957, but we do know that the cost-of-living index has risen almost 6½ percent in the last 2 years.

RETARDED CHILDREN NEED SPECIAL ATTENTION

Although no accurate figures are available, it is estimated that 3 percent of the children already born are mentally retarded in some handicapping degree. If the current birth rate continues, there will be 300 babies born every day in 1958 whose mental development will be retarded.

Recently, concern for these children has stirred cities, States, and the Federal Government to action. States have begun to set up diagnostic clinics to help the parents of such children. These clinics are assisted through Federal funds administered by the Children's Bureau.

The Federal Government has embarked on research to find the cause of mental retardation in the hope that ways may be found to prevent it. Research is also being done on teaching the mentally retarded. The big need now is for fellowships and scholarships in colleges and universities to help produce well-trained teachers for the mentally retarded.

EMOTIONALLY DISTURBED CHILDREN NEED HELP, TOO

It is estimated that there are approximately a half million children who are so emotionally disturbed as to be considered mentally ill. They have normal and often superior intelligence but they cannot function as normal children. They are barred from public schools. Private psychiatric facilities, to which they might turn for treatment and education, are scarce and expensive. Public clinical facilities are needed so that these children can be helped more easily. Programs are needed to help communities accept the mentally ill child as a sick child and assume responsibility for his care.

The educational needs of mentally ill children are the same as those of the mentally retarded—special schools or special classes and specially trained teachers. Bills were introduced in the 84th and 85th Congresses to provide a small grant to colleges and universities for the special training of teachers for these children, but these bills, unfortunately, were not enacted.

ACCIDENTS AND HEALTH HAZARDS

Accidents are likely to be the leading cause of death among people under 19 in the coming year, as in the past. The high rate of accident fatalities between the ages of 18 and 19 (50 per 100,000 in 1954) reflects the large number of accidents among teen-age drivers. The rate among children from 1 through 4 in 1954 was 24 per 100,000, and from 5 through 14 it was 20 per 100,000

Thanks to medicine we no longer fear diseases like diphtheria, whooping cough and scarlet fever, which once caused the death of so many children. That a child may die from some other fatal disease, however, is still a stark reality.

Cancer claims the lives of more children than any other single disease. Half of these children, about 4,000 a year, are attacked by acute leukemia, for which there is as yet no known cure. Congenital malformations cause the death of over 17,000 children each year and many others are left with a handicapping condition they may carry through life. In 1955, over 11,000 children in the 1- to 4-year-old group died from the several diseases in the pneumonia and influenza category. Rheumatic fever and other diseases affecting the heart cause over 1,000 deaths a year among children, and tuberculosis almost 5,000, despite the progress made in control of the disease. Muscular dystrophy affects approximately 100,000 children between the ages of 3 and 13. About 250,000 children of school age suffer from rheumatoid arthritis. Forty percent of them are left severely crippled.

Fortunately, the Salk vaccine has largely removed the threat of crippling polio but unfortunately there are still too many children who have not yet had the full series of three shots required for long-time protectiton. There still remain at least 80,000 children badly crippled from polio in the past who need therapy, braces, and other assistance.

MANY CHILDREN HAVE HANDICAPS

"Will my child ever be able to live like other children?" is the question asked earnestly by parents of more than 5 million children physically handicapped as a result of congenital malformations, accident, or disease. By far the largest number are those children suffering from defects of speech and hearing. If all the schools in the country were to give an accurate hearing test this month, over a million youngsters would prove to have hearing difficulty serious enough to require immediate attention.

Over 2 million children in the country have speech disorders of such severity as to interfere with their educational progress and social and emotional development. Cleft palate and cleft lip account for a large number of the speech handicaps. About 5,000 children are born every year with these malformations.

Children with defects of speech and hearing should have more classroom space and more special teachers. There is need for more speech and audiology centers and more research to determine how well the needs of these children are being met.

Over 17,000 children in the country are totally blind, and another 70,000 have only partial sight. Some of the latter who are receiving no care will become blind and the others will go through life with visual handicaps. About 200,000 children are now vic-

tims of cerebral palsy and it is estimated that some 10,000 babies born this year will have one of the damaging brain injuries that comes under that general term. The number of children suffering from handicapping epilepsy is estimated to be somewhere between 300,000 and 500,000.

EXPENDITURES FOR CHILDREN HAVE NOT KEPT PACE

It's more than a little grim, this sum-up of the state of the Nation's underprivileged children.

Before World War II, about 2 million children were born each year in the United States. But during the war, and since then, the annual birth rate skyrocketed, and now it exceeds 4 million. Unfortunately, but understandably, government appropriations—local, State, and Federal—have not been increased quickly enough to provide the needed educational, health, and welfare services for the rapidly increasing number of children; and conditions are likely to get worse in the coming decade, when our child population will be growing faster than ever. In 1940 there were 40 million children under 18 in the United States; in 1950, 47 million; currently there are 60 million; and by 1965 (only 7 years hence) there will probably be 67 million. If the children of the United States are to receive the educational, health, and welfare services that they need now and in the future, appropriations for such services will have to be increased on the local, State, and Federal levels. This may mean increased taxes unless there is governmental reduction in expenditures for armament, foreign aid, or other purposes. But if we want our children to have good schools and adequate health and welfare services, we must be willing to pay for them.

Expenditures on behalf of children should be considered an investment in the future of the Nation. Prosperity in any country depends upon an educated citizenry which will demand and finance a high standard of living and which will be able to supply the competent workmen and executives needed for such an economy. Adult illiterates (there are already 10 million of them in the United States now) are a great liability. Unless children get adequate schooling and services to guard their physical and mental health during their formative years, the result is likely to be greatly increased costs for prisons, mental institutions, hospitals, and relief rolls to provide for them as adults.

Economy and efficiency in government are important, but drastic cuts in essential services for children are not economy. Money spent to improve the health, education, and well-being of children is an investment in priceless human resources which will pay rich dividends in the future—one we should be proud to make.

Storage of Surplus Lignite at Garrison Dam

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM LANGER
OF NORTH DAKOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, March 10, 1958

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a resolution from the industrial committee and board of directors of the Greater North Dakota Association relating to surplus lignite at Garrison Dam.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas the present stockpile of over 2 million tons of surplus lignite stored at Garrison Dam by the United States Army Corps of Engineers may be the trigger that will set off a large-scale industrial development chain reaction in the State of North Dakota by attracting the first large power-consuming industry to our State, and further, since several of those large power-consuming industries have already indicated an interest in the stock-piled lignite; and

Whereas in the event of a national emergency or crisis, such a stockpile of lignite would be of tremendous value as a ready source of energy for military and civilian needs; and

Whereas qualified observers have tested the stored lignite and report very little deterioration has taken place and very little will take place if the stockpile is left undisturbed and properly maintained; and

Whereas there is no demand for the land on which the lignite is now stored; and

Whereas the Federal Government would not realize a proper return from the sale of lignite in the present weak market; and

Whereas such sale would seriously disrupt the orderly marketing of lignite by present private producers: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the industrial committee and board of directors of the Greater North Dakota Association, North Dakota State Chamber of Commerce, That the United States Army Corps of Engineers and any other Federal agency or department involved, be and they hereby are requested to hold the surplus lignite at Garrison Dam, and be it further

Resolved, That should conservation of this potentially valuable resource be impossible, the Corps of Engineers and any other Federal agency or department involved, are hereby requested to dispose of the lignite in such manner as to have the least possible impact on the existing lignite mining industry in North Dakota; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to the members of the North Dakota congressional delegation and to Gov. John E. Davis.

Attest:

HOMER W. LUDWICK,
Executive Vice President.

Statement of Samuel C. Waugh on Export-Import Bank

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GORDON L. McDONOUGH
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 3, 1958

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement of Samuel C. Waugh, president, Export-Import Bank of Washington, before the House Committee on Banking and Currency, on Tuesday, February 25, 1958:

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee: On behalf of the board of directors of the Export-Import Bank I appear before your committee in support of the proposal to increase the bank's lending authority by $2 billion. It has been my privilege to serve as president and chairman of the board of directors of the bank since October 1, 1955. Prior to my present appointment, I represented the Department of State as an ex officio member of the board, so my knowledge of the bank's operations dates approximately from my original confirmation by the Senate nearly 5 years ago. Each director is conscious of the responsibility in representing an institution which on February 12 observed its 24th year as the major foreign lending arm of the United States Government.

This sense of responsibility is greater because of our conviction that, to the great mutual advantage of our citizens and those of friendly countries, the bank has served United States private enterprise and our friends abroad with honor and mutual benefit. The proposal under consideration by the committee is necessary for proper continuation of the bank's present policies and activities.

Most members of your committee will recall the 1954 hearings which again considered our position and then reaffirmed the position of the bank as an independent agency under bipartisan management. It is a pleasure to report to you that these injunctions of the Congress have been upheld, in the spirit as well as the letter. You may be assured that we will continue to be faithful to the spirit of independent, bipartisan service to the international lending needs of the United States.

The primary need for Export-Import Bank is to consider financing abroad which the private capital market in the United States will not undertake. The statute says the bank "should supplement and encourage and not compete with private capital." Over many years of international economic dislocation, of wars and their aftermath, private financing has not been able to meet all the world's needs for trade and investment.

This is partly true for medium-term financing, and particularly true for longer term needs. This is also partly true for the less-developed areas as a whole, and particularly true for some countries with great potential but equally great present-day problems and needs. And it is always true for emergency financial needs of great magnitude.

The Export-Import Bank's objective is to supplement the facilities of the private capital market. But we do much more to supplement private finance and private enterprise than merely by refraining negatively from competition. In a positive, fruitful way, and to an impressive extent, we supplement and encourage private capital and enterprise. Our positive assistance to private capital and enterprise takes many forms, such as the following:

We make development loans to private companies in foreign countries. We act, in effect, as partner. We make loans to supplement private investment when necessary to assure that private funds will venture into the transaction or investment. We have always been especially interested in stimulating investment in private activities abroad, new ones as well as old ones, American-owned as well as foreign-owned. For example, we have conducted operations in association with such representative firms as the American Smelting and Refining Co., American and Foreign Power, Bethlehem Steel, Firestone Rubber, Goodrich Rubber, Lone Star Cement Co., Republic Steel, and the Utah Construction Co. This last point must be stressed because of the impression in some otherwise well-informed circles that the Export-Import Bank does not lend to American business enterprises for their overseas operations.

Our development loans to other governments or official institutions, which cover generally their purchases in the United States, definitely have the effect, directly or indirectly, of assisting the healthy growth in other countries of private industry and trade, foreign as well as American.

Many of our loans to foreign public institutions have been directly for relending to private enterprises. There are many examples of this, such as loans we have made to Mexico, Israel, Italy, and the Philippines.

Many development loans have been to construct basic public facilities for which private capital was not available and without which further growth of the private economy would be difficult, if not impossible. Examples in Asia, and Latin America are part facilities in Turkey, railroads and highways in Iran, power in the Philippines, dams in Mexico and Brazil, the Inter-American Highway in Central America, railway and port improvements in Brazil. Still other loans have been made to assist the restoration of customary financial relations and to permit the resumption of normal private trade and finance.

The bank also makes what we call exporter credits, at the request of United States equipment manufacturers. These credits, assist our United States firms to complete sales which they cannot finance entirely through their own resources. In this manner the bank is able to be of assistance to some of the smaller exporters. This past year we had one credit as modest as $550 to assist in the financing of the sale of a disc plow.

There are other forms of cooperation between the bank and the private capital market. We participate jointly with private banks or insurance companies in making loans to particular borrowers. Commercial banks disburse funds for us under arrangements whereby we guarantee to take them out under certain conditions. Notable along this line are the arrangements for substantial yearly loans to finance cotton exports under which normal marketing and banking channels are employed to the utmost.

We sell loans from our portfolio to banks, thereby freeing our resources. We are constantly working with private banks and this past year have entered into preliminary negotiations with certain insurance companies. Contrary to the opinion of some uninformed, our portfolio is very definitley for sale. We are grateful for the continued assistance and support of United States private banks.

It should be emphasized that Export-Import Bank loans, with very minor exceptions, support our private enterprise economy here at home in the most direct sense in that our loans finance the output of our own firms, our own farms and factories. It is unlikely that there is a single town or county of any size in the United States whose production and payrolls are not at some time directly aided by exports of manufactured goods or farm products financed through the Export-Import Bank. Although they may not even have been aware of our assistance, some of our largest heavy equipment loans reach out to many hundreds of firms throughout the United States.

Let me give you a few figures and comments now, to substantiate the nature and scope of the bank's operations.

During the fiscal year 1957, the bank authorized 182 new credits in 36 countries totalling $1,066 million. Of these credits, 155 were made to private borrowers for a total of $233 million. Twenty-seven loans, totalling $833 million, were made to governments or government agencies. As for the total investment made possible by Export-Import Bank loans, the current period confirms past studies in showing that our development credits work in partnership with investment by others totaling about 150 percent more than the amount of our loans.

It is appropriate first to point out that every bank, consciously or not, is more than just an institution to make money for its stockholders. Every bank, in greater or lesser degree, fulfills a function in serving the needs of its community. When a bank succeeds fully, it succeeds through serving its borrowers by appraising the risks of enterprises and the capacity of their managers, and through advice and, if you will, technical assistance to enterprisers.

The Export-Import Bank has tried in this manner to be a sound bank, serving always the interests of its stockholders—the taxpayers of the United States, but also those of the community it serves, which is simply the community of free nations. As a Government foreign lending institution, our responsibility is particularly great and our awareness highly sensitive regarding the obligation to protect and serve both the interests of our borrowers and those of the United States.

When we make a loan in a foreign country, the economic interest of that country is considered along with that of the United States. That is not sheer altruism, but itself sound business. We are at all times concerned that the operation itself and the overall economy of the country will be able to repay the loan. But particularly as a Government institution, dealing with foreign enterprises or their governments, we do more than to limit our decisions to the creditworthiness of the borrower. Beyond this, we must appraise the effect of the loan on the whole delicate complex of our economic relations with our foreign friends.

To this end, the bank must concern itself with the entire present and prospective position of the other country's economy. We must be informed about the other country's investment potentials and proposals, and with the policies chosen to stimulate orderly investment in all fields, private and public. We never encourage people to borrow beyond their ability to pay. We do not want to create future problems for the United States by assisting even the most eager underdeveloped countries to assume unwise heavy burdens of dollar debts. As a Government institution we must also be particularly careful to avoid any element of unwarrantable interference in the affairs of our sovereign friends.

To do this job properly, we try to earn the good will and confidence of our borrowers and of official circles in foreign countries. We attempt to earn confidence through understanding of their problems and points of view, through consultation and advice, and ultimately through participating with them in achieving real results in the development of their countries.

All of our basic work is done in Washington, and this includes extensive consultation with applicants or their technical representatives. However, we do a great deal of our work on the spot in the field. During the last fiscal year our directors and staff members visited 36 countries to make field studies of pending applications or to inspect loans already made. Many of these trips involved teams of two or more men, and some countries were visited more than once.

To establish confidence is a joint effort and we at all times endeavor to maintain close and friendly cooperative relations with United States industry. Through our association over many years, we enjoy the assistance of the best brains in American industry and banking on technical, financial, and management problems.

The importance of our development banking is, of course, greatest for the fast-growing, ambitious less-developed areas of the world. These countries are eager for assistance in improving and diversifying their economies, in order to increase their productivity and their national income. Although our largest single loans have been to Europe—for immediate postwar needs and to meet the Suez crisis—about 60 percent of our outstanding authorizations are for countries in Africa, Asia, and Latin America. While the bank is best known for our work in Latin America, where we now have $2.25 billion in loans authorized, we have nearly $1 billion authorized to countries in Asia.

Our Latin American loans are probably the clearest example of the coordination previously mentioned. This is because of our long and intimate association with Latin American governments, private investors and traders, and with our own traders, investors, and bankers concerned with that area. It takes time for many loans to give full evidence of their worth to a country. Their value may start immediately after a factory door is opened or a switch is thrown. It becomes more evident as men are employed, costs lowered, products are sold, income earned, and profits made and reinvested. But that is only part of the story.

The truly fundamental results occur as more and more people are trained, as managerial and technical skills are acquired and made available to other parts of the economy, as standards of performance are raised, as new firms are started based on these greater skills and higher standards, in short, as the market economy broadens and deepens. Socially, a middle class grows whose ways of thinking are more and more like our own, a development that assists countries to be more skillful, independent members of the free world. And there is ground to believe that these social and economic developments enable and encourage the people of the country to select and support leaders who favor stable and progressive economic and political policies.

That our activities loom so much greater for Latin America is not simply an accident. Our large scale operations in that area are the natural result of our close relations with our neighbors of this hemisphere. Our large European loans in 1945–46 were to finance the reconstruction needs of that continent immediately at the end of the war. Our postwar loans to several Asian countries, on the other hand, reflect new opportunities and needs for investment which were in our mutual interest. Wherever the changing circumstances of world affairs and economic development have enabled loans to be made, Export-Import Bank activity has increased. If Congress increases our lending authority, we believe this will hold equally true for the future.

The bank's semiannual report will be filed as soon as it is received from the Government Printer. We would like at this time to summarize briefly our financial operations.

During its 24 years' history the bank has authorized loans totaling $9 billion. About $1.6 billion was not used because of cancellations or because we were able to have the commitments taken over by private lenders, and in certain instances sales were made for cash after loan authorizations had been granted. The bank has disbursed about $6 billion, and almost exactly $2 billion of this has been repaid.

We now have on our books loans and authorizations in 59 countries totaling $4.4 billion. Since our legislation permits us to lend a maximum of $5 billion, we have remaining an unused lending authority today of approximately $500 million.

Our lending activity during the last 18 months has been at a peak. Loans authorized last fiscal year totaled $1,066,000,000. During the first 6 months of this fiscal year, we authorized $468 million in new loans.

On the other hand, the bank will have repayments coming in, as well as some cancellations and direct participations by private capital, at an estimated annual rate of about $500 million. But with new operations on the present considerable larger scale, it would only be a few months before the bank would be required to reduce its lending drastically, if not given increased lending authority.

This is true immediately if we are to maintain one of our most basic policies. In the opinion of the directors, the bank should

always retain an uncommitted lending authority of several hundred million dollars in order to have resources to meet unexpected emergencies that may confront the United States in the international field.

For these reasons the President has proposed that the bank's authority to lend be increased from $5 billion to $7 billion, and that our power to borrow from the Treasury be correspondingly increased. As you know, our activities have been conducted by means of borrowing our funds from the Treasury, and then in effect relending these funds.

The bank's gross earnings since it was established total $867 million. From these earnings we have paid all of our administrative expenses, and met some small losses. Congress does not appropriate new funds for the bank's expenses for the bank has always been self-supporting. The procedure has been for Congress to approve a budget for the bank, which then meets all expenses and charges from its own earnings. Our annual administrative expenses for the past 24 years average 1.7 percent of our annual income.

From earnings, payments have been made to the Treasury of more than $200 million in interest on funds borrowed, and in addition $173 million has been paid in dividends on our capital stock, all of which is held by the Treasury. To this extent we make a contribution to the Treasury's operations.

After paying, from earnings, all expenses, interest on borrowed money, and dividends on capital stock, there remains accumulated reserves of $475 million. These reserves now equal about 10 percent of our authorized loans or 15 percent of our outstanding loan funds paid out. The bank's primary objective has not been to make money for its stockholders, but it is good banking and business judgment that adequate reserves be maintained in proportion to loans outstanding.

The officers and staff of the bank have an average of 26 years of experience, either in the bank itself or in work which was direct background for their present assignments.

The bank has been made available for other services than the administration of our own operations. The bank also acts as administrative agent for certain loans of the United States Government, the Department of Defense, and the Office of Defense Mobilization, as well as loans for the TCA, and the ICA and its predecessor agencies. These loans amount to an additional $3.3 billion for a combined responsibility by the bank at the present time of $7.8 billion. An additional activity was assumed last summer under the so-called Cooley amendment to the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954 (Public Law 480). We are now beginning to make certain types of loans to American and foreign private businessmen out of foreign currencies received from the sale of agricultural surpluses. And in accordance with the direction of the Congress we are prepared to administer the Development Loan Fund credits in the same manner that the more than $3 billion ICA credits are being serviced.

It has been my purpose to report briefly to your committee. There is much yet to be accomplished by the Export-Import Bank as our Government's foreign lending institution. It is important for all concerned, here and abroad, and important that it be made clear that extension of credit is a business operation, based on good prospects for economic gain to the borrowers and to be repaid by the borrowers. To be sure, international finance can never be free from consideration of implications of foreign relations. But it should always be founded on the understanding by all that credit assists economically useful investment, and that a credit transaction represents a judgment of mutual benefits to both the lender and the borrower.

It is on these basic conceptions of the bank's continued role in foreign policy that we respectfully request committee approval of S. 3149 to increase the lending power of the Export-Import Bank by $2 billion. It is in this spirit that the Board of Directors would continue to administer the authority given to it by Congress as a bipartisan independent agency of the United States Government.

The United States Inter-American Council

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, March 10, 1958

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I have previously invited the attention of my colleagues to the fine contribution made by the United States-International American Council.

Probably no other private enterprise organization has contributed so much to inter-American cooperation in the inter-American field.

Dating back to its birth in 1941, the council has rendered yoeman services as a spearhead, and as a spokesman, of trade and friendship within the Western Hemisphere.

Represented on the council are some of the outstanding businesses in the United States; trading with the 20 Republics to the south.

The businessmen on the council deal 365 days a year with the practical problems of smoothing out and making ever more beneficial the two-way flow of trade.

With a slump in our own American market here at home, the problems of this two-way trade grow more complex. On the one hand, American businesses naturally seek to expand foreign trade so as to take up the slack in the American market.

On the other hand, our Latin American friends find it increasingly difficult to buy more of our goods because their own purchasing power declines as our purchase of their goods drops.

Despite this, and other problems, I am certain that in the decade ahead there will be, as all the evidence indicates, a tremendous increase in the Latin American market as a customer and as a supplier of American goods.

I earnestly hope that in the lands to the south there will be an ever-improved climate for American investment.

I hope that there will be a diminishing of anti-American sentiment which is found in some places. I hope that there will be an increasing recognition of the need for mutual respect, mutual cooperation, and mutual strengthening of ties.

I send to the desk excerpts from the February 1958 issue of the Inter-American Bulletin, together with excerpts from an important address by Mr. H. W. Balgooyen, executive vice president of the American & Foreign Power Co., the new chairman of the Inter-American Council, as delivered at the council's annual meeting in New Orleans, in mid-December. I ask unanimous consent that both items be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the excerpts and address were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

USIAC ANNUAL MEETING HELD IN NEW ORLEANS, DECEMBER 16

The annual meeting of the USIAC was held at the International House, New Orleans, December 16, 1957. It was the first in a series of general meetings for members to be held four times yearly as part of the expanded and strengthened USIAC program. Harry X. Kelly, president, Mississippi Shipping Co., served as host jointly with International House and the city of New Orleans.

The business part of the meeting included reports by officers and committees, and election of officers and trustees for 1958. Dr. Richard P. Momsen, USIAC advisory board member from Brazil, led an informal discussion on the current situation and outlook in that country; and William A. Melvin, USIAC advisory board member from Uruguay, reported on conditions there. Both replied to questions following their talks.

At luncheon following the meeting, Roy A. Rubottom, Assistant Secretary of State for Inter-American Affairs, discussed matters of current interest in a brief off-the-record talk. H. W. Balgooyen, USIAC chairman-elect, spoke on the role of the Inter-American Council in preserving and promoting free private enterprise in the Western Hemisphere and current issues facing American and Latin-American business. A copy of his remarks accompanies this issue.

USIAC TRUSTEES FOR 1958 ELECTED

The following trustees were elected to office in 1958 at the USIAC annual meeting December 16: Edward Adams, Jr., Sam G. Baggett, Edgar R. Baker, H. W. Balgooyen, Erwin Balluder, William E. Barlow, Charles E. Beard, Howard Bird, Jr., Henry D. Bixby, Jr., S. Bruce Black, Richard L. Bowditch, Spruille Braden, W. D. Bradford, Meade Brunet, Thomas A. Campbell, Horance M. Chadsey, Philip Cortney, H. A. Davies, John A. Diemand, Fred M. Farwell, E. W. Faulk, Amos B. Foy, Lewis B. Harder, Walter Harnischfeger, George P. Harrington, W. R. Herod, Henry F. Holland, R. A. Hummel, Walter Hunnewell, Jr., R. C. Ingersoll, Carl N. Jacobs, and John K. Jenney.

Also: R. C. Joubert, Nicholas Kelley, Jr., Harry X. Kelly, James S. Kemper, William E. Knox, Otto T. Kreuser, Charles Henry Lee, August Maffry (transferred on January 21 to Jean D. Zutter), Frank T. Magennis, S. Maurice McAshan, Jr., G. A. Meckes, Charles A. Meyer, Kenneth R. Miller, Frank R. Milliken, John D. J. Moore, William T. Moore, Robert H. Morse, Jr., J. Warren Nystrom, Howard M. Packard, Herbert V. Prochnow, Webster Pullen, Henry A. J. Ralph, Noel Sargent, Herbert H. Schell, Andrew B. Shea, A. Thomas Taylor, Arthur K. Watson, Leo D. Welch, H. Harold Whitman, and William S. Youngman, Jr.

USIAC OFFICERS AND COMMITTEES NAMED FOR 1958

At the annual meeting of the USIAC December 16, the following officers were elected for 1958: H. W. Balgooyen, chairman; Charles A. Meyer, senior vice chairman; R. A. Hummel, Harry X. Kelly, John D. J. Moore, and H. Harold Whitman, vice chairmen; Kenneth H. Campbell, treasurer; Vada Horsch, secretary; and William F. Combs, executive director.

The following committees were named: Executive committee, membership committee, finance committee, editorial committee,

committee on combating statism, program and social committee.

USIAC WELCOMES 13 NEW MEMBERS AND 1 REENROLLMENT

The USIAC takes pleasure in welcoming 13 new members who have joined in 1957 and 1958 to date, and 1 former member who returned to its ranks. The members, and the individual exercising membership for each, are as follows:

Booz-Allen and Hamilton International, Ltd.; Ralph E. Smiley, president.

Combusion Engineering, Inc.; George M. Chambers, manager, nuclear division.

The Ecuadorian Corp., Ltd.; Forrest L. Yoder, president.

Haskins and Sells; J. Harry Williams, partner.

Home Products International, Ltd.; Eric K. Pfau, president.

Hughes Tool Co.; M. E. Montrose, vice president, sales.

Interamerican Capital Corp.; Fredric J. Evans, president.

Johnson & Johnson International; Robert J. Dixson, president and chairman.

Lehman Brothers; Marcel A. Palmaro, general partner and head of foreign department.

McGraw-Hill Publishing Co., Inc.; Nelson Bond, president, McGraw-Hill International Corp.

Momsen and Freeman; Joseph S. Cardinale, partner.

Roberts and Holland; Henry F. Holland, partner, Union Carbide International Co.; George C. Wells, president, John Wood Co.; Guy George Gabrielson, chairman of the board.

ECUADORIAN SECTION OF IACCP REESTABLISHED

The Ecuadorian section of the IACCP was reorganized and reestablished in a meeting of representatives of the chambers of commerce, industry, and agriculture affiliated with the IACCP in Ecuador, November 25, 1957. Officers, elected for the ensuing 3 years, are: Dr. César D. Andrade, president; Guillermo Tola Carbo, Rafael Lasso Meneses, Juan José Plaza, and Carlos Merello Guzmán, vice presidents; and Lic. Reinaldo Cañizares Palacios, secretary-manager.

EIGHTH PLENARY SESSION OF IACCP LAST JULY AN OUTSTANDING SUCCESS

The eighth plenary session of the IACCP, held last July in Buenos Aires, was in many respects the most successful to date. The climate surrounding the proceedings was vigorous and enthusiastic, and completely cordial. The final resolutions and recommendations were the strongest and best to come out of any plenary meeting thus far. These resolutions, representing the consensus of private businessmen and free enterprise throughout the hemisphere, were presented at the meeting of the OAS, a month later. Copies are available on request, while the supply lasts.

ECLA GROUP TO EXPLORE COMMON MARKET FOR LATIN AMERICA

General news

Six prominent Latin Americans, appointed by the Economic Commission for Latin America to consider ways of creating a Latin American common market, held their first meeting this month in Santiago, Chile. The group comprises José Garrido Torres, president of the National Economic Council of Brazil; Rodrigo Gómez, director of the Bank of Mexico; Flavian Levine, manager of the Cía. de Acero del Pacífico, of Chile; Eustáquio Méndes Delfino, president of the Bolsa de Comercio of Buenos Aires; Galo Plaza, former President of Ecuador; and Joaquín Vallejo, former Minister of Development of Colombia.

INTER-AMERICAN BAR FOUNDATION ESTABLISHED

The 10th plenary session of the Inter-American Bar Association in Buenos Aires, last November, established an Inter-American Bar Foundation to bring about greater understanding among lawyers in the Western Hemisphere, where 21 different legal systems are used. Officers elected are: Roy W. Johns, of Philadelphia, director of several oil and pipeline companies operating in Latin America, president; Dr. Eduardo García, of Argentina, recently elected president of the OAS, vice president; William Roy Vallance, of Washington, secretary; and Charles Norberg, of Washington, treasurer. Directors include Henry F. Holland, former Assistant Secretary of State for Inter-American Affairs; Mary H. C. Zimmerman, of Detroit, former president, National Association of Women Lawyers; Edwin D. Ford, Jr., attorney for American & Foreign Power Co., Inc., New York; and Cody Fowler, of Miami, former president of the American Bar Association.

REPORT ON INFLATION IN LATIN AMERICA

In the latest issue of Latin-American Business Highlights, the Chase Manhattan Bank reports that while 7 Latin American republics have had less inflation than the United States, prices have risen by more than 50 percent in the other 13. In 9 of these countries the cost of living has more than doubled; and in 3 cases it has shot up more than 25 times. Various aspects and contributing causes of inflation are analyzed, with charts.

* * * * *

ARGENTINA ACTS TO EASE UNITED STATES MACHINERY IMPORTS

New measures making it easier to import United States industrial machinery into Argentina have been implemented by the Central Bank of Argentina. A wide range of tooling and production equipment in various broadly described classes as to type of machinery and industry of application already is covered, and other industries are to follow as soon as the balance of payments position permits.

Procedure provides for importing machinery either as capital investment with repatriation, or on time payments. Detailed provisions relating to both types of import were set forth in announcement by the Ministry of Treasury in the Journal of Commerce, November 16, 1957.

* * * * *

BRAZIL ENCOURAGES MANUFACTURE OF TRACTORS

Brazil has invited private firms to submit offers to manufacture tractors, under rules somewhat similar to those already laid down for truck producers. After the first year, tractors or implements must contain at least 30 percent of locally made parts, and by 1963 this must be upped to 90 percent. The Government will determine production types and quotas.

FOREIGN INVESTMENTS FORMED IN BRAZIL

The National Confederation of Commerce in Brazil has approved establishment of a council on foreign capital investments, to study and promote foreign investments for industrial development of the country.

UNITED STATES CHILEAN COPPER INVESTMENTS REACH $130 MILLION

United States copper investments in Chile in 1955, 1956, and the first half of 1957 were more than $129.5 million; with $122.7 million in new investments by Anaconda and $6.8 million by Braden, according to the United States Department of Commerce and the Foreign Investment Committee in Chile. Since Chile's Foreign Investment Law of 1954, the United States has been the leading investor with $11.4 million, or nearly 25 percent, of a total of $46 million of foreign investments in industries other than copper.

KENAF SEEN AS POTENTIAL AID TO CUBAN ECONOMY

A major new industry could be developed in Cuba if efforts are made to develop kenaf, according to a report prepared by Stanford Research Institute for Cia. Cubana de Electricidad, an affiliate of American & Foreign Power. Kenaf, a soft tropical fiber, is said to be usable as a substitute for jute in sacking, and in many industrial fiber applications.

UNITED STATES AND MEXICO SIGN LOAN AGREEMENT

The United States and Mexico have entered into an agreement whereby local currency equivalent to $13.6 million will be made available for economic development, according to ICA announcement. Pesos involved represent partial local currency proceeds of sales of agricultural commodities under Public Law 480.

CHRYSLER TO MANUFACTURE PLYMOUTH-SAVOY AUTOS IN BRAZIL

News of companies and people

In the second half of 1958 Chrysler will start manufacture of the Plymouth-Savoy auto in Brazil. The plant will be the largest of its kind in Brazil, with total investments of $60 million. Annual production of 6,000 cars is planned.

IT&T MAPS CHILEAN PHONE EXPANSION

A $35.3 million, 6-year expansion program for Chile's telephone system is under negotiation between Cía. de Teléfonos de Chile, subsidiary of IT&T, and the Chilean Government.

* * * * *

SEARS, ROEBUCK OPENS SIXTH RETAIL STORE IN COLOMBIA

Sears, Roebuck de Colombia recently opened its sixth retail store in Medellín. It is housed in a $1 million building, on a lot of 5½ acres. Merchandise includes some 10,000 items, of which 93 percent are produced in Colombia. Of 320 store employees, only 3 are United States citizens. The store's expansion program includes plans for a supermarket.

GRACE LAUNCHES SECOND $25 MILLION LINER

The *Santa Paula*, second $25 million passenger liner of the Grace Line, was launched in mid-January. It and its sister ship, the *Santa Rosa*, will enter the company's service linking New York, the Caribbean, and South America, this year.

NEW PUERTO RICAN SUBSIDIARY FORMED BY GRACE

W. R. Grace & Co. has announced formation of International Metalloids, a subsidiary of Grace International, S. A., to produce semiconductor-grade silicon in Puerto Rico.

* * * * *

HARNISCHFEGER TO BUILD CRANES AND SHOVELS IN BRAZIL

Harnischfeger International Corp., in association with Equipamentos Industriais Villares of São Paulo, gives Brazil its first construction equipment industry. A new plant will begin production of Brazilian P & H power cranes and shovels early in 1958.

INTERNATIONAL PACKERS TO MODERNIZE PLANT IN ARGENTINA

Plans to modernize Swift de la Plata's plant in Argentina to increase exports of corned beef and other canned meat to the United States were revealed recently by International Packers. The firm will invest $1 million in high-speed packing machinery.

ALLIS-CHALMERS ACQUIRES TRANSFORMER COMPANY IN MEXICO

Allis-Chalmers de México, S. A., has acquired Industrial Dufermex, S. A., of Mexico, D. F., which previously had operated as a licensee for production and distribution of Allis-Chalmers power transformers. The parent company will continue to manufacture transformers at the Mexican plant and hopes to expand its line.

NEW $26 MILLION LINER "BRASIL" LAUNCHED BY MOORE-M'CORMACK

The *Brasil*, first major United States liner built for service to the east coast of

South America in more than 50 years, was launched by Moore-McCormack Lines in mid-December. The $26 million liner will ply between New York and Brazil, Argentina, and Uruguay.

REMINGTON RAND OPENS TYPEWRITER PLANT IN BRAZIL

Remington Rand, celebrating the 50th anniversary of its activities in Brazil, opened the first plant in Brazil for manufacture of typewriters on October 28. President Kubitschek of Brazil joined President A. H. Gutsch of Remington Rand in the inauguration ceremonies. The plant employs 1,200.

FORD TO INVEST $21 MILLION TO EXPAND IN BRAZIL

Ford Motor Co. has appropriated $21 million to expand its facilities in Brazil. Built in 1953, they are still among the world's most modern. Producing trucks with an ever-increasing percentage of Brazilian parts, plans call for output of 30,000 commercial vehicles annually by 1960, with 90 percent of components by weight, including the motor, of Brazilian manufacture.

HOWARD M. PACKARD NAMED PRESIDENT AT S. C. JOHNSON & SON

Election of Howard M. Packard as president and chief operating officer at S. C. Johnson & Son, Inc., was announced January 16 by the company. Mr. Packard, formerly executive vice president, succeeds Herbert F. Johnson, who has been president since 1928 and now continues as chairman and chief executive officer.

RETIRING USIAC CHAIRMAN H. A. DAVIES RECEIVES TRIBUTES

Appreciation of USIAC members for the leadership and services of Hugh A. Davies, retiring chairman, were expressed in a letter which Mr. Balgooyen, as senior vice chairman, wrote to John L. McCaffrey, chairman, International Harvester Co., December 11. The letter, and a telegram in reply from Mr. McCaffrey, were read at the annual meeting. In another tribute by the city of New Orleans, Mayor Morrison presented Mr. Davies with a gold key to the city of New Orleans.

* * * * *

LATIN AMERICA SEEN AS CONTINENT IN FERMENT

Books, publications, speeches

"Borne onward by the force of fast-growing industrialization, Latin Americans are pulling free of old traditions to become a rising new culture on the horizon of the rest of the world."

With this introduction, Robert M. Hallett, Latin-American editor of the Christian Science Monitor, in an extensive article January 13, discusses what he sees as two fundamental and conflicting forces dominating Latin America today: On one hand, "The Iberian background of most of those in the upper classes with its emphasis on culture and leisurely, gracious living * * *"; and on the other, "the rather frenetic minute-conscious industrial age imported from abroad, mostly the United States. * * *" He concludes: "With Latin America growing faster in population than any other part of the world and playing a larger economic role, it is increasingly important for the rest of the world to understand this rising new culture. * * * It is bound to play an ever more important role on the world stage."

NEW USDC REPORT ON UNITED STATES INVESTMENTS IN LATIN AMERICA

United States Investments in the Latin American Economy, by the United States Department of Commerce (194 pp.; $1.75 from Superintendent of Documents) is the final version of the summary report issued last year on the direct economic contribution to Latin America through operations of United States companies and private investors.

RADFORD CALLS STEPUP IN AMERICAN FOREIGN INVESTMENTS VITAL

One example of continuing interest in this topic is the remarks of Adm. Arthur W. Radford before the annual meeting of stockholders of the Bankers Trust Co. of New York. He said that American private foreign investment, recently around a $4 billion gross rate, must be doubled or tripled. He went on to say that private enterprise holds the key to the free world, depending on brains and management skill and private rather than Government enterprise.

USIAC PUBLICATION ON UNITED STATES INVESTMENTS IN LATIN AMERICA

The USIAC booklet The Profitable Partnership, based on summary findings of the USDC study released last year, already is proving an important means of counteracting the erroneous impression that foreign investment is burdensome to the host country. Single copies will be sent free on request. Larger quantities will be furnished at $30 per 100 copies, plus delivery charges and applicable taxes, while the supply lasts. Please specify English, Spanish, or Portuguese edition when ordering.

THE INTER-AMERICAN COUNCIL—ITS PAST RECORD AND FUTURE RESPONSIBILITIES

(Presented by H. W. Balgooyen, executive vice president, American & Foreign Power Co., Inc., and chairman-elect, United States Inter-American Council, at the annual meeting of the United States Inter-American Council, New Orleans, La., December 16, 1957)

I believe that the most important function of the IAC is to serve as a liaison between the businessmen, and, in case of need, the governments of Latin America and the United States, respectively. The USIAC, for its part, should strive to keep the United States Government and the American public continuously informed as to the attitudes, the requirements and the aspirations of our counterparts in Latin America, just as the various national sections in Latin America should keep their governments and peoples informed regarding the requirements and objectives of United States business enterprise. Our first concern in the USIAC, therefore, should be the development in this country of an informed public opinion concerning Latin America, aware of its primary importance as a business partner in time of peace, and an indispensable supplier and ally in time of war or national emergency.

It would be a waste of my time and yours to recite foreign trade statistics to a group as well informed as this one. We all know that Latin America is the most important source of United States imports—particularly essential raw materials—and is the chief recipient of our foreign investments. These are tangible facts of our economic life. Not so tangible, but nonetheless real, are the ideological and spiritual ties that bind us to the peoples of Latin America.

In a recent speech, one of our esteemed trustees, the Honorable Spruille Braden, commented on the essential solidarity of the Americas and the reasons for it. He then made the very significant statement that this solidarity of our peoples, based on dignity, freedom, and mutual respect, makes us the only nation on the face of the globe that, in an emergency, may have full trust and confidence in one another. I believe that this is well worth pondering. Certainly, we should retain and strengthen our alliances with nations of the Old World; but, within the short span of a generation, we have seen several of our friends transformed into enemies and our enemies changed into friends. I hope and believe that some of our present allies will stand by us when the chips are down, despite their large Communist and Socialist Parties and the shrunken shorelines of our reservoirs of good will. But, I have no doubt whatever as to the stand which will be taken by our Latin American friends if and when the final showdown comes between the forces of communism and freedom. They will be on our side—not because it is the side of the biggest pocketbook, the most powerful missiles or the largest battalions, but because they share our devotion to the Christian ethic of individual dignity and worth, and our faith in the ultimate triumph of right and justice.

I am sure that all of us who know Latin America believe this very sincerely, but we have not done a very effective job in conveying to the American press, to the public, or to our Government officials, an appreciation of the overriding importance of maintaining and strengthening our inter-American relationships. I have said that, in the worldwide struggle between the forces of communism and those of freedom, our Latin American friends will be among our most dependable allies—and this will be true whether in time of prosperity or adversity; whether or not there exists a full measure of mutual understanding among us. But, strong allies are better than weak allies, and understanding friends are better than friends of circumstance or necessity. At the present time, unfortunately, many of our southern neighbors are economically weak, and they are struggling with economic ills that threaten to get more serious before they get better. Furthermore, there are a number of points of friction between them and us which will not be easy to eliminate but will require a great deal of patient effort at mutual understanding.

The USIAC can perform no more useful function than to help awaken the American people to the importance of their inter-American ties, acquaint them with the nature of Latin America's economic problems and of their attitudes toward our economic policies, and thus create the atmosphere of mutual understanding which will lead to a more satisfactory relationship.

* * * * *

All of us have faith in the long-term future of Latin America, but the Good Book tells us that faith without works is dead—dead as Maynard Keynes says that we all will be in the long run. The next 2 years will be critical ones for Latin America; how critical will depend largely on the condition of our own economy. It has been said that a sneeze in the United States can cause pneumonia in Latin America. I am one of a number of Americans who have done considerable sneezing during the flu epidemic and I'm afraid that our national economy has developed some similar respiratory symptoms. I hope that we can cure them rapidly and restore the traditional vigor of our free enterprise economy; but for our own sake and theirs, let's try to avoid trade policies that will result in exporting our ailments to our Latin American friends.

National Full Employment Conference

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM LANGER

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, March 10, 1958

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, a letter and resolution from the UAW International Union, relating to full employment.

There being no objection, the letter and resolution were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UAW WASHINGTON OFFICE,
Washington, D. C., March 6, 1958.

The Honorable WILLIAM LANGER,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR LANGER: We enclose our resolution on full employment adopted by the 3,000 democratically elected delegates who attended the UAW special convention held in Detroit, January 22–24, 1958. You will note that the resolution calls on President Eisenhower to convene a national full employment conference. He has received and rejected this suggestion.

Many regional conferences have been held throughout the country urging immediate action to meet the critical unemployment problem. On March 11, 12 and 13, the AFL–CIO will hold a full employment conference in Washington, D. C., for the purpose of bringing conditions in various parts of the country to the attention of Members of Congress.

As you will note, the UAW resolutions set forth specific proposals for Federal, State, and local action. Your consideration will be appreciated as will any questions or comments you may make.

Sincerely yours,

PAUL SIFTON,
Legislative Representative, UAW
International Union.

RESOLUTION ADOPTED BY UAW SPECIAL CONVENTION JANUARY 22, 23, 24, 1958, DETROIT, MICH., BY 3,000 DEMOCRATICALLY ELECTED DELEGATES REPRESENTING 1,500,000 MEMBERS

FULL EMPLOYMENT

Whereas the free world must fully grasp the dimensions of the world challenge and translate such understanding into bold action on the economic, scientific, and educational fronts. The Soviet Union has achieved leadership in the area of missile technology and other critical scientific fields and is now devoting increased attention to programs of economic penetration and political subversion of the uncommitted peoples in the economically underdeveloped nations, at the very time when both the United States and Canadian economies are limping along and are involved in a deepening recession.

Mass unemployment and underutilization of our productive capacity is dissipating our economic strength at the very time that freedom's margin of survival is narrow and precarious.

A mounting number of UAW members and their families in the United States and Canada are now suffering the hardships and indignities of job loss, idleness, and short workweeks. In the current slump, as always, working people and their dependents are bearing the brunt of an economic decline caused by the greed of corporate management and the shortsightedness of Government administrators.

This is no time for complacency or self-assurance. This is a time for vigorous action to get idle workers and idle machines back to work, to turn out the increased production needed to meet our unfilled human needs at home, and to meet the challenge on the world front. Halfway and halfhearted measures and policies of too little and too late will not get the job done. We must raise our sights and show as much courage, imagination, and good sense in this crisis as we did after Pearl Harbor. We have lost ground not because the Russians are better but rather because we have not been trying, because we have not been fully mobilizing our economic and productive power.

As a nation, we need to raise our sights, to get our values in sharper focus, and to work out a set of national priorities that will put first things first. We need to strengthen our military posture. We need to overcome our lag in the field of education. We need to expand basic scientific research. We need to do all of these things but we need to do more. We need to raise living standards at home and we need to aid the underprivileged peoples of the world to mobilize their economic resources so that they, too, can share in higher living standards and can successfully resist the Soviet Union's programs of economic penetration and political subversion.

These are the positive aspects of freedom's struggle against the forces of Communist tyranny. We need to understand that, in the long pull, military power alone will not decide the contest between the forces of freedom and the forces of tyranny. In the long run, the cause of human freedom will win provided we prove that freemen under free government working together within a free economic system can do a better job of raising living standards, of broadening educational opportunities, of providing our older citizens with a fuller measure of economic security and human dignity, of gearing our developing technology and our increasing abundance to human progress and to the fulfillment of the higher aspirations of human civilization.

In short, we must mobilize our economic resources so as to deter the peril of war, while at the same time, we must work to realize the promise of peace.

We cannot get on with this job unless the national administration meets its responsibilities under the Employment Act of 1946 which obligates the Government to formulate policies and take the necessary action to maintain maximum employment, production, and purchasing power in the national economy.

The Federal Government is further obligated to alleviate the present distress of workers and to initiate measures which will put them rapidly back to work because administration tax and fiscal policies were important causes of our immediate economic predicament.

The tight-money policies of the Eisenhower administration, its policy of favoring high-income over low-income groups in the distribution of the tax burden, and its other economic policies reflecting the undue influence of big business, slowed national economic growth, widened the gap between our capacity to produce and our power to consume, and thus set the stage for recession.

Similar policies were applied in Canada with inevitably similar consequences.

The dynamic balance between production and consumption necessary for full employment in a growing economy was undermined further by the actions of giant corporations occupying monopoly positions in vital sectors of the economy which have abused their power by raising prices arbitrarily and unjustifiably in defiance of the law of supply and demand.

The UAW foresaw the consequences of the unsound and selfish economic policies of the admiration and big business and warned that they were leading to recession. Unfortunately our warnings went unheeded and recession is no longer a future danger but a present fact.

Past experience shows the folly of allowing events to run their course. Left to its own devices, it is clear that the Eisenhower administration, under the guidance of its big business policymakers, will shuttle between indifference to the fate of the unemployed and measures, such as the cut in required stock margins, designed to make speculators happy. Measures to stimulate the stock market, or applications of the trickle-down theory under which the wealthy are further enriched in the hope that they will increase their investments would be not only futile but dangerous under present conditions. Our first and most urgent problem now is not to foster investment but to replenish the wells of purchasing power drying up under the curse of joblessness.

At the same conference at which President Eisenhower announced his do-nothing policy, he indicated that his optimistic indifference to the immediate plight of workers had been inspired by reports from a whole series of bankers. The President is badly in need of reports from a whole series of workers and from a whole series of States and local communities where a deficiency of paychecks is causing a run on unemployment compensation funds, evictions, loss of homes, a lengthening of relief rolls, and local depressions for small merchants and professional groups: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That UAW call upon the President of the United States to convene a national full employment conference of labor, management, farm, consumer, and other economic groups, and the governors from the States and the mayors from the industrial cities where unemployment is most acute, to review the present economic situation, hear reports and recommendations from these groups and from the Government, and lay the basis for a comprehensive full employment program; and be it

Further resolved, That the UAW supports the following program of action at the Federal, State, and local levels to meet the immediate recession emergency and to lay the groundwork for future steady progress toward increasing living standards and greater national security based upon an expanding full-production full-employment economy.

FEDERAL GOVERNMENT ACTION—SHORT-TERM PROGRAM

The object of the short-term measures of the employment program must be to assure immediate help to those currently suffering hardship, and to create new jobs as quickly as possible. Such measures will not merely help relieve immediate problems but can be used to meet similar situations in the future, and in addition some of them will provide a substantial cushion to protect the economy against spiraling recessions, which tend to grow from the losses of purchasing power suffered by laid-off workers.

Unemployment insurance

(a) Immediate action by Congress to enact minimum Federal standards of unemployment compensation to assure that all States will provide adequate unemployment compensation benefits and duration and reasonable eligibility requirements, including a provision to permit the operation of SUB agreements in the few States where supplementation of State benefits is now blocked.

(b) Provision for Federal supplementation of State benefits until the States have had time to bring their laws into conformity with the minimum Federal standards.

Moratorium on home mortgages for laid-off workers

Legislation to protect laid-off workers unable to make payments on home mortgages by a Federal moratorium for the period of their involuntary unemployment.

Taxes

(a) Consumer purchasing power should be stimulated by increasing personal income tax exemptions from the current $600 to a minimum of $800. This will be immediately reflected in higher take-home paychecks due to reduced withholding taxes. It will enable low- and middle-income families to increase their spending thus providing employment. It will provide large families with the most dependents with the most help.

(b) Remove excise taxes on automobiles, appliances, and certain other goods to enable more consumers to buy such items.

(c) Plug tax loopholes in order to make up revenue losses resulting from the above tax reforms. Included among such loopholes are dividend exemption, oil depletion, capital gains, split income, among others, which en-

able the wealthy to escape their fair share of the tax burden.

Defense contracts

Telescope production schedules on defense contracts currently in production in distressed areas to provide maximum employment with a minimum of delay.

Current public construction

Construction schedules on public works in distressed areas for which contracts have already been let should be telescoped to provide maximum employment opportunities immediately. Other projects planned for such areas should be gotten underway with a minimum of delay.

FEDERAL GOVERNMENT ACTION—LONG-RANGE STABILITY PROGRAM

It is not sufficient to concern ourselves only with the immediate crisis. There are numerous measures which should be undertaken with a view to strengthening the economy and helping to prevent a repetition of similar unemployment crises in the future, as well as policies designed to insure swifter and more effective action if unemployment should threaten. Some of these measures, if put into effect immediately, could also be of substantial help in reducing present unemployment.

Industrial rehabilitation

Federal financial aid to municapilities to clear property of obsolete plants and to replace them with new, modern, and diversified facilities to provide new employment opportunities within the confines of the same labor market areas.

Minimum wage

Increase the purchasing power of millions of low-wage workers by amending the Fair Labor Standards Act to provide a minimum wage of $1.25 per hour and extending coverage to all workers who can constitutionally be brought under protection of Federal minimum wage legislation.

Pensions

Raise Social Security Act pensions to levels adequate to provide an American standard of living to retired workers and their dependents, extend coverage to groups not presently covered, provide pensions for disabled workers regardless of age. Adequate pensions will strengthen and stabilize the economy by assuring substantial and stable flow of purchasing power to millions who are now unable to consume their fair share of what our economy can produce. The Social Security Act should also be amended to include hospital-medical care for those receiving social-security benefits.

Defense contract policies

Action and not mere lip service in the allocation of defense contracts to relieve unemployment. Present policies should be liberalized to permit effective use of defense contracts for that purpose. Full weight and recognition should be given to the fact that if additional costs are involved in placing contracts in distressed areas such costs may be more than offset by resultant avoidance of the heavy costs of unemployment to the community and the Nation. The remnants of the policy of industrial dispersion, completely senseless in the era of the H-bomb, must be ended so that work can be made available in areas where there are idle workers already housed and already provided with essential community facilities.

Public works—housing—hospitals

(a) Speed implementation of the Federal program for highway construction.

(b) Immediate congressional action to provide:

1. Federal aid for the construction of schools needed to wipe out the current deficit of 300,000 classrooms and to build the additional 265,000 classrooms which will be needed by 1960 to eliminate school overcrowding and to provide all our children with modern, pleasant, and healthy school facilities in which they can be given maximum opportunity to develop their full capacities.

2. Federal aid for the construction of hospitals to wipe out the current deficit of 838,000 beds and to provide the additional beds which will be needed by our growing population to make possible adequate care for all citizens and to raise the health standards of the American people.

3. Federal aid to assure construction of 2 million housing units per year, including middle-income as well as low-income and public housing, to provide good homes in healthy neighborhoods for all Americans.

(c) Grants and long-term low-interest loans to States, counties, and municipalities for construction of public buildings, airports, and other public facilities.

(d) To prepare for future contingencies, Federal public works programs should be planned and prepared well in advance so that construction may begin without delay whenever needed to avoid unemployment. In addition, Federal assistance should be made available to States and municipalities on terms which will encourage similar advance planning on their part and compensate them for any additional costs involved in advance planning.

Permanent commission on technological change

Establishment of a permanent commission on technological change composed of representatives of labor, farmers, management, and Government to keep under constant review developments in automation, atomic and solar energy, and other innovations of the era of the second industrial revolution and to make appropriate recommendations to Congress and the President to assure that the fruits of technological advance are fairly shared and full employment achieved and maintained.

The commission should give attention, among other matters, to industry locational decisions related to technological and market changes and should recommend congressional action, investigative and legislative designed both to protect workers and their communities against hardship and dislocation resulting from such corporate decisions and to foster a maximum degree of social responsibility in the making of such decisions.

Scholarships and aid to education and research

(a) Federal scholarships to assure that all our young people are given opportunity to remain in school long enough to develop their full capabilities whether through advanced education or through development of work skills. This would not only improve the quantity, quality, and productivity of our scientists, engineers, technicians, and labor force generally, thus strengthening national security and guaranteeing higher living standards for the future; it would also help to keep our labor supply in better balance with demand for labor.

(b) A substantial program to provide technological education and retraining for adults who desire to acquire new levels of skill or who are required to learn new skills because of job displacement resulting from automation or other technological change.

(c) Increase in salaries and improved working conditions for teachers at all levels of our educational system to make teaching an attractive and respected profession.

(d) Provision of adequate funds for research so as to provide further attraction of our best minds to the universities to contribute to our store of knowledge at the same time as they prepare our young people for life in an increasnigly complex world.

Farm program

(a) Immediate restoration of farm price supports to 90 percent of parity to help restore and maintain farm demand for industrial products until a new farm program is developed.

(b) More extensive use of existing farm surpluses to relieve hunger both at home and abroad.

(c) Development of a new and sound farm program, acceptable to the farmers themselves, which would provide full protection for the living standards of the family farmers while recognizing the equities of the consumers.

Aid to small business

Liberalization of Government lending policies to help small business, and stricter control over the exercise of monopoly power by mammoth corporations.

Wage-price-profit investigation

Vigorous prosecution of the Kefauver subcommittee's investigation of wage-price-profit relationships to expose the real reasons for existing high prices and to deter further inflation. National full employment policies cannot work if efforts to create expanded purchasing power are frustrated by the greedy and monopolistic price policies of big business.

Public control of Federal Reserve policy

Legislation to impose public responsibility on the exercise of the vast power of the Federal Reserve Board to throttle business activity and employment by cutting off the supply of money and credit. The Federal Reserve Board bears a major share of the responsibility for the current recession. It must never again be permitted to abuse its powers in ways that will lead to further recessions.

Publication of data on car inventories

The Department of Commerce should collect and publish data on new and used car inventories in dealers' hands broken down by area and, in the case of new cars, by make. This information is vitally important to the automotive production centers if they are to be prepared to meet future fluctuations in auto industry employment. It would also be extremely valuable in the formulation and application of national full employment policies. In addition, publication of the facts on inventories can be helpful in bringing public opinion to bear as a restraining influence on irresponsible production scheduling by the automobile corporations.

STATE ACTION

Unemployment insurance

The growing recession requires that State legislatures act immediately on unemployment-compensation improvements. Legislatures not presently in session should be convened in special session for this purpose.

Unemployment-compensation laws must be amended to bring benefits realistically into line with the wage losses suffered by jobless workers, to provide, as a minimum, uniform 39 weeks' duration for all workers eligible for benefits, and to remove restrictive eligibility requirements and barbaric disqualification provisions.

Improvement in unemployment compensation is the single most effective method available to the States in meeting without delay the problems arising out of unemployment. Improved benefits and duration will not only ease the hardships suffered by the families of the jobless workers; they will also bolster the purchasing-power base upon which the States' economies depend.

The increased benefits and duration should be made available immediately to all workers who have unexpired benefit years.

Moratorium

A moratorium should be declared on all mortgage, installment, and other debts of laid-off workers. Foreclosure and repossessions should be prohibited pending their return to work.

Public works

(a) Construction schedules should be accelerated and telescoped on all State-financed public works, planned or in progress, to provide maximum employment with a minimum of delay.

(b) To prepare for future contingencies, the States should plan and prepare their public-works programs well in advance so that construction may begin without delay whenever needed to avoid unemployment.

Approval of SUB integration

The few States which now block supplementation of State benefits under SUB plans should act immediately to remove the barriers.

As experience has already demonstrated SUB benefits, like improvements in State unemployment-compensation benefits, can relieve immediate hardship and inject additional purchasing power into the States' economies. States which have not acted to permit integration of the two types of benefits are injuring their own citizens—both workers and the business and professional groups dependent on workers' purchasing power.

MUNICIPAL ACTION

Public works

As in the case of Federal and State public-works programs:

(a) Construction schedules on municipal public works, planned or in progress, should be accelerated and telescoped to provide maximum employment with a minimum of delay.

(b) To prepare for future contingencies, the cities should plan and prepare their public-works programs well in advance whenever needed to avoid unemployment.

Industrial rehabilitation

Municipal governments should take the initiative in seeking the enactment of legislation to provide Federal financial aid to city and metropolitan area industrial rehabilitation programs.

Information for municipal planning

Municipal governments in the automotive, agricultural implement, and aircraft production centers should insist that the corporations provide them fully and frankly with a regular flow of information with respect to corporate plans that may affect the welfare of the communities involved.

The major corporations in industry are so large and so important in the economic life of so many communities, that their decisions frequently have greater bearing on the welfare of the communities in which they operate than any decisions that can be made by municipal government. In effect, these corporations constitute a private economic government with more far-reaching powers than duly constituted, democratically controlled, local governments.

Corporate decisions, in fact, can frustrate the efforts of local governments to provide for the welfare of their citizens. Certainly, local governments cannot plan properly to achieve their own objectives without knowledge of plans being made by the major industries upon which they depend.

The people of the communities affected by these industries, through their governments, are entitled to know what the corporations plan for them and to bring the force of public opinion to bear against private corporate decisions adverse to their interests.

This applies particularly to such matters as corporate plans for decentralization and the location of new plant facilities, the impact of automation on community employment opportunities, the impact of production scheduling and product pricing on employment and local business, and so forth.

It is imperative, therefore, that procedures be established for regular, full, and frank consultation between the corporations and the municipalities dependent upon them. Only through such machinery will it be possible to introduce an element of social responsibility into the private economic decisions of the auto corporations.

Information and education

Local governments are close to the people. They feel much more quickly than State or National Government the impact of economic fluctuations on the welfare of their citizens. It is therefore the responsibility of municipal governments not only to formulate and carry out their own plans to meet unemployment problems but also to bring those problems sharply to the attention of the broad public and of State and Federal Governments in order to assure that they carry their share of the responsibility for relieving individual and community hardships and providing work opportunities for the jobless; and be it further

Resolved, That we support the efforts of our Canadian members and of the Canadian trade union movement to meet the problems raised by the particularly severe unemployment in Canada; and be it further

Resolved, That we call upon the leadership of the united labor movement, the AFL–CIO, to convene a national full employment conference in Washington at the earliest possible date to mobilize the broadest support of the labor movement and the public at large behind efforts to get prompt and effective action at all levels of government; and be it further

Resolved, That we call upon the UAW international executive board to convene full employment conferences on an area, regional, or national basis, as seems advisable, to mobilize our own members and the leaders of their communities for similar action; and be it finally

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to the President of the United States, Members of Congress, to governors and mayors of States and municipalities where unemployment is highest, and to appropriate officials at comparable levels in Canada.

An American Story: Caxton Printers—A Unique Venture in Publishing

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY DWORSHAK

OF IDAHO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, March 10, 1958

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article which chronicles the success of an Idaho printing firm and tells a story of a publishing house that is more than a business.

The article appeared in Human Events of October 12, 1957, and outlines the unique story of Caxton Printers and its people—a firm which we in Idaho are proud to have in the book-publishing field.

This article concerns a business operation which stands in sharp contrast to the trend of today—a publishing house which prints works because of their thought-provoking contents, a printing firm that courageously presents the views of thoughtful men who sometimes disturb the tranquillity of the materialistic mind by probing into what is happening in America, and why.

It has been my privilege to know J. H. Gipson, Sr., president of Caxton Printers, for many years. I urge my colleagues to read this article, which is a just recognition of the printing house built on independent thought.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AN AMERICAN STORY: CAXTON PRINTERS—A UNIQUE VENTURE IN PUBLISHING

(By E. V. Stanley)

Twenty miles or so west of Boise lies the town of Caldwell, Idaho (population 10,000). Though physically remote from such power centers as Washington, New York, and Chicago, Caldwell harbors one of the crucially important political phenomena of the day. For it is the home of 1 of the mere 3 or 4 publishing houses where books stressing economic individualism and unyielding anti-communism may still find ready acceptance.

The publishing house in question is called the Caxton Printers, Ltd., a prosperous concern well known to natives of the surrounding Idaho countryside for its journeymen work on such specialties as greeting cards, announcements, and school supplies. Caxton has a national reputation as well, built through a labor of love: With no prospect of financial gain, it has made available to American conservatives important literature that would otherwise have been buried under the relentless pressure of liberal conformity.

Caxton's president is J. H. Gipson, Sr., a liberated spirit who personifies all that is resourceful, self-reliant, and imaginative in the saga of American individualism. With his father, Gipson built the Caxton Printers from meager beginnings to its present sizable dimensions, today handling a volume of business estimated at a million and a half dollars annually. Even so, it remains an enterprise in the classic American mold. Here is no purveyor of mass mediocrity or impersonal haven for the organization man. Caxton management is a family affair, including Gipson's two sons and a son-in-law. Their craftsmanship is personalized and loving, so that every Caxton book has a recognizable character—sturdy and solid, short on New York publishing frills, long on durability and substance. Every book made on the Caxton premises is hand bound, fashioned for the long service required by anyone who loves and uses books.

Caxton first made the transition from printshop to publishing house with the publication, in 1925, of a volume called the Idaho Citizen. This first venture, by virtue of the book's becoming a staple in the list of Idaho State textbooks, was, in Gipson's words, "something of a commercial success." But the real leap into the perilous world of book publishing did not occur until several years later.

"About 1928," Gipson says of these beginnings, "we found ourselves making more money than we really needed for our modest wants. One of our principals had some authors in his immediate family and knew how really hard it always has been for new writers, particularly new writers from the West, to find publishers even when they seem to be doing worthwhile work."

And so the Caxton story took a new, and peculiarly American twist. To exist, Caxton had built a profitable concern. This done, it used its resources to absorb losses—if by so doing others might benefit.

In embarking on its new course, Caxton thought to help deserving authors who might otherwise never have a chance to publish. "We hadn't any idea," Gipson remarks, "that the venture would be profitable—and it has not." (Gipson is probably one of the few re-

maining American businessmen who would offer deplorably small as an unsolicited description of the sales of any of his products.) Americana and fiction—the latter including Vardis Fisher's controversial In Tragic Life—were the standard commodities in Caxton's earliest phase as a publishing house.

Came the 1930's and the roof very nearly fell in. This was not simply owing to the depression; for in the toils of that national misfortune—on top of a considerable previous expansion and a drop in sales of more than one-half—Caxton would lay off none of its employees. Those who wished to remain did so, and all weathered the economic storms together. Meanwhile, net profits fell from $15,000 annually to a deficit of that amount.

To the stress of economic forces was added a more grievous torment—the New Deal of Franklin Roosevelt. Gipson recalls his bouts with the National Recovery Administration: "As an organization we are more or less individualistic and naturally under the old NRA we were in hot water most of the time. Running the Caxton Printers is quite a job for those of us who have put in a quarter of a century at it, and we didn't see quite how it was to be done by bureaucrats in Washington 3,000 miles away * * * had it not been for the Supreme Court decision outlawing NRA, the Caxton Printers would have been spoken of in the past tense."

After these scrapes, Caxton was also afflicted with tragic visitations of theft and fire. The big fire of March 17, 1937, razed the Caxton plant to the ground, consuming manuscripts, records, drawings. Again the Gipson vitality won out; in 2 months, scarcely missing a beat in its schedule of printing commitments, Caxton Printers was completely rebuilt and functioning as of yore.

All thesse tribulations were in the way of a testing—perhaps a strengthening—of the Gipson fiber. For shortly ahead lay what was in many ways the most audacious, and most portentous, by Coxton's publishing adventures—inspired by the dean of modern American libertarianism, Albert Jay Nock. In 1938, Nock wrote in the American Mercury that he was trying, with small success, to persuade publishers to reprint Herbert Spencer's The Man vs. The State. Nock speculated that the impact of this book, if read and comprehended by 5,000 leaders of American opinion, might turn the gathering totalitarian hurricane from our shores. Gipson acted on Nock's hope, and brought out a limited edition of Spencer's classic. The course had been entered, and Caxton undertook to bring out a select number of similar libertarian books in the succeeding years.

The result is a choice list of over 30 books which are essential to an understanding of our contemporary woe. In addition to Spencer's crushing refutation of the New Tories seeking to impose statism on the people of Great Britain, the Caxton Libertarian Library includes books by Nock, Ayn Rand, Cecil Palmer, Erik von Kuehnelt-Leddihn, William Graham Sumner, Felix Wittmer, Garet Garrett and many others.

The flavor of the Caxton brand of publishing may be tasted from inspecting a few of these books.

Garet Garrett's the People's Pottage, for example, is a ringing indictment of America's advance into statism. Garrett, one of our truly great prose artists, shows how the various measures of the New Deal meshed to form a total Socialist unity. He then examines the disastrous consequences of continued profligacy in Government spending at home and abroad. No one can read this truly moving book without conjuring up a none-too-distant apocalypse for America.

In The British Socialist Ill-Fare State, Cecil Palmer pumps stinging buckshot into the fat haunches of the Laborite experiment. Here is a wealth of illustration and argument that should jolt the craftiest of collectivists into silence.

It is fitting that Our Enemy, the State—Albert Jay Nock's lucid assault on statism—should be included in the Caxton library. An essential statement of true Americanism by a disaffected American, it should be read in conjunction with the Nock-recommended book which began the Caxton series, The Man vs. The State.

Also a must on the Caxton list is the irrefutable reasoning of Spencer's American counterpart—William Graham Sumner. What Social Classes Owe to Each Other, Sumner's demolition of the very sophistries and fallacies which plague us today, will be particularly remembered for describing the original forgotten man:

"The type and formula of most schemes of philanthropy or humanitarianism is this: A and B put their heads together to decide what C shall be made to do for D. The radical vice of all these schemes, from a sociological point of view, is that C is not allowed a voice in the matter, and his position, character, and interests, as well as the ultimate effects on society through C's interests, are entirely overlooked. I call C the Forgotten Man."

Erik von Kuehnelt-Leddihn tackles the central domestic question of our time head on: can we indulge in an orgy of economic leveling, he asks, and still retain our essential freedoms? In a literate and scholarly analysis, he shows that the answer must be a definite "No." Liberty or Equality is among the most penetrating works of social and political commentary available today—a fitting addition to the Caxton list.

So the Libertarian Library runs, a veritable motherlode of good American sense—the richest vein of ore in Idaho's rich mining country. And—what is especially reassuring—more such valuable books will be added as time passes. President Gipson's commentary on Caxton's initial experience with The Man vs. The State conveys the matter-of-fact fastness of the company's intention. Nock's pessimistic forecast of sales, Gipson notes, was correct—"because the first printing that we brought out in 1940 amounted to 1,500 copies and, notwithstanding a great press from the reviewers, it took us more than 5 years to sell it."

He concludes, simply: "However, since then we have published many other books and monographs, some of which have sold much better, and we will publish others."

Here is a quiet determination that will not falter before the latest winds of doctrine, nor buckle under the raw demands of liberalism's transient power.

Export-Import Bank Is Our Most Profitable, Practical, and Beneficial Foreign-Aid Operation

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GORDON L. McDONOUGH

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 3, 1958

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, the Export-Import Bank is performing an outstanding service in the field of international relations and the establishment of good will by making loans not only to foreign nations, but also directly to private enterprise in foreign nations.

The loans of the Export-Import Bank are repaid and create trade. And in my opinion, assistance to foreign nations and their citizens through sound loans such as those offered by the Export-Import Bank is far superior to the giveaway programs which have been financed through foreign aid.

The following article, Eximbank Good News for the United States Taxpayer, is an excellent review of the important and constructive accomplishments of the Export-Import Bank:

EXPORT-IMPORT BANK—GOOD NEWS FOR THE UNITED STATES TAXPAYER

(By Blake Clark)

A policeman in a Texas border town was startled not long ago to see a cow gallop past, hotly pursued by a half dozen shouting Mexicans. He joined the chase and in the excitement pulled his gun. Suddenly he found himself flat on his back, laid low by a flying tackle from a little man yelling wildly in Spanish. Haled into court, the Mexican farmer got a sympathetic hearing. The judge ruled that any man who would tackle an armed officer to protect a highly prized cow bound for his stock-poor Mexican homeland deserved to go free.

This incident shows how much a loan from the Export-Import Bank, which is owned by the United States Treasury, can mean to an individual beyond our borders. For that cow was one of 20,000 beef cattle and milkers bought by Mexican farmers last fall and winter from ranchers in 14 of our drought-stricken Midwest States. The Mexicans paid with $5 million lent by the bank to the Agricultural Credit Bank of Mexico; they have 4 years in which to repay the loans.

This transaction is paying triple dividends. It was a godsend to many American ranchers who would have been forced for lack of fodder to dump their cattle on a glutted market. The fine breeds are building up herds below the border, providing our neighbors with better beef and more milk. And the loan, guaranteed in full by the Mexican Government, will earn $135,000 a year in interest over a 4-year period for the Export-Import Bank.

Eximbank, as it is popularly known, enables the United States to help build up living standards around the world while strengthening our own economy. Thanks to credits it has extended, men are mining manganese along the Amazon, uranium in Africa, copper in Peru; building railroads in Africa and Iran; developing hydroelectric power in the Philippines and Brazil; manufacturing cement in Indonesia, fertilizer in Egypt. Equipment and products for projects the bank finances are purchased from United States firms, with few exceptions.

Created in 1934, the bank has $1 billion of capital stock, all owned by the United States Treasury, and authority from Congress to borrow 4 billion more from the Treasury. As of last June it had money out working on 635 projects in some 60 countries. In 23 years it has paid $362.8 million in interest and dividends to the United States Treasury and accumulated a $442.8 million surplus. It is one Government agency that makes money for the United States taxpayer. Losses from bad loans are phenomenally low: One hundredth of 1 percent. (Commercial bank losses average nine times that.)

The Export-Import Bank differs from the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development (the World Bank) in that the latter is owned by 62 member nations and makes only government-guaranteed loans, while the Export-Import Bank extends more than half its credits directly to private enterprise. The Export-Import Bank lends

more money, makes more profit, spends far less than the World Bank.

New Zealand's Murupara project, financed in part by a $16 million Export-Import Bank loan, is an excellent example of how such loans benefit both a foreign country and the United States. In 1913 the New Zealand Forestry Service planted an extensive tract of pulpwood trees on wasteland where the volcanic-ash soil, plus a climate so mild that plants grow 46 weeks a year, make the annual growth many times that of similar forests in Canada, Scandinavia, or the United States.

To take full advantage of this resource, which is expected to produce some 30 million cubic feet of wood a year, the New Zealand Government and the Tasman Pulp & Paper Co., working together, decided to develop electric power in the area and to construct lumber, chemical pulp, and newsprint mills. Total cost will be $84 million, of which the $16 million from the Export-Import Bank is for the purchase of United States products such as machinery for manufacturing paper.

Until the Murupara project, New Zealand's economy was based almost entirely on dairy products, meat, and wool. Now the country is exporting lumber, chemical pulp, and newsprint—and on newsprint it is saving $10 million a year formerly spent to import it from abroad. This saving may now be spent on other imports, either to develop the economy or to provide a higher standard of living, thereby making New Zealand a better market for a variety of United States products.

In pre-Nasser 1946 an Egyptian businessman, Ahmed Abboud Pasha, flying one day with a friend over the petroleum refineries at Suez, saw flaming waste gas flaring from tall stacks. "You could use that waste gas to produce nitrogen fertilizer," remarked the friend, Col. Frederick Pope, former president of the Chemical Construction Corporation of New York.

A year later Abboud showed Export-Import Bank officers engineering designs and economic studies prepared by Colonel Pope's firm, and requested a loan to build a fertilizer plant. The bankers investigated, let Abboud's company have $7,250,000. Today the plant uses the waste gases for fuel and as a source of hydrogen, which is combined with nitrogen taken from the air and limestone from nearby quarries to make fertilizer to increase Egypt's food production.

The number of United States firms getting a boost in sales from one of these export-import loans is astonishing. One $61,500,000 series of credits to a Chilean steel company resulted in 7,807 separate orders to 780 United States suppliers. Overseas sales are only a small percentage of our total business, but for certain segments of our agriculture and industry they are crucial. William Blackie, executive vice president of Caterpillar Tractor Co., says that his firm sells abroad one-third of its entire output, much of this on export-import credits. Without that business, Caterpillar would have no work for more than one-third of its 36,000 employees and its domestic payroll would be lower by about $70 million a year.

What about the harm done to a United States industry when foreigners start making a basic product like steel? Americans raised this objection when Export-Import Bank granted a $45-million loan to Brazil for a steel mill. Here is how it worked out.

The site chosen was Volta Redonda, 65 miles northwest of Rio de Janeiro. This once-sleepy place is now an attractive town with schools, hospital and recreation facilities for 40,000 people. All this building required steel and innumerable other products, many of which were purchased in the United States. Further purchases in the United States of supplies to run the plant itself have, in the course of years, amounted to more than the original loan. Each year the company buys 400,000 tons of coal from West Virginia.

Meanwhile, Brazil's production of steel stimulated the construction of dozens of steel-using industries, producing everything from refrigerators to railway cars. As this Brazilian industrial development progressed, the Volta Redonda mill could not cope with the new demands. By 1951, 5 years after Volta Redonda got in full swing, Brazilian builders had increased their total purchase of United States steel by more than one-third.

Benefits to us from Export-Import Bank loans to friendly neighbors multiply in other ways. Our industrial machine requires an increasing supply of manganese for steel production. Since we must import 90 percent of our manganese, the discovery in Brazil 15 years ago of one of the world's richest stores of this ore was of vital interest.

A woodsman named Mario Cruz, prospecting for gold along the Amazon, picked up a huge rock as ballast for his canoe. Its strange, grayish appearance excited his curiosity, and he took it to the governor of the territory. It proved to be 55 percent pure manganese. Mario Cruz led geologists to gigantic outcroppings of the ore. Shortly afterward a $67,500,000 Export-Import loan to a private company, Industria e Comercio de Minerios, S. A., got Brazilian production underway. Now the precious ore is coming out at the rate of a million tons a year, and almost all of it comes to us.

Similarly, when miners in Africa discovered significant amounts of uranium in gold ore, our Atomic Energy Commission asked Export-Import Bank to grant loans to help the mining companies there extract it. As a result, many plants are now producing substantial tonnages.

Other Export-Import Bank backed projects are moving mountainsides in Afghanistan (for highways), finding and drilling water wells in the desert of Iraq, building a railroad along the banks of the crocodile-infested Limpopo River in Mozambique.

Export-Import Bank has never competed with private capital. It works closely with commercial banks. "There is no competition between Export-Import Bank and us," declares the head of the foreign department of a great American bank. "We commercial bankers seldom lend for exports for longer than 180 days. We don't want our money tied up in long-term investments abroad."

The man who minds the Export-Import Bank till is Samuel Clark Waugh, 67, formerly a Lincoln, Nebr., banker and Deputy Under Secretary of State for Economic Affairs. Before he became president in 1955, the bank averaged only 50 credits a year. Last year its directors authorized 182 credits totaling $1,066,000,000 to borrowers in 36 countries. One unusual loan—to help Britain keep the pound stable—was for $500 million; others were for as little as $2,000. Waugh is a firm advocate of trade to replace aid.

Says he: "We must build up other countries if the United States is to continue to grow and prosper. We can't keep selling abroad unless they can pay. They can do this by accepting a gift, by borrowing, or by earning dollars. For all concerned, the best way is to help them earn dollars by producing goods."

Dr. Dreistein Writes the White House

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 3, 1958

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, although the following is written with a humorous touch, a very serious message is conveyed. I commend it to the attention of our colleagues.

The article appeared in the New Republic, December 30, 1957, issue.

DR. DREISTEIN WRITES THE WHITE HOUSE

(By J. Lincoln Paine)

A letter sent by Albert Einstein to President Roosevelt on August 3, 1939, launched the nuclear age by bringing to the President's attention the phenomenon and promise of atomic energy. In this not-so-gentle spoof of bureaucratic language and practice, a somewhat similar letter gets different treatment. The author, a scientist intimately familiar with the administrative labyrinth that faces a technical project in the Government, writes under a pen name. Professor Dreistein is, of course, an entirely fictional character.

ADVANCED RESEARCH INSTITUTE,
Cambridge, Mass., August 2, 1961.

THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES,
The White House,
Washington, D. C.

ESTEEMED SIR: Some recent work by my colleague, Professor Hauck, of Pretoria, has been communicated to me in manuscript. His findings lead me to believe that scientists may be able to counteract the forces of gravity in the near future. Undoubtedly, if Hauck's new discoveries are further developed and applied, a vast new area of space exploration and missile development will open.

The situation which has arisen seems to call for watchfulness and, if necessary, quick action on the part of the administration. My colleagues here have urged me to bring this obviously significant development to the attention of the appropriate Government authorities. I believe, therefore, that it is my duty to bring to your attention some of the scientific facts which are attached in a separate memorandum.

Of course, my colleagues and I offer our full services toward the further development of this discovery.

Very truly yours,

EGBERT DREISTEIN.

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Office of the Special Assistant to the President, 16 August 1961.

To: The Secretary of Defense.

Attached is copy of letter from Prof. Egbert Dreistein. Draft reply for my signature. Be polite. Incidentally, is there anything to this?

GRANT QUINCEY.

INTER-OFFICE MEMORANDUM

Date: 2 September 1961.
Ref.: CPT-201/1.

To: Col. T. Lee, OPS.
From: The Secretary.

Prepare reply to attachment. Is the institute under contract to the DOD? Quote me their budget figures for the last three fiscal years.

Official use only

INTER-OFFICE MEMORANDUM

Date: 29 June 1962.
Ref.: CPT-201/179.

To: The Secretary.
From: Col. T. Lee, OPS.

The matter referred to in your memorandum CPT-201/1 of 2 September 1961 has been referred to an Inter-Service Ad Hoc Committee of staff-rank representatives. The committee concurred that there was no consensus on the problem.

Individual views were as follows:

1. The Army feels that ordinary gravity is not fully understood yet and sees little purpose in extending studies into the field of antigravity.

2. The Air Force has been conducting small-scale research on antigravity at the top secret level. However, since it is impossible to extend the concept to fit existing

weapons systems, a low priority has been assigned.

3. The Navy has recommended a high priority to anti-anti-gravity investigations under the code name of Plop.

There is no record in DOD files of a facility clearance for the Advanced Research Institute. Professor Dreistein has never applied for a Q clearance. Given the sensitive nature of the anti-gravity question and the extenuating circumstances, the attached draft reply to Professor Dreistein has been made as clear as classification permits.

The committee reached agreement on a single point: Professor Dreistein should not be encouraged. A permanent subcommittee has been set up to provide similar assistance in expediting the handling of any future suggestions from the scientific community.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,
2 July 1962.

To Special Assistant to the President:

In reference to your request of 16 August 1961, attached is draft reply to Prof. Egbert Dreistein.

The receipt of Professor Dreistein's letter has stimulated reexamination of the status of antigravity research in the Department of Defense. Estimated future budgetary allocations for that type of research do not warrant continuation of the projects which have been under way. Accordingly, I have issued an order that they be curtailed.

FRANK WATT.

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Office of the Special Assistant to the President, 5 July 1962.

Prof. EGBERT DREISTEIN,
The Advanced Research Institute, Cambridge, Mass.

DEAR PROF. DREISTEIN: The President has directed me to reply to your letter of 2 August 1961. We thank you for your interest and assure you that the matter has been investigated by appropriate Government agencies.

Your patriotic interest is very much appreciated and the President is always interested in receiving stimulating ideas of that nature.

Yours very truly,

GRANT QUINCY.

MOSCOW, AUG. 5 (1964).—A Soviet spokesman announced today that a manned space station has been established as a satellite around Mars and is now observing landing conditions on that planet.

The achievement was credited to the revolutionary discoveries of Prof. Otto Hauck, formerly of South Africa and now in the Soviet Union. He has been awarded three Lenin prizes for his work.

THE WHITE HOUSE,
6 August 1964.

Prof. EGBERT DREISTEIN,
The Advanced Research Institute, Cambridge, Mass.

DEAR PROFESSOR DREISTEIN: My advisers report to me that you have been interested in the subject of antigravity research. Because of the grave circumstances in which our Government finds itself as a result of the announcement from Moscow yesterday, I am asking you to lead a new high priority project in that direction.

If you will come to Washington the early part of next week, a briefing will be arranged by representatives of the military services and the Central Intelligency Agency who will be able to give you a little of the historical development of Professor Hauck's work.

I, as President, personally hope that you and your colleagues will rise to the challenge of this new emergency.

Yours very truly,

HORATIO CALVIN.

American Merchant Ships, Foreign Trade, and National Security

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOR C. TOLLEFSON
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 10, 1958

Mr. TOLLEFSON. Mr. Speaker, I have just read again the excellent address of our colleague, the Honorable FRANK T. BOW of Ohio, before the American Merchant Marine Conference and the Propeller Club Convention, at Houston, Tex., on October 22, 1957. I had previously read a copy of the speech last fall during the recess of Congress, and would have placed it in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD then had Congress been in session. It is an outstanding address given by one of the outstanding Members of the House of Representatives. Mr. Bow's contributions to the well-being of our Nation have been many. Amongst them has been his fine work in behalf of the American Merchant Marine which is our country's fourth arm of defense and which is an important segment of our economy. I insert his address in the RECORD so that other Members of Congress may read it.

AMERICAN MERCHANT SHIPS, FOREIGN TRADE, AND NATIONAL SECURITY

Quite frankly, my views of your great industry have altered radically in the last few years. Sometime ago, before I became a member of the House Appropriations Committee, I do not think it would have occurred to the Propeller Club to extend the sort of invitation that brings me here today.

In recent years, however, I have had the opportunity to become much more acquainted with the objectives, problems and contributions of the United States Merchant Marine. And no one, as we know, is more zealous than a convert.

What has brought about this conversion? As you might expect, it has been the opportunity, for which I shall always be grateful, of serving as a member of the House Appropriations Committee. I have attended literally hundreds of hearings and heard scores of industries and Government agencies present their justifications for Government financial support.

The testimony given at these hearings varies, of course, both in style and skill of preparation and execution. As committee members, our great challenge, always, is to overlook personalities and other surface impressions and probe for the real issues involved. Why, we must ask ourselves, is the request for financial assistance necessary at all? Is it reasonable in amount—or is the appropriation sought more than required? Or, as sometimes happens, is it inadequate to do the job properly? Is it in line with past requests—and if not, why not? What is its importance to the national interest relative to other Government obligations? Must the expenditure be made now, or can it be deferred?

As taxpayers, I am confident that you would be gratified by the skill and patience which committee members, notably Congressman PRINCE PRESTON of Georgia and your own ALBERT THOMAS of Texas, exercise in assuring that our recommendations will result in a fair return on each tax dollar.

But Congressmen, of course, are human. They frequently enter Congress with preconceived points of view, subconsciously or not, on many issues with which they will have to deal as committee members. These are predispositions formed by childhood, education, geographical environment, and other factors. The last factor—geography—had, I suppose, much to do with my early disinterested view regarding the merchant marine. You see remarkably few C-3's on Nimishillen Creek in Stark County, Ohio, where I come from. My childhood sleep was seldom lulled by the sound of surf or interrupted by foghorns.

MIDWEST GREAT SOURCE OF CARGO

There are many others like me in this country. Yet it is we who are the great source of your cargoes, inbound and outbound; and we of Ohio, we of the Midwest, and we of all the inland areas have a right to know more about you. You have an obligation—to us and to yourselves—to make us aware of your tremendous contributions to our economic and our military strength.

It is not enough that you are ably represented in Washington. We in Congress are obliged to steer a navigable course between our responsibilities to our constituents and, where there is a difference, our conviction as to what is best for all the country. Our Nation's need for adequate ocean transportation under its own flag has become crystal clear to me; it may be less clear, and understandably so, to many other people of Ohio and the Midwest.

It is my duty to act in the best interests of the merchant marine where I consider this, as I must do, to be congruent with the best interests of Ohio and the entire country. I would think that it is your obligation and opportunity, more so than mine, to make known this mutuality of interests that exists between the United States merchant marine and inland America.

Consider for a moment that national problem—the national budget. Paring anything from the costs of governing this burgeoning population of ours is inexplicably difficult. Yet, your industry is part and parcel of an $18 billion entry on the credit side of the national ledger. I refer, of course, to our income from the goods we sell abroad. There would, of course, still be foreign trade without an American merchant marine. But what sort of foreign trade? And at what cost, in terms of reliability, freight rates, assured access to vital imports we lack domestically, and so on? This is obviously too important a piece of United States income to be handed over, lock, stock, and barrel, to our foreign friends—much less our foreign enemies.

A full 8 percent of all those goods we produce that can be moved at all are shipped overseas to foreign customers. Can we trust their delivery to our competitors? I think not. Our worldly wise British friends have an expression applicable here that requires little explanation. The gist of it is, "Don't lend your doughnut to your friend." Or, as they say in New York, "Does Macy's tell Gimbels?"

NATION DEPENDENT ON AMERICAN MERCHANT SHIPS

Few persons in the country know better than you assembled here today how dependent we are on shipping and foreign trade to sustain life in our Nation's industrial machine. I thought I had a fair idea of our dependence upon imports, but I learned just this week that there are only two metals (magnesium and molybdenum) for which we are not at least partially dependent on foreign supplies.

Coming as I do from a highly industrialized area, totally dependent on imports to keep its assembly lines busy and its workers employed, I respect the words I heard recently from one of your industry's greatest leaders, James A. Farrell, Jr.: "The carriage of our export and imports," he said, "is too

critical to the health of American industry—which is, after all, the ultimate source of our defensive strength—to be entrusted to the whims, vagaries, and competitive urges of foreign maritime powers. It is a national jewel far too precious for delivery by the first available messenger."

Let me tell you something else about this Mr. Farrell, while I am about it. He visited my hometown of Canton recently, at my suggestion and at the invitation of our Chamber of Commerce, and what he had to say there about your industry and what it means to Canton and the surrounding area was an education to all those fortunate enough to hear him. I readily admit that I learned some things about Ohio's kinship with the merchant marine that were news to me. Let me mention just one figure that I shall not soon forget. The Committee of American Steamship Lines, which Mr. Farrell represented during his Canton visit, did some work with a pencil and a research economist and developed figures showing that Ohio's share of United States exports last year totaled approximately $1 billion.

Now, gentlemen, let us be completely realistic. If you will take the time to develop figures like that for every State in the Union, and make this information available to the people in interesting, understandable terms, you shall certainly have an easier job from here on in, gaining understanding and justifying support for the United States merchant marine. All this, of course, has to do only with the commercial aspects of our national shipping policy. I am not one of those who believe that national defense considerations are the sole basis for Government support to United States shipping.

I see no sensible distinction between a strong domestic industrial economy and a secure military potential. I see no way in which we can be commercially dependent and militarily secure. I have no formula for developing military independence out of an industrial machine beholden to foreign powers for its bread and water.

MERCHANT MARINE VITAL TO DEFENSE

Nor, so long as we are on this military tack, do I subscribe for an instant to the view that modern warfare has altered the role of our merchant marine. I say this confidently because, unlike some of my associates in Washington, I am not hobbled by the gift of clairvoyance. I do not know what form modern warfare will take. Will the world really seek suicide with an all-out hydrogen war? Or will the very effectiveness of modern weapons serve to prevent their use, reducing future combats to such primitive techniques as those employed in Korea and World War II? For safety's sake, must we not assume something in between the two, in which event the need for seapower and reliable ocean transportation will be no less than it has been historically? Should we risk arming to the teeth with H-bombs and ICBM's, only to find ourselves helpless against any well-directed musket fire?

I make no pretenses at being a military expert; I can only impose the tests of commonsense and past experience on the arguments of those who are. But isn't it reasonable to assume that one way to determine how the next war shall be fought is to examine the facts as we know them to be, then lay our plans from there—fully prepared to revise them as subsequent information, not hunches, indicate?

If that is so, then isn't there some useful indication of the war to come in the fact that Russia currently has a fleet of more than 475 submarines, and is building them at the rate of better than 80 a year? Let me remind you that Hitler started World II with but 57 submarines. Russia, obviously, foresees the need to destroy as much enemy shipping as possible in any future war—which would suggest that she believes merchant ships are important to us, even if some of our own people do not.

SOVIET NAVY GAINING ON UNITED STATES

Since 1950, in fact, the Soviet Navy has been outbuilding our own in combatant tonnage of many classes. They have outbuilt us in destroyers 9 to 1, and in cruisers 14 to 1.

Russia fully appreciates the fact, which some of our own countrymen seem quick to forget, that last year 99.6 percent of our commercial tonnage was carried in ships and 99.15 percent of our military tonnage. One reason for this is that it requires 4 tons of aviation gasoline to fly 1 ton of freight across the Atlantic, for example. So it is clear why Russia would seek to deprive us, when the time comes, of access by sea to our friends, allies and forces overseas. And should she obtain control of these seas, she would dominate nearly 95 percent of the earth's surface.

Will airpower, not immediately, but eventually, make shipping obsolete? I cannot foresee it, but again, I would rather look into the facts than into a crystal ball. Facts show me, as we have seen, that over 99 percent of our foreign trade is currently moved in ships. Every day more than 2,000 merchant ships are traveling the North Atlantic sealanes alone. True, this may change, but I am confident that such change is not so imminent that it could possibly affect the plans we make today. And as of today, there is nothing under this sun to challenge the payload carrying capacity of an oceangoing ship.

You of the maritime industry, then, have much to claim for the role that ocean shipping is destined to play for an indeterminate number of years. You also have problems, of course, that are serious and require assiduous attention. One particularly prominent area for critical self-examination and improvement is cargo handling which, I understand, absorbs between 50 and 60 percent of a cargo liner's revenue. The same attention should be directed to unity within your industry so that you can speak clearly and authoritatively on issues that concern all of you. Then, of course, your labor-management relationship is an area of continuing concern to all Americans.

INDUSTRY SHOULD GET COMMUNICATIVE

None of these problems are easy, but neither are they insoluble. Nor are they the only ones you face. One of the most important of these remaining has to do with your public. This problem will be discussed rather fully by another speaker, so I shall not dwell on it except to say this: that I am part of your public. So are all the other Members of Congress. What you do and what you tell the public about what you are doing will be seen, heard and read by us as well as others. I would suggest that your industry get more communicative. Certainly a long and fruitful step in this direction has been that taken by the committee of American steamship lines. I would hope other industry representatives would follow the committee's example of visiting Midwestern communities to talk in factual terms about the impact that reliable ocean transportation has on their economics.

I understand that it has visited Cedar Rapids and Racine as well as Canton, with top line executives touring local plants, appearing on radio and television and speaking before chambers of commerce and manufacturers associations on the importance of a strong merchant marine. This should be a continuing activity.

The reason that such efforts must be unceasing is clear. Since the Merchant Marine Act of 1936 was passed, the taxpayers have contributed $1,028,000,000 to the support of the United States merchant marine in the form of construction and operating subsidies. Based on present population figures, that breaks down to little more than the cost of a pack of cigarettes a year per capita. Nevertheless, it is still more than a billion dollars. But, in my opinion, it is an expenditure that can be justified.

It is simply the nature of the business you are in that justification before the bar of public opinion is an additional task you must assume willingly and execute both skillfully and unceasingly. It is not enough that certain of us in Washington are aware of the need for an adequate United States merchant marine. Our constitutents in every town and village should be equally aware. I wonder if they are?

This, gentlemen, is an opportunity for your industry; more importantly, it is your responsibility to your country.

Minnesota—Past and Present

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, March 10, 1958

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, this is Minnesota's centennial year. The March issue of the Minnesota Farmer, serving Minnesota farm families for over 45 years, contains 2 editorials on Minnesota past and present.

I ask unanimous consent that the editorials entitled "So Young—Yet So Old," and "Centennial Thoughts" be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SO YOUNG—YET SO OLD

It has been 100 years since Minnesota was admitted to the Union as a State.

While 100 years seems like a long time and many great developments and progress have been made in that time, the State is still young—and yet, the land within its boundaries is so very old.

Records show that 200 years before Minnesota's birth as a State, the first white men, two young Frenchmen, Sieur des Grosseilliers and Pierre Radisson, explored parts of Minnesota and wrote the story of their travels here. Others may have explored the State previously but their records are rather dim.

But the history of this land goes back much further than that. The little time covered by man's written records is but a snap of the finger compared to the vast expanse of time that Nature has been working over the mountainous masses of rocks, wearing them down, and breaking them into smaller particles through ages of wind and water erosion, freezing and thawing, long areas of volcanic upheavals, and extensive periods of floods and wtaer inundations and marine life.

Nature began the preparation of this great fertile State when the first drop of rain sizzled off the molten masses and began its slow process of wear and tear to the eventual reduction of the masses to a powdery form on which we depend so much today for growing our crops.

Then in more recent geologic times, the glacial period put the finishing touches to the process. Vast ice masses at various times ground slowly southward crumbling and pulverizing and spreading the masses of materials over the entire territory carrying a lot of our good nutrients so necessary to plant life down across the State of Iowa.

These ice masses gradually melted and receded northward again, leaving draining systems, rivers and valleys, and likes which were so important when man came upon the scene.

So this great expense of soil building by nature, this long process of laying out a landscape so beautiful and so endowed with a wealth of mineral and fertility, reduces man's activity in Minnesota to a mere snap of the finger.

But the available fragments of man's records of more recent developments of this great agricultural area are intensely interesting. Thanks to the many people who have gathered facts and contributed to the accumulation of these records now kept in the archives of the State historical society and to the many county historical collections.

With this thought in mind, most of the pages of this issue of the Minnesota Farmer are devoted to the story of yesterday in our forestlands and prairies, the crude implements with which the early settlers plowed the land and put in crops. It is a story of cooperation between agriculture and allied industries.

Before agriculture could expand much, building materials were needed. The early lumber mills provided that. Then transportation facilities were needed. The railroads furnished that. Then as more grain and livestock was produced, flour mills, stockyards, and slaughtering houses were constructed. These and other industries grew up hand in hand with agricultural development.

At this time, with Minnesota celebrating its 100th birthday, and standing out so prominently as a great agricultural, livestock, and poultry area of the Nation, the Minnesota Farmer salutes not only farmers, but all the allied industries which have contributed to our century of agricultural progress.

CENTENNIAL THOUGHTS

We hear a great deal about Minnesota centennial these days. Here in the cities, parades, celebrations, TV and radio programs, newspapers, and magazines all carry stories, pictures and other reminders that our State is 100 years old this year. The actual birthday date will be May 11.

Prior to that date in 1858 the State was called Minnesota Territory and embraced a lot of territory which is not included within its boundaries today. Conditions were much different then. But now that our State has reached the 100-year mark, we naturally try to imagine what went on during the past 100 years to make Minnesota what it is today. Also we wonder what might happen within the next 100 years.

As one of our office visitors recently remarked, "I guess we can expect just as great things and changes to take place in the next 100 years as what has happened during the past 100 years."

That may be true, it's easy to look back, but difficult to even imagine the future. But we have some very good records of the past which aid us in measuring the progress made in Minnesota.

Think back around 100 years ago when this State had less than 7,000 citizens, around 300 farmers with only slightly more than 5,000 acres of improved farmlands. That was the record in 1850. Just 8 years later Minnesota became a State. At that early time there was practically no wealth accumulated, and real estate held by settlers was almost unsalable. Money was scarce and interest on borrowed money was 2 percent per month and at times even higher. There were no industries nor manufacturers here at that time. Not even 1 mile of railroad had been constructed. No sound banks or currency existed. Not a cent was in the State's treasury. And to make things worse, a severe depression hit the country that year and the harvest was almost a complete failure.

That is about the way Dean T. H. Fenske of the Minnesota University Institute of Agriculture portrayed it in a talk to visitors attending the recent Farm and Home Week program in St. Paul. It took stouthearted, determined people to stay here in those days and help build the State's future.

Today there are 145,000 farms in Minnesota, not quite as many as a few years ago but farms are larger now. Those farms aggregate over 30 million acres. The forces that played a key role in the development of the State's agriculture since 1858 are clearly brought out by Dean Fenske. They are:

1. Mechanization of most farm operations.
2. Introduction of electricity on a broad scale, through the Rural Electrification Administration.
3. Development of new varieties of crops and livestock and other knowledge by agricultural experiment stations around the country.
4. Growth and development of agricultural education through colleges, schools, vocational courses in high schools and the Future Farmers of America.
5. Development of the Agricultural Extension Service and 4–H Club work.
6. The cooperative movement in agriculture.
7. Development of general farm organizations, such as the Grange, Farm Bureau, and Farmers' Union.
8. Organization of the Soil Conservation Service and soil conservation districts.
9. Government agricultural programs.
10. War—especially World Wars I and II.

Born in a panic back in 1858, there was little else for the State to do but to progress. It couldn't be much worse. Since then farmers and allied industries have made steady progress to lift the State to its present status.

From 1880 to 1885, wheat and other small grains were the major products. By 1880 wheat farming was well established in the Red River Valley.

Livestock farming increased in the southern part of the State from 1885 to 1905. The first cooperative creamery was started in Freeborn County in 1890.

From 1897 to 1917 Minnesota farmers were generally more prosperous than at any time previously. Markets were good and the population of the State was growing.

Then came World War I followed by a price decline in the early 1920's. The farmer's dollar dropped to 77 percent of prewar value. Some recovery was made in the late 1920's, but the great depression of 1929 and the early 1930's saw an avalanche of prices reach record low levels. Corn on Minnesota farms brought 26 cents per bushel. Hogs sold from $4 per hundredweight downward, many below $3. Potatoes sold at 28 cents per bushel.

Pointing to recent progress in farming, Fenske referred to figures from the 30-year-old Southeastern Minnesota Farm Management Association. Farms in that organization since 1928 have grown 42 percent in size. Corn yields have increased by 55 percent per acre. Big litters have doubled per farm, and 382 percent more mechanical power equipment has been added.

On those same farms, he emphasized that 51 percent of total sales—$4,456 per farm—went for cash expenses in 1928, leaving a $2,258 net labor income. In 1956, their total sales averaged $18,844 and 70 percent went for expenses, leaving $5,611 labor income.

Getting back to prospects for the next hundred years, farms are becoming larger, more machines and equipment are being used. This undoubtedly will continue with, perhaps, more speed. Engineers in farm equipment are already working on ideas for higher speed in farm equipment. In fact this seems to be the age of speed for everything, missiles, sputniks, etc. So it is reasonable to feel as our office visitor felt, that developments in the next hundred years could be as great as developments of the past hundred years.

As Fenske said to his Farm and Home Week listeners, "the challenge of tomorrow is to so live to pay in part that debt to the past, so that those who came after may look at what men today are doing and be satisfied with what has been done."

Situation in the Sudan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BARRATT O'HARA
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 10, 1958

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, in view of the present tense situation in the Sudan I am extending my remarks to include a report I made early in the year to my constituents in the Second District of Illinois. This report was based upon my observations as a member of Chairman WAYNE HAYS' subcommittee of the Committee on Foreign Affairs. The gentlewoman from Illinois [Mrs. CHURCH] was the third member of the study group. The report follows:

THE SUDAN

Khartoum is a charming city of 75,000 near the junction of the Blue Nile and the White Nile. In our Embassy the personnel go to work at 6 or 7 in the morning, quit at 2 in the afternoon, as a matter of living with the climate. There are 15 Americans in all, including the Ambassador and the USIS staff which has many headaches not attributable to the climate to make an annual allowance of $36,000 stretch far enough to cover a country a third the size of our country with American books, films, and broadcasts to offset Communist propaganda.

Pitted against this lone Ambassador and his corporal's guard are 61 Soviet diplomats, each with a regal retinué of highly trained persons who engage in every phase of infiltration under the protection of diplomatic immunity.

This is a relatively recent device in Soviet strategy. We found it first in the Sudan. There are six Soviet bloc countries. Instead of one Ambassador representing all, as would be sufficient, a fully accredited Ambassador is assigned by each of the bloc nations. As the Ambassador must have a staff, the reasonable size of which cannot be questioned under diplomatic courtesy, this device is literally flooding Africa, even in countries friendly to us, with past masters at infiltration.

In the Sudan, for instance, we learned that of the 5 newspapers 3 were Soviet controlled either by ownership or subsidy and that individual newsmen had been whispered where to go when in personal need of funds.

This is why the Soviet regards the Sudan as fertile field; northern portion is inhabited by Moslem Arabs, 6 million in all; Southern portion largely by pagan primitive tribesmen, numbering about 4 million, and overall illiteracy is over 90 percent. Moreover, the Sudan is a signatory of the pact and treaties of the Arab League. (It is also a member of the United Nations and is reportedly party to a mutual defense treaty with Ethiopia.)

Despite the tremendous drive the Soviet is making to take over the Sudan, there was

little indication that the infiltration has reached responsible circles. Indeed, everything seemed to the contrary. We had a long talk with the Prime Minister, Sayed Abdulla Bey Khalil, and later were dinner guests at his home. At a reception by the Minister of Foreign Affairs there were 64 guests, with whom we talked freely. We did not miss any facet of opinion.

Most important were our long conferences with the two religious leaders, Sayed Ali al Mirghani and Sayed Aba al Rahman al Mahdi, at their respective homes, which really are palaces. You will remember that it was through an agreement of these rival religious leaders that the present national cabinet was formed and Sudanese independence accelerated. The Sudan has been an independent nation only since January 1, 1956. At present it is governed by a Supreme Commission with the Prime Minister elected by the national house of representatives, 68 of whose 98 members were elected by direct vote. In February of 1958 another election will be held and a permanent constitution adopted.

My conclusion is that the leaders of the Sudan have their hearts and minds set primarily on the development of their own independence, that there is a pretty general feeling of distrust of Egyptian designs, springing largely from a common but conflicting interest in the Nile River, and that the influence of the two great Arab religious leaders will go far in countering Soviet efforts to stir unrest among the people. The not-announced mutual defense treaty with Ethiopia is an indication of the trend.

Nevertheless, the Sudan is a most critical area. We cannot afford to make mistakes. It has been receiving no American aid, has shown willingness to help itself by spending (1957) $50 million of its own money in development projects. It now looks to the World Bank for a loan to build the Roseires Dam on the Blue Nile, opening another 1.2 million acres to irrigation. This is foreign aid on a sound banking basis.

TV Westerns Tell a Story—Our Diplomats Should Watch Them

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KATHARINE ST. GEORGE
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 10, 1958

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, the following article appeared in that great newsletter, Human Events, on March 10.

I think its author, David Shea Teeple, has some sound advice for our diplomats, and maybe for our legislators.

It is a good thing when we want to know what people think, to find out what they read and, in our modern world, what they watch and see.

In the following article we get an answer that shows that the rank and file of our people have not changed very much and that they still believe in right and wrong, black and white, courage and cowardice.

They admire the same virtues that inspired their forefathers who came from many kindreds and climes to make up this Nation. For this, Mr. Speaker, we can be truly thankful.

TV WESTERNS TELL A STORY—OUR DIPLOMATS SHOULD WATCH THEM

(By David Shea Teeple)

In the otherwise gloomy skies of 1958 at least one cloud has a silver lining. The television westerns are telling a story that our diplomats and political leaders should watch.

Many conservatives viewed with alarm the spread of television, recognizing its tremendous capabilities for political indoctrination from Washington. The fireside chats of FDR, after all, were still a vivid memory; and we know who controls most of the radio and television industry in America. To put it mildly, they could seldom be characterized as conservatives.

For some time it looked as though such fears were well founded. For years the American people have been fed a TV diet of psychological dramas portraying the innermost struggles of man with his environment; sociological messages; arty shows, often effeminate in character; plays which ended so abruptly that the present writer (for one) had to inquire of his wife if the show were really over; sex rampant; the eternal triangle, etc.

We know, however, that the Madison Avenue hucksters are motivated by only one goal, namely, profits. The sponsor has got to sell his goods or he will seek another agent. Eventually, the Madison Avenue boys have had to respond to the public demand in TV entertainment or lose out to their more sagacious competitors.

The TV owners and pressure groups did not cause the present situation—it was forced on them by popular demand.

If you want to know what the people demand, take any TV guide for your area and make a compilation. The people want westerns—horse operas. In the Washington, D. C., area (presumably one of the most cynical and sophisticated regions in the country) between 7 and 10 p. m., there are 25 such programs scheduled every week. Just for the record let us list them:

Wells Fargo; Frontier Theatre; Annie Oakley; Have Gun, Will Travel; Tombstone Territory; Tales of the Texas Rangers; Jim Bowie; Judge Roy Bean; Footlight Theatre; Frontier Doctor; Wyatt Earp; The Californians; Wagon Train; Stories of the Century; Cheyenne; Colt 45; Trackdown; Gunsmoke; Zane Grey Theater; Restless Gun; The Lone Ranger; Wild Bill Hickok; Sheriff of Cochise County; Sugarfoot; Maverick.

In the event that anyone believes these to be children's programs, he has only to question his adult neighbors as to their viewing habits. (This does not deny similar leanings among the kids. Christmas trees last year sheltered realistic imitations of almost every type of lethal weapon. It appears that the owner of a nationwide concession of do-it-yourself United Nations peace conference kits would starve to death.)

The format of most TV westerns is basically the same. In fact, it is the same sort of thing that many of us watched in the Saturday matinees in the days of Tom Mix and Hoot Gibson—before we were taken over by a group of fuzzy-minded internationalists.

Did anyone ever see a western hero who lacked courage, integrity, honesty, patriotism, and devotion to his friends? Have you ever seen a horse opera that did not glorify the past of our Nation? Does the hero ever have any question in his mind about what is right and what is wrong? Does the show so much as ever imply that the hero will even consider any compromise with evil? As a viewer, do you ever have any question as to which will triumph—good or evil? Don't the villains have all the bad personal habits and can't you identify one just by looking at him? Isn't there a constant dose of respect for God, women, and the home?

Considering that millions of Americans watch these performances every night, can we draw any conclusions? In the first place this is propaganda—but self-administered propaganda. The public has told the hucksters that if they want to sell their cigarettes, cereals or automobiles via TV they have to present westerns. Furthermore, in the successful western the hero must be a rough-and-ready character, not a dressed-up dude rancher. If he draws his gun somebody is going to get hurt. Nobody pushes him around.

Unless this trend is merely a mechanism for total escape from reality, which the author doubts, wouldn't it be a good idea for our diplomats and political leaders to watch more of these shows? Maybe they could learn something. For example, would Wyatt Earp stop at some frontier equivalent of the 38th parallel when the rustlers were escaping with the herd? Ridiculous. Would Marshal Dillon refuse to allow his deputies to use shotguns for their own defense because of the terrible nature of the weapon? Ha. Would the Lone Ranger under any circumstance allow himself to be bullied and threatened by those who sought to destroy the principles by which he lives? Would Restless Gun or Jim Hardy of Wells Fargo attempt to buy friends who would not support them otherwise? Can you imagine Paladin of Have Gun, Will Travel standing aside while women and children were being massacred? (Dare I mention Hungary?) Can you imagine Cheyenne living in a perpetual state of jitters because he feared the next move of some gunslinger? Can you feature Judge Roy Bean releasing a murderer on some technicality devised by a slick lawyer? Would Wild Bill Hickok sell guns and whisky to the bad men? (Should we mention Tito?)

Our diplomats seem to be going one way while the American people are going the other. While the striped-pants boys appear to be bent on peace at any price, have the American people begun to indicate that what they want is a return to the fundamental virtues which made this Nation great—death before dishonor, justice, liberty, honesty, and human dignity?

The American people seem to have realized (if their taste in television is any indication) that peace with the bad men can only be accomplished if the bad men desire to reform and assume a decent position in society. The reformation must be demonstrated by deeds, and not by words.

The American public, according to these and other signs, wants to abandon the fuzzy-minded philosophy that can see nothing but grey, and return to the days when things were either black or white, right or wrong.

Maybe it would be a good idea to make TV westerns compulsory viewing for United States diplomats so they then will have a rough idea of how the vast majority of the American people are really thinking.

GOP Split Widens Under New Pressures

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 10, 1958

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, in my extension of remarks I include the following analytical and objective article written by William S. White and appearing in the New York Times of March 9, 1958.

GOP SPLIT WIDENS UNDER NEW PRESSURES

(By William S. White)

WASHINGTON, March 8.—The harsh and strange pressures of 1958, a congressional election year, are now rapidly wearing away the thin surface that long has covered a basic division between the Eisenhower and the orthodox Republicans.

It has always been a reluctant accommodation, drawn up as it was between the mod-

ern Republican East and the unmodern Republican heartland of the Middle West upon two factors: the simple power of the Eisenhower Republicans and the simple necessities of the older Republicans from beyond the Alleghenies.

Now the midwestern old man of the party, so to speak, is breaking away from what to him was always an unnatural arrangement.

To a significant degree, the Eisenhower Republicans, in and out of Congress, are now going it alone in their own party on a complex of policy whose indispensable points are foreign aid and reciprocal trade.

The other Republicans—who before this in the last 2 decades have more than once gone it alone—are doing it again, as they had not even attempted to do it since the moderns sealed in 1952 their capture of the party nationally.

The indispensables for these old Republicans are less foreign aid—in a good many instances none at all—and far more domestic aid, especially in the farm subsidies that the President wishes further to cut and in the western water development projects that he wishes to hold down rather than to upgrade.

DIVISION ON TRADE

Where the Eisenhower Republicans seek to foster more and freer world trade, the orthodox Republicans return, with ancient instinct, back toward more and more tariff protectionism.

They look homeward—as they have not done in many years—toward something very similar to what used to be called isolationism.

This gradual but now swiftening parting between the President and the old Republican conservative-to-right factions has, of course, been going on for some time during this Congress.

But how far it had gone had not been widely brought to public notice until this week's press conference statement by the President that he would refuse support to those Republican congressional candidates who did not agree with him on a short but important list of issues that in his mind expressed the big things.

The beginning, and indeed very nearly the end, of this list was made up of what he calls national security issues—foreign aid and strong alliances, foreign trade and stronger common western economies.

He said in effect, with unusual vigor for him—in view of the fact that he has never at any point been a sharp or consistent or determined party leader—that his point of toleration would be passed when Republicans defected on these issues.

CALLED TO TASK

The fact that he drew so clear a line, while arresting in itself, was less striking than two other considerations. One of these was that he recalled to the orthodox, for the first time in public, that they had lost Congress in 1954 after an Eisenhower presidential landslide of only 2 years before and had lost Congress again in 1956, in the middle of an even bigger Eisenhower presidential landslide.

The President's comments were in retort to some open and much sotto voce Republican congressional comment that Eisenhower coattails in some States would be worse than useless this time. The most important things were that he believed it necessary to say, this far ahead of November, what he did say, and that what he said caused no visible tremors in Congress. For the first time the orthodox Republicans there felt it safe not to respond to the highly infrequent admonitions of what had twice in presidential years been shown to be Eisenhower magic of a most potent kind.

BASIC SITUATION

For this is the basic situation that has developed here: The passage of time—that is, the fact that this is, after all, the President's last possible term—and the President's greatly reduced participation in Government have combined with other circumstances to permit the first real stirrings of two determined orthodox Republican efforts.

The first of these efforts is subdivided into what might be called public effort and private effort. The declared public aim of the orthodox congressional Republicans is to regain control of Congress. But no senior Republican known to this correspondent actually treats this as more than a kind of desperate hope.

The second, and real, subdivision of aim is to hold prospective Republican losses in Congress to the minimum. And it is here that the President is, quite honestly, seen by many orthodox Republicans as a great handicap.

They believe his legislative program could scarcely have been harder on Republicans, as one of them puts it, "if the Democrats had drawn it up themselves."

This is because the President's domestic budget makes less appeal to powerful "belly" voter interest, in every critical section of the country, than any in recent memory.

And the second of the twin major efforts of the orthodox is to reclaim the mind of the Republican Party and therefore its direction.

NO ROUTINE STAKES

Thus it is that the stakes are far beyond the fairly routine partisan stakes of any and every fairly routine congressional election year. For involved are not only such highly measurable and familiar matters as to what party shall have what seats and what committee chairmanships after November.

Involved also are deep emotional wounds to many traditional Republicans who see in the President's tenure what they believe to have been the failure of what in their eyes could have been the first properly conservative administration since Herbert Hoover's—and possibly the last in their lifetime.

They are determined that if their party is to enter a long minority era—and this is precisely what many of them fear—that then they or their kind of people must control what is left of it. This is, perhaps most of all, why they do not listen with great intentness any more to the President's advice for the future.

Recognition of Small Business

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE S. McGOVERN

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 10, 1958

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, recently I introduced a resolution (H. R. 480) which would give standing committee status to the House Small Business Committee.

It has seemed to me that the small businessman is the forgotten man in American Government. My measure would insure an increased attention to the problems of this segment of our economy.

I have always believed that the Main Street merchant and other small-business men play a most essential role in our national economy. They also represent an important part of our way of life. Americans have always believed that business opportunities should not be limited to the few and the powerful.

For that reason I have been increasingly disturbed by the mounting pressures on the smaller business elements of our economy. Small business failures have reached the highest peak since the 1930's. The trend toward consolidation and absorption of small-business units by the giants of industry and finance has reached the greatest tempo in a quarter of a century. There is an urgent need for greater tax consideration to small business, better enforcement of the antitrust laws and more attention in general to the many difficulties that beset the small business community.

I believe that shall business should be given the same committee status in the Congress that exists with reference to labor, agriculture, banking, and so forth.

I am very pleased that Mr. George J. Burger, vice president of the National Federation of Independent Business, a man who has given most of his life to the problems of small business, has seen fit to commend my bill. I am including Mr. Burger's letter to me of February 21, 1958, at this point:

NATIONAL FEDERATION OF INDEPENDENT BUSINESS,
Burlingame, Calif., February 21, 1958.

Hon. GEORGE S. McGOVERN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN McGOVERN: I want to again express to you in behalf of small business our appreciation of your splendid action in introducing a resolution, H. Res. 480, which provides standing committee status for the present House Small Business Committee. We are glad of your action because now it is nonpartisan as a similar resolution was introduced by our good friend, Congressman H. R. GROSS.

Your action means a great deal to small business, whether it is in your State of South Dakota or any of the other States. It's a definite indication that there are men in Congress, including yourself, that have a very sincere interest in the welfare of efficient independent business.

It's rather strange and still most important that a similar nonpartisan action was taken in the United States Senate just 8 years ago when at that time the first chairman of the Senate Small Business Committee, the Honorable JAMES E. MURRAY, of Montana, Senator SPESSARD HOLLAND, and the late Senator Wherry of Nebraska, had action taken on their resolutions making that committee a continuing committee of the United States Senate for the first time in the history of the Senate. It is to be noted that we had the invaluable support at the time of the then Senate majority leader, the Honorable Scott Lucas.

Congressman McGOVERN, I can truthfully state to you that without the operation of the Small Business Committees, both in the Senate and the House, for the past 17 or 18 years, it goes without saying, many things in our economy could have happened, all tending to reduce the position of independent business.

Then it is significant and important to note that after these committees were constituted by the Congress, many of the old time Government agencies took a sudden interest then in small business and established within their respective agencies a small business section.

We believe now these committees have grown up and they are entitled to have the same standing as other standing committees in the Congress, Education, Labor, Agriculture, et cetera.

The most important part of having these committees standing committees of the Congress is that they will attract competent personnel who desire to make a career in the congressional committee.

We maintain the same opinion as it relates to the Small Business Administration, that agency being made a permanent agency of the Congress will attract more competent personnel who desire to make a career with the Government. In this you are to be complimented in the 1st session of the 85th Congress when you and 392 other Members voted to make the agency a permanent agency with the increased power, which should be of tremendous benefits not alone in your State but throughout the other 47 States.

I know that you will use your best efforts in having the Rules Committee act on your resolution so with our combined efforts, we can crown our work that this can be accomplished, making the House Small Business Committee a standing committee now in the 2d session of the 85th Congress.

Again, Congressman McGOVERN, thank you for your splendid action and you have made a major contribution for the future welfare of independent business.

With highest regards,

Sincerely,

GEORGE J. BURGER.

Ghana's First Birthday

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BARRATT O'HARA

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 10, 1958

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, on this, the first anniversary of the independence of the sovereign state of Ghana, I join with my colleagues in warm congratulation to Prime Minister Nkrumah, to the members of his government, to the distinguished membership of its legislative council and to all the men, women and children who comprise the population of a new nation dedicated to freedom and human dignity. In the doing of good works, in the ceaseless battle against unnecessary poverty and in the establishment of brotherhood as the foundation of all of man's relations with his fellow man, Ghana, her government and her people, always have the good wishes and the good wishes and the prayers of the people of the United States.

As a member of Chairman WAYNE HAYS subcommittee of the House Committee on Foreign Affairs that recently visited Ghana on a study tour, I wish to take this opportunity of stressing the importance to Ghana, to the entire continent of Africa and to the free world of the prompt commencement and completion of the Volta River project.

It is my well considered opinion, based upon my own study and observation, that if our Government continues to brush off this project, opening the area to a world of mineral wealth and industrial power, we will end by missing the boat. Africa is a continent of boundless resources and a future of limitless possibilities. Its development depends on large projects, all engineeringly sound and economically sound as well, and its peoples will not be held back. It is time that we came to that realization.

In the Belgian Congo there is underway a project that will entail a total cost of $2½ billion. The Government of the Belgian Congo is going it piecemeal rather than permitting willing American private capital to share in the investment.

Private capital has shown marked interest in the Volta River project in Ghana. At one time the aluminum people were reported ready to put $600,000 in the venture. It is completely beyond my understanding why some of our people in high posts of Government authority continue on the policy of a stick of candy for a poor orphan child instead of sitting down, as the Belgians do, trying to work out, mainly with private capital, perhaps with some initial encouragement from our Government, ways of going ahead with works that are vital to the future of Africa and offer investment fields that the experts I talked with united in calling attractive.

Mr. Speaker, I think it is fitting that on this first birthday of Ghana, I should conclude my remarks with the following editorial from the March 6, 1958, issue of the Chicago Daily Defender, the only Negro daily newspaper in the United States:

GHANA'S FIRST ANNIVERSARY

Ghana celebrates its first anniversary today as an independent nation which has emerged from the British-administered Gold Coast. While retaining its centuries-old traditions of culture and background, the new African state is moving with incredible momentum toward adopting the economic and political principles which have guided the destiny of the civilizations of the West.

Under Prime Minister Nkrumah, the people are enjoying a new surge of progress compounded of confidence in the future and determination to achieve their goal of economic stability and national security.

Although the country's economy is at present largely supported by one crop—cocoa—Ghana is rich in such extractive resources as bauxite, diamond, and gold. But it needs a large outlay of capital to work the mines, develop harbor facilities and increase its agricultural production.

Based upon a careful estimate of Ghana's potential productive capacity, the Canadian Aluminum Co. was a major partner in a financial pool that was to underwrite a $600 million loan to the Ghanan Government. Unfortunately, political ferment in the Middle East, which poses a threat to both north and west Africa, has undermined the prospect of such a loan. Even Uncle Sam is hestitating to extend that kind of assistance to Ghana.

The question of stability of Nkrumah's administration is another cloud that befogs the economic needs of the new nation. Under the British system to which Ghana has fallen heir, a vote of no confidence by the opposition party in the African Parliament can end overnight the Prime Minister's reign.

And the opposition to Nkrumah is growing. Whether he can ride out the coming storm is a matter of some concern among his local followers and overseas sympathizers. Had he been elected for 4 years, as under the American system, much confidence might have been placed in his Government. And a sizable foreign loan might have been arranged.

In any event, Nkrumah's intelligent leadership, his economic and educational reforms, his program of tribal unification have swept aside the old friction that Africans cannot govern themselves. Ghana is a shining example of the darker races' ability to lift themselves upward toward the light of democracy and self-salvation once the yoke of subjugation is removed.

Vocational Agriculture in Iowa

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOS. E. MARTIN

OF IOWA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, March 10, 1958

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. Mr. President, the February issue of the American Vocational Journal published by the American Vocational Association, Inc., contains a salute to Iowa which succinctly but commendably tells the story of Iowa's excellent vocational agriculture education program. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the leading article in this section, entitled "The Journal Salutes Iowa for Vocational Agriculture."

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE JOURNAL SALUTES IOWA FOR VOCATIONAL AGRICULTURE

Farming in Iowa is big business. The farms in the State produce approximately one-tenth of the food for the Nation. In 1956 the gross farm income was $2.2 billion. This was an average gross income per farm of $11,270, or almost twice the national average. Of the 200 high counties in the Nation in farm income, 37 are in Iowa.

The fertile soil and the temperate climate of the State are ideally suited to the growing of grains and forages and the raising of livestock. Iowa ranks first in corn, oats, hogs, and in marketing of beef cattle; second in soybeans, and third in butter and in marketing of sheep.

The people in Iowa are intelligent and industrious with good homes and communities. The total population is 2,707,830. There are 715,389 people living on farms, or almost one-fourth of the total population. Of the employed people in the State, 26.3 percent are in farming, 16.6 percent in manufacturing, and 57.1 percent in nonmanufacturing work.

Farming is changing rapidly with scientific developments. It is increasingly mechanized. Farms are increasing in size. The needs for capital are large. Business management is more important. Abilities and skills are needed to efficiently produce crops and livestock and use farm machinery and equipment.

There are 190,263 farms in the State with more than 286,000 tractors and 72,000 trucks. The average farm is 182 acres. The people employed on farms has decreased approximately 2 percent a year, except for the past 2 years.

The public schools of the State through their administrators and the boards of education have actively supported the vocational agriculture program. Starting with 6 departments in 1917–18, the program has grown to 303 departments for this year. With the further reorganization of school districts, 400 departments can serve the needs of the State.

As community educational agencies, the public schools are ideally situated to develop a farmer training program. They are close to farms and to people with resulting economies. Each year in the State, there is a need for some 8,300 people to replace those who leave farming, with 6,300 of these being farm operators. The new developments in farming further indicate the need for a training program. In this Nation with 16 people on farms producing sufficient food for themselves and 84 people off the farm, it is increasingly necessary that they be efficient producers of farm products and intelligent

custodians of our soil. The high school students enroll for vocational agriculture and three other courses each year. The 4-year training program in farming is based on the supervised farming programs of the students and the home farm situations. This includes livestock, crops and soils, farm mechanics, and farm management. The enrollment is 11,200 students this year. The number of graduates each year is approximately 2,400, not all of whom farm. Beginning in 1929, the FFA has been an integral part of the farm program. This organization provides leadership training and other benefits to members. All vo-ag departments have chartered chapters.

Young farmer classes are conducted by 60 schools this year with an enrollment of 1,200 out-of-school young men. As the high school graduates enter farming on a full-time basis, they desire training adapted to their needs. The training includes both classroom and individual on-the-farm work, based on their problems in becoming established in the occupation.

Adult farmer classes enroll 18,000 farmers in the 303 departments. The first adult farmer class in the State was held in 1921–22 with continuous growth in succeeding years. Since 1928, the enrollment in adult farmer classes has exceeded the enrollment in high school classes. An adult farmer advisory council works with the instructor in planning courses.

The typical vocational agriculture department has an enrollment of more than 100 persons. The average enrollments are 37 high school students, 20 young farmers and 60 adult farmers. It serves some 300 to 400 farms with an investment in land, buildings, farm equipment, livestock and supplies of ten to fifteen million dollars. The school provides an agricultural classroom with a reference library and equipment and a farm mechanics shop with hand and power tools. Each year, a program of work is planned for the department in the community. The reimbursement to the school amounts to about one-third of the instructor's salary and mileage.

The Veterans institutional on-farm training program has been conducted by public schools in the State since 1946. More than 21,000 veterans have received training in accord with Public Laws 346 and 550. This year, the enrollment is 3,800 veterans in 174 classes in 138 public schools. The values to individual veterans, to communities and to public schools have been large. This work has been coordinated with the vocational agriculture program in which methods, techniques and facilities were developed.

For the future, there is a need for a farmer training program to train the next generation of farmers and to keep farming in step with new developments. Our increasing population will require larger amounts of the products of the farms. The vo-ag program accepts the challenge.

Excise Taxes an Unfair Burden Upon Pharmacists

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM LANGER
OF NORTH DAKOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, March 10, 1958

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a letter I have received from Al Doerr, secretary of the North Dakota Pharmaceutical Association, relating to excise taxes.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NORTH DAKOTA
PHARMACEUTICAL ASSOCIATION,
Napoleon, N. Dak., February 22, 1958.

Senator WILLIAM LANGER,
United States Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR: Again this office is receiving numerous complaints of the methods employed by the Federal investigators or checkers of excise-tax records.

The papers are full of tax cuts one day, and in the next issue no cuts are in store in this session of Congress—be that as it may.

However, it appears to me that some adjustment should and could be made along the excise-tax level. It is without a doubt the most unfair, unjust piece of legislation on the books; placing undue burden upon the retailer. Is it a piece of legislation to create more jobs, or is it essential to the economy of the country? If it is the latter, why not transfer it to the manufacturers, where it rightfully belongs?

The original intent was for a temporary source of Federal revenue (wartime emergency). No one complained and took on this added responsibility as all good Americans should. Since then, there has been nothing but confusion and guesswork as to what articles are subject to tax, and the blame lies at the door of the Internal Revenue Service. Now after 13 years of the country being overrun with Government tax men, spotters or checkers, inflicting deficiency assessments against the retail druggists—an official list of taxable products has been published by the Internal Revenue Service. Even now this is not the answer, for there are considerable borderline products, which may or may not be taxable, depending how they are advertised by the manufacturer.

There are bound to be discrepancies, through pilferage, spoiled merchandise, broken or destroyed, and merchandise sold at sale on bargain counters.

I am personally acquainted with each and every pharmacist in this State and also know that each and every one is an upright citizen and a credit to this great State of ours; yet a large majority are assessed arbitrarily for supposed failures in remittance of collections.

The members of this association trust that you will exert every effort possible to either do away with this senseless tax burden or transfer same to the manufacturer.

Respectfully yours,
AL DOERR, *Secretary.*

Bulwark on the Defense: Carl Vinson

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. L. MENDEL RIVERS
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 10, 1958

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include, herewith, an article appearing in the New York Times under date of February 27, 1958, titled "Bulwark on the Defense: CARL VINSON." Those of us who have served on the committee with this distinguished American know him and love him. He is a dedicated American to the cause of this Nation's security—to Mr. VINSON all other considerations are secondary. CARL VINSON is a tireless and an indefatigable worker. He inspires the Members who have the privilege of serving with him to work by leading the way. He spends many and long hours in his office, and he burns the midnight oil that America may be the leader of the free world.

Next to you, Mr. Speaker, CARL VINSON has served in the Congress longer than any other present Member. The article which I now insert, Mr. Speaker, while I may not agree with all it says, it only points to show what kind of American sits as chairman of the House Armed Services Committee. Mr. Speaker, I and every other single member of this committee love CARL VINSON, and we love to work for him because in working for him, we know that we serve better as better Americans.

The article follows:

[From the New York Times of February 27, 1958]

BULWARK ON THE DEFENSE: CARL VINSON

WASHINGTON, February 26.—When the Truman administration was looking around for a Secretary of Defense, the name of Representative CARL VINSON was mentioned as a possibility. Mr. VINSON, chairman of the House Armed Services Committee, heard about this and put it to sleep with this comment: "Shucks, I'd rather run the Pentagon from up here." This was taken largely as not being too much of an overstatement, even though made facetiously.

Today, in collaboration with the committee's senior Republican member, Representative LESLIE C. ARENDS, of Illinois, Mr. VINSON put forward a formula for more efficient operation of the Pentagon.

Characteristically, the Vinson reorganization plan was announced without prior notice and bills to put it into effect were introduced in the House before the Eisenhower administration had perfected its own proposals. Thus, whatever legislation is enacted is likely to be cut more closely to Mr. VINSON's pattern than to the administration's.

CARL VINSON is now in his 44th year in the House. At 74 years of age, he shows, according to other oldtimers, equal if not more vigor in national defense matters than when he entered Congress at the age of 31. Only one other present Member has served longer. He is SAM RAYBURN, of Texas, the Speaker, who beat Mr. VINSON to the House by 20 months.

DRESSES FOR COMFORT

Mr. VINSON, a large and hard-going man who dresses primarily for comfort, has headed military-affairs problems in the House since 1931, except when the Republicans got occasional control. His assignment was chairman of the Naval Affairs Committee until the armed services group was installed in 1947.

He has ruled this panel with a kindly but iron hand. Around Congress he is called the Swamp Fox, after Francis Marion, the South Carolina planter who became a general and master strategist in the War of the Revolution. Mr. VINSON has become as unpredictable and telling with his operations, it seems, as the original Swamp Fox.

Admirals and generals called from the Pentagon with supporting staffs frequently quaver as Mr. VINSON suspects flaws in their testimony. While he has campaigned effectively for more ships, planes, troops, and other military necessities, he has refused to accept Pentagon pleas willy-nilly.

He demands all the facts. He punishes admirals and generals, and the civilian officials who are their superiors, without mercy.

Mr. VINSON is either loved or feared at the Pentagon, but he is universally respected.

He has been the driving force in preserving military department requests for authorizations, even to a point of breaking through budget estimates. He also has prevented Congress from ignoring budget limitations in response to prevailing voter mood and appeal.

Mr. VINSON is a Georgian with a large nose on which he rests spectacles halfway down and looks over them instead of through their lenses. He represents a district almost wholly rural, but holds a powerful hand upon the expenditures that now take about 54 cents out of every tax dollar.

A TOUGH COMMITTEE

He rules a tough and determined committee of 40 members with a mixture of tranquility and Swamp Fox strategy. He is the target on occasion of heavy and angry bombing, by rebelling committeemen. He smiles through the attacks and then says: "All right now, let's get on with the business."

He makes a point of politely permitting any member to propose any amendment to a pending measure that he desires. But when the final committee votes are taken the amendments he doesn't like usually are in the ash can.

Mr. VINSON's home territory is Milledgeville, Ga., a city of about 10,000 population. He was born in this area on November 18, 1883.

He attended the Georgia Military College, and was graduated from Mercer Law School in 1902. He practiced law in Milledgeville, was made county prosecutor, went to the legislature and later served as a county judge. Then he came to Congress in 1914. In 1921 he married Mary Green, of New Philadelphia, Ohio. She died in November 1950, having been an invalid a long time. There were no children.

When he is at his 675-acre farm just outside of Milledgeville he indulges in no hobbies, except the reading of history, magazines and newspapers. His primary thoughts, he says, are Government and National defense.

On his farm he occasionally walks around looking for places where his fences might need mending. He does not have to worry about his political fences.

Mr. VINSON, with more than two score years of continuous public service on his record, started hinting some years ago that he might retire. He stopped talking this way when in 1955 Congress raised its own pay from $15,000 to $22,500 a year.

"Well," he observed, "if they are going to pay that kind of money in Congress, I think I'll make a career of it."

But those who know him best are firm in belief that he would not have retired if congressional pay had been reduced instead of being raised.

Small-Family Farmers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BARRATT O'HARA
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 10, 1958

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, by unanimous consent I am extending my remarks to include the following article by Father James L. Vizzard, vice president of the National Catholic Rural Life Conference and vice chairman of the National Council on Agricultural Life and Labor, in the March 1958 issue of Work:

When the food-surplus problem is being discussed these days, whether in Washington or elsewhere, a very curious argument often shows up. It usually goes something like this:

There are two surpluses that are plaguing us—too much production and too many farmers. The answer is both of these problems is simple and obvious. Just get rid of the surplus farmers. Antomatically you'll cut down on production and get rid of the surplus. And there'll be a bonus, too; with fewer people to divide up the farm income, there'll be more for each.

Very neat. But it doesn't take much analysis to spot the fallacy of the argument—and the insincerity with which it is often proposed. For the writers and speechmakers never suggest that we try to get rid of the really big producers—the top few percent of corporation farms that account for a large share of total production.

AID TO CORPORATIONS

Not only are no efforts made, or even suggested, to move them off the land and take the vast quantity of their production off the market, but they actually are encouraged and helped by our present kind of farm program and its administration.

It is rather the small, inefficient farmer that these spokesmen want to see squeezed out of agriculture by the hundreds of thousands, and they usually are not too squeamish about how it is done. Where the refugees go or what they do, what they gain or lose by abandoning the land, these high-minded speechmakers do not say and they do not seem to care.

FARM FALLOUT

One fallacious side of the argument can be spiked easily. The last census of agriculture, in 1954, listed 1,200,000 commercial farms which had yearly sales of less than $2,500. Suppose that all of these small-scale farms were closed out, and the families occupying them went to the city (where, unskilled and lost, they almost certainly would end up in the slums).

How much production would that remove from the markets?

Seven percent.

What would happen to the land they left?

Experience proves that most of it would be acquired by the nearby larger farm operator who produces more efficiently—and abundantly.

Net result?

Even greater surpluses.

Agricultural Income

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM LANGER
OF NORTH DAKOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, March 10, 1958

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the GTA Daily Radio Roundup of the Farmers Union Grain Terminal Association for Monday, March 3, 1958.

There being no objection, the Daily Radio Roundup was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

GTA DAILY RADIO ROUNDUP OF MARCH 3, 1958

Let's take a look today at some farm statistics. It seems timely to do so, because the Secretary of Agriculture arrived in Minneapolis Sunday for his talk today (Monday) before the farm forum sponsored by the Minneapolis Chamber of Commerce. Mr. Benson told newsmen that farm State Republicans will pick up votes by backing his program, and then he cited some statistics which, he said, show that the administration's farm program is working out well for farmers, and he said that farmers are backing him up.

The Secretary said that farm prices now are 8 percent above a year ago, and 11 percent above 3 years ago. He added that in 1957, per capita farm income hit $993, 10 percent above the $902 registered in 1956.

Now, these are official statistics. No one is arguing with them. But, it has always been our belief that the purpose of statistics is to clarify matters, not confuse them. That's why it is unfortunate that the Secretary does not explain the figures more fully, because they are confusing to many people who know other facts. Farmers and Main-Street merchants know that agriculture is in trouble.

From his high position in government, the Secretary certainly has the responsibility to explain, for example, that farm costs of operation have climbed to an alltime record high—more than 300 percent above the 1910–14 average. And, of course, that means that more of the money farmers take in goes out to pay for seed, machinery, gas, oil, and so forth. In fact, high, fixed costs of operations hit farmers so hard in 1957, that their net income fell down to an estimated $11.5 billion. It was $11.9 billion in 1956. And, we might point out that this net farm income, which is take-home pay for farmers was up as high as $17 billion 10 years ago.

It should be pointed out, too, that the Secretary's emphasis on farm per capita income rising to $993 is very misleading. The Governor of Minnesota's farm factfinding commission has brought out that fact that farm per capita income in Minnesota is less than half what people in the city get. City per capita income is well above the $2,000 level.

This is something that farm people understand full well, and they wonder why the statistics that the Secretary gives out in speeches don't explain the entire story more clearly. Quite naturally, farmers do not want to go on hearing statistics about conditions growing worse in agriculture. Farmers would like to be able to hear that a program is at work to bring price equality to agriculture. That's the basic problem—getting fair prices to keep family farmers on the land and a free agriculture in operation.

With this goal in mind, tens of thousands of Northwest grain farmers are working with their neighbors, and marketing their grain, GTA, the co-op way.

Imports Are Curbed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. CARLTON LOSER
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 10, 1958

Mr. LOSER. Mr. Speaker, my attention has been called to a news article which appeared in the New York Times on February 28, 1958, concerning the action of the Australian Government in temporarily suspending imports of printed cotton textiles.

Since the importation of Japanese cotton textiles into our own country is a matter of much concern to me, and the cotton manufacturers of my section of the country as well as the whole Nation,

I am placing the article in the RECORD, under leave to extend my remarks, and hope that each Member of the House will read how Australia is handling the serious situation threatening her cotton textile industry.

The article follows:

IMPORTS ARE CURBED—AUSTRALIA BARS NEW LICENSES FOR PRINTED COTTON CLOTH

MELBOURNE, AUSTRALIA, February 27.—Japan has taken her first voluntary action to restrict exports to Australia under a trade agreement signed last year. At the same time the Australian Government has taken the unparalleled action of suspending temporarily imports of printed cotton textiles.

Trade Minister John McEwen said last night that the recently developed Australian cotton textile industry would be threatened with serious damage if the restrictions were not applied. Japan had agreed to limit printed cotton textile exports to Australia to 20 million square yards in the year ending June 30, but as a surge of imports from many countries developed the Australian Government decided to suspend the issuance of such import licenses pending a report of the tariff board on the textile industry.

Pedro Estrada—Undesirable Alien

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES O. PORTER
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 10, 1958

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, John O'Rourke, the distinguished editor of the Washington Daily News, is also president of the Inter-American Press Association. In both capacities he is well qualified to write about the request that Pedro Estrada, recently deposed Himmler of Venezuela, be admitted into this country permanently. Under unanimous consent I include a news item from the Washington Daily News for Wednesday, March 5, 1958, and an editorial from the same paper.

PEDRO ESTRADA—UNDESIRABLE ALIEN

(By John Hoover)

Pedro Estrada, chief hatchetman in the overthrown regime of Venezuelan Dictator Gen. Marcos Perez Jiminez, has applied for a United States immigration visa, it was learned today.

The hated chief of secret police has made 2 trips to the United States on a visitor's visa since he fled to safety in Dictator Rafael Trujillo's Dominican Republic last January. Now he has returned to Ciudad Trujillo where he has asked consular officials to grant him permanent entry to the United State.

NO BIAS

A State Department spokesman said that no basis has been found to exclude Estrada under the pertinent laws and regulations.

Estrada was the iron fist with which Perez Jiminez ruled.

In the violence which accompanied the overthrow of the Venezuelan dictator, Estrada's officers were particular targets of the citizenry. Many of his secret police were literally torn to pieces, it was reported in dispatches at the time, so great was the hatred of Estrada's gestapo system.

United States laws and regulations regarding immigration list some 30 provisions for withholding visas from applicants, including conviction or admission of crimes involving moral turpitude. However, Estrada has never been convicted of such crimes, and the United States laws specifically exempt purely political offenses.

REQUIREMENT

A State Department spokesman said, however, that Estrada would be required to swear that he will not engage in any subversive activity directed against a foreign government while he resides in the United States.

If the provisional government that now rules Venezuela should prefer charges against Estrada it can seek his extradition under provisions of a treaty signed between the United States and Venezuela in 1922.

A spokesman at the Venezuelan Embassy said no word had been received there concerning Estrada's application. Consequently there have been no instructions from the Venezuelan Government to protest Estrada's entry or seek extradition.

Gen. Perez Jiminez has already been granted a United States immigration visa.

UNWELCOME

"Give me your tired, your poor,
Your huddled masses yearning to breathe free.
The wretched refuse of your teeming shore
Send these, the homeless, tempest tost to me * * *"

So says the inscription on the "Old Lady," as she holds her torch in New York harbor to light the way for homecoming tourists, hopeful immigrants and bloody-handed murderers and dedicated enemies of freedom.

Thirty years ago we were more choosey.

The Countess Vera of Cathcart came over in 1926, but such was the moral purity of the times that the authorities stopped her cold at Ellis Island. It seems she had a boy friend. She admitted it. That's called moral turpitude.

This is a sort of spiritual "b. o.," and the immigration laws provided that our fair land's innocent poppas and mommas be protected from it.

However, we see by today's story on page 4 that apparently, by holding our noses, policy is now more liberal. Not only has the enemy of freedom, Gen. Perez Jiminez, ousted dictator of Venezuela, been allowed to immigrate here, but we are preparing to welcome the head of his secret police, Pedro Estrada. This man was the head of the organization responsible for the jailing, torture, exile and death of many Venezuelans dedicated to freedom. So we will have not only his fat little boss, who reputedly fled with millions; we will also have Venezuela's discarded Himmler.

How does the verse quoted above apply to them?

They're not tired; they've been resting up in the Caribbean. They're not poor; they're rich. They're not homeless; their handsome hotel suites face the sea. True, they're tempest-tost, but they raised the storm themselves.

The Venezuelan people will say they certainly qualify as refuse.

In all fairness, neither the State Department nor the Immigration Service can be blamed for this state of affairs; it is the way the immigration law reads.

We're told our law requires the wrongdoing must either be admitted or a conviction must be on record. No Venezuelan court has yet tried them for their crimes against humanity. There is, furthermore, a sort of tradition among South American nations of allowing asylum to political exiles.

But there are still ways to keep them out of the United States, if the Venezuelan Government will start legal proceedings against them, as the Argentine Government has done against Peron. Perez Jimenez and Estrada can certainly be indicted, extradited, and tried.

Exiled Estrada came into the United States on a visitor's visa, and has gone back to that zoo of dictators, the Dominican Republic, to apply for a permanent immigration visa.

We hope our Government will not act too hastily. These men have, if political events in Venezuela mean anything at all, committed great crimes against the Venezuelan people.

Perhaps court actions will be instituted in Venezuela which will clearly show that which we already know; that they do not come to our shores with clean hands and that they are in the truest sense of the word, undesirable aliens, and the proven enemy of every ideal of liberty for which our country stands.

Incentives to Prosperity

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. A. S. HERLONG, JR.
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 10, 1958

Mr. HERLONG. Mr. Speaker, with leave to extend my remarks, I desire to include in the RECORD the following editorial by Mr. David Lawrence appearing in the U. S. News & World Report of March 14, 1958:

INCENTIVES TO PROSPERITY

(By David Lawrence)

It's an ill wind that blows no good, and the belated discovery in recent months that talented people should be stimulated by scholarships and other inducements to excel in the field of science applies as well to other fields of human endeavor.

The nation that seeks to standardize all individuals will find itself plagued by mediocrity.

The nation that carries the abstract principle of equality to the point where success is penalized retards its own progress.

The nation that restricts the gifted and the enterprising and virtually confiscates their earnings will not thereby accomplish the maximum good for the maximum number. In fact, the very opposite will be the result.

We can attain real prosperity by recognizing the importance of incentives to prosperity.

The biggest single incentive that could be applied in America today is in the field of taxation. The current recession and the economic convulsions of our times are directly related to the punitive rates in our tax system.

Low tax rates that are productive would bring in more revenue to the Treasury than it has ever received before. For when earnings are stimulated, the Government receives a larger and larger total—a share not only of the bigger profits earned by corporations but a share of the increased payrolls derived from full employment.

Tax revision cannot be achieved all at once, but a start can be made with a 5-year program which brings the individual tax rates within a range of 15 percent at the low point and 42 percent at the top and puts a ceiling on corporate taxes at 42 percent of net income. This is, in brief, the proposal made in the bill introduced by Representative SADLAK, Republican, of Connecticut, and Representative HERLONG, Democrat, of Florida.

The theory that individuals with large incomes spend it all on themselves is fallacious. There's a limit to the luxury that any individual can enjoy. Probably more than 90 percent of a rich man's income

above ordinary living expenses and charitable contributions is usually invested in productive enterprises, thus helping to build new businesses and create employment opportunities.

There is no sensible reason for stifling the initiative of the most successful individuals in our midst. Even the Moscow regime has discovered that, when everybody works for the government, there is lassitude and that money incentives become necessary to stimulate ambition and increase efficiency.

The worst mistake we make in our tax system is in the field of corporate rates. Here we expect the enterpriser who takes the risks of everyday business to be enthusiastic about his position as a minority partner. There isn't much incentive felt in being a 48-percent partner, while the Government takes the major share—52 percent—of all net income.

Apart from the psychological discouragements of such a disproportionate partnership between the Government and businessmen, this system fails to build the necessary surpluses for modernization and expansion of plant.

America would have an era of unprecedented prosperity if the tax structure were revised so that, by a reduction of 2 percentage points a year, for instance, companies could see in the next 5 years a chance to plan ahead with an assurance of a fair return on the money and energy invested by them. It would be the quickest way to restore confidence among businessmen and bring an early end to the current recession.

Until we become realistic about the handicaps in our tax structure, we shall not absorb the more than 900,000 new workers who are added to the total labor force every year. Thus, in January 1958, there were actually only 340,000 less persons employed than in January 1957, but we have not made it possible for business and industry to absorb the new workers. Our population is growing, and we must find a way to enable business to create more and more jobs.

A simplified-tax structure based on such incentives would solve our current problems and avoid "recessions" in the future. It would bring balanced budgets and large surpluses long before the 5-year period elapsed. It would pave the way for even lower tax rates in subsequent years.

Reform of the tax structure is necessary to cure us of our chronic recessions—but this will not come until an informed public opinion persuades the politicians that the best politics is sound economics.

It is the duty of our leaders, both political and economic, to take a long-range view and begin to lay the basis for a sound prosperity.

We must face up now to the need for a fundamental program that will enable America to stabilize prices, to arrest inflation and to create more and more job opportunities in an expanding economy.

Prime Minister Abdullah Khalil

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BARRATT O'HARA
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 10, 1958

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I am extending my remarks to include an editorial from the March 8, 1958, issue of the Chicago Defender, as follows:

MEET SUDAN'S ABLE PRIME MINISTER

The Egyptian-Sudanese dispute which Emperor Haile Selassie, of Ethiopia, prevented from reaching a crisis point, has brought to the fore one of the leading personalities in the contested territory. It is Abdullah Khalil, the Sudanese Prime Minister, a tough soldier-politician known for bluntness, horse sense and courage.

It was his firm prowestern policy that caused his government, last year, to turn down a Russian offer to buy the Sudan's whole cotton crop in exchange for arms. Khalil quickly realized the sinister motive that prompted the Soviet bid. It was clear to him that the offer was in keeping with Russia's policy of stirring up trouble in sensitive areas.

In turning the Russians down, the Sudanese Prime Minister said pointedly that his country wasn't planning to fight anyone, that Sudan needed farm equipment and not tanks. Though the politicians who belonged to the opposition party were overtly critical of this stand, Khalil was so determined to keep Russia out of the Sudan that he staked his whole political future upon that decision.

He is a good administrator who believes in a pay-as-you-go policy in an area noted for fiscal fantasy in government. His enlightened leadership has keep Africa's biggest new nation from being a helpless pawn on the chess board of international intrigues. He is not unaware of Egypt's design to annex his country, which is four times the size of Texas and with a population in excess of 10 million.

There are pro-Egyptian factions among his countrymen who stand ready to compromise their nation's independence by bringing the Sudan within the orbit of President Nasser's newly formed United Arab Republic. But Khalil is a fearless nationalist who wields enough power to smash any plot against the Sudan as a sovereign state. With a little aid from the Western bloc, the Sudan may become a bright star in the constellation of free democratic states.

Voice of America Should Continually Expose to the People of Central Asia Soviet Propaganda Against Alleged Western Colonialism While It Imposes Brutal Imperialism on Them

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER H. JUDD
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 10, 1958

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Mr. C. L. Sulzberger, from the New York Times of March 1, 1958:

MOSCOW'S HUGE COLONIALIST HOAX
(By C. L. Sulzberger)

BELGRADE, YUGOSLAVIA.—One of the most important cold war propaganda centers is Tashkent, capital of the Soviet Republic of Uzbekistan and largest city in all central Asia. From that sprawling, jerry-built metropolis within sight of the great Tien Shan range of mountains that divides the U. S. S. R. from China, a powerful radio disseminates Communist propaganda in most of the languages of the Orient.

The main burden of this message is one of nationalism and hostility to the western colonialist powers. Above all, Islamic peoples, especially the Arabs, are advised to heed Moscow, their benevolent, disinterested friend. And when Asian or Moslem dignataries visit Russia they are invited to the Uzbek capital. It is displayed as a showpiece of non-European, Asian-Soviet benignty.

The Kremlin is rarely inhibited by paradox. Therefore it sees nothing contradictory in exhorting underdeveloped peoples elsewhere to rise up against colonialism from Tashkent, administrative center of one of the largest existing colonial empires, that of Russia.

For, in fact, what is known as Soviet Central Asia, embracing an area larger than Europe and inhabited by non-Slavic, Turkic and Iranian peoples, is held in thrall by Moscow's own imperialism. The old Mohammedan and Asian cities of Tashkent, Bukhara and Samarkand are governed by atheistic Europeans sent eastward to provincial tasks much as Christian British officials once went eastward to Hindu India.

The incongruity of this situation is splendid. Tashkent, which has its Russian quarter much as Delhi once had its English quarter, which has its garrison of European battalions, and which is administered in all but name by non-Asians, challenges Asia and Africa to rise up and cast out remaining vestiges of foreign control. And what do we do to expose this hoax? The truth is we do pitifully little.

VOICE OF AMERICA PROGRAM

Our only official radio propaganda is transmitted by the Voice of America. This has budgeted precisely $40,178 this year for broadcasts to the unimaginably immense realm of Soviet central Asia. A pittance is spent to maintain 1 daily 15-minute program in the Uzbek language sent from Munich.

Our Uzbek propaganda service has 8 employees, 3 of whom are American citizens. Its single meager message is all our Government sponsors to tell the millions of Soviet Asians, only some of whom are Uzbek, anything about democracy. Compared to the torrent of "anticolonialist" words emitted by the colonial Tashkent radio it is as if one likened a flea to a grizzly bear.

Nor do other non-Communist countries pay much heed to what goes on within the U. S. S. R.'s own imperial domain. London's BBC says nothing, in their own languages, to the Kazakhs, Turkmenians, Kirghiz, Tadzhiks, and Uzbecs ruled by Russia. Nor do neighboring and racially akin Turkey and Iran. They fear Moscow complaints that they might seem to sponsor irredentist movements. Only Pakistan, in Turki broadcasts, occupies itself with the problem.

To be sure, a private American organization, Radio Liberation, seeks in some degree to fill the gap. For some years it has transmitted in the five principal languages of Soviet central Asia by shortwave from Lampertheim, West Germany. But these programs are generally weak and fragmentary because of successful Russian jamming. Radio Liberation concedes: "We are not producing as strong and as reliable a signal as our engineers would like."

SOVIET TACTICS IN TURKESTAN

Soviet authorities are trying to make the inhabitants of what was known as Turkestan forget they ever had an individual historical heritage. This was one no more connected with the bureaucrats of Moscow than the historical heritage of India was connected with the bureaucrats of London prior to the British Raj.

In its transmissions, Radio Liberation says, "Major emphasis is placed on the Turkestani charge that the Soviet Union—despite its constantly reiterated claims of friendship for colonial peoples—has itself hypocritically erected history's greatest colonial empire in which their own country [Turkestan] is the largest component. Broadcasts disclose, among other things, how the U. S. S. R. oppresses its inhabitants as well as exploits the resources of the homeland."

Nobody, of course, likes the idea of a cold war. Most people hope their statesmen can

eventually get together and arrange some basis for a harmonious peace. But the chances of this happening in a hurry are not brilliant.

In the meantime it is absurd for the free nations to sit by almost idly while the Kremlin, from its main colonial capital, boasts that only the Kremlin fights against colonialism. We know the opposite is true. But do we do enough about it?

For example, shouldn't we ask our friends in the Baghdad Pact to supplement the meager description of our views sent out by Lampertheim's tormented engineers? And shouldn't the Voice of America be given more help to tell our tale? Right now it is draining the Caspian Sea with a teaspoon.

The Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. A. S. HERLONG, JR.
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 10, 1958

Mr. HERLONG. Mr. Speaker, with leave to extend my remarks, I desire to include in the RECORD the following editorial by Mr. Fred Booth, an editorial writer for the Daytona Beach News Journal, and appearing in the Daytona Beach Evening News of February 24, 1958:

RAYBURN SOUNDS A WARNING

Speaker RAYBURN said something last week which underscores the folly of taking anything for granted. There's a chance, he said, that the bill renewing the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act may be defeated this year in the House.

This session the bill provides for 5 years' renewal of the reciprocal trade program. The last time Congress renewed the program was in 1955—for 3 years. The program expires June 30, this year, unless renewed.

Protectionists fought in 1955 against renewal of the trade program, yet it passed. From the time the Roosevelt administration introduced and sponsored the program in 1934 down to the last time it came before Congress, protectionists have fought it with richly financed lobbying and propaganda.

Yet each year the proposal came before Congress it passed, and the process of cutting import tariffs has kept this country in a fortunate trading relationship with other countries. Maybe the fact that the program has remained in force for 24 years has led many people to take for granted that it will continue in force.

For this reason RAYBURN's warning that the program is in peril of defeat was fortunately timed. It gives plain citizens and business interests a chance to rally in support of a policy which is essential to our continued friendly relations with other non-Communist countries, and which may be essential to our continued survival.

Support of the reciprocal trade agreements program is bipartisan. Republicans who favor it on conviction do not mind too much the fact that it was fathered first by a Democratic President. Democrats who favor it on conviction aren't bothered by the fact that President Eisenhower has recommended its passage.

On the other hand there are Republican and Democratic foes of the bill. They represent protectionist interests which regard any measure of liberalism in import trade as injurious to a few domestic industrial and commercial interests.

For this reason the proposal faces three dangers. One is the possibility of amendment virtually killing the effect of any bill that may be passed. The second is the danger of reducing the time the law shall stay in effect. The last time the law was good for 3 years. The renewal should be for 5 years. Its term may be cut to 1 year. Finally, the bill may be defeated altogether.

Speaker RAYBURN truly says it would be mighty bad for the country for the program to be defeated. RAYBURN and all other Members of Congress know Russia is making extraordinary efforts to bring other nations under the sway of its influence, by drumming up trade and by making easy, low-interest loans to underdeveloped countries.

All Congressmen know one of the most effective ways by which this Nation can strike up friendly and strong relations with other countries is to lower trade barriers so they can sell their products to us and buy ours. Only by this means can we improve our export trade. Moreover, the agreements would make it easier for the United States to obtain needed raw materials from other countries through the stimulus of international trade.

Recent developments in Europe have sharpened the need of a 5-year renewal of the program. Sinclair Weeks, Secretary of Commerce, said recently:

"Such a renewal is necessary to help American industry and agriculture in developing their relationships with the newly established European Economic Community. The six members of the new community—Belgium, France, Germany, Italy, Luxemburg, and the Netherlands—last year bought nearly $3 billion of our exports. Under the arrangements which they have agreed on for the new community, they are to have a common external tariff applicable to imports from other countries.

"The steps toward development of their new tariff will take shape gradually, and important developments are expected to occur during 1962, toward the end of the 5-year renewal period which we propose. During this time we must make careful and exhaustive preparations and conduct detailed negotiations. * * * In order to insure the effective participation of the United States and to promote our interests throughout this important period of development of the external tariff of the European Economic Community, we need a 5-year extension of the trade agreements legislation with adequate authority to reduce tariffs * * *.

The trade-agreement program has been a unique and beneficial undertaking by our country in the trade field. Its continuation is essential to preserve our gains and to lead the way to a broader realization of the mutual benefits that it makes possible for us and for our free-world partners."

Two points in the reciprocal trade issue are worth bearing in mind. One is that renewal of the program would help materially many more people and businesses than it would hurt. The other is that the program is a must in the great enterprise of achieving closer and stronger friendships with other powers.

Culture, Not Race

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BARRATT O'HARA
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 10, 1958

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, it long has been my practice on Sunday afternoons to include in my reading the editorial columns in the Chicago Defender. By unanimous consent I am extending my remarks to include Louis Martin's column in the Defender of March 6, 1958, as follows:

Dr. St. Clair Drake, the distinguished anthropologist of Roosevelt University, touched upon an idea in a housing discussion last week which fascinates me no end. He spoke before a group called by the Chicago Urban League to consider the critical housing issue.

Of courses, Dr. Drake is a very provocative talker and he has a keen, lively sense of humor which is delightful. Then too, he looks like an egghead with a penetrating look and a quizzical grin on his broad face. He punctuates his remarks with quick decisive gestures like many teachers who know how difficult it is to get a new concept through the average skull.

In speaking of the critical and complex housing situation, Dr. Drake made it clear that he has no easy solutions to the problems. Almost as an aside, however, he brought up the possibility of the allocation of certain areas of the city in which some cultural groups might be free to follow their own ways without upsetting the rest of the community.

Dr. Drake did not explore this suggestion very far, but he stated that the thought had occurred to him that some of these cultural islands might serve a worthwhile purpose until such time as the urbanization process was complete and all groups could live together in peace.

In this connection he said it has become fashionable now to refer to hillbillies as "Appalachian whites."

In Chicago, for instance, immigrants from Puerto Rico, Mississippi plantations, the Ozarks, and Appalachian foothills have been pouring in for years without any planning.

Most of these people are not only rural and nonurbanized, but some are prepared to resist any efforts to change their style of living. They want the advantages of the city and at the same time they wish to keep as many of their folkways as possible.

I suppose the old ghettos, little Italys, Corktowns, etc., served some such purpose for the great tidal wave of immigrants who came from Europe a few generations ago. As I understand the suggestion of Dr. Drake, however, the islands he has in mind would be basically cultural and with planning most of the evils of the ghetto would be avoided.

Today, immigrants with vast cultural differences and strange styles of living are scattered throughout the general community. For instance, a fellow who hankers to strum his guitar until 3 o'clock in the morning is living next door to an old conservative Chicago family that prefers organ music in the daytime and at church.

Dr. Drake would be the first to admit that there would be enormous practical difficulties in experimenting with the sort of program that he has in mind. Nevertheless, I share his interest in the idea even if it does seem a little farfetched.

In the first place, I think segregation on the basis of race or skin color is wrong anyway you look at it. Jim Crowism simply has no merits in my book. Cultural ties are more important than racial ones.

A Negro physician and a white physician have more in common than either one of them would have with an unlettered sharecropper of either race. Here intellectual and cultural interests transcend the small matter of race and skin color.

If the city of Chicago were divided up into cultural groups rather than racial groups all of the existing ghettoes would disappear. Then too, the element of force would be eliminated because the cultural groupings would be voluntary rather than compulsory. Dr. Drake is concerned primarily with the immediate problem of what ot do with these hordes of difficult people who insist on liv-

ing in their style and refusing to conform to urban life.

Whatever you may think of Dr. Drake's idea, at least, he has been doing some original thinking on a very serious issue. Everybody is jumping up and down, tearing his hair out on the housing issue, but very little is being accomplished. Racial tensions are building up and each conflict leads to another. Housing is in short supply, Jim Crowism makes it even worse and the population is increasing. Something is going to have to give.

It was Dr. Drake, however, who gave me the first idea what I might do about that fellow who likes to drink beer from a can while running barefoot up and down the block in the middle of the night. Let's get some "islands."

The United States Army Band

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 10, 1958

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, while the American public is understandably and properly preoccupied with those ramifications of national defense dealing with such critical areas as the combat potential of the component armed services, frequently overlooked is the continuing contribution of the military to the scene of American culture.

Such an outstanding example, well-known to Members of Congress and residents of the Washington area, is the internationally known United States Army Band, led by Maj. Hugh Curry, of Cambridge, Mass. One of the services' quartet of great musical organizations stationed in this city—the others of equal fame being the Marine Band, Navy Band, and Air Force Symphonic Band—the United States Army Band is an active contributor to the cultural life of the National Capital, performing at frequent intervals before the public, during the summer season at such locations as the steps of the Capitol and the Watergate and, during the midwinter series of concerts, at the Interdepartmental Auditorium.

Maj. Hugh Curry, the leader and commanding officer of the United States Army Band, the official representative band of the Department of the Army is the son of the late Hugh Curry and of Alice Duggan Curry. He attended St. Paul's Parochial School in Cambridge, the Cambridge High and Latin School, and graduated from the Boston University College of Music with the degree of bachelor of music. Just prior to entering the Army of the United States, he was prominent as a teacher of music at Rindge Technical School in Cambridge, Mass.

Hugh Curry entered the Army in 1941 and served as an enlisted man in the band of the 101st Field Artillery of the 26th Division, Massachusetts National Guard, until June of 1942 when he entered the Army Music School for Bandleader Candidates in Washington. He was later appointed a warrant officer band leader, and subsequently served in the United States Army Band as its assistant leader. The band was at that time assigned to Allied Force Headquarters of the north African theater of operations in Algiers.

On October 1, 1945, Assistant Leader Curry was designated acting leader and commanding officer of the Army Band, shortly after which he directed the band on a highly successful concert tour of the United States in the interest of the victory bond drive sponsored by the United States Treasury Department. On January 4, 1946, Chief Warrant Officer Curry was appointed leader of the Army Band to succeed Capt. Thomas F. Darcy. He was commissioned a captain in the Army of the United States in 1946, and in 1952 was promoted to the rank of major.

Among the first acts of Gen. John J. Pershing on becoming Chief of Staff after World War I was the creation of the United States Army Band.

Although the General Headquarters Band of the American Expeditionary Force was organized in France in 1917 by General Pershing, then commander in chief of the AEF, it was only temporary and broke up soon after the armistice.

Partly because of that unit's outstanding record during its brief existence and partly because of a genuine need for a permanent military musical outfit, General Pershing brought the United States Army Band into being in 1922.

The United States Army Band quickly assumed its important role in local, national, and world affairs. The general's faith and judgment were increasingly juistified down through the years, and to the present day it has become an inseparable part of the pride and colorful tradition of the United States Army.

It is made up of more than 100 bandsmen—the cream of the Army's musicians. Before their incorporation into military service, they played in well-known orchestras and dance bands throughout the country, and many of them are products of America's finest music schools. Names of brothers are on the rolls and there is also a father-and-son team. Nucleus around which the organization revolves is a respected, slowly dwindling little group of men who are all onetime members of the "Pershing's Own" 1917 band.

The United States Army Band is often called on as the lead unit in important parades. It has taken part in parades commemorating national holidays, both here and abroad, and in parades of welcome for returning heroes. A partial list of the more noteworthy of these parades gives some idea of the scope of its job as the United States Army's representative musical outfit.

For example, there were Bastille Day, 1943, in Algiers; Armistice Day, 1944, in Paris; Dwight D. Eisenhower's homecoming in Washington in 1945, and the homecoming of the 82d Airborne Division in New York City in 1946.

It has marched in the glittering inaugural parades of five of our Presidents—Calvin Coolidge, Herbert Hoover, Franklin D. Roosevelt, Harry S. Truman and Dwight D. Eisenhower; and it has solemnly led the way in the funeral corteges of Warren G. Harding, Woodrow Wilson, and William Howard Taft.

On July 19, 1948, the band once more marched slowly to the muffled beat of drums. On the way to his final resting place in Arlington National Cemetery was its gallant progenitor, Gen. John J. Pershing.

Simple ceremonies at the Tomb of the Unknown Soldier in Arlington National Cemetery and elaborate, formal receptions for visting dignitaries are frequent highlights in the United States Army Band's notable career. Other, more diversified activities for which it is called on are the annual Cherry Blossom Festival in Washington, the opening baseball game of the American League season when the President traditionally tosses out the first ball, and national meetings of patriotic groups like the Daughters of the American Revolution, American Legion, Veterans of Foreign Wars, and Gold Star Mothers.

The United States Army Band has been a regular contributor to radio and television and it has made countless broadcasts over the country's major networks since it first went on the air in 1923. Some of its better known presentations have been Division Dairy, This Week in History, and Campus Salute. Its annual Freedom Sings series of concerts, featuring internationally famous guest stars, for a number of years has been a steadily popular Tuesday night feature.

During World War II it traveled extensively overseas, entertaining American and allied troops and civilians, and from June 1943 until its return to the United States, 2 years later to the month, it gave more than 500 performances in 17 African and European countries.

Allan E. Pestcoe, Science Talent Search Award Winner

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANTE B. FASCELL
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 10, 1958

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, Allan E. Pestcoe, 17, a high-school senior from Miami Beach, Fla., has been in Washington February 27 through March 3, as one of 40 most promising research scientists in America's high school selected in the 17th annual science talent search conducted for the Westinghouse science scholarships and awards by science clubs of America. He was invited to Washington for an all-expense trip along with other winners from 19 States and the District of Columbia chosen by judges from among 25,039 contestants.

As his qualifying scientific projects, he investigated the effects of 2,4-D, a commonly used plant spray, on the absorption of sulfur in plants and has determined the movement rates of sulfur and phosphorus in leaves. Both projects were carried out in the radioisotopes laboratory in his high school and are

reported in his required search paper. As student director of the laboratory, he has helped to design and build a gamma-ray chamber and to adapt Atomic Energy Commission handbook procedures to the equipment available to the students. He is now planning the construction of a small heavy-ion linear accelerator.

The son of Mr. and Mrs. Harry Pestcoe, 6375 Indian Creek Drive, Miami Beach, Allan would like to attend the California Institute of Technology following his graduation this year from Miami Beach High School.

I feel his unusual scientific ability is certainly well evidenced by these very able activities. In this era of great scientific emphasis, I take pleasure in congratulating him and commending his efforts to my colleagues' attention.

Extension of the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 10, 1958

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks I include a very fine letter supporting the extension of the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act sent to me by Ernest Henderson, president of the World Trade Center in New England, Inc., 470 Atlantic Avenue, Boston, Mass. Mr. Henderson is one of the outstanding businessmen in the United States.

The letter follows:

THE WORLD TRADE CENTER
IN NEW ENGLAND, INC.,
Boston, Mass., March 5, 1958.

Hon. JOHN W. McCORMACK,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. McCORMACK: The World Trade Center in New England strongly advocates a 5-year extension of the Trade Agreements Act which expires on June 30 of this year.

We really favor a much longer extension than the one requested by President Eisenhower but will go along with this proposal as the very barest minimum requirement at this critical time.

Under the Trade Agreements Act the United States has participated greatly in the worldwide exchange of goods and has substantially expanded its markets abroad by reciprocally lowering tariff and trade barriers and liberalizing trade regulations.

Foreign trade has poured more than $30 billion annually in recent years into the lifestream of our economy and it is estimated that the families of at least 4,500,000 American workers gain their livelihood from this important area of economic activity.

It is indeed unfortunate that we do not stop to realize that our exports play such an important role in our economy and prosperity and that exports are geared precisely to imports since others must sell to us in order to buy from us. Our business friends overseas must be able to earn the dollars they spend for our products and they can only do so if we provide them fair and reasonable access to our markets.

Great and important, however, as foreign trade is to us, it is of far more importance to other friendly nations of the world. Foreign trade averages about 5 percent of our gross national economy, but the corresponding figure for Holland is 40 percent, for West Germany 15 percent, for Great Britain 18 percent, for Italy 12 percent, and for Japan 15 percent. The future growth of many countries depends, in great part, on expanding trade with each other and us.

Every time we move to impede instead of liberalize world trade we not only hurt ourselves but we alienate more friends abroad. Unless we pass the Trade Agreements Act we are playing directly into the hands of the Soviets who, with their full and immediate control over trade policies, are in a position to fill every vacuum we create and win every battle we lose.

In addition, we seem to forget that Russia has accelerated its productivity to the extent that, within a period of as little as 20 years, it will have caught up with and, perhaps, surpassed the United States. If Russia retains her controlled economy and we do nothing to meet this challenge we will be unable to compete with her in foreign markets and we will be obliged to yield victory in the cold war by default.

The development of international business is the reason for the existence of the World Trading Center and at this moment we are alarmed that all we are striving for and all the United States has worked for in promoting trade throughout the world for more than a generation can be lost and that we can hand the Soviet Union another cheap and significant victory.

The World Trade Center in New England, having given this matter careful consideration and study, firmly believes that the extension of the Trade Agreements Act is one of the most important matters facing the Congress today. It deserves the support of all of the people because its passage will serve notice on Soviet Russia that we are vitally interested in world development which is the basis of peace and understanding and that we will bend every effort toward that end.

The World Trade Center in New England respectfully urges you to support extension of the trade agreements program.

Sincerely yours,
ERNEST HENDERSON,
President.

Hearings on H. R. 10293

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OREN HARRIS
OF ARKANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 10, 1958

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, on Friday, March 7, I issued the following release with respect to hearings to be held on H. R. 10293, a bill to establish a national scientific reserve fund, introduced by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DAWSON]. In view of the great interest which has been manifested by many scientists throughout the country, I would like to serve notice that the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce stands ready to hold hearings on this legislation as soon as possible after reports have been received on this bill from the departments and agencies of the Government.

The text of the release is as follows:

Congressman OREN HARRIS, Democrat, of Arkansas, chairman, House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, announced today that hearings would be scheduled on H. R. 10293, a bill to establish a national scientific reserve fund, as soon as possible after receipt by the committee of reports from the various departments and agencies of the Federal Government, setting forth their views with regard to this legislation.

The committee has been advised that the National Science Board of the National Science Foundation will meet on March 14, 1958, at which meeting the Board will consider the position of the National Science Foundation with regard to this legislation. Requests have been made of the departments and agencies of the executive branch to submit their views on this legislation as soon as possible so that hearings may be scheduled promptly on H. R. 10293.

The Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce is aware of the great and urgent need for additional support for basic research. As a matter of fact, hearings were begun by the committee on January 24, 1958, on this very subject in the course of which Dr. Detlev Bronk, Chairman of the National Science Board and President of the National Academy of Sciences; Dr. Alan T. Waterman, Director of the National Science Foundation; and Dr. Paul M. Gross, Chairman, Executive Committee, National Science Board, testified.

Since introduction of H. R. 10293 by Congressman DAWSON, Democrat, of Illinois, the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce has received hundreds of communications from scientists who are active at universities and research institutions all over the country, in support of this legislation. These communications indicate the great interest in this legislation on the part of all those who are seeking to keep the United States ahead in basic research.

Let's Quit Soil Bank Fiasco, Brannan Plan Is Much Better

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROY W. WIER
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 10, 1958

Mr. WIER. Mr. Speaker, in the Springfield Advance-Press, Springfield, Brown County, Minn., Thursday, March 6, there appears a fine editorial written by Aug. G. Erickson. It deals with the present farm program and is a very thought-provoking article and I should like to call it to the attention of all Members of the House. Therefore, I ask that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

The editorial follows:

LET'S QUIT SOIL BANK FIASCO, BRANNAN PLAN IS MUCH BETTER

Paying farmers for taking land out of production is wasteful. Just as it is uneconomic to pay people for being idle, so it is a waste of money to pay for letting land lie idle. It was hoped that the soil bank idea would serve to cut the surplus, but it hasn't proved effective. Some landowners received fabulous checks—and what did they do to deserve them? They did nothing.

Farmers should be paid for producing food and fiber, not for not producing. The Brannan plan would do away with this foolish idea of paying for waste. The Brannan plan would save the small farmer and the marginal farmer and shift the responsibility for surpluses to those responsible for them, the bonanza farmers. It would solve the surplus problem.

Don Brown, Waseca editor, who was defeated in the recent first district primary for the GOP nomination, said last week: "Support benefits should be based on production, not on acreage. Too, we should have a graduated scale of support to prevent giant operators walking off with $100,000 Government checks. Our income tax payments are graduated according to the size of our income."

These ideas would fit perfectly into the Brannan plan, which plan Mr. Brown said "was not all wrong" when he filed for Congress.

Assuming that subsidizing the farmer is fair, since we subsidize labor and industry with the protective tariff and provide unemployment insurance for idle workers, the Brannan plan provides the simplest means of accomplishing this.

Give the little fellow enough to provide full parity for what he produces and sells on the open market. If he raises 1,000 bushels of wheat for which the elevator pays him $1.50 a bushel and parity is $2 a bushel, the Government pays him $500. That he has earned, if he is entitled to parity, and who says he isn't? Same with all his products up to a limited amount. For a certain amount of farm income, say $5,000 (just as an example) pay enough extra to give him parity. On the next $5,000, pay enough to give him 90 percent of parity. Then 80 percent, 70 percent, 60 percent, etc. That means that the farmer who farms on a large scale may have to curtail operations, perhaps sell some land to small farmers, reversing the evil trend of the past decades and putting farmers back on the land. At least it should stop the migration of farmers from the land. Nobody need worry about that big farmer, either. He can take care of himself. He's the one that caused the surplus in the first place, the man responsible for the problem.

In the end everybody gets his subsidy in dollars, so what difference does it make whether it is squeezed out of the public through tariff and labor laws or paid in cash by the Government?

Under the Brannan plan the farmer sells on the open market and receives from the Government the difference between what he gets and what he should have gotten in order to receive parity. Everyone admits he should get parity. President Eisenhower said at Kasson he should get 100 percent of parity, while the Democrats had been guaranteeing him only 90 percent. If prices are low, the consumer benefits. Price supports hurt the consumer.

Remember, there's always a market for farm products, at some price. No matter what the farmer ships to the livestock market, it gets sold. The elevator always buys his grain at the prevailing price. The small farmer won't have to worry about what that price is. He will get his parity. The bonanza farmer may find the price too low to continue producing on a large scale. He will cut his acreage, and he won't get paid for it.

The result of such a plan would be more small farms, more people remaining on the farm, where they will be happy and fairly prosperous, instead of glutting the labor market by moving to the cities, already plagued by unemployment.

This plan will save the marginal farmers of northern Minnesota. They are having a rough time now. It will stop the trend in southern Minnesota of farmers buying adjoining farms and tearing down the building which may be progress of a certain kind, but it is not social progress. When you tear down a farm house that once housed a contented farm family, you are reversing social progress, banishing a neighbor and taking from the small town a rural customer. And to what purpose? To build up the big cities, already overcrowded.

Only this Brannan plan will put more people on farms. In time it will result in the conversion of the vast cutover region of northern Minnesota into a populated and substantial agricultural area. This simple plan will work miracles, and in the end solve the surplus problem.

Why Modern Highways Are Essential to America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. W. R. HULL, JR.
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 10, 1958

Mr. HULL. Mr. Speaker, we in Missouri are extremely proud of our State highway system. A large part of the credit for our excellent system goes to the voters of Missouri who have consistently supported sound road programs.

The will of the people for good roads, soundly financed, has been given a push toward realization by an outstanding professional group, the Missouri Highway Engineers Association.

This group met recently in Kansas City, Mo., and those in attendance had an opportunity to hear, among other speeches by outstanding men, a very fine talk by Missouri's distinguished Senator, the Honorable STUART SYMINGTON.

A former member of the Senate Committee on Public Works, Senator SYMINGTON, discussed the subject, Why Modern Highways Are Essential to America.

Under unanimous consent, I include his speech in the Appendix of the RECORD:

WHY MODERN HIGHWAYS ARE ESSENTIAL TO AMERICA

(Address by Senator SYMINGTON before the Highway Engineers Association annual dinner, Kansas City, Mo., February 27, 1958)

At a time when the minds of many are concentrated on outer space, it would seem wise—and it is certainly pleasant—to get down to earth and talk about our highways.

This is one subject on which we can point up our needs, outline our deficiencies, and still know that we are far superior to any other country on earth.

There are those who believe that world conditions make it necessary to curtail heavily our highway program, in order to increase our defense strength.

Nothing could be more erroneous—or, for that matter, more dangerous.

In this nuclear age, highways are an integral and vital part of our defense strength. We must be able to move rapidly. There can be no breakdown in transportation. Such a breakdown would immobilize America.

As illustration, into the city of New York alone, there moves each day over the bridges and through the tunnels over 20,000 tons of food.

Without one of the world's most modern highway systems leading into that city, this would be impossible.

Let's not consider as any luxury, therefore, our planned, modern highway system. It is a necessity, and the record so proves.

For some time I sat on the Senate Public Works Committee, that committee which handles the highway program in the Senate. Both in that committee and on the Senate floor, Senator ALBERT GORE, of Tennessee, was the leader in development of progressive highway legislation.

The ranking minority member and former chairman is Senator EDWARD MARTIN of Pennsylvania; and I never heard the matter of good highways come up that he did not emphasize their value to our national security.

Such a system is also vital to our prosperity. America can only continue to exist as we know it through emphasis on a strong, progressive, dynamic economy.

In the past 10 years our gross national product has increased from $257 billion to $434 billion. Our highways must be geared to support that gigantic increase in economic activity.

Money and effort efficiently devoted to highway construction can only be a sound investment in the future of the United States.

Today, with this country experiencing an economic decline, the Nation's highway program has an added significance.

It is quite possible that the tortoiselike speed exhibited in much highway construction throughout the country has in itself contributed to the current recession. Certainly, this added stimulus to employment, plus the increased demand for construction materials and equipment, would help turn the trend of our economy in the right direction.

But essentials such as highways should not be postponed, like medicine, for use only when economy is ill.

A construction program geared to the increased needs and increased population is sound, regardless of our general economic health.

It is better to have a stepped-up highway program now, with the resultant improvement in our economy, than to have a relief program inaugurated later in order to stay the rate of deterioration of our economy.

This same principle applies to school construction, flood-control projects, and other comparable programs.

The Federal Government as well as the State and local governments have a constructive tool ready at hand to accomplish two major objectives—eliminate our highway deficiencies, and reverse the recession trend.

The Federal-aid highway program is based on the principle of partnership between the Federal Government and the States. It is important that this does not involve a taking over by the Central Government of the prerogatives of the States.

The broad interests of the country as a whole, and of each taxpayer in particular, should be protected and encouraged by the Federal Government. In so doing, that Government has insisted on minimum construction standards; and has retained a veto power as to where Federal funds should be used.

These powers have been embodied in law and are all right if used in an atmosphere of agreement on objectives.

But the role of the States is largely unimpaired by this centralized authority. Federal highway aid should not and has not been translated into Federal domination.

On this point may I give deserved credit to the contributions—both in attitude and in ideas—of Missouri officials and Missouri citizens who have played a most important role in the passage of the 1956 act.

As you know, the proposal for an all-powerful Federal organization to administer our road programs was discarded; and is something we plan to do our best to see will not be revived.

Any actions which would tend to delay or stymie effective implementation of the present program can only encourage the pro-

ponents of greater centralized control to revive their unfortunate proposals.

Historically, Federal-State cooperation in building highways has been increasing at an irregular pace. Fortunately, however, it has been going in the right direction.

As we view the history of this progress, three major legislative actions stand out.

The Federal Highway Act of 1916 initiated the development of an integrated highway system, and established the requirement that every State must have a functioning highway department before it could be eligible for assistance under the act.

The Federal Aid Act of 1944 authorized a national system of interstate highways to connect metropolitan areas and industrial centers throughout the country.

The most recent legislative milestone in this field is the Federal Aid Highway Act of 1956. In this act our legislative program came of age—more nearly geared, in magnitude and policy, to the economic and defense needs of the country.

If this legislation is administered as Congress intended, we will have, in fact, a national highway system.

This 1956 act earmarked funds from specific sources. I cannot say I believe that this is necessarily the best way to finance a program of such importance and magnitude, as the amount of funds can fluctuate downward while the need for the highways increases.

Actually, a sound and adequate highway structure benefits all—not just the users—and hence necessary funds might appropriately come from general revenue accounts.

In spite of certain weaknesses, however, I consider the 1956 Highway Act an outstanding development in highway legislation.

Now that the intent of the American people, reflected through their Congress, has been clearly expressed in this law, it would seem wise to go about getting the job done as effectively and promptly as possible.

At this point, let me draw a brief parallel with what happened last year in the military defense program.

National intelligence information substantiated beyond reasonable doubt that we were rapidly losing both our qualitative and quantitative superiority to the Soviets in weapons systems. The need to act to reverse our relative decline was clear. Yet, our military manpower was cut back, funds for research and development were withheld, production schedules of planes and submarines were decreased, and ballistic missile programs were curtailed.

Turning to our new highway program, we see some of the same forces at work. Efforts are being made to stretch out the program. Actions are proposed for diverting money from the trust fund to pay expenses of the Labor Department, to pay tax collectors of the Treasury Department, to finance costs for national forest roads, and to withdraw revenues obtained from the aviation gasoline tax.

These diversions are estimated to amount to as much as $68 million per year.

Here, again, we have evidence of the policy of placing fiscal objectives ahead of this country's welfare.

In the face of increasing costs and increasing requirements, the need is to increase the highway trust fund—not to raid it.

There are many features of this highway program about which you know much more than I.

As example, there is the question of the State allocation formula, currently being reviewed because the Congress soon has to take action regarding it.

Hearings are being held, and I understand the Comptroller General is being asked to analyze the data.

Without attempting to suggest the proper formula before we have all the facts and analyses, I do believe that it is necessary to have uniform criteria for defining the needs of the respective States, regardless of what formula is used.

And so, in summary, it would seem that a sound approach to carrying out the highway program can be stated simply: Determine the needs for highways for all purposes; provide, on a Federal-State cooperative basis, as much financing as is required to meet those needs fully; and then put the program into effect as quickly as possible, without adjustments for nonhighway objectives.

Forthright Report on Security

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GLENARD P. LIPSCOMB
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 10, 1958

Mr. LIPSCOMB. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I am submitting for inclusion in the RECORD an article written by George Todt, which appeared recently in the Valley Times, California, commenting on the Committee on Government Operations report on United States military aid and supply programs in Western Europe.

The article follows:

FORTHRIGHT REPORT ON SECURITY

(By George Todt)

"The sickening pang of hope deferr'd." Scott's Lady of the Lake.

In a hard-hitting but completely down-to-earth, unanimous bipartisan report, the House Military Operations Subcommittee said pretty much in effect what this column has repeatedly warned its readers of over the last 3 years: "Military aid programs are developed and funded with little, if any, regard for the net increase in defense posture which could be obtained if the resources applied to foreign programs were applied to United States military programs."

Which is a polite way of saying our allies have been dragging their feet in the so-called mutual security program. The report minced no words about it and called a spade a spade in this instance. Two of the signers were Los Angeles' Congressmen GLENARD P. LIPSCOMB, Republican, and CHET HOLIFIELD, Democrat. Democrats and Republicans all banded together on this one.

Frankly, the Military Operations Subcommittee seems to feel that we have been milked—but good. Here is a part of its statement which touches on this vital area:

"While the United States embarks on a program of speedup in the development of missiles and to increase the strength of its Armed Forces, no similar approach can be expected of the Western European countries.

"Under present methods of operation, we do not know what we are trying to accomplish through military aid.

"Congressional appropriations are little better than blank checks.

"It is necessary to dispel the illusion that our dollars have bought more security than is the case.

"Charges of waste and mismanagement in our military aid program have been viewed by many as an attack on the basic objectives of the program. This shield will no longer serve. A hardheaded reexamination is long overdue because the wastage is too great to be ignored."

But how do the American people get the facts for the great debate suggested by the thinking of the Military Operations Subcommittee? At least some partial answer was pointed up in regards to the difficulty of our people pursuing such a line of intelligent inquiry for themselves when the report noted that "the data needed for intelligent public debate on military assistance are largely contained in classified documents. For the most part, the American people are asked to take this program on faith rather than on the basis of a full disclosure of relevant information."

This is little short of a damning indictment of the foreign aid program we have pursued since the end of the Second World War. Especially when the dynamite-laden report touches upon—perhaps hints would be a better word for it—what could easily be the real fly in the ointment all along. Consider this: The committee suggested a concentration on forms of aid other than military programs which make "underdeveloped nations a vast dumping ground for secondhand war materiel which can be considered obsolete in any future war which this Nation will quite likely be forced to fight nearly alone. Any modern merchants of death in on this operation? Hmm?

The Subcommittee minced no words about our national security as based on foreign military aid outlays in the past: It called it a dangerous illusion of security. The solons said that the whole concept of NATO (North Atlantic Treaty Organization) military power is dangerously outmoded and requires complete revision from the ground floor up. Its weapons, tactics and strategy are not fundamentally sound—and we are foolish to rely upon it for our own security so much as we may have done in the past.

What the Military Subcommittee seems to be saying to us is something like this: "Let's face it. These NATO partners of ours just don't have it any more. They are incapable of playing their full role with us as comrades-in-arms. Or maybe they just don't want to any longer. Perhaps they hope to sit the next war out on the sidelines. Isn't it time for a public debate on what our own American military policy ought to be in the future? What's the score?"

No, I didn't write this report, myself. But it would appear from my past writings in the Valley Times that the forthright Committee members and I see this matter in much the same light. What about that public debate?

Courage on Summit Parley Issue—United States Stand for Productive Preliminaries Seen Brushing Aside Soviet Pretense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALVIN M. BENTLEY
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 10, 1958

Mr. BENTLEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the text of an article from the March 7 issue of the Washington Star, by David Lawrence, and entitled "Courage on Summit Parley Issue." The article gives well-deserved praise to President Eisenhower and Secretary of State Dulles for insisting on productive and essential preliminary talks before any so-called summit conference takes place. This stand will clearly show whether the Russians desire such a conference for propaganda purposes or whether they

actually want some constructive results to come from such a meeting. The article follows:

COURAGE ON SUMMIT PARLEY ISSUE—UNITED STATES STAND FOR PRODUCTIVE PRELIMINARIES SEEN BRUSHING ASIDE SOVIET PRETENSE

(By David Lawrence)

It takes genuine courage to issue a note such as the Government of the United States has just sent to the Soviet Union in an attempt to brush aside the pretense of the Communists and get to the root of their demand for a summit conference.

First impressions might be that straight talk could prevent the holding of a summit conference. Actually, it may work out the other way. For, as the United States earnestly attempts to clear the air, the way is wide open to an agreement at any moment if by chance the Soviet Union sincerely desires to make one.

Unfortunately, the biggest single obstacle to the holding of a summit conference in 1958 is the record of what happened when the last summit conference was held in Geneva in 1955. It was indeed a showy affair, and when the United States now says it isn't interested in repeating that kind of parley, out of which again would come meaningless communiques, there is no doubt that the true difficulties of a spectacular session are being realistically underlined.

Originally a summit conference meant that the heads of governments would get together for a quiet talk by themselves. But the Geneva session showed that, with a couple thousand reporters and photographers at the doors and lots of secretaries and attachés inside, the meeting might just as well have been held in Madison Square Garden. International agreements are never reached that way. It was a propaganda affair from start to finish.

Even as the Soviets were professing high purposes, they were secretly making an arms deal with Nasser and stirring up tension in the Middle East, which has not since been relieved.

The United States says it wants a conference that would begin seriously to resolve important issues and inaugurate significant steps to limit armaments, and it doesn't want just to get together to have a lot of talk and press notices.

It isn't clear as yet what the Soviet strategy really is. The persistence of the Moscow regime in pushing for a summit conference is not explained by anything that has happened in recent weeks. For there's no evidence from the Soviets of any intention to make any concessions anywhere in the world.

The only explanation that is regarded here as plausible is that the Communist rulers are trying to placate their own public opinion. It is important for Khrushchev to gain prestige with his own people, and there would seem to be no better way from his standpoint than to begin hobnobbing with the President of the United States and the Prime Minister of Great Britain. This seeming recognition of the respectability of the Communist cause in the world is very important internally in the Soviet Union to the men in the Kremlin.

But the United States Government, which is pretty well informed on what's going on inside Russia, has not been stampeded by the propaganda barrage and has not hesitated to insist that, if there is going to be a "summit" conference, it must take up every important issue that is creating tension in the world today. It is significant that the United States, in listing the issues, includes the "enforced partition of Germany" and the "external interference in countries of Eastern Europe" as well as effective disarmament measures.

The mere fact that the United States reiterates its concern over the tragic continuance of a divided Germany and once more emphasizes its dismay at the interference by the Soviet government in the affairs of Hungary, for instance, indicates that the western allies have not been bluffed by the rising tide of artificial opinion generated by the Communists in many western countries in an effort to make it appear that the West is rigid and inflexible and unwilling to make peace.

Every day there are evidences that the Communists have stirred up mass meetings and phony "peace movements" in almost every Western country, using not only their stooges but many well-meaning persons who are gullible enough to fall for these tactics. The impression sought to be created is that the western democracies are "warmongers," eager to precipitate a conflict and desirous only of maintaining large armaments for materialistic reasons. The truth, of course, is that the western democracies have to be prodded into bigger and bigger expenditures on armament and that, at the slightest sign of an easing of tension, there is a tendency to relax the spending.

It is a matter of great encouragement to freemen everywhere that the President of the United States and the Secretary of State not only see through the Soviet maneuvers but are insisting that, if there is going to be another "summit" meeting, something definite will have to be assured in advance—something that will really give tangible evidence of a desire to relieve tension in the world. The latest note is an illuminating example of open diplomacy with all the moral strength that comes from earnestness and sincerity.

Self-Help Economic Plan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JACK WESTLAND
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 10, 1958

Mr. WESTLAND. Mr. Speaker, I am always proud to present to the Members of the Congress the achievements accomplished by the people of the Second District of Washington. Like most people, they have problems. But, unlike some people of our time, these folks try to do something themselves to solve their problems before turning to others outside their own communities.

The concept of the dairy self-help plan originated in my district, because these people believe they should try to solve their own problems. And now the residents of one community have started a self-help economic project to solve an unemployment situation.

This community, Friday Harbor on San Juan Island, normally has 1,000 population. A couple of years ago, however, this dropped to less than 800 because of a poor farming season, a poor run of salmon, a shortage of tourists, and the closing of the island's cement plant.

What the townspeople did about it is told by C. L. Anderson in A Town and Its Do-It-Yourself Economic Project, an article which appeared in the February 16, 1958, issue of the Seattle Times.

Everyone from Mayor Al Lindberg on down attended town meetings and meetings of the economic council in hopes of finding an answer to the unemployment problem. Finally, John K. O'Neil, a television service operator, invented an emergency attachment for radio-telephones which enables a fishing boat to transmit distress signals. It looked as if a possible new industry would be born in Friday Harbor.

Few, if any, of the unemployed knew anything about electronics, so Frank Jones of Eastsound started classes last November. The 75 pupils, such as Cleve Vandersluys, learned quickly.

On January 8, 1958, John Wade, Sam Burton, and Vic Reynolds, production-line men, assembled the first attachment while David Ruthroff, secretary-treasurer of the new company, and Mrs. Patricia Fairweather, the company's first office employee, watched.

By early April, employment is expected to rise to 20. However, this isn't all the town of Friday Harbor expects to do. The townspeople are still looking for new industries. This is in the tradition of the Second District, which believes in self-help.

The article follows:

A TOWN AND ITS DO-IT-YOURSELF ECONOMIC PROJECT

(By C. L. Anderson)

The citizens of Friday Harbor on San Juan Island knew they must do something.

It was late 1956. Farming had been poor that year and the salmon run didn't amount to much. A fish cannery had turned to packing peas, but without profit. The tourist trade was below normal.

Then came a real blow—closing of the Roche Harbor Lime & Cement Co. at the north end of the island. It had employed about 50 persons.

Unemployment became a serious problem. The population, about 1,000 in 1955, was below 800.

The town's businessmen began discussing ideas for putting the economy on a sounder basis and making it less dependent on summer activity. More year-round industry was needed.

An economic council was formed. But after many meetings of the council and townspeople, it was apparent that a tangible project, however small, was needed to spur the program.

John K. O'Neil, 47, operator of a television service at Friday Harbor, came up with one. He had invented what he called a Channelgard, a fishing-boat radio-telephone attachment for distress signals.

Production of the Channelgard looked like a possible new industry for Friday Harbor. But the unemployed persons in the area knew little about electronics. They had been fishermen, loggers, and cannery and quarry workers.

Through the State board of vocational education's help, an intensified training program was set up. Frank Jones, of Eastsound, started classes on a 6-hour-a-week schedule last November and 75 students enrolled. They learned quickly.

Production of Channelgards began December 16, with three men on the production line. Another student was hired as office help. The first Channelgard came of the production line January 8.

The classes are continuing and more students will be hired.

"We expect to employ 20 persons when we've reached our present full-production goal," O'Neil said, "That probably will be in early April. We should be producing 200 a week by then."

Sesco, Inc., the corporation formed to produce Channelgards, already is looking for new products to turn out and sell. Other ideas for increasing employment in Friday Harbor are being developed.

"We're not going to rest until everyone in Friday Harbor is gainfully employed and we're importing persons for jobs," O'Neil said.

Appendix

A Test for Babysitters From Medford, Oreg.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES O. PORTER
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 10, 1958

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent I include the following article, Can Your Babysitter Pass This Test? by Leslie Cameron which appeared in the American Weekly for March 2, 1958. As the father of four children I am among the millions who qualify as a judge of babysitters. This is a good test. Medford High School deserves to be commended for the work they have done in this area, an area that is important for us parents but also has everything to do with the training of girls—and boys too—for the day when they will have children of their own.

CAN YOUR BABYSITTER PASS THIS TEST?

(By Leslie Cameron)

The city of Medford, Oreg., with a population of about 25,000 people, probably can honestly claim that it has the most competent and reliable babysitters in the country.

They are all teen-agers and graduates of a high-school babysitting course that has been taught since 1955 by a faculty made up of a police captain, the director of safety and first aid, the dean of girls, the school nurse and a member of the PTA.

Before a teener can become a certified sitter, available only through an employment office in the high school, he or she must be able to cook and serve simple meals, prepare a variety of baby formulas, bathe, dress and diaper a baby, apply first aid for cuts and minor injuries, and give artificial respiration.

And before the would-be sitter gets a diploma, he or she must pass a written examination and 2 oral tests with a mark of at least 85 percent.

How do you think you, or the sitter you hired last week, would make out on the following questions taken from these tests? Score five points for each correct answer. If you score less than 40 you'd have a hard time getting a babysitting job in Medford, Oreg.

ARE THESE STATEMENTS TRUE OR FALSE?

1. If you hear strange noises, or think someone is prowling around the house, don't call the police until you're sure you're right.
2. It's all right to let a stranger into the house if he tells you that he is a friend of the family.
3. If you get lonely, don't call some of your friends on the phone and hold long conversations.
4. Leave the latch off the door so your employers can get in if they arrive home late and you should fall asleep.
5. In an emergency it is all right to leave the child alone for a few minutes.
6. In case of fire, first call the parents and then the fire department.
7. If the phone rings while you are bathing the baby, wrap the child in a blanket and take it along with you while you answer the call.
8. If you have given a child a dose of medicine and he doesn't retain it, give it another dose.
9. It is not necessary to check on a sleeping child oftener than once an hour.
10. Give a restless child any toy he wants if it will help him get to sleep.

ANSWERS

1. False. Always call the police if you are in doubt about strange noises.
2. False. Never allow anybody but members of the family into the house.
3. True. Don't tie up the phone. Your employers may want to reach you.
4. False. Always keep doors locked and shades drawn when you are alone.
5. False. In an emergency, always take the child with you if you leave the house.
6. False. Get the child, or children, out of the house, call the fire department, then the parents.
7. True. Never, under any circumstances, leave a baby alone in its bath.
8. False. It might be dangerous to repeat the dose.
9. False. The sitter should check up on the child at least every half hour.
10. False. Never give a child sharp toys on which he could hurt himself, or toys small enough to be swallowed.

Parole Is Also Justice

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EMANUEL CELLER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 10, 1958

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, the Honorable George J. Reed, Chairman, United States Board of Paroles, recently delivered the following address, Parole Is Also Justice, at the Third Annual Southern Conference on Corrections at Florida State University, Tallahassee, Fla.

Mr. Reed discusses the need for setting up uniform standards in dealing with the parole of prisoners incarcerated in our Federal correctional institutions. The Supreme Court has often pointed out that parole is not a matter of right but one of legislative grace. Under our laws, the whole matter of parole is left to the informed discretion of our Parole Board. This tremendous duty places upon our paroling authorities a great responsibility to develop a set of firm, uniform standards to assure equal justice to those who seek their consideration.

In the last session of Congress I sponsored a resolution which seeks a similar result in connection with the sentencing of prisoners, House Joint Resolution 424. It provides for a series of institutes or joint councils, under the auspices of the Judicial Conference of the United States, in order that judges and other Federal officials may meet to discuss their experiences and to study and formulate uniform standards for sentencing. I am happy to know that the Chairman of the United States Board of Paroles shares similar views with regard to parole problems. The interesting address which follows points up the need for parole officers to meet and discuss problems in this field so that they may develop uniform standards for use as guides in deciding parole problems.

The address follows:

PAROLE IS ALSO JUSTICE

(Address by George J. Reed, chairman, U. S. Board of Parole, before the Third Annual Southern Conference on Corrections, Florida State University, Tallahassee, Fla., Wednesday, February 19, 1958.)

It is a real pleasure to be with you on this the occasion of the Third Annual Southern Conference on Corrections. It is a good experience to get away from Washington and the regular office routine as well as outside the Parole Board hearing room to meet with professional correctional workers. We in this field need more time to sit down together, to compare experiences, discuss our problems and thereby better define our objectives and keep a fresh objective outlook toward our work.

A little over a year ago, while reviewing the American Law Institute's proposed model Penal Code, I discussed with the Honorable George Edwards, justice of the Michigan Supreme Court, the question of parole selection Justice Edwards pointed out that while parole, from a legal point of view, is a part of the original sentence and is therefore a matter of grace and discretion on the part of the parole board, he was sometimes confused and at the same time concerned at the lack of a true criterion for parole board decisions.

Since that evening, over a year ago, I have been attempting to reassess my own philosophy of parole selection and study present practices in the field in an effort to formulate an adequate answer to Justice Edwards' question. After searching the decisions of the Federal courts I am reassured as to the purely legal authority of a parole board either to grant or deny parole and I refer to a review of the case of *Hyatt* v. *Compagna*, where the Fifth Circuit United States Court of Appeals held in 1949, and was twice affirmed by the United States Supreme Court, that parole is a matter of legislative grace not of right. This far-reaching case further pointed out that under the Federal statutes, "the whole matter of paroles is left to the informed discretion of parole boards and court action is not made a part of it." Special attention is called to the words "informed discretion." While parole is discretionary on the part of paroling authorities the law and the courts assume such discretion to be founded on an informed well-balanced judgment. It seems to me that this puts a very great responsibility on paroling authorities to develop a firm set of standards that will assure equal considera-

tion for all cases. High above the United States Supreme Court Building in Washington, D. C., is inscribed these words, "equal justice under law." As paroling authorities, we need to reexamine our standards, our philosophy, and our procedures to make certain that parole is also equal justice.

If parole boards are to ever develop universally accepted standards for granting or denying parole we must reduce to writing answers to some of the following questions:

Should the parole board retry the case at the time of the parole-board hearing? Should the parole board undertake to equalize sentences? Should health, hardship factors or family need be given great weight in reaching a decision? How far should the board go in releasing obviously doubtful cases in order to give the prisoner the benefits of close supervision on parole? To what extent should the views of the committing court, the prosecuting agency and the community be taken into consideration?

Let us, therefore, for a little while this evening take a look at some of the progress that has been made in this field during the past few years as well as examining our continuing problems.

In an attempt to shed light on the dilemma of assuring ourselves that we practice justice in selecting prisoners for parole, let us first review the use made of parole since its early beginnings. Next let us examine the methods by which present day parole boards select prisoners for release. Lastly, perhaps we may extend our thoughts into the future with the hope that we will be able to draw some conclusions as to the possible avenues we might travel in making a just and defensible decision regarding a man's parole.

Very briefly let us turn to Europe where parole had its beginnings in the mid-1800's. Sir Walter Crofton and Sir Joshua Jebb are generally credited with introducing what was later called the Irish system of permitting a prisoner (by good behavior) to progressively work his way toward lighter forms of discipline and finally to release into the community under supervision. When prisoners were thus released they were given a ticket of leave which was revocable for irregularity of conduct anytime prior to the expiration of the original sentence.

The Irish system later was adopted with modifications in the United States with the establishment of the Elmira Reformatory in New York in 1876. Prisoners could gain parole from Elmira (as under the Irish system) by good behavior in the institution which was measured by a marking system. We find little, if anything, in the literature which indicates that there were any criteria for selecting whom to parole except the criterion of good behavior while incarcerated.

The English used parole extensively under the Borstal system with young offenders. Under this plan there was a board of persons charged with the determination of the time for release under parole supervision.

In America the rise of the reformatory movement and the indeterminate sentence led naturally to the increased use of parole. Rapidly boards were created to administer this program. With the advent of boards of parole there gradually came an awareness that their decisions should be based on other factors than the inmate's behavior while incarcerated.

Let us look briefly now at the methods by which present day boards of parole make their decisions. There are four major areas in which the members gain information regarding the prisoner. The first of these is in the realm of case analysis; by that I mean a study of the written material which has been placed together in a jacket or folder for each prisoner. This folder may container information received not only from institutional authorities, but also from relatives, community members, and the prisoner himself. As you are well aware this material may be very sketchy in some jurisdictions and very professional and complete in other jurisdictions. The second method of gaining information comes from a personal hearing which takes the form of a face-to-face interview between the prisoner and the hearing member. Incidentally, the ability of the hearing member to put the inmate at ease during such a hearing is a valuable asset. The personal hearing before a member of the board of parole should allow sufficient time for the inmate to tell his story. He has been building up for this; he has been planning for it; he has been looking forward to this day. It is important to him to have the opportunity to come before the board and tell his story in warm and friendly climate. I believe the board member should assist the applicant in making the best presentation possible. I know that many times I have had an institutional parole officer tell me that a man performs beautifully until he comes in before a hearing member, and then he simply freezes and sits there at a loss for words, unless the member comes to his rescue and asks some leading questions.

In addition to the study of the case material and the personal hearing parole boards quite often permit community members and relatives to appear before them to speak on behalf of a prisoner. This often adds to the store of knowledge concerning the community temper, the family interest and abilities, and the opportunity for employment or guidance. The Federal Board of Parole spends 2 half-days per week for this purpose. There is also in use in a scattering of jurisdictions the resource of parole prediction tables. I know of no State, however, which uses these tables which does not also use 1 or all 3 of the aforementioned methods of obtaining knowledge about the person under consideration. These so-called prediction tables are actually computations of the mathematical probabilities of success on parole according to certain characteristics possessed by the inmate. These tables are based on the experience of previously released inmates with similar characteristics.

I would now like to present certain elements which combine to influence a parole board member's decision, but first I feel it might be helpful for us to understand precisely what the member is deciding. At first contemplation we conclude that he is deciding which prisoner is to be granted parole and which is to be denied that opportunity. We must realize further, however, that in many jurisdictions that is not the question at issue. Instead the question is, "At what time shall parole be granted?" This occurs in States where parole is mandatory for all prisoners under youth authority or indeterminate sentence laws. In the Federal system the parole board decides both whom to parole and when to parole for the bulk of its prisoners. In the case of those committed under the Federal Youth Corrections Act, however, where parole is mandatory, the sole determination is the date such parole is to become effective.

We have discussed the methods of obtaining facts about the prisoner. Certainly this information becomes the primary basis for the board member's vote. We can never overlook, however, the fact that something of a member's own experience goes into his vote. His decision is based not solely upon the information known about the prisoner, but also upon his personal reaction to that information. We must ask ourselves what personal experience has the parole board member had with criminal offenders or with other members of the human race who have had difficulty adjusting to society's demands. We must further ask what academic background has he had or what study has he made in the field of corrections.

As a member reads the summaries contained in a prisoner's case file, what are the various factors which he examines before placing his vote on the official order blank? The most obvious of these is the offense which led to the conviction. Occasionally a prejudgment of the prisoner is entered at this point, and if this is a strong and all-prevailing prejudgment there is little reason to consider any other factor. Sometimes this prejudgment has already taken place by the public at large when it permits the passage of repressive legislation barring certain types of offenders from parole. Sometimes this prejudgment is made by the board member who either consciously or subconsciously forms a harsh or lenient attitude toward certain offenses. What is the member's personal reaction, for instance, toward narcotic offenders, sex offenders, draft dodgers, income-tax evaders, embezzlers, and so forth?

Closely allied to the present offense is the offender's prior criminal record. There is not time here today to discuss the concept "Once a criminal, always a criminal," but we must realize that there are groups who accept such a theory. The judicious member will study certain facts about that criminal record, such as the length of time since the last serious offense, and the pattern of the offenses. He will also consider any present influences on the prisoner which were not existent at the time the criminal record was being amassed.

The family situation should be taken into account. What is the prisoner's marital status? Who would be his associates in the household and what is the social and financial status of those associates? Have there been significant changes since imprisonment began?

It has been said that, "A man's vocation is the watershed down through which the rest of his life flows." By that is meant the employment engaged in by a person vitally affects all his other day-to-day behavior. Many a parole plan has gone for naught due to the lack of a realistic employment opportunity. And so we must examine a man's previous experience in the industrial world. How long has he spent on previous jobs and why did he leave them? What skills did he learn prior to and during institutionalization? Further, was his employment a factor in his offense? For instance, did he become an embezzler while working for a loan company, or did he sell narcotics while employed in a hospital or clinic? At times it is possible for the board, through its agents, to practice social manipulation in making possible successful parole.

Other factors to be considered include the prisoner's health as it affects his opportunity for employment. Incidentally, it might be interesting to learn how often poor health or disability prevents an ex-convict from committing further crimes.

The parole board should inquire into the availability of professional psychiatric and social-work treatment within the institution and in the community following release. It should also inquire as to the use the individual has already made or will make of this help. Equally important is an evaluation of the prisoner's basic attitude toward authority gained while in the controlled environment. Is it strong enough to carry over in surroundings where there is considerably less control? What difficulties has he experienced with parents, teachers, employers, police, and military authorities? What has been his institutional adjustment as reported by custodial authorities? You will note here that I am referring to this factor as only one of the many previously described. Under the artificial system of marks or demerits in vogue 50 years ago, this one factor of institutional conduct normally was the only criterion for selecting whom to parole. I contend at this time that it remains an important factor, but it is only one of many factors which should be considered.

Another major area in which a parole board should inquire is the area of community reactions to the prisoner and his crime.

In both the first and last analysis, the parole board's first responsibility is to the society which created it. It must, above all, represent the total community conscience, and not any one vocal segment who would force their thinking upon the board. It must never become so interested in rehabilitating a given individual that it fails to protect society against persons who are apt to again injure it. It is conceded that the parole board has been created by the general population and is charged with the responsibility of using its own professional knowledge in making judicious and sometimes unpopular decisions. It thus must, at all times, accept the responsibility of independent action. Parole, as an American institution, however, will not long last if it violates the conscience of an enlightened society. The neighborhood feeling into which the parolee would return, moreover, has an influence on whether or not he would be accepted or rejected, and thus is a factor to be reckoned with in determining who will succeed on parole and who will fail.

Modern-day social scientists in the field of corrections have become concerned with the extremely large number of variables which go into a parole decision. In an attempt to streamline parole selection procedures, as well as to make the decisions more accurate, they have devised tables of probable success on parole. These tables are based on studies of characteristics found in parolees previously released. Notable among these social scientists is Dr. Lloyd Ohlin, who did his pioneering in the State of Illinois. Ohlin has studied the careers of thousands of parolees and has drawn some conclusions regarding the relative significance of the informative items found in a case history. He has found that among the more significant factors are the type of offense, home status, social type, work record, personality type of the offender, and others. Using the experience of the past, he has assigned numerical values to the factors in such a manner that the information in a case history may be converted to numbers, with the total score forming the basis for a prediction of probable success or failure on parole.

I would like to take a minute to discuss the use to be made of followup research, especially insofar as prediction tables are concerned. In Illinois the research on past parolees has evolved into a mathematical formula for predicting the probable success of future groups of parolees. It is most significant, however, that such tables do not purport to predict the success or failure of any one given individual. It is valuable only in predicting the adjustment of a group. Ohlin himself expresses this when he says, "There is a close parallel between the part played by experience tables in the parole selection process and the use of life tables in establishing insurance premiums." In other words, risks for longevity of life or success on parole can be classified into groups on the basis of certain physical characteristics, but it is still impossible to predict the length of life or degree of parole risk for any one individual within that group. The makers of prediction tables are the first to recommend that scores obtained from the tables should serve only as guidelines. They realize that computation of a mathematical score is only one possible step in the selection process.

We of the United States Board of Parole are now in the midst of a followup study of persons committed under the Federal Youth Corrections Act. This study is being conducted in three parts. Part I is complete and consists of a description of the offender himself. We have gained valuable information regarding the personal characteristics of the youths with whom we are working. Part II is an examination of the institutional influences which are being brought to bear on these persons. Part III will be a survey of the elements to which they are exposed during the parole supervision period. It is anticipated that several of these categories of information thus gained will be correlated with the eventual success or failure while on parole. We trust that such a followup study will provide us with helpful information in our determination of the best time for parole of the individuals to be committed under this act in future years. In addition to this study, we also plan thorough research into the probable causes of failure of all Federal parolees who violate the conditions of their release.

We, of the United States Board of Parole, have discussed at various times the use of prediction tables in our work. Each discussion, however, ends with the conclusion that there has not yet been devised a system which would replace an intensive study of each case file. In the Attorney General's Survey of Release Procedures of 1939 it was shown that, and I quote, "It seems that the Federal Parole Board is able, on the basis of a commonsense approach to the problem of parole selection, to recognize many of these general traits which are associated with good risks and poor risks for parole. Since this is the most that a parole-granting agency could hope to do by using a quantitive prediction device, it does not seem that the introduction of such a device into the Federal parole practice would bring about any substantial improvement * * *." This was in 1939. What is the situation today? Turning to a copy of the 1957 annual report of the Board, I observe a direct relationship between the paroling practices of the Board toward certain types of offenses and the violation rates of the persons who committed those offenses. To be specific, our statistical research shows that in the case of automobile thieves and forgers we parole less often and at a later period in the sentence. Auto thieves received parole only 24 percent of the time and forgers 21 percent, compared to 34 percent for all types of offenders. They also served respectively 47 percent and 50 percent of their sentences prior to parole, compared to only 44 percent for all offenders. Correlated with this is the fact that auto thieves and forgers made up the highest proportion of violators. Thirty-one percent of the auto thieves and 23 percent of the forgers violated their paroles, compared to only 20 percent for all Federal parolees. It thus appears that we are being less lenient toward the poor risks and more lenient toward the good risks. This is being accomplished without the aid of any prediction device. We however do make available to our Board members the results of our quarterly and annual statistical material. I believe this is possible because my colleagues on our Board are able, out of their own experiences, to make intelligent evaluations and to place their own weights on the elements surrounding the individual according to the value it plays for that particular person. This is a task which a prediction table can never do.

I hasten to assure you that even though we, at the present time at least, do not desire to use prediction tables, we are hungry for information concerning those whom we have paroled. We try to absorb all known facts about our parolees and incorporate them into our thinking before making decisions. This is done, however, after a thorough individualized case study rather than on an artificial paper approach. There are countless uses for followup research other than for creation of a prediction table. Research can help to eradicate unscientific prejudice on the part of the public as well as the voting board member. Preconceptions or prejudgments often fade in the light of scientific analysis. Further, in those jurisdictions where members who have not had extensive experience in the field of human relations are appointed to boards of parole, the supplying of information concerning parolees' behavior can help remedy that lack of knowledge. Even the most experienced member, however, cannot accurately predict all the factors involved in success or failure of those under parole consideration because times and conditions change, and the most capable of members need to receive a constant flow of organized and meaningful data on human behavior.

Using the results of a followup study completed 10 or 15 years ago is false economy. The types of offenders have changed—the industrial world has changed—social agencies have changed—indeed every facet of society has undergone extensive modification which would make any 10- or 15-year-old study in the field of social science obsolete.

Likewise, to use the results of a followup study of parolees in another geographical area is also false economy. The elements involved in the correct of prisoners committed in California, New York, or Virginia are vastly different from those committed in Alabama, Florida, or any other State. Conditions in a county or State government vary tremendously from conditions in a State or Federal Government. The obvious need then is for continuing research within one's own jurisdiction.

A well-balanced judgment on the part of a parole board suggests that such decisions should be the result of a board action and not the thinking of any one individual. If the parole board is to be completely objective it must be free of any political or outside administrative pressure. Many boards of parole are appointed by the chief executive of the State for stated terms, thus providing sufficient longevity and security to assure independence of judgment in making decisions. It is also important that a parole board have a cross-fertilization of ideas and philosophy. To effect this desired result board members should be selected from various disciplines and training so that the broadest possible understanding of human behavior will be weighed in making board decisions. At the present time the Federal Board of Parole is composed of 8 persons serving in a full time capacity with a 6-year appointment. Members of the Board are appointed by the President with the advice and consent of the Senate. Members on the present Board include officials from the probation, parole, and institutional services, as well as other areas of Government where actual knowledge has been gained in an understanding of not only criminal behavior but of people generally. The President, in selecting the present Board, has been careful to select people from various professional backgrounds directly related to parole, which include the legal profession, sociology, social work, education, psychology and Government.

To summarize, let us review what has been said and see if we have gained any insight into both the need for, and the methods of obtaining justice in our task of selecting whom to parole and deciding the most propitious time for parole. In order to assure that each prisoner is receiving equal opportunity for parole under a just selection procedure we must have some uniformity of criteria. In order to arrive at agreement as to what criteria shall be used and the relative importance of each, I believe we must take some necessary first steps. The following four points, I feel, represent not only a summary of my remarks but also point out the steps which must be preliminary to formulation of a set of uniform criteria for parole selection.

1. Parole consideration consists of the gathering of all available information about the prisoner, studying it against the backdrop of one's own life experience, which include the assimilation of knowledge gained through research surrounding parole.

2. In order to reach a valid judgment as to the appropriateness of parole it is necessary to dispel any cloud of prejudgment

which may exist and this might best be accomplished by appointing board members having broad experience and training. Further, some form of followup research would aid members in maintaining objectivity.

3. Experience has shown that certain characteristics of the prisoner or his environment are more or less significant in the success or failure of parolees when studied as a group, but that it is necessary to gage the significance of any one element to the particular individual in question. For this reason where prediction tables are used they must be supplemented by individual case study by qualified persons.

4 (and last). Parole decisions should be made by parole boards composed of members free to exercise independent judgment having a variety of training and experience backgrounds so that the broadest possible understanding will be represented in the composite thinking and decisions of the board.

In conclusion, it would appear that in the past 30 years much progress has been made in better defining our criteria for parole selection, but much remains yet to be done in establishing well-defined standards. The courts have ruled that paroling authorities have legal authority to act within their informed discretion. But we must, through research discussions and conferences, such as the one we are attending now, more clearly define our basic principles in this area, if parole is to ever realize its full potential as a part of the field of corrections.

Thank you.

Surplus Property for Science Education

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 10, 1958

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, on January 27, 1958, I inserted in the RECORD at page A713 some data indicating that interested executive agencies were cooperating in an effort to break a number of bottlenecks to increase the amount of surplus property made available for educational, health, and civil defense purposes.

I have been pleased to note that the allocations of property for the month of January 1958, have increased to an all-time high of $29,078,312. The latest report from the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare indicates the following allocation of property by States:

Total property allocated to the States, by regions and States

Region I:	
Connecticut	$577,335
Maine	101,227
Massachusetts	322,180
New Hampshire	57,229
Rhode Island	92,617
Vermont	69,764
Total	1,220,352
Region II:	
Delaware	89,970
New Jersey	592,029
New York	2,161,158
Pennsylvania	917,960
Total	3,761,117

Total property allocated to the States, by regions and States—Continued

Region III:	
District of Columbia	$104,184
Kentucky	325,687
Maryland	521,228
North Carolina	1,204,070
Virginia	416,049
West Virginia	443,900
Puerto Rico	107,773
Virgin Islands	----------
Total	3,122,891
Region IV:	
Alabama	473,766
Florida	497,289
Georgia	644,637
Mississippi	306,806
South Carolina	414,783
Tennessee	692,654
Total	3,029,934
Region V:	
Illinois	1,462,351
Indiana	597,375
Michigan	856,538
Ohio	757,299
Wisconsin	370,634
Total	4,044,197
Region VI:	
Iowa	165,696
Kansas	192,867
Minnesota	152,246
Missouri	2,423,710
Nebraska	1,540,855
North Dakota	36,845
South Dakota	193,568
Total	4,705,787
Region VII:	
Arkansas	160,659
Louisiana	248,638
New Mexico	225,645
Oklahoma	375,750
Texas	980,264
Total	1,990,956
Region VIII:	
Colorado	612,862
Idaho	226,810
Montana	99,060
Utah	180,364
Wyoming	66,107
Total	1,185,203
Region IX:	
Alaska	10,179
Arizona	331,588
California	4,049,135
Hawaii	111,611
Nevada	93,178
Oregon	862,436
Washington	559,748
Total	6,017,875
Grand total	29,078,312

A more recent development regarding donable property for science and research in educational institutions has been initiated. On February 5, 1958, as chairman of the Special Subcommittee on Donable Property, I addressed a letter to the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, raising the question: First, whether or not it would be possible for that Department, in cooperation with interested educational agencies and institutions, to develop a list of priority items needed in the teaching of scientific courses and, second, if the Department of Defense which controls most of the available stocks of property and the General Services Administration could not cooperate in screening available stocks and expedite the declarations of excess property in order to meet the educational requirements.

The other members of the Subcommittee on Donable Property are: Hon. JOHN E. MOSS, JR., Hon. EDWIN H. MAY, JR.; ex officio, Hon. WILLIAM L. DAWSON, Hon. CLARE E. HOFFMAN.

I have been pleased to receive a favorable letter from the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare on the subject. Copies of my letter of February 5, 1958, and Secretary Folsom's reply of February 27, 1958, follow at this point:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
OFFICE OF THE MAJORITY LEADER,
Washington, D. C., February 5, 1958.

Hon. MARION B. FOLSOM,
Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: Further reference is made to my letter of November 12, 1957 and to your reply of January 3, 1958, concerning suggestions for improvement of the donable surplus property program.

In amplification of the suggestions contained in my letter and with a special reference to educational requirements for scientific purposes I would appreciate your reaction to the following:

1. HEW, after consultation with interested educational agencies and institutions might submit a list of requirements to the Department of Defense. This list to set forth priorities and be in accordance with the classification and nomenclature of items as reflected in the new cataloging system.

2. The Department of Defense, the General Services Administration and the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare expedite the screening, declaration and allocation of these items to the extent feasible.

I believe that there may be many surplus items of current use and need for scientific training in our educational systems, and that priority screening and expeditious declaration of these items will be in the public benefit with little or no additional cost or inconvenience to the holding agencies. It also seems to me that the procedure herein outlined leaves the discretion with the holding agencies as to necessary inventory levels for current missions.

It will be appreciated if you will consult with other interested agencies and advise me as to your conclusions at your convenience.

I am sending a copy of this letter to Assistant Secretary of Defense (S. and L.), Perkins McGuire and the Administrator of the General Services Administration, Franklin G. Floete.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN W. McCORMACK.

THE SECRETARY OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION, AND WELFARE,
Washington, February 27, 1958.

Hon. JOHN W. McCORMACK,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. McCORMACK: This will acknowledge your letter of February 5, 1958, wherein you make certain amplifications to the suggestions contained in your earlier letter regarding surplus property, particularly in the areas of scientific utilization.

Your first suggestion that, after consultation with interested educational agencies and institutions, there might be submitted a list of requirements to the Department of Defense is generally a good suggestion. We have not as yet determined the best method for accomplishing this purpose.

Your second suggestion that the Department of Defense, the General Services Administration, and this Department expedite the screening, declaration, and allocation of these specialized items to the extent feasible is currently under consideration.

In order that you may be brought up to date on our activities of improving the procedures of allocation of materials appropriate for use by schools and colleges in the areas of mathematics and science, we can advise you that the Office of Field Administration is working with the Office of Education. A special committee has been established in the Office of Education, composed of specialists in secondary and higher education, for the purpose of working out with educational organizations and the Office of Field Administration more effective methods and procedures in this area.

In addition, we have been in contact with the National Science Foundation, which agency is planning some 200 to 400 workshop programs for science teachers during the summer. It is hoped that we will be able to contact each of these teacher workshops with a view to outlining how the schools which they represent can secure surplus scientific equipment. We have also been in touch with the Atomic Energy Commission with a view to learning if that agency can be of assistance in this area.

Our Division of Surplus Property Utilization staff is at work in the development of procedures to improve scientific equipment allocation.

The plans outlined above should result in the development of an action program. In carrying out such a program, we will solicit the cooperation of the National Association of State Agencies for Surplus Property, through their executive committee.

One other aspect of this development which we think would be helpful is the proposal to suggest to the States that they name a small advisory committee in each State, to be composed of a secondary, higher, and administrative education person, which could serve to assist the State operational unit in the development of special need lists and in expediting procedures generally.

Sincerely yours,

MARION B. FOLSOM,
Secretary.

Need for Additional Judges in Certain States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MERWIN COAD
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 10, 1958

Mr. COAD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter from E. E. Poston, clerk, United States district court, Des Moines, Iowa, March 4, 1958, concerning the need for additional judges in certain States, and his enclosed table listing the present population per judge in each of the 48 States, together with additions, in certain cases, as recommended by judicial conference:

DES MOINES, IOWA, *March 4, 1958.*

Hon. MERWIN COAD,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE COAD: Inasmuch as the perennial bill for additional judges will come before Congress, I thought it might be of some value to give you the enclosed information on the relative need for additional judges in certain States, and including Iowa. The population figures are based on Rand-McNally's 1956 estimate. I believe those figures will give you the picture of the judges per population in the several States and the impossible situation existing in Iowa at the present time.

If Congress gives us one additional judge it will still leave the population per judge 901,000. If two additional judges, the population per judge would still be 676,000, which would in my opinion be a normal load.

From my experience in this court one additional judge will still leave such a burden as to tax their strength and health. I would definitely recommend two additional judges with limitation that no additional judge be appointed after a vacancy by death or retirement.

The amendment could also provide that the fourth judge be subject to the chief judge of the circuit court for allocation to other districts where an emergency arises.

Sixteen States have retired judges within their borders, many of whom are taking assignments and relieving congested dockets.

If you need further information, please let me know and I will try to get it to you.

Sincerely yours,

E. E. POSTON,
Clerk, United States District Court.

State	Judges	As recommended by Judicial Conference	Population per judge
North Carolina	3	1	1,433,000
Maryland	2	1	1,400,000
Iowa	2	1	1,352,000
Wisconsin	3		1,244,000
Connecticut	2	2	1,135,000
Ohio	8	3	1,125,000
Indiana	4		1,095,000
Mississippi	2	1	1,051,000
Kansas	2		1,043,000
Michigan	7	1	990,000
Massachusetts	5	1	990,000
Maine	1		900,000
Arkansas	2	1	892,000
Tennessee	4	2	861,000
Rhode Island	1		853,000
Minnesota	4		797,000
Texas	11	3	791,000
Colorado	2	1	790,000
New Jersey	7	1	787,000
Illinois	12	2	786,000
Alabama	4		761,000
Louisiana	4	3	739,000
California	18	1	735,000
Georgia	5		731,000
Virginia	5		725,000
Pennsylvania	16	5	692,000
South Dakota	1		684,000
Nebraska	2		640,000
New York	27	6	621,000
Wyoming	1		608,000
Kentucky	5		606,000
Missouri	7	1	594,000
South Carolina	4	1	576,000
Oregon	3		561,000
New Hampshire	1		560,000
Washington	5		520,000
Florida	5	1	519,000
Arizona	2		504,000
West Virginia	4		502,000
New Mexico	2		402,000
Utah	2		395,000
Delaware	3		394,000
Vermont	1		380,000
Oklahoma	6		365,000
North Dakota	2		323,000
Montana	2		319,000
Idaho	2		308,000
Nevada	1		231,000

Yes—Baths for Camel Drivers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. A. S. J. CARNAHAN
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 10, 1958

Mr. CARNAHAN. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial taken from the New York Herald Tribune of March 6, 1958, entitled "Yes—Baths for Camel Drivers":

YES—BATHS FOR CAMEL DRIVERS

Egypt is not only one of the world's poorest lands, but one of its sickliest; the life expectancy of the average fellaheen is only 27 years. One of its greatest scourges is bilharziasis, caused by a hookworm which rides a microscopic snail and through it invades the kidneys, liver and spleen of Egyptians, causing bleeding. Its reproductive cells are discharged to infest other human hostages. Since Egyptians use the Nile for both bathing and sewage, they constantly reinfect themselves in an endless cycle.

One of the worthiest things ever done with United States foreign-aid funds was the construction of bathing facilities in Egypt and other Middle Eastern lands which would enable the people to break this chain of infection. But those who wish to discredit all foreign aid have singled out this program for particular denunciation before the House Foreign Affairs Committee, now considering renewed aid appropriations. They have found just the right name to make it sound like a disgraceful boondoggle: "Bathtubs for camel drivers."

Maybe, as Foreign Aid Chief James H. Smith, Jr., indicated, the truth about "bathtubs for camel drivers" will help demolish all the other distorted and malicious half-truths the enemies of foreign aid like to sling around. Let them try bathing in the Nile.

Boost for Coal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM H. NATCHER
OF KENTUCKY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 10, 1958

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include herewith an editorial, Boost for Coal, which appeared in the February 24, 1958, issue of the Madisonville Messenger, of Madisonville, Ky.

The editorial is as follows:

BOOST FOR COAL

The electric utilities being soft coal's good customer, people in coal-producing areas will be greatly interested in a prediction that the electric utility market for bituminous will almost double in the next 12 years.

The forecast came from Dr. Myles E. Robinson, director of coal economics of the National Coal Association, and was made in Baltimore during an address to the Maryland Coal Association.

Dr. Robinson's reassuring words on the subject were:

"The electric utility market for bituminout coal for the next decade and even beyond should expand and not contract."

Tonnagewise, Dr. Robinson estimated that by 1970 electric utilities would be consuming in the neighborhood of 300 million tons of coal a year, an increase over present utility consumption of about 91 percent. In 1957, the industry furnished approximately 157,400,000 tons of bituminous to electric utilities.

In a survey of coal markets, both present and future, Dr. Robinson, after a careful review of both optimistic and pessimistic projections of the amount of nuclear power to be built by 1980, concluded that nuclear power poses no great threat to coal.

With regard to other coal markets, Dr. Robinson forecast that the cement industry,

stimulated by the Federal highway construction program, will consume more coal than ever in the next decade. He declared that coal sales to the steel industry—second only to the utilities as a coal consumer—will stabilize and increase as the economy recovers from the adjustment through which it is now passing.

Dr. Robinson summarized coal's 490 million ton market in 1957 as follows, in millions of tons: Electric utilities, 157.4; steel, 112.9; other industrials, 89.9; retail, 36.2; cement, 8.8; railroads, 8.4; Canada, 19.3; and exports (other), 57.

Teachers' Schooling

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD P. BOLAND
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 10, 1958

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, there is a bill now before the Ways and Means Committee, H. R. 4662, which has great merit in this day when America is striving to improve the quality of teaching. This legislation sponsored by Congressmen KING and JENKINS would permit teachers to deduct from gross income up to $600 for any single year expenses incurred in the furtherance of education.

I am wholeheartedly in favor of this legislation and think that it would stimulate young teachers to advance themselves professionally by taking extra courses toward higher degrees. These teachers have to finance the cost of this higher education. Congress should look with favor upon legislation that would give them a tax credit for the money they spend on advancing themselves in the interest of better education. I certainly hope that the Ways and Means Committee will give this legislation serious consideration and report a favorable bill to the House.

Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include in the Appendix of the RECORD the following editorial in today's edition of the Washington Post and Times Herald dealing with this subject:

TEACHERS' SCHOOLING

Teachers are under a good deal of pressure to go to night school or summer school in order to improve their teaching competence. One would suppose that the cost of such study would be reckoned a professional or business expense and be treated, consequently, as deductible from gross income in a teacher's income tax return. The Office of Internal Revenue says, however, that this cost is personal, not professional, and therefore not deductible, although the National Education Association and other teacher organizations have been trying for a good many years to make the tax officials see it the other way. We think the teachers have a pretty good point—a point that merits special sympathy at a time when the national interest calls for improved teaching.

As a part of its hearings on overall tax revision, the House Ways and Means Committee is now giving consideration to the King-Jenkins bill which would allow teachers in accredited schools to deduct from their Federal income tax returns expenses for tuition, books, travel, and living expenses while away from home (to the extent that they exceed normal living costs) up to a limit of $600 a year. There is substance to the Treasury Department's contention that this would constitute something of a loophole in the law. But at a time when oil companies are allowed extravagant depletion allowances and business concerns can take tremendous deductions for entertainment expenses, this loophole for teachers seems no more than equitable. Until the larger loopholes are closed, let's give the teachers this break.

Depression or Recession?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALVIN M. BENTLEY
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 10, 1958

Mr. BENTLEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the text of an article from the Frankenmuth News of March 5. Frankenmuth, a small town in the northeastern part of Saginaw County, Mich., is peopled largely by thrifty, hard-working individuals of German background. As we hear all this talk of recession and depression, it is good to know of communities such as Frankenmuth where things are entirely normal.

The article follows:

DEPRESSION? RECESSION?—FRANKENMUTH NORMAL HERE

Recession?
Depression?

There's a difference. If the neighbor is laid off, it's a recession. If I am laid off, it's a depression.

Frankenmuth seems to be suffering from neither. From what the Frankenmuth News staff could learn in a telephone and personal contact survey this week, business in Frankenmuth is almost normal with some exceptions, of course. Business, in general, is down a little but most people contacted feel it is a general seasonal slump and that things will pick up again in a month or so.

Employmentwise Universal Engineering Co. has been working a 4-day shift for the last 5 weeks while Carling Brewing Co. workers are working full time, with more people working during the usually slack months of January and February than normally work during that period. Business at the Carling plant is up despite the general decline in the brewing industry. Employment at the brewery is down only 28 from its peak employment figure of 188 last August.

The 4-day workweek instead of 5 affects about 350 shop workers at Universal, about one-third of them being Frankenmuth area residents, the rest driving in from nearby communities. Some of the office personnel is on a 4-day shift also. A general drop in business accounts for the shorter workweek. Factory shutdowns throughout the country mean no orders from them, and the orders that do come in are for less pieces. The local plant is faring much better than tool-manufacturing plants in other areas. Workers in plants which, for instance are tooled only for the automotive industry, have been suffering the hardships of unemployment for some time.

Frankenmuth is fortunate in that its economy isn't based on the automotive industry. Diversified industry here has continued to keep the employment picture generally bright as it has in many other parts of the country where consumer income is high and retail sales continue to hold up.

Granted that some people are forced by reduced paychecks to shop for price rather than quality, retail sales aren't bad in Frankenmuth. Shopping seems to be going on in the usual normal manner. Customers are asking for the same cuts of meat they've always requested and there's no real quibbling or dickering over prices. Hardware and appliance sales seem to be down but that is partly a seasonable problem too. People seem to have the attitude of "let's wait another month and see what'll happen." Comments on wearing apparel and shoe sales range from almost normal to a 40-percent drop.

Car dealers report business is a little below normal but nothing to be alarmed about. New car sales seem to be holding up but used car sales and service is down, again attributed to a seasonal slump caused by income and property tax payments which are due now. Local service stations, like all businesses dependent on automotive trade, are feeling the pinch. There is less business and there are more charges, with the gasoline price war in neighboring communities making it that much rougher for local stations.

The hotels had one of their biggest Sundays of the year several weeks ago with one of them serving 1,000 guests compared with the 300 served on the same Sunday a year ago.

Deposits are on the increase at Frankenmuth State Bank and scheduled payments are being made satisfactorily. Only a very small percentage of collections are behind schedule.

There is some concern in Frankenmuth about the much talked about recession but there are few real complaints and business is nearly normal. There is some hesitancy about spending, common in times of threatened depression when people think twice before they buy, but the situation here is not abnormal.

The concensus of opinion is that keeping Frankenmuth dollars circulating in Frankenmuth will help Frankenmuth retain its "business as usual" status. The general outlook is optimistic. Spring's on the way. Days of sunshine are just around the corner.

Lahey Appraises Today's Newspapers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BARRATT O'HARA
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 10, 1958

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, as everyone knows, Edwin A. Lahey, chief of the Chicago Daily News Washington bureau, is one of the great newsmen of our times. Virile, sharply intelligent, dynamic with the saving sense of humor he is never stuffy.

I first met him almost three decades ago when I was defense counsel in a murder trial that was attracting wide public interest. He had visited my office at night, and we were conversing about the trial, then nearing the close, when the telephone rang. The jury, supposed to be locked up, was reported missing. Somehow it had evaded the guards, and was on the loose.

Ed Lahey, then a cub reporter with the sense of humor characteristic of him, commented lightly on the seriousness of a jury in a sensational murder case being loose on the town and then set out to

find the jury and bring it home. His mission he performed. Early in the morning, after knocking at countless doors, he found the jurors eating and celebrating not without some noise in the restaurant of a tavern, got them safely back to their moorings. He had come to my office on the chance of picking up a stray angle or two, went back with a real story.

After 30 years' experience in every path and bypath of reporting, and the attendant observations, what is Lahey's appraisement of present-day journalism? This is a changing world, and the changes are affecting individuals and institutions as well as nations. Journalists, as well as others including politicians and statesmen, discuss these changes in the areas of their respective interest, but frequently the discussions are so stuffy that the point, if any, is lost. Not so with Ed Lahey.

Mr. Speaker, I am extending my remarks to include the following article by C. M. Zens in the current issue of the Catholic Standard, the archdiocesan newspaper of Washington, with the suggestion that nowhere else in comparable reading time can my colleagues gain a better picture of present-day journalism as viewed by a newsman of long experience and international distinction:

A blunt assessment of the current situation of America's daily newspapers was given to a group of aspiring journalists last week by Edwin A. Lahey.

Things are rough, on every side.

Rising mechanical costs and fierce competition for the advertisers' dollar have put financial considerations foremost in publishers' minds today, according to the chief of the Chicago Daily News Washington bureau. It is past time to argue whether a daily's first duty is to inform, or to instruct, or to crusade. The first purpose today of almost every newspaper is to remain solvent, to survive.

When the American newspaper publisher sees his industry dwindling through continual mergers and sales and failures, he underlines one demand to his editorial staff: give the public what it wants. Saleability, Mr. Lahey explained, gets top priority today in newshandling.

Looking at the readers, Mr. Lahey finds that they no longer give the daily newspaper the attention it has traditionally enjoyed. The ritual of easy chair, pipe, slippers and paper is on the way out, he believes. The appeal of TV particularly, along with radio, news magazines, and sports and entertainment, has had a strong effect on newspaper readers. When they pick up a paper now, they skim rather than read.

Examining the nature of the news today, Mr. Lahey points to further cause for dismay on the part of the practicing journalist. Recently Newsweek quoted him as concluding that superficiality was a principal characteristic of capable journalism today. One of Lahey's associates, reading this, complained to him that he must have been misquoted. Ed Lahey was not misquoted: He believes that world affairs move so fast and with such complexity that they can only be treated superficially. To claim thoroughness and depth for newspaper reports is false; why not admit the necessity for superficiality and stop apologizing for it?

To clinch his point, Mr. Lahey asked his audience to read any newspaper story on the status of international disarmament, and then to ask themselves honestly whether they knew any more about the subject than before they had read the article. Disarmament—just one of dozens of complex topics—is simply not to be explained in the kind of terms that journalists use. Those who understand it, the experts, can't establish contact in the minds of newspaper readers.

All of this might be considered rather shattering information to pass on to a group of young people who are viewing journalism as a lifetime vocation. Ed Lahey was setting the keynote for an 8-week course to follow; some spirit of idealism and enthusiasm was expected of him.

However, despite the negative character of his observations, Ed Lahey had an ideal in mind. He sought to picture the newspaper world of today not as it ought to be, could be, or would be, but as he himself knows it to be. It was his intention to clear away misconceptions and glamorous illusions, and give his young listeners a solid base on which to build their view of the jounalist's life. His was the idealism of the whole truth.

A good part of the whole truth about newspapering as a career, though, came across to these young men not through Ed Lahey's words but in his personality. His bounce, after 30 years of every kind of reporting post, and his zest in telling anecdotes about newspaper work, were highly pertinent testimony.

Ed Lahey summed up by saying that he was lucky to begin his newspaper career 30 years ago. He extended his sympathy to those who were determined now to enter a dying industry. But he fooled no one. Futility of newswriting or not, a man like Ed Lahey would be beating down the doors of the city room today if he had to do it over again.

Coal's Protest Against Foreign Oil

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM H. NATCHER
OF KENTUCKY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 10, 1958

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include herewith an editorial, "Coal's Protest Against Foreign Oil," which appeared in the March 6, 1958, issue of the Messenger, Madisonville, Ky.

The editorial is as follows:

COAL'S PROTEST AGAINST FOREIGN OIL

The soft-coal industry's plea to Congress to prohibit excessive imports of foreign residual fuel and crude oils, which are flooding American markets and costing many American miners their jobs and reducing the take-home pay of others, will, it is hoped by coalfield people everywhere, produce some results.

Cutting down on the amount of oil which can be dumped from abroad into the fuel markets of our country is one way to relieve economic distress. Being sound in principle it should not have to be based on a distress basis, of course, but upon plain commonsense. If it can't be based upon the latter, it should be based upon the former, particularly at a time when the administration is claiming to be deeply concerned over the size of our unemployment rolls.

Dr. C. J. Potter, president of Rochester & Pittsburgh Coal Co., a Pennsylvania producer, presented coal's case against foreign oil at a House Ways and Means Committee session. His recommendations to the committee were:

1. That imports of crude oil and petroleum products shall be limited to the 1954 relationship of such imports to domestic petroleum demand. Imports in excess of this ration shall be deemed to endanger national security.

2. That whenever the President determines that imports of a commodity shall not exceed specified levels, any company whose imports exceed such levels shall be subject to a duty on the excess imports equivalent to 30 percent of the value of the cargo at point of entry, and shall be subject to specific penalties, including damages and confiscation of cargo.

3. That the Trade Act be renewed for 1 year, only, to give Congress an opportunity to review compliance with the provisions relating to energy supplies and resources.

Dr. Potter charged, and with sound reason, that importing companies manipulate prices of residual oil to undersell coal. He presented tables showing that resulting market losses have depressed the coal industry's current production level, which is about 15 percent below the output considered necessary to meet mobilization base requirements in time of crisis.

Once coal is crowded out of a fuel market and there is no more competition for foreign oil, prices on imports may be expected to return to very high levels. There is the Florida case, for example, in which a delegation of utility people appeared before Congress in 1956 to protest increases in prices of foreign residual oil, which then had almost a complete monopoly in markets in the Sunshine State.

We have had a lot to say recently about the bad effect upon American mine and mining produced by Export-Import Bank loans and foreign-aid grants to Poland to rebuild its coal industry. There is slim chance, we suppose, for any action to curb this unsound practice, which has already lost the Argentine coal market which heretofore has belonged to American mines and miners.

As for the dumping of excess foreign oil upon our shores, here is something which could be stopped overnight. Not only are the jobs of miners affected, but railroads which haul coal are hit, too, and their protest should be considered along with coal's.

Railroads, in fact, get more revenue from coal than from any other commodity they haul.

Revision of Coal Mine Safety Law Is Imperative in Safeguarding Human Lives

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 10, 1958

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, legislation was introduced in the Congress on January 13 to bring all underground coal mines in the United States, no matter how many men are employed, under the jurisdiction of the Federal Coal Mine Safety Act of 1952.

Under the present law, mines employing 14 or less men cannot be shut down by Federal coal mine inspectors no matter how hazardous are the conditions existing in the mines. These are known as title I mines. Title II mines—employing 15 or more men—can be ordered shut down by Federal inspectors for violations of the safety law.

I was a Member of Congress when the first mine safety bills were introduced. The legislation received my full support throughout the years when it was being shunted back and forth between congressional committees and from the House to the Senate. The fight was hard and bitter. The United Mine Workers of America, as sponsors of the

original bill, were opposed by the Federal Bureau of Mines, the States bureau of mines, the coal mining industry and other powerful interests of the Nation who were violently opposed to such legislation on principle. It was a desperate and bitter struggle which ended year after year with no action by Congress. The bills died and coal miners died. Meanwhile as many as 2,500 a year were crushed or blown to eternity, as high as 50,000 injured, and many crippled for life. Widows and orphans were thrown upon cold charities for an existence or forced to depend upon friends and relatives, in many cases almost as poor as the dependents themselves.

One of the strongest arguments used throughout the vicious fight was the argument that there was no necessity for the law, because it provided a duplication of State effort which was unneeded. It was a powerful argument and carried great weight with legislators who knew nothing of coal mining or coal law enforcement. So the slaughter went on from day to day, month after month, year after year, until the saying that "every ton of coal mined in America was stained with the blood of the men who mined it" became almost literally true.

Then came Centralia with its 111 burned and blasted bodies and Orient number 2 with its 119 dead, to awaken the public conscience and lend force to the demand that the Congress do something. And the Congress, acting slowly and reluctantly, passed a punchless and toothless law that gave the experts of the Bureau of Mines the right to inspect any mine in America but gave them no power to enforce their findings. Presumably the Congress of the United States had hoped by its action to force the various mining States to provide more rigorous laws and strict enforcement under the threat of having the blame for these explosions laid right upon the doorsteps of the State. If so, it did not work and the killing and maiming went on although in a slightly less degree.

It remained for a colleague of mine from Pennsylvania and a fellow Republican to provide the answer for most of the mining problems of that day, particularly those of major disasters. Representative Samuel J. McConnell, the ranking Republican member of the House Committee on Education and Labor, troubled by the terrific death and injury rate in the coal industry, introduced legislation covering mine safety. The bill was referred to a special subcommittee of the Committee on Education and Labor, under the leadership of the late Augustine B. Kelley, Democrat, of Greensburg, Pa. With thousands of people prophesying defeat, these dedicated men sat down with the experts from the mining industry, the Government and the union, and drafted a bill which became Public Law 552 in the 82d Congress.

I know every man on the Education and Labor Committee at that time is today proud of the part the committee played in passing title II of the coal-mine-safety bill. It was brought out of the full committee with a few added amendments, one in particular by the present chairman of the committee, the Hon. GRAHAM A. BARDEN, which has resulted in the setting up of 9 modern State mining laws, more efficient, more up to date than our own Federal setup. Another amendment, limiting Federal law enforcement to mines employing 15 or more men was accepted in committee in the interests of getting legislation passed. It was accepted under protest by the United Mine Workers of America, the Bureau of Mines and some coal operators. Other Congressmen besides myself doubted that it was good legislation but in the spirit of compromise it was accepted. Both Republicans and Democrats in the Congress gave this bill enthusiastic support and approved it with little opposition. And the result was overwhelming. From an industry which had killed as high as 2,500 men a year and injured many thousands, it became an industry that saw 461 killed in 1953, 396 in 1954, 413 in 1955, 446 in 1956, and 473 in 1957. In 1955 and 1956 there were no major disasters, an almost unbelievable phenomenon. At long last everyone in the business of mining coal—operator, miner, inspector, State and Federal—were working together and the death and injury rate started dropping. It is unthinkable that it should be allowed to start once again on an upward spiral.

Mr. Speaker, I am confident that no member of Congress wants the return of conditions in coal mining which prevailed before 1952. I am sure everyone was highly elated at the success of Federal participation and wants it to continue as long as it is doing a good job. There is plenty of work for all concerned—Federal, State, county, and local safety groups, which aid and implement each other to the benefit of all who work in this necessary and dangerous industry.

I am alarmed, however, over the rising death and injury rate as shown in recent statistics from the Bureau of Mines. Times are hard and economic conditions are forcing workers to accept risks and corner cutting in safety measures that they would not accept under ordinary circumstances. The death and injury rate in roof falls is increasingly alarming. In my own State of Pennsylvania we read regularly of whole mining communities being called upon to spend agonizing days and hours trying to save the lives of poor unfortunates who have taken their lives in their hands trying to make a living in some doghole or abandoned mine.

The most appalling is the fact that proportionately there are 3 deaths in the small mines to every 1 death in the larger mines.

The small mines produced in 1956 only 7.6 percent of the total production of coal, both anthracite and bituminous coal, but they killed 21.1 percent of the men who died in coal-mine accidents.

In 1955 the small mines killed 19.2 percent of the total number of men killed. In 1956 the small mines killed 21.1 percent of the total. And in 1957 the small mines killed 25.9 percent of the total.

The fatality rate in the small mines for 1957 was 4.49 per million man-hours of exposure. In the larger mines the fatality rate for the year was 1.22 per million man-hours of exposure.

In 1956 the small underground mines produced only 28,139,454 tons of coal, while the larger underground mines produced 344,254,843.

Yet there were in 1957 a total of 7,659 small underground mines producing, as against only 1,484 larger underground mines. The charge has been made that many small coal operators purposely employ 14 or less men so that they will not have to obey the Federal law.

In addition to the 7,659 underground small mines, there were (in 1957) 1,586 strip mines in production and 150 auger mines. These surface operations are not covered by the Federal law as far as authority to close them down is concerned.

Latest information, for the period from January 1 through January 30, 1958, shows an ever increasing trend in fatalities in the small underground mines. For that period the small underground mines killed 37 percent of the men killed; the larger underground mines killed 53 percent, and strip mines killed 10 percent.

Mr. Speaker, I have sponsored H. R. 10807, a bill to bring all underground mines in the United States under the jurisdiction of the Federal Mine Safety Act of 1952. Many of my colleagues are sponsoring similar bills. I think the legislation is needed. I can see no justification for saying that a mine which employs 15 or more men must comply with the law and keep its mine in a safe condition while one that employs 14 or less can do as they wish about conditions and no one can intervene in the cause of safety. Personally, I can see no reason why any employer should object to this amendment to the existing law. Any man who keeps his mine in a safe condition has nothing to fear from an inspection whether he employs 1 or a 1,000 men. If it is not safe he should not be allowed to operate. I think every man who enters a hole in the ground to mine coal is entitled to every protection his government—Federal, State and county—can give him. Surely, now with conditions depressed in the coal industry, we should be more vigilant than ever. Since we have found the answer to some of the problems of this dangerous industry it is my opinion we should strive more diligently to further reduce its perils by strengthening the law wherever possible.

Thomas Masaryk: Man of Ideals

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 6, 1958

Mr. RODINO, Mr. Speaker, March 7 marks the 108th anniversary of the birth of a man of great ideals, the founder of the Czechoslovak Republic, Thomas Masaryk. Although the life of that re-

public was short lived, nonetheless, the name of the man who gave it creation will live long in the memory of all of us.

I know that the people of the world who hold sacred the ideals of freedom and independence, which inspired Masaryk, join with me in the hope and prayer that the bells of freedom will ring out once again for the subjugated nations of the world. I know, too, that Americans of Czech origin and the people who inhabit that part of the world look eagerly forward to that day.

It is my privilege on this anniversary date to salute those Americans who claim kinhsip with Thomas Masaryk and join with them in just reverence to his memory.

To Halt Preemption

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. CARLTON LOSER
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 10, 1958

Mr. LOSER. Mr. Speaker, a rather timely editorial appeared in the Nashville (Tenn.) Banner the other day that should be of great interest to the Congress. The rights of the several States of the Union have been trampled upon of late by the Supreme Court in its rulings in certain criminal cases. The doctrine of preemption has been invoked to invalidate State statutes.

The Committee on the Judiciary, headed by the distinguished gentleman from New York, the Honorable EMANUEL CELLER, is now considering a States-rights bill, which I hope will be favorably reported out of committee.

Legislation on this subject by the Congress is imperative if the States are to retain their sovereignty.

The editorial follows:

[From the Nashville (Tenn.) Banner of March 7, 1958]

TO HALT PREEMPTION: FOR STATES RIGHTS—A LAW

On the House Judiciary Committee Calendar now—and demanding swift action by Congress—is a States-right bill of urgent moment. In brief it provides that State law on a subject with respect to which the Federal Government has legislated would continue to be valid and enforceable unless there is a direct and positive conflict between the two statutes.

It would correct and rebuke the doctrine of Federal preemption which the Supreme Court has so extensively developed in recent years; notably, when it invalidated State laws against sedition on the grounds that the Smith Act superseded them.

That was a blow to law enforcement, e pluribus unum in court treatment of subversive treatment cases.

It is significant, surely, that the proposed legislation to discountenance that view was swiftly presented this time. It is H. R. 3—meaning that it was the third bill cast into that hopper.

What can the private citizen do to speed that matter, as it reads to be speeded, into enactment, for stronger national protection?

Write. Let Congress know (your Congressman) that you are watching, and that as a citizen you demand the action that is needed. It is one way of exercising discipline and restraint upon the Court. After all, the Declaration of Independence specifies that the just powers of government are derived from the consent of the governed. No Constitution-minded element of the governed has consented to any other kind of powers.

Future in Farming

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. FLOYD BREEDING
OF KANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 10, 1958

Mr. BREEDING. Mr. Speaker, there appeared recently in a Stafford County, Kans., newspaper an article contributed by Mr. Jerry Gee, vocational agriculture instructor at Stafford High School.

Mr. Gee, while saluting the Future Farmers of America organization sets forth his reasons for believing that indeed there is a future in farming, a greatly worthwhile and satisfying future; a belief with which I wholeheartedly agree.

Mr. Gee, in the last paragraph of his article, sums up with a thought which I believe can be widely applied in these uncertain times. He states that we must change our thinking and instead of looking at the setting sun, and saying we are through, let us look at the rising sun and say we are just starting. There is work to be done, it is a new day. Let us all pitch in and do it.

JERRY GEE DOESN'T AGREE THAT THERE IS NO FUTURE IN FARMING

(This article contributed by Jerry Gee, vocational agriculture instructor in Stafford High School.)

This week is FFA Week. What does FFA mean? It stands for an organization that is nationwide, the Future Farmers of America. This organization is made up of high school boys all over this country, who are enrolled in vocational agriculture. These boys believe that there is a future in agriculture.

Many times we hear farmers and other people say, "There's no future in farming; I don't want my boy to be a farmer. There are too many hardships to be a farmer."

How many times have you heard or said this in the last month? I hear these words almost every day. But I disagree with this thinking. I believe there is a future in agriculture and always will be. If I didn't, I wouldn't be able to teach these boys vocational agriculture.

At present we hear from all sides of us, "Let's make our boys engineers and scientists."

Who, more than a farmer, is both engineer and scientist? A farmer must be able to repair, design, and make much of his own equipment on the farm; adjust his drill to plant only a few pounds per acre; adjust and set his combine for alfalfa, wheat, and grain sorghums so that it will do a good job of threshing. If these aren't master engineering problems, what are they? A farmer must also figure out how much fertilizer to apply to his soil; how to treat seeds and plants to control insects and diseases; figure feeding rations for his livestock so that they have a balanced feeding program; be able to detect disease when it first starts in a herd and get it stopped before it can spread. This is science and plenty of it.

To the people who say there is no future in farming, I would like to ask this question: If there is no future in farming what are you going to eat in a few years? Farming was and still is the basic profession that we must have. We can live without cars, even though we think we can't; without TV's, without many of the extra things we have, but we can live but a period of a few days without food.

Our population is increasing almost 8,000 people a day in the United States, or about 3 million a year. Our farmland is decreasing several thousand acres a year due to erosion, land taken out of production for highways, factories, etc. It is estimated by the USDA that by 1975 we will need 36 percent more cattle, 16 percent more sheep, 44 percent more hogs, 25 percent more milk, 34 percent more corn, 35 percent more pasture, 12 percent more wheat, and 20 percent more cotton.

I will agree with anyone that farmers have had tough going the last 4 or 5 years, but we here have had them before and we'll have them again; but this does not mean that there is no future in farming.

FFA CREED

I believe in a future of farming with a faith born not of words, but of deeds; achievements won by the present and past generations of farmers, in the promise of better days through better ways, even as the better things we now enjoy come to us from the struggle of former years.

I believe that to live and work on a good farm is pleasant as well as challenging, for I know the joys and discomforts of farm life and hold an inborn fondness for those associations which, even in the hours of discouragement, I cannot deny.

I believe in leadership from ourselves and respect from others. I believe in my own ability to work efficiently and think clearly, with such knowledge and skill as I can secure, and in the ability of organized farmers to secure our own and the public interest in marketing the product of our toil. I believe we can safeguard these rights against practices and policies that are unfair.

I believe in less dependence on begging, and more power in bargaining; in the life abundant and enough honest wealth to make it so—for others as well as myself; in less need for charity and more of it when needed; in being happy myself and playing square with those whose happiness depends on me.

I believe rural America can and will hold true to the best traditions in our national life and that I can exert an influence in my home and community which will stand solid for my part in that inspiring task.

This is the creed of the Future Farmers of America. Let's make it the creed for each of us, farmers and businessmen alike.

Yes, I know that there is a future in farming. All we must do is change our thinking and, instead of looking at the setting sun, and saying we're through, let's look at the rising sun and say we're just starting. There is work to be done; it's a new day. Let's all of us pitch in and do it.

The Reuther Plan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALVIN M. BENTLEY
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 10, 1958

Mr. BENTLEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to revise and extend my remarks, I wish to include the text of a letter I

have just received from a constituent of mine who also happens to be a member of the United Auto Workers at Saginaw, Mich. I am quite certain that there are many members of organized labor, especially in the automotive industry, that share the writer's feelings about Walter Reuther. For obvious reasons, I am omitting the writer's name and address.

The letter follows:

MARCH 4, 1958.

DEAR MR. BENTLEY: Want to thank you for the congressional bulletins. I am a G. M. C. auto worker at Chevrolet Service Plant in Saginaw, Mich. And as men talk in the plants, I am writing a few suggestions that have come up lately. Most men would like to have a 5-year contract with union and companies to insure them against strikes. In their buying power most factory workers buy on installment plans which takes 2 to 3 years to pay for a new car and other home appliances and it also would improve home building and buying. I know a number of workers with 10 to 20 years of seniority in the plant and out on other jobs that would buy but are afraid of the Reuther plan. Most union men are changing views now as this extra $5 assessment is being assessed to them for this strike fund. More men are in favor of a right-to-work law and longer contracts with unions. More are not in favor of a closed shop now than at any time that this question has been talked over with men in plants and out in other fields. By our news of the banks the savings in stocks, bonds, and cash, loan contracts, mortgages were greater in 1957 than ever before. But most people like myself will not spend with a Reuther plan and his big strike hanging over our heads if a strike is called with the company. New car inventory as high as it is most of us will have to use our savings to eat. Will you please talk this letter over with other workers.

Thanks.

Veterans' Benefits

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. IVOR D. FENTON
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 10, 1958

Mr. FENTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include a letter I have just received from my good friend and comrade, Mr. Lewis M. Krebs, Sr., county director, department of veterans' affairs, Pottsville, Pa.

As a veteran of World War I, I have always supported legislation to benefit our veterans, their families, and dependents, and I am pleased to recommend Mr. Krebs' views to my colleagues for consideration in future legislation.

The letter follows:

DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS' AFFAIRS,
Pottsville, Pa., February 28, 1958.

Hon. IVOR D. FENTON,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN FENTON: In my daily work as county director of veterans' affairs, for Schuylkill County, Pa., and my membership in the American Legion for the past 38 years, I have come to realize that the veterans of World War I are really in a separate class of war veterans when it comes to benefits for war veterans by our Government.

After World War I we did not find much help from Congress, and there were:

No $300 discharge bonus (just $60).

No 52–20 club to tide you over for 1 year.

No United States Employment Office to find you a job.

No GI training program for veterans not disabled in war.

No special homes for veterans' (paralyzed, loss of limbs, etc.).

No automobiles for handicapped veterans (loss of limb or sight).

No social security benefits.

No special insurance dividends.

Yes—and there were no local Veterans' Administration offices to file your claims; no county directors of veterans affairs; and no special trained service officers as the many veterans' organizations have today; and you were very lucky to get admitted to a hospital for service-connected disabilities.

Yes, the veterans of World War I are the forgotten veterans when it comes to being a little liberal in benefits to them by a grateful Government now that they are 63 years of age or older, and a great many not covered by social-security benefits.

Yes, a pension, without all the stopgaps that the Veterans' Administration has tied to the pensions of the old veterans of World War I which in many worthy cases keep them from receiving a small pension of $66.15 or $78.75 monthly, would be a great help to them.

In the past 5 years here in Schuylkill County we have had 550 World War I veterans die, or an average of 110 yearly. In a few more years there will not be many of them left.

I am a service-connected disabled veteran of the First World War and I believe that the benefits for the service connected are very liberal at present. But we sure had a tough road to travel before World War II came along and Congress opened the door for veterans' benefits in a more liberal form.

I am asking you to remember the Economy Act of 1933 by Congress, and the grave injustice inflicted upon the disabled veterans of World War I and of the Spanish-American War by that act. Yes, I know because I was one of those affected by having my compensation reduced to near nothing.

Please keep these things in mind when any attempt is being made to cut off the benefits of these old veterans, and any new bill to increase the benefits will deserve your influence and support.

Thanking you for your kind consideration and help in behalf of all the war veterans. I am,

Very respectfully,
LEWIS M. KREBS, Sr.,
County Director, Department of Veterans' Affairs, Courthouse, Pottsville, Pa.

Two Hundred and Seventy-eight Dollars Per Acre Is Average Worth of Illinois Farmland

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEO E. ALLEN
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 10, 1958

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, and include a newspaper article entitled "Two Hundred and Seventy-eight Dollars Per Acre Is Average Worth of Illinois Farmland":

TWO HUNDRED AND SEVENTY-EIGHT DOLLARS PER ACRE IS AVERAGE WORTH OF ILLINOIS FARMLAND

URBANA, ILL.—Illinois farmland, worth an average of $83 an acre in 1940, today is worth an average of $278 per acre. Some is valued at $427 an acre, and there's little for sale.

This is the estimate of C. L. Stewart, University of Illinois professor of land economics, and Harold Guither, assistant extension editor for the university's college of agriculture.

Not only is the price of land going up, but land is getting difficult to buy, the two men report in the February issue of the Illinois Banker magazine.

They say that in recent years little land has been offered for sale.

Stewart and Guither attribute zooming prices partly to an increased demand, a result of farmers needing more land to overcome higher machine-operating costs.

Rather stiff competition for land has arisen in areas where farmers have large farm machinery investments and limited acreage to expand upon.

Owners of even limited acreage, Stewart Guither report, hesitate to sell while prices are going up. And owners consider the value of their land a good hedge against inflation.

Educational Standards

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT J. McINTOSH
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 10, 1958

Mr. McINTOSH. Mr. Speaker, today the American people are engaged in an effort to improve educational standards throughout the country. Before the Congress are a number of proposals with that object in view.

Certainly at the heart of attempts to improve educational standards stands the teacher himself. No scholarship program, however vast, and no Federal-aid program, however extensive, can ever take the place of the character, skill, and devotion of individual teachers. Every effort must be made to provide incentives to well-qualified teachers. The impressively sponsored and staffed Educational Policies Commission said this:

The quality of learning in schools and colleges depends upon skillful teaching * * * the highest single priority, therefore, in responding to the contemporary challenge to American education is the recruitment, education, and retention in the profession of qualified teachers.

Teachers, however, have seldom received the incentives that their crucial role in the life of our society deserves. Through the years, teachers' salaries have lagged behind compensation for other professions and vocations. The average college faculty salary is estimated by the NEA to be around $4,100 for instructors and $5,730 for associate professors. The average salary of an instructor on the college level is less than the average income of an industrial worker. A full professor's salary is only slightly more.

While low salary levels affect recruitment of teachers, this is primarily a problem to be met by local action. But

complex and confused rulings by the Internal Revenue Service on the deductibility of teachers' continuing education costs have discouraged the teacher, once licensed, from pursuing his education to his full capacity. This situation which discourages ambition at the very level where it should be most encouraged is one that falls within the scope of congressional action. Legislation that will permit the teacher to deduct the costs of continuing his inservice training should be enacted.

In a sense, such legislation does not properly fall into the category of tax relief but rather into the category of a just correction of a now existing discriminatory practice against the teaching profession. A lawyer can attend a real estate institute and deduct the costs as necessary expense. An insurance man can take a short course in estate planning and deduct the costs as necessary expense. A doctor can take a refresher course in anaesthetics and deduct the costs as necessary expense. An actor may take a physical culture course to shed excess poundage and deduct the costs as necessary expense. The science teacher, however, who takes a summer course in physics to keep abreast of ever-expanding horizons cannot deduct the costs as necessary expense.

The Celina (Ohio) Daily Standard described the inequity in this somewhat blunt but picturesque way:

> A businessman is after a fat contract. So he loads the prospect into a private plane and flies to Florida. They live in $60-a-day hotel suites, eat the best food, drink the best liquor, take in all of the night spots.
>
> Every penny—the liquor bill and the tips and all—is tax deductible. It is part of the expense of making a buck. But an underpaid teacher goes to school for the summer. He lives in the cheapest room he can find, cooks beans on a hot plate, buys dog-eared text books.
>
> Tax deductible? Are you kidding? Not if he is going to school just because he wants to become a better teacher.

Sounds incredible, does it not? But, incredible as it sounds, it is happening every day. At present, teachers can deduct the expenses of attending a summer school or evening classes only if they take these courses in order to keep their present positions. This concession was made only after the courts ruled in Hill against Commissioner that courses taken under administrative edict were deductible. The Internal Revenue Service has taken a very narrow view of this ruling. In effect, its interpretation holds that a teacher cannot deduct these educational expenses unless he would have been fired had he not taken the courses. This interpretation is so restrictive that its effect has made it almost impossible for a teacher to deduct any educational expenses. A strong recommendation is not enough. It must be a requirement. To take just one example, the Chicago Board of Education does not require that any teacher expend any money to keep a position after passing the exam to receive it. Thus, no Chicago teacher, under this interpretation, is able to deduct any expenses for professional improvement. Examples could be multiplied ad infinitum.

The Internal Revenue Service's defense in strictly limiting deductions by teachers is an alleged lack of statutory authority for deductions. The history of uncertainty in interpretation and ambiguity of regulation on the whole issue seem to suggest that a satisfactory resolution of the problem can only be achieved through clarifying legislation.

In the case of Coughlin against Commission, the courts have upheld the right of an attorney to deduct the cost of attending a series of lectures on taxation. The court pointed out that the attorney was morally bound to keep himself informed and up to date and that expenses of this sort were deductible when directly connected with practices of his profession. Surely, the teacher has an equally great moral obligation—if not greater—to keep himself informed and up to date. Yet even the proposed modifications will not permit him to do so and deduct the expenses.

So clearly do such examples reflect a demand for more just and equal treatment for teachers that 25 Members of Congress, including myself, have introduced bills designed to bring greater justice to the American teacher.

Most of the bills provide that established teachers may deduct the amount of their educational expenses up to $600 in any 1 taxable year, without having to prove that the courses taken were necessary to prevent loss of job.

Many organizations have studied and endorsed this legislation. They include:

The United States Chamber of Commerce which calls for permission for teachers to deduct from gross taxable income reasonable costs for courses taken to increase their competence and professional position.

The National Science Teachers' Association which says the Federal Government can stimulate and assist in this area—opportunities for science teachers to update their knowledge of subject matter and techniques of teaching—by passing legislation to allow income-tax deductions for funds spent by teachers to take inservice and summer courses for self-improvement.

The National Education Association which believes that the Internal Revenue Code should be amended to establish a uniform policy granting tax exemptions for professional expenses.

It is, of course, axiomatic that if the youth of the country are to be well educated, we must have a well educated and well informed body of teachers. With summer school attendance becoming more and more costly, many teachers who would like to take additional instruction are financially unable to do so. The small relief provided by this legislation would undoubtedly enable some teachers to make these expenditures and would provide an incentive to others.

The annual revenue loss is estimated to be—at most—$18,372,374. The legislation does not involve any appropriations for increased salaries or subsidies or Federal control of any kind. It simply extends to teachers the even break they deserve. It is a positive step in the right direction that can be taken now to provide personal incentive to improve our teaching profession.

Everyone agrees that something must be done to help our schools. Here is a simple way to enable teachers to help themselves. This bill will end discriminatory practices against and provide incentive for the most overburdened and underpaid professional in our society: the American teacher.

The Financial Institutions Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARENCE E. KILBURN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 10, 1958

Mr. KILBURN. Mr. Speaker, I am sure the Members of the House will be interested in the following insertion. It is part of a speech given by Senator A. WILLIS ROBERTSON of Virginia, at a banquet of group 1 of the Virginia Bankers Association at Virginia Beach, March 8, 1958. I have selected the portions of Senator ROBERTSON's speech which have to do with the Financial Institutions Act already passed by the Senate. A companion bill has been introduced in the House by the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. BROWN]. These bills are now before the House Banking and Currency Committee.

I hope all the Members will read Senator ROBERTSON's clear and concise statement:

> As I started in a speech before the State bank division of the American Bankers Association in Atlantic City last September, there is no group in the United States that is more interested in a sound economy and a stable dollar than our bankers. It was in recognition of that fact that I proposed in the summer of 1956 a review of our banking and credit laws and their codification.
>
> That proposal resulted in a bill, designated as the Financial Institutions Act of 1957, which was passed by the Senate last March and which is now pending in the House along with a companion bill sponsored by Representative BROWN of Georgia.
>
> These bills, unfortunately, have become the subject of misrepresentation and unfounded charges, including one that they are bankers' bills. To put the real facts on record, I want to review with you, briefly, the history of the Senate bill.
>
> Virginia lawyers know how often the general laws of Virginia have been reviewed, new acts codified and published as a new code. Lawyers also know how often the criminal provisions of the United States Code have been codified and a few years ago the Congress codified the tax laws. But, strange to say, never in our history has there been a codification of the Nation's banking and credit laws. Prior to 1956 the banking laws had not even been reviewed since the passage of the Banking Act of 1935.
>
> So, in the summer of 1956, Chairman FULBRIGHT of the Senate Banking and Currency Committee authorized me to conduct a study on behalf of the committee of all the Federal statutes governing banks, savings and loan associations, and credit unions.
>
> All of the Federal supervisory agencies, namely, the Comptroller of the Currency, the Federal Reserve Board, the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, the Federal Home Loan Bank Board, and the Bureau of Federal Credit Unions were asked to review their statutes and submit recommendations for

amendments. In addition, the Treasury Department, the General Accounting Office, and the Bureau of the Budget undertook similar studies.

Along with the help of the Government agencies, we also desired the views of private industry. In August 1956, an advisory committee consisting of leading experts representing all segments of the financial field was appointed to assist our committee.

Some critics of the bill have implied that there was something sinister about the advisory committee, and have said that it was terrible to have one. I have never been associated with a finer group of public-spirited men. They paid all their own expenses in connection with their committee work and did not receive any compensation from the Government. Each Senator on the Banking Committee appointed one member of the advisory committee, and the attempts that have been made to impugn the motives of the advisory committee are resented. It is experiences such as this that make private citizens reluctant to serve the Federal Government in any capacity.

In November 1956 our committee held hearings on the more than 180 amendments recommended by the Government agencies. In December, 1956, the advisory committee submitted a report covering more than 200 different proposals.

After carefully reviewing all of the testimony and the recommendations made by the Federal agencies and the advisory committee, the able counsel of my subcommittee, Don Rogers, and I prepared what I announced to the press as a tentative bill which would be the basis for public hearings.

I deliberately eliminated from the tentative bill new policy issues and limited the controversial issues as far as practical to those which had previously been considered either by the Senate or the House but on which no final action had been taken.

This draft was printed as a committee print bill, and in January and February 1957 5 weeks of hearings were held on it. Testimony was received from the Government agencies, all the major financial trade associations, and all private individuals who requested to be heard. As a result of these hearings, the proposed bill was revised and amended and reported to the Senate as the Financial Institutions Act.

The Senate debated the bill for a week and adopted further amendments before it was passed late in March 1957.

There is no basis in this history to support a charge that this is a bankers bill. It is true that the views of the financial industry were solicited—it would be foolish not to. However, we also solicited the views of the Government agencies and of every private individual who expressed an interest in the legislation. And certainly the United States Chamber of Commerce in endorsing the Senate bill was speaking for the business interests of the Nation and not just for bankers.

I do not suggest that this is a perfect bill, and I don't want to imply that I agree with every provision in it. There is room on some items for honest differences of opinion, as was brought out in the debate in our committee and on the Senate floor. But on the whole, the bill is a constructive one and in the public interest. Therefore, I object to anyone characterizing the bill as being dictated by any segment of private industry. To make such a charge is to impugn the integrity of every member of the Senate Banking and Currency Committee and the United States Senate—to say nothing of our splendid committee staff members who worked so faithfully on the technicalities involved.

Those who make the charge that this is a bankers bill never mention the provisions that strengthen the powers of the banks' supervisory authorities. To mention just a few of these provisions: There is the prohibition against conflicts of interest by supervisory agency employees; the requirement for the disclosure of the identity of major stockholders; the authority to limit dividend payments by national banks; the strengthening of the procedure for the removal of bank officers and directors for unsafe and unsound practices; the strengthening of the procedure to terminate FDIC insurance; the prohibition against political contributions by insured banks; and many others. These provisions are specifically designed to give the Federal agencies authority to meet modern day problems and to better protect the depositors of our banks.

It has been charged that there are a great number of sleepers in the bill. I can assure you that the Members of the Senate were not asleep when they voted for the bill. It was given careful consideration.

Among items called sleepers was a provision permitting national banks to write insurance in cities of under 5,000 population. This statute has been on the books since 1916 and was not changed by the Financial Institutions Act. The extraordinary charge has been made that if this provision is continued in the law, it will put the jobs of 200,000 insurance agents in jeopardy.

How absurd. The statute has been in operation for over 30 years, and there are only 77 national banks writing insurance in cities under 5,000 population. This is just one example of the fantastic campaign of misrepresentation that has been waged against the bill. I am happy to say that the National Association of Insurance Agents has not been misled by this accusation and has filed a statement with the House Banking and Currency Committee stating that the association has no objection to the present law.

A great turmoil has been stirred up about another relatively minor provision of the bill. This amendment to the present statute regarding the maximum rate of interest that may be charged by a national bank consists of only one sentence, as follows: "The purchase of obligations or evidences of indebtedness from the actual owner thereof shall not for the purposes of this section, be deemed a loan or discount if such purchase would not, under the law of the State in which the purchasing bank is located, be deemed a loan or extension of credit subject to the interest or usury statutes of such State."

There is nothing mysterious about this language. It merely puts national banks on a par with State banks and is clearly in line with our desire to perpetuate a dual banking system. Yet it has been charged that this provision is "immoral" and would permit national banks to charge 50 percent interest. If those who made such charges would talk to our State bankers and their customers, they would find out how wrong they are.

It also has been charged that the bill would permit banks to make gifts, such as tickets to My Fair Lady and Cadillac automobiles, to their big depositors. This is really a bewildering accusation, because the bill contains exactly the same language as the present Federal Reserve Act concerning time and demand deposits. The irresponsible nature of these charges seems to have no bounds.

I am confident that H. R. 7026, by Representative BROWN, which to a large extent is the companion bill to S. 1451, will be passed and differences between the House and Senate adjusted in conference. It is constructive legislation to codify the banking laws so that bankers can get easy access to the rules under which they operate, and it is in the public interest to make the Federal supervision of financial institutions more effective while helping these institutions to meet the modern-day credit needs of our people.

Last, but not least, this banking legislation recognizes a vital principle of our Government—a dual banking system functioning within the framework of private enterprise. It contains no new encroachment of Federal powers over the rights of the States—a trend which I deplored in a speech at Virginia Beach last October.

Adapting Federal laws to meet modern-day demands without upsetting the delicate balance of powers between Federal and State units is essential if we are to preserve the unique system of government fashioned by our Founding Fathers.

I feel that the Financial Institutions Act is in keeping with that fundamental principle and merits the support not only of bankers but of all businessmen interested in the perpetuation of the American system of competitive enterprise privately financed.

German Lobby and $125 Million War Claims

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 3, 1958

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I commend to the attention of our colleagues the following column by Drew Pearson which appeared in the Washington Post and Times Herald of February 23, 1958:

THE WASHINGTON MERRY-GO-ROUND
BIT OF A FUROR OVER $125 MILLION
(By Drew Pearson)

Not even the White House staff knew exactly what the shouting was all about, but a recent White House meeting on paying $125 million to Germany for war-seized property broke up in a verbal free-for-all.

Several top Government officials had been summoned to the White House to discuss what to do about paying off German firms whose assets were seized during World War II.

For 10 years, a free-spending German lobby has been pulling wires to get back money which, under a postwar agreement, the United States isn't obligated to pay. The lobby even hired a prominent Illinois Republican, Gen. Julius Klein, founder of the Jewish War Veterans, to work with Hitler's former financier, Hermann Abs, in order to tap the United States Treasury for the return of German property.

Klein is an influential gentleman with friends in high places. He sold Secretary Dulles on the phrase "sanctity of private property" which President Eisenhower later used in describing the new policy for the payment of German property.

At the White House meeting, two presidential lawyers, Edward McCabe and Roemer McPhee, sat in for Gerald Morgan, the President's counsel, who couldn't attend because of illness. The meeting was supposed to be strictly secret. However, this column can report what happened.

Doug Dillon, former Ambassador to France, now Deputy Under Secretary of State, passed out a document marked "Limited Official Use." This spelled out in legal language a proposal to charge American taxpayers $125 million to pay off both American and German war claims up to $10,000 each. He described the proposal as an equitable plan arrived at after much hard work, and suggested that it should be acceptable to everyone.

"As you know," Dillon added, "the Cabinet approved this last July."

Budget Director Percy Brundage jumped to his feet.

"Don't tell me what the Cabinet decided," he thundered. "I was there."

Forgotten promise

Brundage, who has to find the money to balance the budget, bluntly announced that he would never agree to using public funds to make good these war claims. He reminded Dillon that the State Department was apparently willing to forget about the United States agreement with its 17 World War II allies not to require reparation payments from Germany, but to keep German property seized in the United States and other allied nations in lieu of reparations.

Andy McGuire, general counsel for the Foreign Claims Settlement Commission, pointed out that there was $82 million in the war claims fund, barely enough to settle all American claims against Germany. These have been pressed by American citizens whose property in Europe was damaged by the war.

McGuire, with Brundage chiming in to agree urged sending a bill to Congress to pay off American claimants against Germany, but not German holders of war-seized property.

Port of Detroit Commission Statement on Reciprocal Trade Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES E. CHAMBERLAIN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 10, 1958

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. Speaker, the Port of Detroit Commission has adopted a policy statement in support of the extension of the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act of 1955, now being considered by the Committee on Ways and Means.

There is no question that, with the coming of the St. Lawrence seaway, Michigan's stake in world trade is bound to increase. The commission points out that already 1 out of every 7 workers in Michigan owes his livelihood to world trade. Under leave to extend my remarks, I include the commission's statement at this point in the RECORD:

THE PORT OF DETROIT COMMISSION POLICY STATEMENT RELATIVE TO THE 1958 RECIPROCAL TRADE AGREEMENTS PROGRAM

The Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act of 1955, which expires on June 30, 1958, is the basis of our world trade policy and should be extended because of its many vital domestic and international political and economic effects.

The extension of our Reciprocal Trade Act program is necessary to continue and increase our $30 billion import-export commodity trade business with other countries of the world, plus the additional billions of dollars of income which accrue to our trade service industries. Of further inestimable value are the countless domestic industries which sell all or part of their goods or services to the international trade businesses of the United States.

The 4½ million United States jobs are another popular indication of the value of our world trade business. Best figures available show that 1 out of 7 workers in Michigan owe their livelihood to world trade.

World trade, to a substantial degree, has superseded our aid program. The slogan, "Trade, not aid," has now become a reality. United States trade with Western Europe is as important today to keep these countries from communism, as aid was immediately after World War II. By aiding these countries initially, we knew we were building up their productive capacity to enable them to trade with us. Consistency dictates that we now continue to trade with them whose productive capacity we willingly and knowingly helped to create.

The emergence of the European common market, beginning January 1, 1958, also makes it necessary for us to maintain our present trade program. We must have a liberal trade policy to negotiate with this marketing area having approximately the same population as the United States. Not being equipped with the proper legislative trade tools to negotiate with this new economic union would result in the loss of our current markets in Western Europe. With a proper trade program, the United States can realize the tremendous benefits that the newly formed west European economic union can generate.

In addition to the above valid, well-publicized reasons for a liberal trade policy, there are several less known but equally important ones that carry a tremendous weight in favor of a liberal trade policy. These are in the marine field in general, and the port field in particular.

The prosperity of our merchant marine industry is also dependent on a liberal United States world trade policy. Our merchant marine's annual payroll of $2 billion, its expenditures of $1.3 billion on goods and services annually, and the $3 billion allocated to its shipbuilding program in the next few years, are an indication of the value of our merchant marine to our economy. Since world commerce constitutes a large portion of the business of our merchant marine, it is important that this commerce be permitted to move relatively freely between the United States and the rest of the free world.

Port activity is another large economic national function whose degree of prosperity is in direct relation to the liberality of our trade program. A substantial part of the total business of over 200 United States ports consists of world trade. The direct and indirect operations of our various ports is a multi-billion-dollar operation. The greater the amount of world trade flowing through these ports, the greater their contribution to the local, State, and national economies.

Failure to extend the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act would undoubtedly result in repercussions by other countries and, to some extent, jeopardize the self-liquidation of the St. Lawrence seaway because of decreased world trade movements, and also would retard the development of its full potential.

Several Great Lakes ports are spending millions of dollars constructing port facilities in anticipation of seaway world trade. In order to realize the many direct and indirect benefits of world trade through these ports resulting from an enlightened trade policy, the extension of the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act of 1955 is necessary.

For the above reasons we desire to extent our support for the extension bill now before Congress, with the following reservations:

1. The extension of the bill should be for a long term but not less than 5 years. In this way, the United States can prove to the free world that American economic leadership is of a sincere and positive nature, and that we aim to sustain our present world customers and acquire new ones in the competitive world market.

2. Section 4, the escape clause, should be revised in order to function in the best interests of our national security and economic well-being by agreeing to the following definitions:

a. The term "injury" should be defined to limit effects attributed to imports and not to other domestic unrelated causes.

b. Duty increases from escape clause action should not pe made permanent. The United States importing industry should be given the right to apply for review to determine whether duty rate increases are still justified from time to time.

c. The word "industry" should apply to an entire industry and not to a single producer or small group of producers.

3. The point included in the present extension bill (sec. 3 (a) (1)) which permits the increase of tariff rates on the 1934 base, rather than the 1945 base as currently constituted, represents a departure from the main objective of our reciprocal trade agreements program, which is lower tariffs and freer trade and their numerous resultant effects.

Egg Month Gains Further Recognition

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUBERT B. SCUDDER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 24, 1958

Mr. SCUDDER. Mr. Speaker, recent events here in the past 2 weeks have added to the gaining momentum in the recognition of the egg as a storehouse of vital food elements for good health.

I was delighted to be able to play one of the leading characters in opening the promotional campaign to alert the American people of the intrinsic value of the egg in the human diet. It was also with a great deal of pride that I partook of this campaign since Petaluma, a city in the First Congressional District of California is world renowned as the egg basket of the world.

The following editorial appeared in the Petaluma Argus-Courier, one of the leading newspapers in that area, and I respectfully call it to the attention of the membership and have it inserted in the RECORD at this point:

REPRESENTATIVE SCUDDER KEYNOTES MARCH AS EGG MONTH

An egg a day is the complete way for Americans to receive most of the minerals required for normal good health, Hubert B. Scudder, Representative from California's First Congressional District, which includes this "egg basket of the world," told the House last Wednesday. The Congressman, in an address keynoting March as Egg Month, declared: "Most of the minerals required for normal good health are found in the egg, an important item in a well-balanced meal."

House Members were told that eggs are a source of food and income on two-thirds of the farms in the United States, and that the poultry industry is the third most important source of cash income on American farms. They were reminded, too, that many agricultural crops are consumed in the development of poultry and egg production. The Nation's laying flock, which numbers over 300 million head, consumes about 14 million tons of feed per year, a high proportion of which is grain. This feed has a value of about $1 billion.

"While grains are supported as an agricultural crop and are purchased by the poultryman, he in turn must sell on the open market under a free competitive system. He should, therefore, be encouraged in every manner possible to create a demand for his product," Congressman Scudder emphasized.

The poultry industry has designated March as Egg Month in an all-out campaign to increase egg consumption, and through various advertising media is calling attention to the importance of eggs in the human diet. During this campaign a new word, "wantedness," has been coined. "Wantedness" is the extra quality people see in things they choose to spend their money for—even when substitutes are available at no cost. The housewife must be made to want more eggs, more often, and in preference to other foods that are readily available to her.

To demonstrate the why of his convictions on eggs, Congressman Scudder yesterday noon treated Members of the House and press to a "double yolker" serving of eggs, through the courtesy of the poultry producers of central California.

And what better place to endow the egg with this quality of "wantedness" than here in Petaluma, "the world's egg basket"?

Antichrists on Prowl

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HALE BOGGS
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 6, 1958

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the New Orleans States of March 4, 1958:

ANTICHRISTS ON PROWL

A stepped-up drive by the Soviet Communist Party against Christianity occasions speculation on how long it will be before the Kremlin masters futilely acknowledge that man's finest instinct cannot be crushed.

It would seem that Russia and her Communist puppets might have learned their lesson in the sanguinary uprisings by the Balkan peoples in quest of dignified freedom of expression.

Apparently certain, though, that the Russian peasant will more readily relinquish his religious instinct, the Kremlin antichrists relentlessly push their atheistic campaign throughout the Soviet states.

Komsomol Pravda, the Young Communist League newspaper, declares religious holidays present a real danger to activities of the league and appeals for a war on observance of church festivals and holy days.

Chernomorskaya Kommuna of Odessa demands intensification of anti-religious and atheistic education and indoctrination of workers. In the Southern Urals, Radio Orenburg complains not enough lectures on scientific-atheistic propaganda are being given.

More than 20 such lectures are given in Kiev, capital of Ukraine, in less than a month's time. Excessive religious activity in that region raises grave concern among Communist authorities.

Pravda Ukrainy, a Kiev Russian language newspaper, demands that atheistic propaganda be intensified in order to counteract the influence of religious sermons on certain unstable and poorly educated people.

And so goes the campaign.

Much consolation may be drawn from the nonviolent complexion of the drive, however. The Communists are displaying awareness that physical persecution strengthens religious conviction and defeats any chance of reorienting the devout in the ways of atheism.

On the other hand, though, the Kremlin forgets that, in line with the essence of Christianity, ridicule and humiliation only fortify hallowed tenets and enhance the intransigence of divine belief.

Oligarchies relatively more powerful than the Russian leaders have tried through millennia to quench the fire of Christianity. What supercilious fools the Communists must be to think they can succeed.

Replies From Auto Manufacturers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES E. CHAMBERLAIN
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 10, 1958

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. Speaker, I have had replies from the four automobile manufacturers to whom I wrote recently urging that they reevaluate their price structure in the interest of stimulating automobile production and alleviating the unemployment conditions in Michigan.

In addition, I urged their support of the proposal to repeal the Federal excise tax on automotive vehicles. At the same time, I wrote to the president of the United Auto Workers, Mr. Walter P. Reuther, pointing out that extension of his contract with the auto manufacturers for a period of 1 year would do much to create renewed business confidence and establish good will for subsequent negotiations. As yet I have received no reply from Mr. Reuther.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I am including the text of the replies from Mr. Henry Ford II, president of Ford Motor Co.; Mr. H. H. Curtice, president of General Motors Corp.; Mr. L. L. Colbert, president of Chrysler Corp., and Mr. George Romney, president of American Motors Corp.:

DEARBORN, MICH., *March 6, 1958.*

Hon. CHARLES E. CHAMBERLAIN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. CHAMBERLAIN: Your recent letter is a thoughtful appraisal of the current economic situation as it affects the automobile industry and I am glad to have had the opportunity to read it and discuss it with my associates at Ford Motor Co.

The atmosphere of uncertainty to which you refer is a strong deterrent in the minds of many thousands of people who have the means to buy but who are putting off their buying decisions because they lack confidence in the future. Uncertainty breeds more uncertainty and can lead only to increasing difficulty for all segments of the national economy.

We have reached a crucial point in the recession—the point where optimistic words are of little avail and where prompt and direct action is indicated. Repealing the excise tax on automobiles is certainly the sort of action that will help to reverse the present unfortunate trend. This one step cannot by itself cure every problem, but it could produce beneficial results for an industry which exerts an important influence on the entire American economy.

As far as Ford Motor Co. is concerned, any reduction in the excise tax will be excluded from our charges to our dealers with the specific recommendation that they, in turn, exclude it from their charges to their customers.

With regard to your suggestion for a thorough reevaluation of our prices, I want to assure you that the prices of our products are under constant study. Price reductions, however, cannot be made in the face of rising costs. In the past 10 years, for example, while our labor costs were rising 70 percent, the price of a typical Ford car was increased only 30 percent.

Although it would not be appropriate for me to comment on your proposal to Mr. Reuther, I naturally would be interested to hear his response to this point.

Thank you again for your expression of constructive interest.

Very sincerely,

HENRY FORD II.

GENERAL MOTORS CORP.,
Detroit, February 21, 1958.

Hon. CHARLES E. CHAMBERLAIN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN: I take pleasure in acknowledging your letter of February 17 and attachments. I am in full agreement with the points you make, namely, that public confidence is an importantly significant factor as regards the business outlook; that assurance of a realistic and peaceful settlement of the collective bargaining issues in the automobile industry would strengthen public confidence, and, finally, that a tax reduction would be most helpful with respect to both the willingness and ability of consumers to buy.

I am enclosing a copy of my year-end statement and copies of two letters I have written to the UAW–CIO. As you will note, I spoke out on the first 2 of these 3 points in these documents. As you may be aware, I suggested an across-the-board tax reduction in my recent appearance before the United States Senate Subcommittee on Antitrust and Monopoly. I am confident that such a move would revitalize confidence on the part of both consumers and the business community. My suggestion was given excellent visibility by the press, as indicated in the enclosed brochure with excerpts from news articles and editorials on this subject.

Thank you for writing to me. I appreciate your point of view and your evident willingness to take constructive action regarding these important matters.

Sincerely yours,

H. H. CURTICE.

AMERICAN MOTORS CORP.,
Detroit, February 20, 1958.

Hon. CHARLES E. CHAMBERLAIN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN CHAMBERLAIN: I have read with care and interest your thoughtful letter of February 17. You suggest three programs to encourage employment: (1) A 1-year continuation of present agreements with the UAW; (2) a reevaluation of automobile prices, and (3) the repeal of the excise taxes on automobiles.

We have, of course, been studying the causes of the present business decline insofar as they are ascertainable. We believe that the fundamental cause of the drop in automobile sales is the excess concentration of power in both industry and the union. The result of this excess concentration has been to force labor costs and consequently prices to such high levels that buyers are postponing car purchases.

Furthermore, in our opinion, this excess concentration has resulted in a lack of product competition with the Big Three automobile manufacturers offering excessively bulky and costly vehicles. This point of view is expressed more fully in my recent statement to the Senate Subcommittee on Antitrust and Monopoly, a copy of which I am attaching.

We believe there is considerable merit to your proposal that the automobile industry

and the UAW agree now to a continuation for at least 1 year of present union agreements. We wish to point out, however, that any such continuation would extend for another year the present inequities between American Motors agreements with the UAW and those of the Big Three. These inequities involve our paying higher wages and more costly economic benefits and practices than do the Big Three.

We have studied and restudied the pricing of our vehicles. We have been eager to keep our prices at a minimum consistent with our costs and the imperative need of being in the black. As nearly as last September, in order to generate more sales and employment, I proposed to our automotive employees and their unions that we explore the possibility of a $100 price rebate. This possibility could become an actuality if our employees, through their unions, would reduce our labor costs to Big Three levels and if, through the cooperation of suppliers and dealers, we could generate additional volume and lower costs per unit. We are still awaiting a reply from the union to this proposal.

We believe that the repeal of the excise taxes on automobiles as suggested in your bill would stimulate automobile sales and employment through the price reduction it would make possible. We hope that the House Ways and Means Committee will act favorably at the earliest possible moment.

Sincerely,

GEORGE ROMNEY, *President.*

CHRYSLER CORP.,
Detroit, Mich., February 21, 1958.

Hon. CHARLES E. CHAMBERLAIN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN: I want to express my sincere thanks to you for your thoughtful letter of February 17 and complete agreement with the goal of stimulating business and employment by strengthening confidence.

With regard to your suggestion concerning a reevaluation of automotive price structures, I want to assure you that Chrysler Corp. has a long-standing policy of pricing our vehicles at the lowest possible level, consistent with labor, materials, and other costs and our obligations to the public, our employees, and the people who have invested their money in our company. As recently as February 6, I reaffirmed this policy at some length before the United States Senate Subcommittee on Antitrust and Monopoly, chaired by Senator KEFAUVER.

Concerning automotive excise taxes, as you know the automobile industry has consistently opposed the singling out of the automobile for a discriminatory tax burden. We have never been willing to accept the concept that a product as essential to the progress and growth of our Nation's economy should be treated the same taxwise as are luxury items.

I deeply appreciate your interest in matters so vital to the automobile industry and I want to thank you again for your thoughts.

Sincerely,

L. L. COLBERT.

Not the Answer

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEO E. ALLEN
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 10, 1958

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include an editorial entitled "Not the Answer," from the Rockford Morning Star, Rockford, Ill.:

NOT THE ANSWER

President Eisenhower's comments at his press conference Thursday gave some assurance that the administration is not going to be pressured into a pump-priming flood the present economic situation does not warrant. The President said he doesn't believe it is wise to make the Federal Government the most important factor in efforts to defeat the recession.

The President gave assurance the administration will continue to take what it regards as reasonamle steps to spur the economy. When more action is needed, he said, it will be taken—and in time. In the meantime, the administration is watching the situation and preparing for possible eventualities.

President Eisenhower spoke as Democrats in Congress were pushing for revival of the public works administration and crash programs to jack up the economy. Experience has shown that a big recovery job can't be done with public works. Public works didn't solve our economic problems in the Roosevelt era. Today we have a vast Federal highway program and the St. Lawrence seaway project underway, but they are not helping to reverse the business slowdown. The effect of such programs is to increase costs and boost inflation.

As President Eisenhower pointed out, the Government is spending a great deal of money now in its $72 billion budget and some more Federal dollars won't provide the answer to the recession problem. He believes the economy has a way of steering its own course, which is influenced by the attitude of the people.

One thing that should be kept in mind is that the current recession is from the highest peak of prosperity ever reached by the Nation. Compared to the early postwar years, this would have to be called a time of prosperity.

Congress is well advised to be sure of the size of the target before firing everything in its arsenal at the recession now.

Testimony of Joseph S. D'Antoni, M. D., President of the Standard Fruit and Steamship Co., Before the House Ways and Means Committee Hearing on Friday, March 7, 1958

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HALE BOGGS
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 6, 1958

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following testimony of Joseph S. D'Antoni:

TESTIMONY OF JOSEPH S. D'ANTONI, M. D., PRESIDENT OF THE STANDARD FRUIT AND STEAMSHIP CO., BEFORE THE HOUSE WAYS AND MEANS COMMITTEE HEARING ON FRIDAY, MARCH 7, 1958

My name is Joseph S. D'Antoni. I am president and chairman of the board of directors of the Standard Fruit and Steamship Co. To briefly give a résumé of this company, I would like to say that it began operations in Honduras in 1899, having been founded by my grandfather, my father, and two great-uncles. It became a corporation 33 years ago, has survived 2 world wars and 2 depressions, and now has more than 4,700 shareholders.

The company is domiciled in New Orleans and is primarily engaged in the production and purchase of bananas in four Latin American countries. Certain segments of our operations necessitate our conducting business in 9 foreign countries outside the continental United States. As a banana importer we own 7 refrigerated vessels and have at this time 11 additional refrigerated vessels on charter from 2 to 20 years. We import into 4 ports in United States and maintain for marketing 2 large regional offices with 29 district offices east of the Rockies, dispersed throughout the United States.

My testimony will be both specific, as regards our company, and general, as regards an American corporation operating outside the United States.

The company which I represent imports more than one-fifth of all the bananas consumed in the United States. We obtain these bananas either through direct cultivation of lands we own, through participation contracts with the nationals of a country who own the land and to whom we advance moneys for the development of banana farms and furnish technical know-how, or through outright or contract purchase from local producers.

We are directly concerned with and heartily endorse the extension of the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act, since, regardless of the type of our operation, under its terms individual agreements have been entered into between the countries in which we do business and the United States. Not only could any change in these agreements seriously affect the conduct of our business, but unnecessary economic problems in countries of Latin America can result in higher prices of bananas for the consuming public in this country.

Let us, as an example, use Honduras, the country in which we have our largest operation, with a fixed gross investment of $29 million. In that country, we have at the present time under cultivation more than 20,000 acres, planted in bananas, citrus, and coconuts, employing in excess of 10,000 persons. We operate 330 miles of railroad to transport our fruit from farms to shipside. We maintain a wharf extending over 1,200 feet into the Caribbean for unloading United States manufactured machinery and goods, and loading ocean-going vessels with our own agricultural products and hardwoods of Honduras produced by others and exported primarily to the United States. We use tremendous amounts of agricultural machinery and implements, fertilizers, insecticides, and other products related to a "central" type of agricultural enterprise of the magnitude of ours. More than 95-percent dollar volume of the equipment mentioned above is manufactured in the United States.

Last year, we bought in excess of $9 million in equipment and materials from United States manufacturers located in 39 of the 48 States. These included such a variety of items as 8 million plastic tags from Yakima, Wash., to $45,000 worth of machetes from Collinsville, Conn., and $35,000 worth of files to keep them sharp from Providence, R. I. A complete tabulation of all purchases in excess of $10,000 during the year 1955 showing manufacturer, location, wide diversity of product, and expenditure was prepared in March 1956 for another purpose. Since it was appropriate to this testimony it is attached as appendix A, while a partial list of typical products purchased from various States in 1957 is attached as appendix B.

Completely apart from this, in 1957 our steamships made 272 voyages and purchases of ship stores totaled well over $1 million. Most of these purchases were made from

small business houses in New York, Charleston, and New Orleans. My object in pointing out these facts in such detail is to convey to you the thought that we, a relatively small company, are merely an example of the direct importance of overseas sales to thousands of United States businesses, large and small.

Our company operates in Honduras under an agricultural concession granted us many years ago. The Reciprocal Trade Treaty between the United States and Honduras strengthens the validity of this concession. The failure of the Congress of the United States to renew the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act could jeopardize these concessions and encourage the levy of tariffs against the equipment and materials we must bring into Honduras. Such a turn of events would then demand a reexamination by us of the relative economic merits of machinery manufactured elsewhere than in the United States. To date, existing treaties have allowed United States-made goods to remain competitive, but failure to renew the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act would unquestionably develop unnecessary competition from goods manufactured in Europe and elsewhere.

It is noteworthy that one of the largest manufacturers of agricultural machinery in the United States has made the statement that 35 percent of its production is sold overseas. A good part of our agricultural machinery in Latin America is purchased from this firm. The loss of any part of such a market could cause substantial dislocation to industry and labor in the United States.

Another aspect of our company's particular problem is that in operating our fleet of steamships to carry bananas from producing areas into the United States, these steamers carry substantial tonnages of cargo southbound—over 85,000 tons of cargo in 1957—which helps reduce the cost of steamship operations. If these tonnages are reduced due to elimination of tariff concessions granted to goods manufactured in the United States, our transportation costs will rise correspondingly and this rise will be reflected in the selling price of our fruit to consumers in this country.

I would not wish anyone to interpret my statement as meaning that a failure to renew the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act would put the Standard Fruit & Steamship Co. out of business. It definitely would not. But it undoubtedly would result in increased costs for us, and these costs eventually would have to be passed on to American taxpayers in the form of higher prices for the fruit we bring here.

Up to this point I have dwelt only on the effects of the reciprocal trade bill as it affects the United States buying public, the economies of our good neighbors to the south, and employment of United States labor. The final implication and its most serious one is the position of the United States in maintaining world peace.

It is an accepted fact that the prestige of the United States in matters military and scientific has suffered substantially as the result of Soviet advances in recent months. Too much has already been written and spoken on this subject for me to have to explain its significance.

We do, however, tend to take comfort in the fact that we enjoy such a predominant lead in economic strength that we will never be overtaken. Does the concept of great economic strength prevail in an era of divide and conquer when the ingredient of atomic warheads is added? True, Soviet industry is being protrayed to us as producing only a fraction of the consumer goods that we in this country produce, and of a type and in a fashion that reflects almost incredible inefficiency, but gentlemen, can we afford to wait for Russia's economy to sink into a morass of inefficiency, and be rudely awakened one day to the fact that the Russians have done in this field what they did in the fields of science and military achievement? We as a country, have not profited by the experiences that led us into World Wars I and II. Already reports of recession are being used by protectionists as a false premise in defense of their cause. They say: "Why have reciprocal trade when 5 million people are unemployed in the United States?"

It is a matter of record that the Russians have developed more than economic beachheads throughout the world. We see daily evidence of Russian trade commissions hard at work developing trade in Latin American countries. High government officials of these countries have stated publicly that communism has already become a menace in their countries. We speak of peace but invariably find ourselves at war to achieve it. This war, whether cold or actual, is not 5,000 miles away, but is in our backyard, and the strongest defense we can begin providing now is the picture of a balanced and potent free economy in action—an economy that provides a high standard of living for ourselves and our allies throughout the world. What we are taught and teach as our free and democratic system is, in effect, our "ultimate weapon."

APPENDIX A

Purchases made by home office in 1955 from vendors supplying in excess of $10,000

Aidmon Bottle & Supply Co., Inc., Brooklyn, N. Y., bottles	$10,694.54
Ardco Manufacturing Co., Jersey City, N. J., locomotive parts	19,496.00
Armour Fertilizer Works, New Orleans, La., fertilizer	25,277.24
American Brake Shoe Co., New York City, car wheels	10,858.80
American Cast Iron Pipe Co., Birmingham, Ala., cast iron pipe and fittings	12,201.19
American Can Co., New York City, cans	72,757.83
American Creosote Works, Inc., New Orleans, La., creosoted piling	13,749.66
Armstrong Cork Co., Lancaster, Pa., crowns and bottles	115,281.00
Baldwin-Lima-Hamilton Corp., New York City, locomotive parts	15,556.77
Barade & Page, Inc., New Orleans, La., sodium bisulphate, etc	15,457.82
Batesville White Lime Co., Batesville, Ark., lime	34,996.50
Brown & Sites Co., Inc., New York City, locomotive parts	15,077.46
Colgate-Palmolive Co., Jersey City, N. J., soap and toilet articles	8,976.98
Columbia Malting Co., Chicago, Ill., malt	87,327.00
Cordeleria Modelo, S. A., Merida, Mexico, banana twine and rope	41,033.87
Crown Cork & Seal Co., Inc., Baltimore, Md., crowns and filler parts	83,772.56
Cudahy Packing Co., New Orleans, La., meats	11,513.78
Continental Can Co., New York City, polyethylene, cellophane	95,167.80
Caterpillar Tractor Co., Peoria, Ill., diesel engines-tractor parts	67,143.03
G. H. Charbonnet & Son, Inc., New Orleans, La., dry goods, etc	16,344.85
Ecusta Paper Corp., Pisgah Forest, N. C., polyethylene tubing	159,744.49
Esso Standard Oil Co., New York and New Orleans, fuel oil	2,075,605.83

Purchases made by home office in 1955 from vendors supplying in excess of $10,000—Continued

Extruders, Inc., Hawthorne, Calif., polyethylene tubing	$55,269.35
Fleischmann Malting Co., Chicago, Ill, malt	42,026.96
Froedtert Grain & Malting Co., Milwaukee, Wis., malt	58,990.27
Fulton Bag & Cotton Mills, Atlanta and New Orleans, bags and polyethylene tubing	67,168.10
Grace Chemical Co., Memphis, Tenn., urea	300,245.19
A. Gusmer, Inc., Woodbridge, N. J., malt, etc	27,109.04
General Electric Supply Co., New Orleans, La., electrical supplies	13,597.55
Hardie Manufacturing Co., Hudson, Mich., spray pumps and parts	26,347.44
Illinois Cereal Mills, Inc., Paris, Ill., brewer's corn flakes	73,264.00
Ingersoll-Rand Co., New York City, engines, pumps, parts	135,110.69
Koppers Co., Inc., Pittsburgh, Pa., Wolman's salts	37,931.40
Kieckhefer Container Co., Camden, N. J., cartons	54,605.06
Kimberly-Clark Corp., Neenah, Wis., kimpak	79,390.22
R. G. Lafaye Co., New Orleans, La., tomato paste, seafoods	23,317.92
Land O'Lakes Creameries, Inc., Minneapolis, Minn., powdered milk	22,983.72
Longview Lime Corp., Birmingham, Ala., lime	11,243.75
Lone Star Cement Corp., New Orleans, La., cement	20,958.50
Magnolia Petroleum Co., New Orleans, La., lubricating oil for ships	22,726.19
George J. Meyer Mfg. Co., Cudahy, Wis., bottle washer parts	12,792.52
National Oats Co., Cedar Rapids, Iowa, oatmeal-cereal	19,487.50
National Malting Co., Paterson, N. J., malt	23,552.96
Nestle's Products, Inc., New York City, milk and candy	28,621,85
Nicholson File Co., Providence R. I., files	21,475,32
Owens-Illinois Glass Co., Toledo, Ohio, bottles	33,635.07
Pillsbury Mills, Inc., Minneapolis, Minn., flour	53,073.45
C. T. Patterson Co., Inc., New Orleans, La., hardware and supplies	36,777.65
Paul, Rice & Levy, New Orleans, La., ship supplies	19,947.32
Phelps Dodge Refining Corp., New York City, copper sulphate	1,291,764.90
Quaker Oats Pan-American, Inc., New York City, oatmeal, etc	21,356.22
Ross Bros., Fort Worth, Tex., mules	29,080.96
Schwill, Albert & Co., Chicago, Ill., malt	39,977.52
Standard Supply & Hardware Co., New Orleans, La., hardware and supplies	34,438.60
St. Clair Lime Co., Oklahoma City, Okla., lime	17,881.25
Stauffer, Eshleman & Co., Ltd., New Orleans, La., hardware and supplies	88,571.55
Theonett & Co., Chicago, Ill., flavorings, etc	20,970.65
The Texas Co., New Orleans, La., lubricating oil and grease	75,969.59
Utley Paint Co., New Orleans, La., paints, etc	11,307.13

Purchases made by home office in 1955 from vendors supplying in excess of $10,000—Continued

United Paper Co., New Orleans, La., bags, etc	$11,174.51
Van Der Horst Corp. of America, Olean, N. Y., cylinder liners restandardized	12,423.71
R. T. Vanderbilt Co., Inc., New York City, Vancide PEPS	37,602.00
Visking Corp., Terre Haute, Ind., polyethylene tubing	234,448.91
Wholesale Market, New Orleans, La., meats	20,514.51
Woodward, Wight & Co., Ltd., New Orleans, La., hardware and supplies	23,778.09
Southeast Supply Co., Charleston, S. C., ships' supplies	66,092.78
	6,375,039.93

(Prepared by purchasing and accounting departments, Mar. 16, 1956.)

APPENDIX B

STATE AND TYPICAL PRODUCT

Alabama: Agricultural lime, valves, hatchery supplies.
Arizona: Water filters.
Arkansas: Agricultural lime.
California: Canned fish, polyethylene plastic sheets, hops.
Colorado: Porcelain products, rat poison.
Connecticut: Machetes axes and shovels, hardware.
Delaware: Paint, chemicals.
Florida: Citrus wrapping and packing materials.
Georgia: Brewery machinery, polyethylene plastic sheet, textiles and thread.
Idaho: Hops.
Illinois: Farm machinery, dietetic foods, engines, bottles, brewers flakes.
Indiana: Soft drink supplies, pharmaceuticals.
Iowa: Locomotive parts, machinery parts, foods.
Kansas: Aircraft and parts.
Kentucky: Cigarettes, soap machinery.
Louisiana: Orchard spray oil, fertilizer, salt, containers.
Maine: Canned sardines.
Maryland: Bottle closures, tolletries and cosmetics.
Massachusetts: Packaging machinery.
Michigan: Motor trucks, pharmaceuticals, railway motor cars.
Minnesota: Railway motor cars, engines, dairy food.
Mississippi: Crates, disinfectants.
Missouri: Brewery machinery, veterinary medicines, beverage dispensers.
Montana.
Nebraska: Brewery supplies.
Nevada.
New Hampshire.
New Jersey: Cartons, bottles, pharmaceuticals, polyethylene plastic sheets.
New Mexico.
New York: Textiles, battery goods, clothing, copper sulphate.
North Carolina: Packaging materials, tobacco.
North Dakota.
Ohio: Polyethylene plastic sheets, Jeeps, bottles, foundry products.
Oklahoma: Agricultural lime.
Oregon.
Pennsylvania: Pharmaceuticals, machinery parts, bottle closures, locomotives.
Rhode Island: Files.
South Carolina: Oil mill supplies.
South Dakota.
Tennessee: Gasoline lanters, urea, saddlery supplies.
Texas: Copper sulphate, mules, chemicals.
Utah: Dairy bottling supplies.
Vermont.
Virginia: Baked goods.
Washington: Plastic tags.
West Virginia: Laundry supplies.
Wisconsin: Malt, machinery, locks and hardware, cleaning materials.
Wyoming.

Address of Mr. Wade W. Hollowell

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK E. SMITH
OF MISSISSIPPI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 10, 1958

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, the Mississippi Valley Association is today recognized as one of the outstanding organizations in the country, dedicated to the sound development of our water resources.

A great deal of the credit for the fine record of this organization should go to its recent president, Mr. Wade W. Hollowell, of Greenville, Miss. Mr. Hollowell, now chairman of the board of directors, had a very successful year in stimulating constructive activity in this great organization.

All of the people of the Mississippi Valley are indebted to his efforts toward the constructive development of our natural resources. Under unanimous consent, I include Mr. Hollowell's address as president of the Mississippi Valley Association made at the annual convention of the organization in St. Louis on February 10.

The address follows:

REMARKS BY W. W. HOLLOWELL, PRESIDENT, MISSISSIPPI VALLEY ASSOCIATION, BEFORE THE 39TH ANNUAL MEETING OF THE MISSISSIPPI VALLEY ASSOCIATION, ST. LOUIS, MO., FEBRUARY 10–11, 1958

This report will deal but very briefly with the activities of the last year, for we have prepared a little booklet to be distributed amongst our membership reflecting the progress made and the accomplishments of the association either by its own efforts or along with many other forces interested in water resource development in relation to the platform which you adopted at the annual meeting last year.

I would like to mention; however, a few matters not mentioned in the report. During the last year either your chairman of the board or your president were able to meet in every area of the Mississippi Valley Association, including the entire Missouri Basin from Kansas City, North, Minneapolis, Chicago, New Orleans, Shreveport, and Little Rock. Your president was represented by one of our senior staff members in a meeting in St. Louis and in the Ohio Valley. It is self-evident that the Mississippi Valley Association more strongly represents all elements of water resource interests in the Great Mississippi Basin than ever before and the results of the past year are convincing evidence of the need for one organization as this one, representing transportation, navigation, flood control, conservation, pollution, and industrial development to serve as a clearinghouse and a catalyst for all of those organizations specifically devoted to the interest of only one of these phases of water-resource development.

During the past year a Mississippi Valley Association office was opened for the first time in Kansas City because of the problems in lower Missouri area.

In my meeting with the directors through the various districts I feel I am safe in saying that the association is strong.

Added emphasis has been placed on water pollution and industrial development during the past year at the request of the membership and am happy to report that progress is being made in the organization of a water pollution committee aimed toward development of a concern on the part of governments, States, municipalities, and industries on the importance of protecting the streams which the American people have so devotedly controlled for useful purposes.

The future of the valley association holds many challenges. Let me begin by mentioning the challenges presented to the water-transportation industry. As a believer in private enterprise and the need for the profit motive for total development of our economy, I have admired for many years the development of the transportation system on our waterways, even in the face of governmental owned or governmental subsidized barge lines. As evidence of the strength of the profit system we have today a fine system of water transportation for all commodities, such system has about even the largest Government-owned organization. The threats to this industry are great. There seems to be a trend toward discounting the philosophy of our Nation's founders. Thomas Jefferson left as one of his endowments a philosophy that the waterways system of America are free for the use of all Americans so long as the rights of each user is respected by the other. Thomas Jefferson specifically with his farsighted vision appealed against the imposition of any type of tolls on other than manmade water systems. Now the water-transportation industry, as a successful result of private enterprise, is faced during the year with very direct threats; namely, the imposition of tolls and user charges on our waterways. At the urging of other modes of transportation which have not been able to settle their own differences and which have become enmeshed in a tangle of governmental controls and interferences, would now like to see controls imposed on those whom they believe to be their competitors, despite the economic impact. I do not propose to debate the issue, but I take sides and say this is a challenge which you as members of the Mississippi Valley Association must meet because it is a direct threat to all of our waterways projects.

The theoretical philosophers would have us believe that because the Tennessee Valley Authority has been so successful, the Missouri Basin can only succeed economically through the imposition of bureaucratic control of the Missouri Basin. The basin developments successfully were accomplished by concerted effort on the part of all interests, both private and governmental on the basic premise that the waters of the Missouri should be and are being controlled; first, for flood control; second, for navigation; third, for soil conservation; and finally for incidental power generation. We are being beseiged by those whose philosophy approves governmental ownership for all of our economy, including the generation of electric power as the primary purpose of stream control. As the Missouri Basin goes on this Government power question, so will go the rest of the Nation. I challenge the members of the Mississippi Valley Association and all interested in the free-enterprise system of the Nation to make every effort to refute the false premises of the Government power people and to defeat in the Congress all efforts to change the basic philosophy under which that great system on the Missouri River has been developed in the last 15 years.

Along with this objective of Government power proponents there is an effort to discredit and relieve the civil functions from the Corps of Army Engineers as an efficient,

proven nonpolitical corps training career engineers, the Mississippi Valley Association has an obligation to preserve the function of the Corps of Army Engineers.

Since I became a man at the age of 21, America has been in one crisis, out of that crisis into another one. The latest crisis to stampede America has been the sputnik. Without discounting the importance of the sputnik, because I am not professionally qualified to do so, I do know that in some quarters we are stampeded to expend all funds for the protection against external threats at the expense of a strong American economy. It is readily apparent that dollar economies will have to be made. We know that we must spend two times as much on a dam in 1959 as the dam would have cost in 1949, and we do know that the inflation of our dollar, particularly the inflation of our labor dollar, has caused a great deal of this increased cost. It is a challenge to this association and others like it that the strength of middle America be maintained and that strength includes the protection of our cities and States from flood and erosion and the development of proper navigable channels to tap the Nation's resources still untapped because of the need for water, but it is further a challenge that this be done as economically as possible with a curb on inflated prices; further, that new starts be limited to the expenditure of those dollars vital to the economic and commercial well-being of the areas affected. As patriotic and trained water resource interests we must distinguish between what is good for the Nation versus what is good only for the interests of a very few in order to conserve dollars. Our platform prologue is still applicable: "Let's keep the Mississippi Valley the greatest in the world."

The program of the Missisippi Valley Association has traditionally been limited to the endorsement of projects that show a high ratio of benefits to cost. Careful scrutiny has always been exercised to maintain the absolute integrity of the association's platform.

The present state of world and domestic affairs makes it particularly imperative that all projects be even more carefully screened, that each one can be justified as an investment in the future welfare of the valley and the Nation, and of importance to national security. This platform has been prepared with these standards constantly in mind.

Along this line it is up to each one of us to support our representatives in the halls of Congress against the encroachment of their authority by an appointed Budget Bureau, a further evidence of the trend toward rule by appointed bureaucrats rather than by elected representatives. We are losing sight of the checks and balances intended by our Constitution in this and many other fields. From these remarks it is apparent there are great challenges affecting all America indicating a need for the leadership of the Mississippi Valley Association in water resource development.

I am certain that my successors in office will accept these challenges.

This has been a great year and a wonderful experience to be associated with the members of our executive committee and with the tremendous staff members who carry on the day-to-day work of the Mississippi Valley Association. To them I would like to say thank you and to the membership as a whole I should like to give my best salute for the cooperation and judgment in the matters in which we have been so vitally interested in the past year.

The Turn of the Thumbscrews

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. CHARLES A. BOYLE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 6, 1958

Mr. BOYLE. Mr. Speaker, on March 9 the Sunday Star, a North Side Chicago newspaper, edited and published by Leo Lerner, Herrick award winner, contained in his famous The First Column a most provocative article entitled "The Turn of the Thumbscrews." The explosively dynamic Mr. Lerner, one of the most picturesque and beloved persons in the newspaper business, has endeared himself to the reading public by his positive stance against inhumanity, injustice, and abuses in all branches of government. It is with pride and pleasure that I present his latest column, as follows:

THE FIRST COLUMN—THE TURN OF THE THUMBSCREWS

(By Leo A. Lerner)

Did you ever write something explaining how you feel about a certain subject and then want to write more because you feel you have not explained it properly?

That is how I feel about my last column on foreign aid, as it related to our China policy and the possible deportation of Hsuan Wei, whom we are trying to hand back to Chiang Kai-shek to feed to a hungry firing squad.

A letter from a reader, unsigned, said last week that I am a terribly prejudiced man. The writer of the letter objected to my stand in favor of paroling Nathan Leopold and then accused me of prejudice.

Well, I do admit to a prejudice—in favor of any underdog. One of the things I hate to see is overpunishment, no matter for whom. And of course, if a man hates anything, even something unjust, he can be accused of having a prejudice, even if it's against something bad. If all prejudice is alike, I must plead guilty.

Mr. Wei is not a Nathan Leopold, but is a Chinese, and here I find myself appalled by the fact that the Immigration and Naturalization Department said the other day to Congressman SIDNEY R. YATES that they will proceed to make all possible efforts to deport him if the Congressman's private bill to save Wei fails.

It just doesn't happen to make any sense to me to deport a human being to death.

I would feel the same way about any human being who finds himself in a tough spot, I say to the anonymous letterwriter who accuses me, and I am not ashamed to say that it makes no more sense to turn the thumbscrews on a man than it does to put good money after bad.

I wish that we would stop being unreal about what we are doing with our foreign aid. At one time it seemed like a good idea to support the Chinese Nationalist Government. As time went on, this idea became less and less real, but we are still doing it.

Mr. Dulles once used the expression "unleash Chiang" in a speech, suggesting that we were holding the hound in check, but at the same time admitting he was our dog. You can't unleash a dog unless you have the key.

Today that idea is not only foolish but extremely silly. And worse is the fact that Chiang is posed in a hopeless position where he hangs on by our feeding and whatever dignity he can get out of being our pup.

Mr. Wei, who spoke against him and then asked us for asylum, is quite likely to be shot in the back of the head, not so much because Chiang is determined to do it and this can be proved, but on the utterly inevitable conclusion that a ruthless dictator frustrated at home cannot be prevented from taking out his wrath on the nearest object of his disaffection.

The position of the United States Government is almost as bad as Mr. Chiang's. He that keeps a mad dog can become one. Rabidity is highly contagious. We won't bite Mr. Wei ourselves, but, having billions of dollars invested in Chiang, we will feed him a live human being because we are as frustrated as he is. We have so much respect for our dough, we can't think straight.

And here is where we come to the rest of the foreign aid program. The one thing in this life a man or a nation must try to do is to keep out of the company of criminals and lechers. The United States of America is not succeeding in this.

And yet, through some subtle process that goes with abandoning our principles, we have come to the place where most of our allies are some kind of hounds, from oil lechers to Fascists, from quasi-Communists to real Reds. There are only a handful of decent countries in the whole foreign aid program, so low have we fallen.

Before you get me wrong, I'm still for technical and economic aid, but I think we ought to be more realistic, honest, and practical about it. We should openly recognize the kind of people with whom we are doing business.

We should say to them, "We want fair elections in your countries or no help."

Or, "Every piece of American goods should be marked 'from your friends in the U. S. A.'"

Or, "If you touch a hair on the head of a man we return to you, now or ever after, we are through with you forever because we never forget an injustice, even to one man."

Or, "If any of this money goes into graft or corruption you are through."

Since we are openly handing out money to get friends, let's at least make them friends, even if they are bought ones, and not dull our palms with entertainment of unfledged comrades, on the right or the left.

It is sad and sickening that we have done so much dirt to our friends among the decent governments, while we make love to the least admirable. For instance, we brought on the whole Nasser cycle by mistreating Britain at the time of the Sues. All of a sudden we got a jitter of morals, although we have had no scruples about people like Generalissimo Franco or the Chinese island 'gissimo.

We never really made any good effort to help the Hungarians in their revolution, and we even abandoned the refugees.

The only decent democracy in the Middle East, Israel, is not allowed by us to have arms to defend herself in an increasingly menacing situation.

France needs our help and sympathy, not a pushing around and American neutralism. We won't stand for any neutralism from her, why should be tread so lightly when she needs help so desperately?

The world grows more complicated and our thinking grows more muddy. We have slid a long distance downward because the sliding is so gradual we now take for granted that which 10 years ago would have horrified us.

It is never too late to go back to clear and sharp thinking and a moral foreign policy, which includes the best slogan I know, "Honesty is the best policy."

The Right Way To Give Economic Assistance Abroad

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER H. JUDD
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 10, 1958

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following portion of a report on our mutual security program in Libya by Mr. Marcus J. Gordon, who is director of our United States economic assistance mission there. Mr. Gordon's testimony before the Committee on Foreign Affairs illustrates vividly that we get more credit and good will for our aid if we do not try too hard, and too obviously, to get credit. So often it is easier to give aid than it is to help other peoples help themselves:

We are trying a variety of approaches in our Libyan projects, in order to obtain a maximum of development activity at a minimum cost. Some of our assistance is on a self-help basis. In the early stages of our program, we were persuaded that every man must receive a full day's wage for any work he was induced to do. Because of poverty, malnutrition (and perhaps tradition) it was felt that things must be done for the people, rather than on the basis of helping them to help themselves. However, we determined that it was important in all cases to require people who were to benefit from a project or activity to invest something in it. This concept was accepted slowly at first but has now gained widespread appreciation. More than 100 old Roman cisterns have been cleaned and thousands of cubic yards of earth dikes constructed on a self-help basis. More than 1,000 individual farmers are engaged in improvements using tools which we lend them, and in accordance with technical instructions given. Three communities are providing the labor for the construction of elementary schools. Our big problem has become lack of technical personnel to respond to the numerous applications for self-help assistance. We have received about 2,000 applications from individuals and tribes who will provide the labor to clean their cisterns, if we will give technical advice and furnish cement. This has been an interesting experience in human relations. We have found without exception that the people are prouder of their improvements when they have had to make a substantial effort, and that they have a higher regard for us when we do things with them rather than for them. A shiek will print "Thanks to America" on the wet cement of a cistern when he has had to furnish his own labor, even though the ownership of the cistern may be in doubt, but he will not likely do so if he has been paid in full for the job.

We are also trying various forms of incentive payment plans to induce farmers and communities to undertake improvements such as terrace and dike construction, tree planting, developing small irrigation systems from springs, etc. In some instances this has taken the form of token cash payments. In other instances we have used surplus wheat. In still others we have used a combination of the two. The results have been excellent.

The Libyan Government has given considerable publicity to the American aid program. A report was issued by the Government about 6 months ago entitled "Accomplishments of the Libyan Government Economic Development Program Made Possible by American Aid." It was not a journalistic model, but it does give a factual account of everything that had been done and was underway at that time, financed by our assistance. It has received wide distribution in Libya both in the English and Arabic languages. All Government officials, schools, and libraries have received copies. Also the report was run serially in the principal newspapers of Libya.

Cancer Fight Mounted

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALBERT RAINS
OF ALABAMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 10, 1958

Mr. RAINS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call the attention of the Congress to the cancer detection program promoted by the West Point Manufacturing Co. in Alabama's Chattahoochee Valley.

This drive, aimed at getting people to see films and read literature on how cancer may be detected, is one of the most comprehensive programs a private company has ever undertaken in the cancer field, according to the American Cancer Society.

The West Point Manufacturing Co. and the thousands of citizens in Lanett, Shawmutt, Langdale, Fairfax, and Riverview who are assisting in this drive are to be commended.

The following editorial from the Anniston (Ala.) Star, March 4, 1958, describes the cancer detection program underway in my district:

CANCER FIGHT MOUNTED

Operating 10 textile mills in 5 Alabama communities strung along the Chattahoochee River, the West Point Manufacturing Co. hardly can hope to escape union labor's customary charge of paternalism where one industry dominates the economy of a given area.

But if West Point Manufacturing's employee relations are fatherly, the kind of person anyone familiar with its policies would picture is a kind and helpful man. The valley towns are widely acclaimed for their modern facilities, cleanliness, and good order.

And they've gotten in the news again just recently by reason of a unique campaign West Point Manufacturing currently is waging.

The Wall Street Journal of last Wednesday carried a front page story telling of an incessant sales pitch via radio, TV, and newspapers that is being directed at residents here in this charming valley, meaning the Lanett-West Point region.

The article hastens to point out, however, that the effort is being put forth, not to sell any consumer goods, but to cut down on cancer's toll among 7,500 workers and their families.

Described by the American Cancer Society as one of the most comprehensive efforts a private company has ever made in the cancer field, the aim is to get adults—especially those over 35—to witness two films on early detection of cancer, to read some pamphlets on cancer's seven danger signals, and to visit their doctors if they have any of the signs.

It seems that on one particular day that the movie was shown in 4 local theaters, 900 persons saw it, and soon after, 6 of that total had successful operations to remove malignant growths.

The reporter for the Journal quotes Joe Lanier, president of West Point Manufacturing, as modestly saying: "What we are doing here might not be practical for some companies in other places."

This observation errs on the side of overcaution, we believe. For clearly the techniques being used to curb cancer in the Chattahoochee Valley could be adapted to other localities. And the cost to sponsoring firms would not be great, Mr. Lanier having estimated the out of pocket outlay by his company at less than $500.

Serious Problems of the Aging

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RUSSELL V. MACK
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 6, 1958

Mr. MACK of Washington. Mr. Speaker, during the past 20 years the problems of our senior citizens have properly become the subject of considerable legislation both on the State and Federal Government level.

We now have a Federal social security retirement program as well as other retirement systems covering selected groups of workers. It is serving a good purpose to the extent it has been developed.

With the number of our elder citizens—those over 65 years of age—increasing at the rate of 500,000 a year it is time we took stock of our present retirement program. There are many thousands of our senior citizens who are still not receiving the care they should have under our high American standards.

Many of our magazine and newspaper publishers are now asking questions about our plans for improving the declining years of our citizens. Such an inquiry is an editorial from the Vancouver, Wash., Daily Columbian which I ask to have printed at this point in the RECORD.

The editorial follows:

SERIOUS PROBLEMS OF THE AGING

The public is becoming more and more aware of the problems of the aging as a growing percentage of the population reach advanced years. It is well that this understanding becomes widespread because the problem is getting more difficult and complex all the time.

In just half a century, the aged in this Nation have increased fivefold. At the turn of the century there were only 3 million Americans 65 years of age or more. Today the estimate is 15 million; by 1975 the total is expected to rise to 20 million. The number increases by one-half million a year, or about 2,000 a day.

To accommodate the large numbers of those of advance years who need continuing care, the country has 25,000 nursing homes. It is estimated that these establishments house 450,000 patients, with an average age of 80 years.

To improve care for the aged will require a coordination of public and private programs. Some 7 million now receive benefits under the social security retirement program but a great number are on public assistance. Nursing homes are expensive and oftentimes overcrowded.

Persons over 65 have a high hospital admission rate and also stay in hospitals longer than younger persons. And, relatively few older persons are protected by health insurance.

These are some of the many facets of the problem. We must have a clear understanding of them before we can find the answers.

Reciprocal Trade

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. W. J. BRYAN DORN
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 10, 1958

Mr. DORN of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, the reciprocal trade bill I am introducing today is the only reciprocal trade bill before Congress at this time. My bill will promote an increase in foreign trade on a truly reciprocal basis.

The following is an analysis of my bill which I believe an overwhelming majority of this Congress can support:

SECTIONAL SUMMARY

This bill spells out a declaration that the Congress seeks to restore reciprocal, mutually advantageous trade with friendly foreign nations in a manner which is consistent with a sound domestic economy, in harmony with broad aspects of our foreign trade policy, and also protects domestic agriculture, industry, and labor and benfits our national security.

Section 360 of the bill continues in effect existing rates of duty, including rates established by trade agreements. Even though existing trade agreements be cancelled, there would be no automatic increase of such rates.

Section 361: The Tariff Commission is renamed and designated as the legislative agency to carry out the policy of the Congress. There is vested in it additional powers to carry out its duties as the legislative agent to whom the Congress has delegated the task of administering the provisions of the bill. The name of the Tariff Commission is changed to the Foreign Trade Board and the present Tariff Commissioners continue to be members of the Board.

This section of the bill also provides that the number of members of the Board shall be increased to seven and that members hereafter appointed to the Board shall be removable from office only by the Congress.

Section 362: This section sets out duties to be performed by the Board in carrying out the general principles of the bill so as to vest in the Board full responsibility to provide information by which the President shall be guided in negotiating trade agreements.

This section also establishes criteria by which the Board may determine whether a trade agreement would be reciprocal and beneficial to the United States and a foreign country. It also describes types of discriminations against the commerce of the United States.

This section further provides that the Board, rather than an executive department agency, shall prepare a list of items on which it is proposed to negotiate a trade agreement with a foreign country.

Section 363 directs the Board to advise the President as to the extent to which duties and other import restrictions applied by foreign countries affect exports from the United States.

Section 364: This section establishes the principle that trade agreements shall be concluded on a bilateral basis with a foreign government as to any or all items of merchandise for which each foreign government is a principal supplier to the United States.

This section also utilizes provisions of existing law, modified in some respects, requiring public hearings to be held in connection with items which are intended to be included within a proposed trade agreement.

Section 365: This section continues the existing provisions of law defining domestic industry.

Section 366 is an entirely new provision of law in which the Board is directed to establish peril points. Criteria are set forth to guide the Board in making peril-point determinations prior to the negotiation of a trade agreement, including the establishment of quota limitations.

Section 367 is a modification of existing law as to application of reductions in rates.

Section 368 continues existing law limiting the term of a trade agreement to a period of 3 years, subject thereafter to termination upon 6-months' notice. It also requires that each foreign trade agreement concluded pursuant to provisions of the bill shall be reviewed periodically in order to determine whether the entire agreement continues to be truly reciprocal and mutually advantageous.

This section continues the provisions of the existing law insofar as the most-favored-nation principle is concerned. It amends existing law in that it spells out categories of discrimination against American commerce which nullify or impair the most-favored-nation principle. The enumeration and description of acts of discrimination represent a means of protecting our export markets as well as our domestic commerce.

Section 369. This section puts into law administrative practices which were followed prior to the proclamation of GATT. In bilateral agreements concluded under the Trade Agreements Act of 1934, several of these agreements contained provisions that either party could withdraw from the agreement, or modify its terms in the event that a third country became chief beneficiary of a concession contained in such agreements. The bill would establish this desirable administrative practice as a permanent policy objective of the Congress.

Section 370. This section substantially repeats the provisions of existing law concerning escape-clause remedies. It provides however that in instances where injury or threat of injury under the escape-clause provisions has been found to exist, that the President may not disregard such findings but injury or threat of injury shall be deemed to constitute a discrimination against domestic commerce.

Section 371 modifies existing law concerning products having a national defense or national security aspect.

Section 372 provides for "escape" relief, where a product involved has a national defense or security aspect.

Section 373 provides that existing trade agreements shall be reviewed in order to determine whether they conform to the policies and standards expressed in the bill for the conduct of our future reciprocal trade relations with foreign countries.

The section also provides that existing trade agreements shall also be reviewed in order to determine whether concessions made therein have destroyed or adversely modified the duty rate structure established in the Tariff Act of 1930, which recognized and provided for percentage differentials in rates of duty upon (a) a raw material, (b) a semiprocessed article produced in whole or in part from such raw material, or (c) a finished article or product produced by utilizing the semiprocessed item in whole or in part.

Section 374 provides that wherever a recommendation of the board for concessions in duty or modifications of import restrictions be limited to a certain volume, that the President in his negotiations with a foreign country be required to limit such concession to permit imports to be admitted up to an amount equivalent to 5 percent of domestic production of like or directly competitive articles during a specified period of time.

Dr. Morgenthau on Foreign Aid

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BARRATT O'HARA
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 10, 1958

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, by unanimous consent I am extending my remarks to include a letter published in the New York Times of March 7, 1958, from Dr. Hans Morgenthau, Department of Political Science, University of Chicago. Dr. Morgenthau, a former consultant to the State Department, is the director of the Center for the Study of American Foreign Policy at the University of Chicago. His letter follows:

To the EDITOR OF THE NEW YORK TIMES:

Every year when spring approaches the Nation engages in a debate on foreign aid.

The administration tries, as it were, to sell a certain amount of foreign aid to Congress, and Congress refuses to buy that amount. If Congress appropriates much less than the $3.9 billion requested, the President has just told us, we will have "a beleaguered America, her freedoms limited by mounting defense costs and almost alone in a world dominated by international communism."

Congress, unimpressed by such hyperbolic statements, has in the past not been deterred from slashing appropriations for foreign aid. There is little doubt that Congress will not be impressed this time, either.

Responsibility for this sad and dangerous state of affairs lies primarily with the administration, which has not been able to convince the American people that it must have $3.9 billion because it has not presented to the people a rational and intelligible program for foreign aid, because no such program exists.

In the absence of a well-thought-out and coherent aid policy, oriented toward and subordinated to the political objectives of our foreign policy, the administration asks the people to buy a package whose contents they must take on faith.

LINE OF INQUIRY

The question before the administration, Congress and the American people is not whether or not we ought to have a policy of foreign aid. To ask that question is as senseless as to ask whether or not we ought to have a foreign or military policy. Nor does it make sense to limit the inquiry to asking how much money we ought to spend for foreign aid.

The really vital question, which hardly anybody bothers to raise, concerns the kind of policy of foreign aid we ought to have. As it has developed in recent years our policy is fundamentally weak. It has been conceived as a self-sufficient technical enterprise, covering a multitude of disparate objectives and activities, responding haphazardly to all kinds of demands sound and unsound, unrelated or only by accident related to the political purposes of our foreign policy.

Whenever an administration has been able to demonstrate the existence of that relationship, as it did in the cases of the

Marshall Plan and of aid to Greece and Turkey, the people have supported its policy and they did not ask how much it might cost. If the administration knew what it wanted in terms of foreign aid, it would get from Congress what it wants in terms of money.

But by mistaking the methods of the medicine man for those of the statesman it defeats its own policy. For political medicinemanship may work, at least for the time being, in a totalitarian country. But it is the very measure of the vitality of the democratic spirit in America that it does not work, even on a bipartisan basis, with the American people.

SUPPORT FOR PROGRAM

The American people, at least in the long run, seem to prefer statesmanship, however partisan, to medicinemanship, however bipartisan. Their assertion of their critical faculties is a heartening experience. And it renders the more inexcusable the failure of the administration to think hard about foreign aid and to develop a policy which makes sense in terms of the political objectives of the United States, putting such a program before the American people as it is, without frills or tricks. If this were done, the country would support, as in the past, what it is convinced it needs for survival.

The danger is great that if the administration does not change its approach quickly and drastically, foreign aid will share the fate of the League of Nations and for similar reasons: a sound purpose faultily conceived and inadequately presented and hence rejected by the American people. Yet while we had time to recover from the failure to commit our political and military strength to our interests in the interwar period, it is not likely that history will allow us to retrace our steps if we should now fail to support our political objectives throughout the world with our economic strength.

HANS J. MORGENTHAU.

CHICAGO, *February 26, 1958.*

Nonsense About Foreign Aid

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHESTER E. MERROW

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 3, 1958

Mr. MERROW. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include therein an editorial from the New York Times, New York, N. Y., on Sunday, March 9, 1958, entitled "Nonsense About Foreign Aid":

Should the American taxpayer give up his hard-earned pennies in order to buy striped pants for Greek undertakers? Should he provide bathtubs for Egyptian camel drivers? Is it right that the sweat of his brow should be expended in order to plant grass along the highways to Lebanon, or to build roads so the King of Saudi Arabia may exercise his expensive imported American motor cars, or to furnish iceboxes for Eskimos?

It is not right, as Director James H. Smith, Jr., of the International Cooperation Administration testified before the House Foreign Affairs Committee. It is not right and it hasn't happened. The ICA did buy shoes for the Greek Army. It did provide facilities for Egyptians, including camel drivers, to fight hookworm by washing their feet. It did help Lebanon plant grass to stop erosion. It built no roads in Saudi Arabia, although it did improve a port and an airfield. It didn't give any iceboxes to Eskimos; they didn't want any.

Mr. Smith shouldn't have had to use up his own time and the time of the House Foreign Affairs Committee in answering this sort of nonsensical rumor. Even those who invented these stories probably didn't believe them. They were intended to fool people. But if the opposition to the $3.9 billion foreign-aid program is so devoid of good arguments that it has to resort to this sort of thing, perhaps we may be hopeful.

It is true that not every penny is expended without error. The pennies we spend on domestic government are not expended without error. But there is no doubt that we get as much out of our foreign-aid program in benefits to our neighbors and in security to ourselves as we do out of any funds appropriated by any governmental agency for any other purpose.

Russia 5 Years After Stalin—Country as Tyrannical and Menacing as When Ruthless Dictator Ruled

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALVIN M. BENTLEY

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 10, 1958

Mr. BENTLEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend and revise my remarks, I wish to include the text of an article by Constantine Brown which appeared in the March 6 issue of the Washington Star. The article, entitled "Russia 5 Years After Stalin," indicated that the basic characteristics of menace and ruthlessness that typified Soviet foreign and domestic policies when Stalin was alive are still just as present today as they were then.

The article follows:

RUSSIA 5 YEARS AFTER STALIN—COUNTRY AS TYRANNICAL AND MENACING AS WHEN RUTHLESS DICTATOR RULED

(By Constantine Brown)

Five years ago Josef Vissarionovich Djugashvili, a Georgian who was known to the world as Josef Stalin, died an apparently natural death in Moscow. For 30 years he had wielded the most despotic power known to mankind since the days of Genghis Khan. He had built the Bolshevik state that emerged from the Russian revolution into a great world power, probably the second most powerful in the world. He had masterminded the spreading of Communist tentacles into nations all over the world.

Cynically, he had used the unstinted support of capitalist nations, which he fully intended ultimately to destroy, to defend his Soviet nation from almost certain conquest at the hands of Hitler's Nazi legions. As soon as the Nazis were destroyed and Hitler was dead, he lost not a moment in double-crossing the Allies who had preserved him and his government.

When the aged dictator died, mourned only publicly by a few men who had survived his purges but by no one else, Stalin held in his steel grip all the formerly independent and proud peoples of Eastern and Central Europe. Most of them never had a chance to resume their old freedoms after World War II; they were "liberated" by Russian armies, and the brutal liberators remained to enforce a Government of Communist puppets of Moscow on each of them in turn. Czechoslovakia, which did have a brief chance for self-determination, was betrayed and captured in a cold and treacherous coup. One nation, Yugoslavia, defied the Stalin grip and somehow made the defiance stick.

The striking economic, industrial, and military successes of the Soviet Union under Stalin were achieved at a frightful cost in human lives, human values, human dignity. Successive bloody purges destroyed even vestiges of independent thought. The men, women, and children of the Russian empire paid in abysamally low living standards for the gains in Soviet heavy industry. Housing, clothing, food, and all the amenities of civilized life were sacrificed forcibly to the grim determination of the dictator to build up Russian industrial potential, and thus to build up the Soviet military machine.

When the Kremlin announced that the great dictator had gone to join the ghosts of the millions he had slain or caused to be slain, for whatever rewards they had ready for him, most of the world breathed a sigh of relief. Surely, the prevailing thought was, things cannot be as bad under his successors as they were under his brutal tyranny.

Now five years have passed, and the monolithic Soviet State remains, as tyrannical, totalitarian and menacing as over. True enough, the battle for the possession of the reins of power did take place, and is still going on. Nikita Khrushchev, on top for the moment, plainly does not feel his power is consolidated enough to enable him to shoot his political foes, as did Stalin. That will probably come later, if Khrushchev wins the final round.

As for the Soviet Union in world affairs, there has been no real change. Seeking time for the carrying out of the power struggle, the Soviets have, to be sure, made a lot of peaceful noises. They have brought forth a deluding bait called "peaceful coexistence" as a carrot to bring a suspicious free world closer to the jaws of the Soviet bear. But the bear's teeth and claws are revealed in moments of crisis, as in Hungary when a once-free people rose in violent rebellion against Red tyranny and were ruthlessly suppressed by Russian tanks and bayonets.

The political ferment inside the limits of the Soviet empire is still bubbing, all the signs indicate. Until the future dictator is firmly in the saddle, Moscow needs a breathing space. That is largely why the Kremlin is so assiduously seeking a summit conference with the West. A period of relaxed international tension would give the men of the Communist inner sanctum a chance to settle which of them is the new Stalin.

Ireland Needs Help

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALFRED D. SIEMINSKI

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 6, 1958

Mr. SIEMINSKI. Mr. Speaker, the United Irish Societies of Baltimore—the Ancient Order of Hibernians, Friendly Sons of St. Patrick, the Hibernian Society, and the Emerald Isle Club—are to be commended for launching a program designed to attract new industries to Ireland.

Because so many of my constituents are of Irish heritage, I am even more mindful of the economic struggle that has long confronted the proud people of

Ireland, and the program to locate major industries in that country deserves complete support and understanding on the part of business leaders throughout the Nation.

Ireland has always been and will continue to be a popular tourist center, but American businessmen have been slow to recognize the tremendous potential and actual opportunities which exist there. The available manpower, the excellent facilities, resources, and the friendly and cooperative attitude of Irish officials are but some of the factors that make Ireland ideal, geared to accommodate industries of all types and sizes.

As the program undertaken by the Irish Societies of Baltimore gains impetus, I am sure a growing number of American firms will investigate conditions and become firmly convinced of the fact that Ireland has much to offer.

Pole Veteran Urges War on Impossible

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOEL T. BROYHILL
OF VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 10, 1958

Mr. BROYHILL. Mr. Speaker, I request permission to insert in the extension of remarks the following article which appeared in the Washington Post on February 23, 1958, pointing out the highlights of a speech given by Dr. Paul A. Siple, South Pole veteran, at a Washington's Birthday banquet of the District Society of the Sons of the American Revolution on Saturday, February 22, as follows:

POLE VETERAN URGES WAR ON IMPOSSIBLE

(By Wendell Bradley, staff reporter)

Paul A. Siple, who spent last winter at the South Pole in a climate colder than modern man had ever lived in, said yesterday that unless this country continues to try the impossible it will deteriorate.

The great question facing the American people, he said, is whether we are capable of solving problems when the chips are down.

Siple spoke at a Washington's Birthday banquet of the District Society of the Sons of the American Revolution.

Siple said the Nation faced almost insurmountable problems in establishing a winter base at the South Pole in connection with the International Geophysical Year. It cost about $1 million per man to put the 18 scientists and Navy personnel there, he said.

"If the time comes when our Nation says a problem is too difficult or solving it is going to cost too much we will lose our place in history because there are others who don't say that," Siple said. He said we will become mentally asleep.

America became great conquering frontiers and has more to conquer, Siple said. He listed them as outer space, the continent of Antarctica, the unknown bottoms of the oceans, and later, perhaps, exploration toward the center of the earth.

Siple and the men under him lived in temperatures of 100 degrees below zero. For 159 days the thermometer never rose above 49 below. Siple said a Defense Department official told him:

"If you just remain alive through the winter we will feel the camp was successful even if you fail to gather any scientific data."

One thing the scientists learned, Siple said, is that the South Pole gets less snow, about 6 inches, in a winter than Washington got in the snowstorm just past.

Edward Asbury O'Neal, III

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT E. JONES, JR.
OF ALABAMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 10, 1958

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I want to take this opportunity to bring to the membership of the House the good works and outstanding record of achievement of Edward Asbury O'Neal III, the grand old man of American agriculture who recently passed from our midst. No other farm leader in our time has contributed more than did Ed O'Neal to the development and welfare of American agriculture. We sincerely mourn his passing, and his position of leadership will be most difficult to fill.

As a fitting tribute to the great life and works of Edward O'Neal, I want to place in the RECORD at this time an editorial from the Decatur (Ala.) Daily of March 2 which appropriately describes this leader's great accomplishments:

EDWARD ASBURY O'NEAL III

Books could be written on the life and works of Edward Asbury O'Neal III, grand old man of American agriculture and president of the American Farm Bureau Federation from the dark days of 1932 until his retirement 7 years ago owing to ill health. Mr. O'Neal died Wednesday night at his home in Florence where he had been a semi-invalid since 1954.

Alabama has had no man of greater or more lasting influence on the lives of the American people than "Mr. Ed" O'Neal.

In looking over Mr. O'Neal's life we see him as farmer, architect, sculptor, team member, friend and gentleman.

He loved the land and what it stood for. He loved to talk of his farm, of the strong red valley land, of cotton, corn, oats, and livestock. He went to the top in American agriculture because his foundations were practical, in the land. He was a farmer. He knew farm needs in legislation. He knew what he was talking about and he had the courage, ability and conviction essential to bringing great farm programs into reality. His convictions were based upon the sound economic position of the American farmer, not upon any political considerations or advantages.

In the background he was the architect of Muscle Shoals and he took great personal pride in the development of the Tennessee Valley area. Some feel, and we are among that number, that it was through Mr. O'Neal and his friends and their long years of work that Wilson Dam was possible, the nitrate plant in the first world war, the foundations for the modern TVA. Some feel, and again we are among them, Mr. O'Neal was responsible for the interest of Senator George Norris, of Nebraska, in Wilson Dam and Muscle Shoals and later the TVA.

We knew Mr. O'Neal as the actual author of farm legislation which brought agriculture and the Nation out of the depression years. Those were drastic years calling for drastic changes in legislation and thus was created the AAA, the Bankhead plan, the ever normal granary. Agriculture is still working under the 1938 farm law as amended and many of the amendments since the days of Mr. O'Neal certainly have not had either his thinking or his blessing.

He was the sculptor of the farm bloc, in which the South and the Midwest joined hands for the protection of all agriculture of the Nation. Through the fire and drive that was his coupled with the ability to win, he almost singlehandedly molded the historic farm bloc, which, if it were in existence today, would do away with many of the economic ills which beset the American farmer. Through the thick and thin of many battles the farm bloc stood against all odds. It did not crack, or splinter or yield until Ed O'Neal and the men he developed passed from the stage. Farmers will remember the strength and artistic touch of the sculptor who carved the effective farm bloc.

The great team for agriculture after 1932 was Franklin D. Roosevelt, John H. Bankhead, and Ed O'Neal. The President and the Senator were great ball carriers. "Mr. Ed" called the signals, planned the plays, provided the teamwork strategy. It is common knowledge in Washington that Mr. O'Neal cornered the votes necessary for the passage of this historic farm legislation.

Few people had friends in so many walks of life. The tenant farmer and those of low estate loved "Mr. Ed." He was always kind and had a word of cheer and there was a closeness. This was also true of many leaders in American life who sought his companionship and listened while his mind fought with and analyzed the local, national, and world problems of agriculture. As one north Alabama tenant farmer put it, in his own words of praise for Mr. O'Neal, "He knowed folks across the waters."

We knew "Mr. Ed" as a smiling, kindly, southern gentleman for he knew the chant of the cotton choppers and the feel of the dust on the farm road as it skirted between the field and the thicket, and he knew the cluck of the wagon wheel as it moved to the barn with a load of corn. True to the beloved tradition of the South his life wide and broad, he knew the sassafras bush and the quail and the thrill of a pointer as he froze on point.

Franklin D. Roosevelt and Dwight D. Eisenhower respected his counsel. The tenant farmer and the presidents of the great cotton companies admired and loved his courage and ability. To us all, "Mr. Ed." was a champion.

Resolutions Memorializing Congress Against Certain Legislation Commonly Referred to as Right-to-Work Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 10, 1958

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks, I enclose an attested copy of a resolution adopted by the General Court of Massachusetts, urging "the Congress of the

United States not to enact any legislation relating to the right to work, so called":

THE COMMONWEALTH OF MASSACHUSETTS,
Boston, Mass.

Resolved, That the General Court of Massachusetts respectfully urges the Congress of the United States not to enact any legislation relating to the right-to-work, so-called, or any similar legislation designed to prohibit closed shops or to provide that no employee shall as a condition of his employment be required to join a labor union, which proposed legislation will, if enacted, tend to undermine the strength of labor and of labor unions throughout the country; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of these resolutions be transmitted forthwith by the Secretary of the Commonwealth to the presiding officers of each branch of the Congress of the United States, and to each member thereof from this Commonwealth.

House of representatives, adopted, February 24, 1958.

LAWRENCE R. GROVE,
Clerk.

Senate, adopted in concurrence, February 26, 1958.

IRVING N. HAYDEN,
Clerk.

A true copy.
Attest:

EDWARD J. CRONIN,
Secretary of the Commonwealth.

Lithuanians' Aspirations for Independence of and Freedom in Lithuania

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 10, 1958

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks, I include a copy of resolutions adopted at a mass meeting of Americans of Lithuanian blood and descent of Greater Boston, held at the South Boston High School, Boston, Mass., on March 2, 1958:

Resolutions unanimously adopted at a mass meeting of Lithuanians of Greater Boston held in the auditorium of South Boston High School, South Boston, Mass., on March 2, 1958, and attended by more than 1,000 persons and representatives of the enslaved nations of Lithuania, Latvia, Estonia, and the Ukraine, under the auspices of the American Lithuanian Council of Boston:

"Whereas the Great Congress of Lithuania, which had met in Vilnius in 1917 to demand freedom from Russia, there elected the Council of Lithuania, which, on February 16, 1918, 40 years ago, proclaimed the Independence of Lithuania in accordance with the recognized right of national self-determination and asserted its restitution as an independent state, which status was thereafter recognized by all the great nations of the world, and marked the severance of the ties of bondage by which it has been enslaved since 1795; and

"Whereas the traditional American leadership in principles of justice, morality, and equal rights to all human beings paved the way for American supremacy in political, military, and economic world affairs which this country is today providing for the benefit of mankind; and

"Whereas the Government of the United States of America maintains diplomatic relations with the Governments of the Baltic Nations of Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia and consistently has refused to recognize their seizure and forced incorporation into the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics; and

"Whereas the mere denial to recognize the Soviet claims of that area, when not accompanied by any positive action on the part of the United States to back its stand, do not and will not bear the slightest effect on leaders of the Soviet Government: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved*—

1. That we reassert our faith and loyalty to the President of the United States and to all forces opposing totalitarian rule and oppression,

2. That we unite in appealing to our representatives in Government to exert all efforts to adopte a clear and firm foreign policy such as America's leading role in world affairs necessitates,

That our Government's foreign policy shall include the liberation of Lithuania and other Soviet-enslaved countries as an integral part of its program,

4. That we denounce the Soviet doctrine of coexistence as it would continue the enslavement of heretofore free people in the countries of Lithuania, Latvia, Estonia and all other Soviet-dominated countries,

5. That the President of the United States and the Secretary of State in formulating their presummit discussions with the leaders of the U. S. S. R. now being proposed shall include in their program a full discussion of the liberation of Lithuania and of all other Soviet-dominated nations to the end that all freedom-loving people shall be free,

6. That copies of these resolutions be forwarded to the President of the United States, the Secretary of State, the United Nations, the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, the Members of the Senate and House of Representatives in Congress from this district, the Honorable Foster Furcolo, Governor of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, and to the Honorable John B. Hynes, mayor of Boston.

K. HOCHING,
Chairman.
T. SONDA,
Secretary.

MARCH 2, 1958.

Why We Can't Enjoy It

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN J. RHODES
OF ARIZONA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 10, 1958

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, under leave previously granted, I would like to include in the RECORD an editorial that appeared in the Chandler Arizonan of February 27, 1958. This is a most thought-provoking editorial and I thought it should be brought to the attention of the Congress:

WHY CAN'T WE ENJOY IT

It's a bad state of affairs when people can't enjoy improved conditions. One hears grumbling that business is down and that merchandise isn't moving. But both big and little businesses are finding their financial statements at the year's end showing increased sales and profit.

What's happened? Local concerns found 1957 the best year we ever had. And Robert Short, manager of the Mesa Employment Service, reports little change in the unemployment situation here so far this year as compared to a year ago. He also points out that we are in a much better situation than other parts of the country.

Consequently, with this proof to show us that conditions are as good or better than last year, we can't seem to enjoy them. Why? Perhaps it's all in our minds.

Maybe we've just forgotten what it was to hustle for something instead of having things come our way—and that can be taken literally.

Go back to the time before the economy boost of war conditions in 1938 and 1939. You don't have to go back as far as the depression, just to the time a salesman had to sell in order to make a living—and train service was polite and courteous, making a trip pleasurable.

With the labor shortage during the war years, it was not surprising to be confronted with a sales technique of "may I help you, please." So many years we had to guess the car prices which didn't need to be shown then because the demand was so high and the production so limited. Now prices are being printed again and salesmen are traveling many miles to make a sale.

All this is another way of saying it may be a shock that we have to sell once again in order to make a sale and that we may have to extend ourselves beyond the mere exchange of money for services. We may have to take the time and have the patience to be polite and courteous. We may find this difficult with the speed of our time.

With the many demands of our complex living, we may never be able to slow up sufficiently to regain the intimate relations of doing business, for example, with the family doctor who takes care of all our ills instead of being referred to specialists.

All this may be a malady of the tenor of our times, but it surely is too bad we can't enjoy prosperity.

Linguists in Short Supply in United States—Training in Foreign Language Should Begin at Early Age

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MELVIN PRICE
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 10, 1958

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, in a time when communications and exchange of ideas among nations is of critical importance, we are discovering that we are in short supply of the instruments of such interchange—persons fluent in foreign language.

I have recently seen a report that only 8,000 Americans are proficient in Russian, a language that is essential, for example, in the translation of many significant scientific reports. The Armed Forces are aware of this need for linguistic skill in a wide range of foreign tongues and are conducting schools for this purpose. At the college level, a great number of our students who go abroad to visit or study lack ability in foreign languages—a gap which makes their experience less rewarding.

While this condition prevails, educators tell us that youngsters in the elementary grades are at a ripe age for learning another language in addition to English. The time is within memory, I am sure, of many Members of Congress when elementary schools in their areas taught a foreign language because of the large number of foreign-born parents who wanted their children to understand their ancestral language.

In one of the cities in my district, Belleville, Ill., youngsters were taught German for this reason in the public schools. But in the emotional fervor of World War I, German was dropped from the schools, never to return. In my home city of East St. Louis, Polish is still taught to children at St. Adalbert's parish school. This program of early training in languages has much to commend it. I wish to insert the following editorial on this subject which appeared in the Belleville News-Democrat on March 6, 1958:

BELLEVILLE PROVED IT LONG AGO

When does a baby start learning to talk? He isn't many months old when he starts babbling gibberish syllables, perhaps in imitation of the meaningless (to him) sounds he hears constantly issuing from the mouths of adults. This is the beginning.

A little later, awed parents hear him utter his first monosyllable. Then he begins to show that he understands the meaning of some words. By the age of two the average child is beginning to achieve a little fluency in using speech as a means of communication.

Modern educators reason that if a 2-year-old can learn a language, the task should not be beyond the powers of a 9-year-old. But many individuals have expressed doubts about this. Fourth graders, they say, are entirely too young to learn French. Yet French children learn it much younger.

In the E. Francis Medill elementary school in Newark, N. J., where an experiment is now going on, fourth graders are learning French and Spanish, and enjoying it. They have acquired the knack of carrying on conversations in a foreign tongue and singing songs in it.

The Newark experiment is hailed in educational circles as something excitingly new and revolutionary. Here in Belleville it's "old hat." For many years the German language was taught in all Belleville grade schools, both public and parochial, along with and as compulsory as English. German, however, was discontinued during World War I as unpatriotic, and afterward never resumed.

Belleville children were introduced to this modern foreign language in the first grade at the tender age of 6, and indoctrination continued through the eighth grade. However, German was never really regarded as a foreign language here since German immigrants and their descendants predominated in the community. And the German language, of one dialect or another, was preferred over English in many homes and churches.

That German teaching was dropped in the first place was lamentable; that it was never resumed, inexcusable. Now, 40 years later, our Nation is finally waking up with a start to the lag in foreign language education. President Eisenhower has told Congress that the American people are generally deficient in foreign languages and that to overcome this is important to our national security.

In a list of 36 countries compiled accordinf to the number of years of foreign language teaching in their public schools, the United States ranks lowest. Foreign languages are compulsory in most of these countries' schools. In the United States students generally may choose. Most choose not to study any.

As a result of this belated reexamination, a crash program is being readied by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare to correct the situation. And so we begin to rouse from our lethargy of complacency. But it takes almost a crisis to get us back on the ball.

Washington Report by Hon. Bruce Alger, of Texas

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BRUCE ALGER
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 24, 1958

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include my weekly newsletter of March 8, 1958:

WASHINGTON REPORT

(By Congressman BRUCE ALGER, Fifth District of Texas)

MARCH 8, 1958.—The Treasury, Post Office, and Tax Court apppropriation bill involved $23,600 million (this equals $23 per minute since Christ was born), the year's second biggest money bill, next to defense. Of this $8½ billion was permanent indefinite appropriations (mainly $7.8 billion interest on our national debt). Nor could we cut the $11 billion representing trust funds ($8 billion old-age and survivors payments, $2 billion for payments to unemployed, and 13 others). This left $4 billion for Congress to consider. The Post Office got $3.4 billion, which is $77 million more than last year and $19 million less than requested. The Treasury Department actually asked for $200,000 less than last year, an action almost unheard of in Government agencies, and the new Secretary of the Treasury drew some compliments. So it can be done. Hats off to Secretary Bob Anderson.

H. R. 8002, the accrued expenditure bill, is one of the Hoover Commission's legislative recommendations, aimed at economizing in Government. It passed after spirited debate. Under an accrued expenditure system, Congress would appropriate only as much money each year as the agencies would actually pay out during the year. It would replace the present system under which Congress authorizes agencies to incur financial obligations for years ahead by ordering goods or services and then drawing on the Treasury to pay for them as delivered, even though payments may be made for years after the appropriation was originally made. Enactment of this type of legislation will result in much improved control over Government expenditures and permit substantial savings, it seems to me. Obviously, lead time required between placing of military orders and delivery date will be recognized and necessary adjustments made so contractors will be assured of getting their money. Opposition came, surprisingly enough, from senior members of the Appropriations Committee, claiming the bill would fail to limit expenditures. This I cannot believe. This bill fits the pattern of the constitutional amendment I support which would compell Congress to balance the budget yearly.

Widespread citizen support has forced Congress to consider this bill now, pointing out for all to see what an aroused citizenry can do. Why don't citizens everywhere rise up and demand fiscal responsibility and cutbacks from Congress in other legislation? Why permit an increasing budget in welfare and social programs in the face of slackening business? Increased Government spending now to increase employment is like using gasoline to put out the fire. A sure way to stimulate the economy is through a tax cut. This in turn is practical only if Government expenditures are cut; otherwise, inflation, the most dangerous tax, results.

Nationwide farm facts we all should know: (1) Per capita farm income in 1957 was highest in history; (2) farm assets are at an alltime high,, and home equities are up; (3) two-thirds of the farms are free of mortgage; (4) three-fourths of farms are operated by owners; (5) sale prices of farms are high, with ready buyers; (6) present programs will tend to free farmers rather than tighten controls on them. Help for the farmer, as I see it, will not come from more Government regulations, only from less, and ultimately from no Government regulation. All taxpayers should commend Secretary Benson's efforts to free farmers from further Government stangulation.

Trade, not aid is more than a slogan to many Members who are disillusioned with self-defeating foreign aid. What's at stake in foreign trade? More than 4½ million American workers are estimated to work in industries dependent wholly or to a large degree upon foreign trade. In 1957, the United States exported about $19½ billion worth of goods to all parts of the world. These goods were sold for dollars and were exclusive of all military aid. Imports in 1957 were measured at about $13 billion, $11 billion of which comprised materials and partially processed goods completely noncompetitive with domestic production. The balance, therefore, shows $30½ billion in trade which benefits every American and $3 billion that offers competition to some segments of our economy. (Here's the rub—Congress must protect domestic industries—including Texas' defense-vital oil production industry.)

While Capitol Building expansion might be disapproved by some on economy grounds, including myself, yet it should be remembered that the Capitol has been added to many times, and such additions are hardly improper in themselves. As the gloom and doomers point to rising unemployment figures (and some politicians are going to be awfully disappointed if things don't really get bad) maybe its time somebody pointed out the amazing rise in folks who are working. Take Dallas County—according to the Department of Labor, the number of people employed has soared from 268,100 in April of 1950 and 311,300 in July of 1954 to a whopping 348,300 in January 1958. That's a 30-percent increase in the number who are employed in less than 8 years.

Government Operations and Policies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALBERT W. CRETELLA
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 10, 1958

Mr. CRETELLA. Mr. Speaker, from time to time I receive correspondence from Mr. A. Bryan Clark, president of Associated Seed Growers, Inc., of New Haven, Conn. Mr. Clark often offers interesting and intelligent insight into many of the current problems facing our

Government and I look forward to his correspondence.

I should like to include herewith a letter of his, dated March 4, 1958, which I believe is presented with the utmost clarity and commonsense. He touches on some important facets of our Government operations and policies. I am pleased and honored to include this note for the reading of all Members of this body:

ASSOCIATED SEED GROWERS, INC.,
New Haven, Conn., March 4, 1958.

Hon. ALBERT W. CRETELLA,
Member of House of Representatives,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. CRETELLA: The problem of deciding how much money the Federal Government should spend and for what, is as staggering as it is important. My crystal ball is not better than the next fellow's, and not as good as yours with some of the source of information available to you. Many decisions of far-reaching consequences, however will have to be made by you and your colleagues in Congress during the coming months relating to this problem, and for this reason I would like to express to you some of my hopes and concerns, and perhaps my prejudices and preferences in this field.

The great majority of us, I am sure, would prefer to see questions of this type determined more than they have been in the past on the basis of the common good of the Nation and the world and less on the basis of the special interests or organized and local minorities. Basically, I side with those who are concerned about the vast total of the sums being raised and spent by the Federal Government. Agreement is pretty general on this point, I guess, with the differences of opinion coming about the point at which the expenditures should be reduced.

The demands of national defense are no doubt paramount, and I agree that they should be given priority, but that they should be weighed carefully in relationship to the fundamental strength and vitality of the national economy, which in itself is a major pillar of defense. The astute support of military and economic effort abroad on the part of our natural allies and potential allies is also, in my opinion, highly important and appropriately viewed as part of our defense effort. In fact, it is probably an unsound concept to think of our most important responsibility as a matter of defense. We are engaged in what we all regard as a life and death contention with a hostile view of the proper mode of life and way of conducting world affairs. Accordingly, our prime responsibility and the chief interest of the Federal Government is not defense in a passive or negative sense. It is rather our aim at a Nation to generate and foster worldwide development in a direction that will permit the institutions and practiecs of liberty and democracy to function and to flourish. The ultimate success of this mission is the only condition on which we can maintain an ultimately successful defense.

Within the limits of our economic and financial capacity, then, the needs of our national defense and of our world mission, which are simply different facets of a common project, deserve first priority.

The other activities of the Federal Government seem to me to be distinctly secondary. Many of them are obviously important and necessary, but hardly, it seems to me, deserving of the enormous sums expended on most of them.

Much that is attempted by the Federal Government I feel can adequately, if not preferably, be handled by State and local governments and this includes matters of education. New needs and a new sense of direction may well be called for in this field, but that is largely a matter of judgment and common conviction. Given a sound sense of direction it can as well be followed by local governments as by the Federal Government, if the economic health of the Nation is protected by the Federal Government, and sources of revenue are relinquished and made available to the States and localities.

In the field of agriculture, to my mind, great damage has been done rather than great good performed by the expenditure of vast sums as subsidies in various forms to the agricultural communities. For the most part the largess has not gone to neediest parts of the farm population, but rather to the most astute speculators or the largest and most efficient agricultural producers and operators. At a time when financial solvency is a great national peril, it sems to me to be plain asininity for the Federal Government to be spending great sums on reclamation projects to bring new acreage into production to compete with and to displace the acreage now in production under prior reclamation projects, and at the same time to be spending other great sums to subsidize the taking of agricultural acreage out of production. In the process the Government subsidy program handicaps the advance of agricultural technology and fosters such things as production of varieties of maximum yield for Government purchase and storage as against the production of varieties of better commercial quality for use and human consumption. The perpetuation of the inequities and iniquities of these conflicting farm policies, which even in total are for the benefit of such small and favored groups even of the total farm segment of the population, is hard to understand.

Lastly, it is hard for me to understand why cooperatives, even when organized by 4 or 5 or 6 individuals for the conduct of a business operation, should be accorded tax exemption or tax favoritism when the tax burden today is the largest and most crushing business consideration of any. The Government needs tax revenues. The health of the economy needs fair competition. The ordinary business corporation has to pay taxes on its earnings and its stockholders are required to pay a second tax on their dividends. Why is it that cooperative business organizations continue to be exempt at this advanced stage of their economic development from equal taxation with the rest of the community?

I have followed your efforts and actions as a public figure, and I thoroughly appreciate the fact that your views coincide with mine on many, if not most, of these points expressed above. For this reason, I am writing more to reinforce these points of view and your judgment on them than to take issue with your particular stand on these questions. I have great respect for what you have done and for what you are trying to do in the present session of Congress.

Sincerely yours,

A. BRYAN CLARK,
President.

Our National Guard

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. W. R. HULL, JR.
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 10, 1958

Mr. HULL. Mr. Speaker, in a statement before the Armed Services Committee of the House of Representatives on March 3, the Honorable James T. Blair, Jr., Governor of Missouri made a significant statement regarding a recent recommendation handed down by Pentagon officialdom.

The National Guard, to which this Pentagon recommendation relates, has served our Nation well in war and peace. During the last world war, the caliber of National Guard divisions was rated very highly by our enemies, the Germans and the Japanese. National Guard divisions likewise were called into service at the outbreak of the Korean war and performed nobly during that conflict. In times of internal disaster, the Guard has always responded quickly and effectively to the call.

Governor Blair delineates in cogent fashion the unique importance to Missouri of its National Guard forces and his statement comprises a convincing argument against weakening of our National Guard in this perilous age.

Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the full statement of Governor Blair:

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, I appear before you today in a threefold capacity: As the Governor of the State of Missouri and commander in chief of its military forces; as a member of a select group of State chief executives; and as an individual American citizen.

I am here because, in each of those capacities, I share with my colleagues a keen interest in the security of the United States, and, in particular, in the Army National Guard as an integral part of the first line of defense of this Nation.

The long and proud history of the National Guard is convincing evidence of its volunteer contribution to the development and security of our country. In its dual status, unique in our governmental system, it serves the States in time of peace and provides the Republic with a Ready Reserve force for defense in time of war. We Missourians are exceedingly proud of our National Guard, both Army and Air, and of the service rendered to the State in times of disaster and to the Nation in combat. In my opinion, Pentagon planners are prone to treat the National Guard only from an aspect of the Federal Government, while discounting its value to the States. Our presence here today is overwhelming evidence and proof of the importance we attach to any program which would unfavorably affect the guard. I am seriously concerned with the apparent attempt in certain quarters to downgrade our existing conventional forces. While I favor the increased emphasis being placed upon the development of ultimate weapons and programs designed to reinforce our country's scientific and technical leadership, it is my firm opinion that our military posture must not be weakened by further decrease of our Reserve force.

For some time, we have been engaged in the dubious procedure of reducing the strength of the active Armed Forces. Now, the national budget for fiscal year 1959 would decrease the only effective Ready Reserve force available to the Army—the Army National Guard—by 40,000 officers and men.

Concurrently, reports have reached me that the Army has developed a revised troop basis for the Army National Guard which proposes to eliminate six divisions and many hundreds of nondivisional units.

Such actions can only be ascribed to our retarded entry into the space satellite arena and the consequential hysteria which would have us place all of our eggs in the "missile basket" at the expense of our Active and Reserve Ground Forces. Moreover, we cannot dispel the thought that the current situation provides an excellent cover for those

whose continuing aim has been to downgrade the Army National Guard and relegate it to a secondary and minor role.

The fact that plans to materially reduce the number of units in the Army National Guard have been developed in an air of secrecy and under the cloak of security classification is most disturbing. Such action effectively precludes any attention on my part to illustrate for you the actual losses in strength and organizations which would confront us in Missouri in the event of their approval. I am aware, however, that distinguished and competent officers of the National Guard already have appeared before this body and that they have furnished you with specific information applicable to these matters.

I have always considered the National Guard in the nature of a joint venture between the Federal Government and the States. As a matter of fact, this arrangement envisaged and provided for by our forefathers is as old as our country. As in any such system, both parties share a part of the burdens, and to both mutual advantages should flow from the common enterprise. When changes or modifications are required in this type of partnership, the necessary plans should be developed through mutual participation and cooperation. Apparently the Department of the Army does not view the guard in this light and intends to present Missouri and the other States with a finalized and completed blueprint on a take-it-or-leave-it basis. This is in contravention of existing Federal statutes which provide that changes of this nature in troop branch and allotment may not be effected without the consent of the governor of the jurisdiction concerned.

As the Governor of the State of Missouri, the National Guard is more to me than mere numbers of bodies and rosters of units; it is a living, vibrant organization made up of individuals who have volunteered above and beyond the obligation of Federal requirements and have placed themselves at the disposal of their State. It is a vested part of the community life of my State; it provides full-time and part-time employment for our citizens; it supports civic activities; it assists in preserving order, and it provides excellent training and discipline for our young men. In addition, it is a definite economic force in the smaller towns and communities which cannot be discounted.

In the State of Missouri, we have 801 officers and 7,051 men in our Army National Guard. This force is organized into 112 units and dispersed throughout 60 communities. We have a tremendous investment in State-owned armories and other facilities, together with hundreds of thousands of dollars invested in a joint State-Federal constructed installations. We have a competent State military headquarters engaged in the control and direction of this military force. The problems confronting the Missouri Army National Guard are our day-to-day concern. It would take vitally important and cogent reasons to convince us of the wisdom of any plan designed to cast adrift our guardsmen, eliminate our units, and charge off our investment. From any standpoint, military or economic, Federal or State, such a course cannot be supported by valid arguments.

It is my understanding that the present attack on the guard is twofold. It consists on the one hand of an attempt to reduce 40,000 members, nationwide, by means of reducing appropriations in the national budget for fiscal year 1959. Concurrently, and from another quarter, is the proposed plan to eliminate six divisions and over a thousand additional nondivisional units. I stand solid against either action. I am opposed to any reduction which would decrease the number of volunteer citizen soldiers, and I am equally opposed to any plan that arbitrarily directs the destruction of organized units. Rather, it appears to me to be a far wiser course to accelerate the conversion of the units and organizations of the Army National Guard into the Pentomic structure. This should be accomplished within the present framework of the guard and designed to take maximum advantage of existing personnel, equipment, and facilities. Missouri does not wish to maintain units which do not meet the requirements of support desired by the Army, neither do we wish to destroy the handiwork of years by the stroke of a Pentagon pencil.

I am aware that this Committee and the Congress at large has ever been a refuge of the National Guard when hundreds have sought its destruction for the purpose of concentrating military power in the Pentagon. Today the Army National Guard constitutes the largest and most effective ready Reserve force available to the Army. This is adequate evidence of the past wisdom and foresight of the Congress. On you rests the present responsibility of preserving this force and enabling it to perform its historic role for the country. I know that this responsibility is in good hands.

Editorials Concerning Agriculture From the Falls City Journal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PHIL WEAVER
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 10, 1958

Mr. WEAVER. Mr. Speaker, we have a number of fine daily and weekly newspapers in Nebraska, the majority of which are locally owned and operated. The people who run these papers are an important part of the community itself and, as a general rule, they quite accurately reflect the thinking of the home folks. My hometown of Falls City, Nebr., in the heart of our agricultural area, has a newspaper of which all Falls Citians are proud. It is staffed by local people who know our problems and understand them. I am pleased to include herewith two recent editorials from the Falls City Journal concerning agriculture which I commend to every Member of this House for reading:

Congress and the administration are moving to offset the economic slide with various pump priming projects, moves to inject new money, the lifeblood of prosperity, into the ailing economy system. We hope that the agencies of Government will not overlook a major factor in the slump—the sick agricultural industry. In the years leading up to the economic storm which began a devastating movement through the country and grew into the massive depression of the 1930's, the agricultural industry was the first to feel the blow. Today, many claim that the trouble in the agricultural economy, the loss of rural buying power, actually caused the slump which snowballed from that point into a major depression. Is the agricultural slump again leading the way into a major depression? We hope not. But let's not wake up to the fact 20 years from now and find out at that late date that the agricultural depression of the middle 1950's again triggered a severe depression national in scope. Let's bolster the agricultural economy, restore the buying power of the farm, before it is too late again. The farmer is not as big a figure in the national statistics today as he once was but when he's well and healthy financially, he still is a most important customer of basic industries and when he can barely meet fixed expenses and living costs, it means trouble in thousands of mills and factories over the country.

A week or so ago, nine wheat-belt Republican Senators called on Secretary of Agriculture Benson to peg wheat prices at $2. Yesterday, a group of 30 Republican Congressmen sent a delegation to the Secretary of Agriculture to urge upon him a shift in farm policies. But the Secretary of Agriculture was adamant. He plans to continue his present policies. He figures there's no cure for his patient, so he's going to let sick American agriculture get well or die by itself. Mr. Benson has apparently adopted the policy that, since the current practices of supporting farm prices and attempting acreage controls haven't worked perfectly, they should be junked. His philosophy makes about as much sense as for a man to junk his old automobile because it doesn't work perfectly before he has a better replacement within reach. Nearly everyone knows, as Mr. Benson does, that the sup orts and the controls of the last 10 years or so haven't worked perfectly. But, on the other hand, we cannot afford to scrap this help to agriculture until we provide a better crutch for it to lean on.

Statement of the Honorable Sinclair Weeks

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HALE BOGGS
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 27, 1958

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement of the honorable Sinclair Weeks, Secretary of Commerce, before the Committee on Ways and Means, House of Representatives, Monday, February 17, 1958, 10 a. m.:

Mr. Chairman, I am here to urge legislation to make jobs and to protect jobs, the jobs of more than 4½ million American workers whose livelihood is provided by world trade.

I have come before the committee to urge favorable consideration of H. R. 10368, introduced by Chairman MILLS, and its companion measures introduced by Congressmen KEAN, FRELINGHUYSEN, and CHAMBERLAIN, which would amend and extend present trade agreements legislation. The purpose of this bill in general is to extend for a period of 5 years the President's authority to enter into trade agreements with other countries, and to give the President certain additional authority to reduce United States tariff rates in return for reciprocal concessions by foreign countries.

The trade-agreements program, given its close and direct relationship to our economic welfare and national security, by its very nature deserves bipartisan support. The President in his message to Congress on January 30, urged adoption of this legislation and said:

"The enactment of this legislation—unweakened by amendments of a kind that would impair its effectiveness, is essential to our national economic interest, to our security, and to our foreign relations."

I am here to tell you how all of this affects our economy, but I warn you that the Soviet Union's new global economic drive

puts to hazard our favorable trade posture, menaces free world unity and jeopardizes the foundation of peace.

These ominous new factors introduce logical grounds for those with previous doubts about reciprocal trade to reexamine their position. Even more, these developments provide impelling reasons for everyone—in sheer self-interest, in security—to consider extension as a means of strengthening that security.

It's either more trade or more trouble.

If these conclusions are correct and if this legislation is good for the country, it should be adopted by the Congress. Because I thoroughly and completely believe the legislation is not only good for the country but essential in the national interest, I am here to open the discussion and present the evidence.

COMMERCE DEPARTMENT RESPONSIBILITIES IN TRADE

Let me first point out that the responsibilities of the Secretary of Commerce, as set forth in the statute, are to foster, promote, and develop the foreign and domestic commerce of the United States. Obviously in doing this the needs of all segments of American business and industry must be taken into consideration.

All segments include both those who produce for export and those who have little or no interest in foreign markets. It includes those who depend heavily on imported commodities and those whose goods must compete with imports in the United States markets. It includes all who process, transport, and distribute our exports and our imports, as well as those with a vital stake in our overseas investments. I spell it out in this manner to make clear that in formulating the judgments which I am communicating to you, I have, I think, considered the interests of all sectors of American business.

With world trade an ever-more important part of our economic life, the Department of Commerce is playing an increasingly significant role in the formulation of our foreign trade policies. Recently the President strengthened Commerce's role in trade agreement matters and in foreign economic questions generally by creating a Cabinet-level Trade Policy Committee, chaired by the Secretary of Commerce.

This committee, already in operation, directly advises the President in the administration of the trade agreements program. The recommendations made to the President by this committee, under commerce leadership, will include action in escape clause cases. It will guide the direction of GATT negotiations and it will be consulted on the proposed composition and membership of the delegation to the GATT. The committee will review and advise the President upon all recommendations of the interdepartmental Trade Agreements Committee, and will be consulted in all other situations that influence this country's posture in world trade. Creation of the Trade Policy Committee reflects the fact that our domestic economic situation is receiving due weight when decisions on international questions are taken.

The very fact that the Secretary of Commerce has been asked by the President to present to the Congress the administration's trade proposals reveals the increasing responsibilities in this field of the department with wide experience and understanding of the problems of private industry.

RECORD HIGH LEVEL OF TRADE

Let me first say a few words about the increasingly high level of our total trade, which reached a record high in 1957, and the relationship of our trade picture to other important segments of our economy.

First. Exports of manufactured products, raw materials, and foodstuffs in 1957 (exclusive of military aid) reached the staggering total of $19½ billion approximately the highest in our Nation's history.

During the same year, imports in the same categories totaled $13 billion approximately.

A recital of figures of this magnitude must immediately convince anyone of the great importance of this trade to our economy as a whole.

Second. Foreign trade provides the livelihood for at least 4½ million American workers, or about 7 percent of our labor force. This figure includes those engaged directly or indirectly in production or service for export, or in the distribution of imports, or in the first factory processing of imported materials.

Our exports of goods and services currently represent about 6 percent of the Nation's output. The value of United States goods marketed abroad in 1956 exceeded the value of:

All consumer purchases of automobiles, parts, and accessories; or

All residential nonfarm construction; or

All consumer purchases of furniture and household equipment.

Around 9 percent of our entire output of movable goods was exported in 1956. For example, we exported: 11 percent of our machine tools, 19 percent of our production of trucks, 26 percent of our construction and mining equipment.

I am giving you examples from the field of manufactured products in which I have special responsibilities.

My understanding is that later Secretary Benson will give this committee examples of even higher export percentages for agricultural commodities.

RECIPROCAL TRADE AGREEMENTS ROLE IN TRADE

A recital of trade developments leads me to the part which the reciprocal trade agreements program has played, in my estimation, a significant, and constantly increasing role.

In a real sense, however, an examination of developments during the past 5 years or so is the first opportunity we have had to really judge the program and the trend. Before this, World War II, with its aftermath, and the Korean war had so distorted world trade, had so increased the need of many countries for imports, and so reduced their ability to export, that the effects of reciprocal duty reductions were temporarily overshadowed during this period.

By looking at the last 5 years when economic conditions have become more normal in most countries, we can see better what has happened during a period when tariff rates have again become an important factor in trade. In this way we can form some idea of the worth of a program under which we and all our important trading partners have reciprocally lowered many duties.

Let me first present to you a chart in which we have compared, under the heading of "Exports and Imports of Finished Manufactures in Constant 1956 Dollars," the trend of exports and dutiable imports. The export total has been arrived at by subtracting the total value of our foreign-aid grants.

The really significant factor to be noted is the tremendous increase of our exports of finished manufactures in the last 5-year period as contrasted in this particular field with a relatively small increase in dutiable imports of the same category of goods.

TRENDS IN PARTICULAR COMMODITIES

In somewhat more detail let me now refer to several charts depicting trends of the last 5 years in exports and imports of particular types of commodities. For this purpose, I am choosing examples from industries whose products are both exported and imported on a significant scale. I am including several industries whose spokesmen have been known to complain publicly about competitive imports, even though their products are exported in much larger volume than they are imported.

As I look at the figures I wonder if such spokesmen are bearing in mind the stake which their own industries have in the maintenance of export markets, and if they realize how much they themselves might risk should the United States follow short-sighted policies leading to shrinkage of our markets abroad.

Let us look, for example, at our chemical trade. In 1953, we exported about $900 million worth of chemicals and allied products and imported some $450 million worth. Our exports of chemicals have risen steadily, and by 1957 totaled $1½ billion, roughly 70 percent above the 1953 level. Our imports, on the other hand, have remained at or below the 1953 level throughout this period.

This does not strike me as the record of an industry in dire jeopardy from import competition. Rather, it suggests an industry with a vital stake in keeping as clear as possible its channels to export markets.

One of the most important single classes of United States exports is industrial and business machinery. Such exports have risen from about $1.7 billion in 1953 to more than $2.6 billion in 1957. Imports of industrial machinery, although acquiring some consequence in the past decade, have risen much less since 1953, from $150 million to $280 million a year.

Similarly, while imports of iron and steel-mill products have held steady at roughly $200 million both in 1953 and 1957, over the same span, exports of steel products approximately doubled—moving from about $560 million to more than $1,100 million.

For several decades, the automobile industry has been one of our major exporters. Much attention has recently been attracted, therefore, by the rise of foreign passenger cars in our import trade, from slightly more than $50 million in 1953 to well over $300 million in 1957. What has not been so widely noticed is that United States exports of autos, parts, and accessories have risen over the same period by an even larger amount, from just under $1 billion to nearly $1.3 billion. As in the other cases just cited, this two-way exchange reflects primarily a high degree of industrial specialization from which both we and our trading partners realize substantial gains.

Still another industry in which our exports have grown rapidly is paper manufacturing. Exports of paper and paper products have risen by more than 60 percent since 1953. To be sure, our imports of paper and paper manufactures (exclusive of newsprint, for which we rely chiefly on foreign supplies) have risen by a similar percentage, but they remain less than one-third as large as corresponding exports.

Now let me turn to cotton textiles, where the trade picture does not look as good as some of the others. Imports of cotton manufactures doubled from $75 million in 1953 to $154 million in 1956, and amounted to about $135 million last year. Over the same interval, exports of cotton manufactures have declined somewhat, from $272 million in 1953 to about $250 million in 1957. But we should not lose sight of the overall picture, in which United States cotton textile exports remain nearly twice as large as imports.

Imports represent a quite small proportion of our total consumption of cotton textiles. Figures showing the ratio of imports to domestic production are not available for cotton manufactures as a whole, but there are some data for particular sectors. In the case of cotton broad woven fabrics, an important segment, foreign supplies were probably not over 2 percent of domestic production in 1957. For the textile mill product and apparel industries as a whole, including cotton and other materials, it is

estimated that imports amounted to 3 to 3½ percent of our domestic production.

Finally, in this connection, I would remind you of our recent efforts in bringing to the attention of the Japanese the implications of the very rapid rise in United States imports of cotton textiles which was underway a few years ago. The Japanese decided to limit their exports of such products to us, and I believe that this voluntary action on the part of Japan has worked well in the interests of both countries.

In a world as complex as ours, in which a variety of factors affect trade, it is difficult to isolate the effects on trade of any one influence. It is clear that many things in addition to the reciprocal trade agreements program have played a part in these favorable developments which I have described. But while it would be incorrect to attribute these advances solely to the reciprocal trade agreements program, it is downright wrong to condemn a program under which such spectacular strides have been achieved. We may not be able to measure precisely the part played by the program in expanding our exports, but these were the rules under which the game was played while our trade was making such outstanding progress. In the light of the results how can one say the rules are bad?

FREE TRADERS AND PROTECTIONISTS

It seems to me that thoughtful people cannot fail to be impressed by the trading history of recent years. Certainly these developments have influenced my own thinking and taken in conjunction with other cardinal facts in today's world—the Soviet threat, the compelling need for free world unity in the fact of that threat, and the creation of economic entities such as the European common market—they are compelling arguments for continuing the program.

Don't infer from this that I've become a free-trader; I'm no more a free-trader than I am a hardshell protectionist. Basically, I consider myself a moderate, and I feel that the bill under consideration is one a moderate can wholeheartedly support.

Mr. Chairman, I say categorically to the committee what I have said many times before, that there is nothing to be gained in this picture by having free-traders and protectionists screaming imprecations at each other. If either side wins the battle outright, both sides will lose it; and the only possible thing that can be done today in this country is to exhibit a little give and take and approach this trade problem in a moderate manner, to the end that we may build for the future on a solid foundation.

A basic reason we are anxious to export is that by exporting we earn the means to pay for our imports. The same reason is equally applicable to our trading partners. They want and need to obtain from us a wide range of goods, usually because our products are better, or more readily available, or cheaper. In order to buy, however, they must earn the wherewithal to cover their purchases, and that it why they consider it so vital to sell their goods and services to us. If we do not buy from them, they cannot buy from us. If they could not buy from us the goods they need, they would have to find substitute sources, while our own efficient export industries, cut off from their important overseas markets, would experience great difficulties because they had lost their customers.

Our exporting industries are, as I have described, very important; any difficulties they might experience would have noticeable repercussions throughout the entire economy.

We think a great deal in this country about protection. However, as we give a measure of protection against hurtful foreign competition we had better begin to think of affording a measure of protection to our vitally important export trade as well.

There are those who profess to see no connection between our imports and our exports, who say we could continue to sell even though we refuse to buy. I think they are wrong. A private citizen who cannot sell his products soon has to reduce his own purchases. In the same manner, a nation which cannot find export markets for its own products must soon cut down on its purchases even thought the products purchased play a vital role in its economic life. Nor can our future trade be limited to what foreigners can earn by selling us wholly noncompetitive products, such as coffee or bananas.

EUROPEAN COMMON MARKET

The objective of this bill is to reduce obstacles to our exports and imports and thereby encourage international trade and heightened economic activity in our industries which depend directly or indirectly on trade. A recent development abroad illustrates very well the importance of our following consistent, forward looking trading policies in our own economic self-interest. I refer to the creation at the beginning of this year of the European Economic Community—the so-called European Common Market. Here six European countries, with a combined population almost equal to ours and a combined national product about one-third of our own, are in process of forming a new economic grouping.

When the common market is ultimately achieved, in 12 to 15 years, all duties on the internal flow of goods within this community will have been eliminated. Beginning in about 4 years the participants will take the first steps to apply a common customs tariff to the outside world, including the United States. If the common market works as planned, the participating countries will ultimately enjoy a higher standard of living than they would otherwise have been able to attain. They will reach these higher living standards only if industry and agriculture in the common market countries become more efficient and more productive—more competitive, if you will.

A Europe where economic activity is heightened, where more goods and services are being produced and consumed, will clearly offer greater trading opportunities to United States business. We need only look at what has happened to our exports to these same 6 countries during recent years, when European economic recovery made such remarkable strides, to get an idea of the close connection between economic activity abroad and the levels of our trade. During 1953 our exports to these 6 countries totalled $1.5 billion; in 1957 we exported to them $3.2 billion worth of goods.

The extent to which we can benefit from these enlarged opportunities will depend upon the tariff rates ultimately adopted by the European Economic Community. The Community stands ready to adjust individual rates in return for reciprocal concessions by its trading partners. To my mind, it is extremely desirable for the President to have authority in this field which will enable us to maintain and expand our export markets in this vitally important area of the world. The countries of the European Common Market will be developing their uniform tariff over the next 5 years and will be placing it in effect at the close of that time. A 5-year extension of the Trade Agreements Act, as provided in H. R. 10368, will give the President needed authority and flexibility to negotiate throughout this important period.

In the words of the President, himself, "Such an extension with the tariff reduction authority to be requested is necessary to carry the trade-agreements program through the early formative years of [this] European economic community and strengthen our ability to further vital American interests there and elsewhere in the world." It is obvious that the crucial period in determining future trade patters will occur during the next 5 years. It will be tragic if American industry is penalized by appearance of indecision which most certainly will result from a prospective change in trade policy during the 5-year period.

At the same time, the United Kingdom and most other western European countries not in the community are considering ways to associate themselves with the common market to form a still wider free-trade area. If this endeavor succeeds, our need for adequate powers in this field will be even more urgent.

SAFEGUARDS TO AMERICAN INDUSTRY

I have been stressing the general desirability of an expanded foreign trade, and our need in this connection for the authority conferred by this legislation. I want to stress equally my belief that when we work for increased trade we have a clear duty to see to it that we do not grant tariff reductions which cause serious injury to individual segments of American business. I believe the safeguards contained in the present legislation, as reinforced by H. R. 10368, fully meet this essential need. It is because I am on the one hand convinced of the desirability of expanded trade, and on the other of the adequacy of the safeguards against serious injury to United States business, that I am prepared to support this legislation so unequivocally.

I would like now to review the actions taken by the President to date in escape-clause cases. Since the provision was written into the law, the President has made escape-clause decisions on 23 commodities. Of the 23 commodities in question, the President invoked the escape clause in the case of 9. He declined to do so in 14 cases. Included in this 14 figure are lead and zinc, on which he arranged an alternate remedy, and velveteen fabrics, where relief for the industry was afforded by the voluntary decision of our foreign suppliers to limit their export to us.

In each case where he decided not to invoke the escape clause, the President documented fully and publicly his reasons. In some cases the President concluded that serious injury as a result of imports had not been demonstrated; in others, that the proposed tariff increase would not remedy the situation in any significant way. While basing his decisions primarily on these considerations, the President—whose responsibility it is to conduct the foreign relations of the United States—obviously, also had to weigh the effects of particular actions on our relations with other nations, on our alliances, and on our military security itself.

As an example, in the case of fish fillets the President concluded that the raising of duties would not really improve the situation of our industry, and, as I interpreted his action, it might well push a friendly country far into a position of economic dependence on the Soviet Union. The country in question, Iceland, plays a vital role in our defense alliances by virtue of its geographic position. Therefore, instead of raising duties, the President decided instead to take a series of other measures which he judged would more effectively assist our domestic interests without prejudicing our relations with an essential ally.

This exemplifies the vital role played by the President's discretionary powers in these matters. I know that some wish to limit the President's discretion in escape clause cases. I submit that this would be little short of disastrous. These matters are never completely black or white, and they do vitally affect not only particular segments of our economy but also our national interest and national security as well. I believe it absolutely crucial that the President continue to retain discretionary powers in this vital area. I know these are strong words; I have purposely made them so.

RECIPROCAL NATURE OF TRADE PROGRAM

It has been charged that the reciprocal trade agreements program has in fact not been reciprocal; that we have reduced our duties without receiving in return equivalent reductions from our trading partners. The facts do not bear out this assertion. We have obtained direct tariff concessions from foreign countries on a wide range of commodities.

By the best estimates we have been able to make, we have obtained concessions from other countries—that is, duty reductions or bindings—on some $7 billion of United States exports, of which at least half would be exports of goods that pay duty in the importing country. For our part, we have granted concessions on about $7 billion also, but about three-fifths of this amount has consisted of binding rates for goods which already entered our market duty free.

Trade figures, of course, do not tell the entire story. Let us look at changes in the tariff levels of some of our principal trading partners during the period covered by the program.

The average ad valorem duty rate on Western Germany's imports, for example, was less than 8 percent in 1956. This contrasts sharply with the level in prewar Germany—26 percent in 1937. Over approximately the same interval, corresponding data for France show a decline from 17 percent to 6 percent, and the average rate on Italian imports fell from 12 percent to 8 percent.

For the United Kingdom, the statistical picture is somewhat obscured by the high British revenue duties on such items as liquor and tobacco. These levies, which are essentially consumption taxes, have been increased since the beginning of World War II. Exclusive of the revenue duties, however, the average British tariff rate has been reduced from 4 percent in fiscal 1938 to 2 percent in fiscal 1956.

Belgium and Sweden already had comparatively low tariffs before the war. Nevertheless, these also have been significantly reduced—from 9 percent in 1937 to 5½ percent in 1956 in the case of Sweden, and from 6 percent to 4 percent for Belgium-Luxembourg.

These examples show that other industrial members of the GATT have kept reasonably well in step with the United States in reducing tariff barriers from their high prewar levels. Generally speaking, tariff schedules of underdeveloped countries have not been characterized by similar reductions. Among such countries who are members of GATT, however, reciprocal concessions have certainly kept duties lower than would otherwise have been the case.

Following the war, many foreign countries imposed quantitative restrictions on dollars goods for balance-of-payments reasons. Such quota restrictions had considerable effect on trade patterns. We agreed that quotas could be used as long as balance-of-payments problems made them necessary. These financial problems deferred some of the benefits we obtain from tariff concessions, but this was inevitable as long as countries could not in any case pay dollars for more imports. There was full agreement by all parties, however, that quota restrictions should be relaxed and removed as rapidly as circumstances permit, and this basic principle is written into the GATT.

There has been very considerable progress in breaking down quotas on imports of our goods in recent years, particularly in Western Europe. Today, for example, Belgium and the Netherlands impose virtually no restrictions on imports of dollar goods. Germany has virtually eliminated its quantitative restrictions. Sweden has freed 70 percent of its private dollar imports from quota restrictions, Italy 72 percent, Denmark 55 percent, Norway 86 percent; in fact, practically all the countries of Western Europe have taken some steps to remove quotas on dollar imports. This development undoubtedly has played a part in the extremely favorable development of our European trade in recent years.

When foreign countries are judging whether their payments position permits the relaxation of their controls on dollar imports, one factor in the calculation is their evaluation of United States commercial policies. If they think we intend to follow a basically cooperative trading policy, they feel they can more safely reduce or eliminate their restrictions. The passage of this bill could only give impetus to the movement toward liberalization of dollar trade.

GATT AND OTC

To digress a moment, you all know that the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade plays an important role in the trade-agreement picture. It embodies the basic provisions calling for multilateral, nondiscriminatory international trade, and it provides a mechanism through which negotiations looking to reciprocal tariff reductions are carried out.

To enable the GATT to perform its functions more efficiently and more effectively, the creation of an Organization for Trade Cooperation has been proposed. The administration, with my wholehearted support, has recommneded to the Congress that the United States concur in this action. The OTC itself would in no way limit our freedom of action, nor would it impose any new obligations on us. Its chief function would be to make GATT operations more efficient. Most of those who oppose OTC are those who have reservations about the reciprocal trade program itself, and who thus oppose GATT and any mechanism designed to make GATT operations more effective. If we agree that the reciprocal trade program itself is essential, as I firmly believe, it follows that OTC is a desirable adjunct.

I have already mentioned the Commerce Department's new responsibilities in reciprocal trade matters. If OTC comes into being, its role in these matters—and that of businessmen generally—will be further enhanced. Under the proposed bill authorizing United States membership in OTC, an advisory committee, chaired by the Secretary of Commerce and consisting of representatives of American industry, labor, agriculture, and the public, would be created to advise and consult with the United States chief representative on matters coming before OTC. And it is the President's intention to appoint as our chief representative someone having wide and practical business experience.

ADMINISTRATION'S PROPOSALS ANALYZED

We come now to the specific proposals contained in H. R. 10365. The committee has received a full analysis of the bill and is already familiar with its provisions, so I will be very brief.

First, the administration proposes that the President's authority to enter into trade agreements be extended for 5 years, from June 30, 1958, through June 30, 1963.

The extension is needed for the following reasons: In negotiating for reduction of impediments to United States exports, a better deal can be made if the negotiating country has confidence that our course will not be changed for at least 5 years. Substantial commercial arrangements in the foreign trade field extend over a long time; and governments, as well as commercial concerns, are reluctant to make long-term commitments unless they have some assurance that other governments will maintain a consistent policy for a reasonable length of time. Experience shows that foreign trade may be adversely affected by uncertainty about the trading policies of important countries, including our own.

As I have already explained, a 5-year renewal of negotiating authority is also necessary to enable us to help American industry and agriculture maintain and further develop their trade relationships with the European common market. It is important to American industry and agriculture that the new common market rates be as low as possible. The United States needs to undertake careful and exhaustive preparations and conduct detailed negotiations with the common market; and in order to do so, the President must be provided with sufficient authority.

The administration further proposes that additional authority be provided to reduce duties in carrying out trade agreements entered into between July 1, 1958, and July 1, 1963. This would consist of authority to reduce individual rates of duties to a point not below the lowest rate resulting from applying any one of the three following methods:

1. Reducing the rate to the level which would result from decreasing the July 1, 1958, rate by 5 successive annual reductions each equal to 5 percent of that rate. Under this method, the President would also be authorized to reduce a duty by this same total amount over a shorter period; however, 10 percent of the rate would be the maximum reduction which normally could be put into effect for the first time in any 1 year.

2. Reducing the July 1, 1958, rate by not more than 3 percentage points ad valorem. Such reductions would also have to take effect by stages, over a period not exceeding 5 years. However, normally, no more than 1 percentage point could be put into effect for the first time in any 1 year. This alternative authority would be significant in the case of rates of less than 12 percent, where 3 percentage points would be a larger reduction than the maximum reduction under the first method.

3. Reducing, as is presently authorized, an existing rate which is above 50 percent ad valorem down to 50 percent ad valorem. Here, too, reductions would have to be made gradually; not more than one-third of the total reduction could be put into effect for the first time in any 1 year. This alternative authority would be significant in cases of rates over 66⅔ percent, where it would permit a greater reduction than under the above first alternative method.

The peril-point provisions of the present legislation are reaffirmed.

The administration not only proposes that the peril-point and escape-clause procedures and other safeguards for American industry and labor in the present law be continued, but also that the safeguards be strengthened. Specifically, it is proposed that the President be given greater authority to raise duties. This additional authority will be valuable in escape-clause cases. The President would be authorized to raise duties as much as 50 percent over the rates which existed on July 1, 1934. This represents a significant change from the present law. In escape-clause cases the President now has authority (1) to terminate the trade-agreement concession, with the result that usually the rate established by the Tariff Act of 1930 then applies, or (2) to increase the duty by as much as 50 percent over the rate existing on January 1, 1945. Since on many items the 1934 rates were substantially higher than the 1945 rates, this change would increase the extent to which duties on such items could be raised where necessary to avert serious injury to domestic industries.

The administration also proposes that the law be amended to provide for more prompt and effective consideration of serious-injury cases under these circumstances: The Tariff Commission shall promptly institute an escape-clause investigation, if in the course of a peril-point investigation it finds (with respect to an article on the list upon which a tariff concession has been granted) that an increase in the existing duty or additional import restrictions is required to avoid serious injury.

Under present law, when the Tariff Commission finds that even the existing rate threatens injury, the President is required either (1) to negotiate to increase the rate to the point at which the risk is avoided or (2) to report later to Congress why he failed to do so. Experience has demonstrated that it is usually impracticable to negotiate increases. As a result, there is always a possibility that in such cases it may turn out that an escape-clause action is later instituted in order to give relief to the industry concerned. Meanwhile, several months might have elapsed.

Under this new procedure, no time would be lost in the event the increase were not negotiated. Rather, the procedures of the escape clause would have been started immediately upon the peril-point finding. In many such cases—provided the escape-clause investigations do confirm the threat of serious injury—this automatic procedure would have the effect of saving months in any eventual granting of relief afforded the industry concerned. An industry genuinely deserving relief should receive it without unnecessary delay.

SOVIET ECONOMIC OFFENSIVE

Up to this point I have been describing the bill itself and discussing its economic implications. I would now like to comment briefly on another factor to which I alluded earlier—the relation of this program to our Nation's security in the face of the Soviet threat. Let me quote a statement made by Mr. Krushchev on November 2, 1957:

"We declare war upon you—excuse me for using such an expression—in the peaceful field of trade. We declare a war we will win over the United States. The threat to the United States is not the ICBM, but in the field of peaceful production. We are relentless in this and it will prove the superiority of our system."

Clearly, the Soviet Union is conducting an economic offensive against the free world. Using combined programs of trade and aid, it is attempting to increase its influence in the free world and to lessen our own. Such a program, if successful, could seriously endanger our entire way of life.

The Soviet Union is apparently convinced that trade is the most effective way to influence and win over the peoples of the world—more effective than sputniks, more effective than progress in rocketry, missiles, and armaments. The Russians may well be right.

We would be ill advised to underestimate the economic capacity of the Soviet bloc to stage such an offensive, or the appeal which Soviet offers may hold for other countries. The threat posed by the Soviets in the trade field is a real and a serious one. It would be doubly serious if, while the Soviets preach and practice expanded trade, we were to retreat from our program and were to weaken ourselves by self-imposed restrictions on trade. Stop trade, and the nations dependent on international exchanges will surely move away from us and toward the Communist world.

Let me cite examples of Soviet trade moves which trend to increase their influence and prestige.

In its trade drive Russia is pinpointing areas of political ferment and economic distress in the free world, with particular emphasis on the underdeveloped countries. Within the past few months the Soviet Union has, for example, offered to take wool from Uruguary and coffee from Colombia. It has offered in return both finished manufactures, including machinery, and such interesting items as petroleum. The U. S. S. R. is buying much Egyptian cotton, and in 1957 was Egypt's most important customer. The Soviet pattern of offering to purchase basic commodities that have declined in price on world markets has been repeated in a number of other countries—Burma, for rice, and Ceylon, for rubber, are examples.

Paralleling these trade drives are Soviet programs under which attractive industrial installations are offered to underdeveloped countries at what appear to be bargain terms. To mention only one, the Russians have agreed to provide a steel mill to India. These credits to finance imports from the Soviet Union help the Soviet Union develop economic ties that may become difficult to throw off.

We need not meet the Soviet Union on every economic battlefield by offering to take commodities which are in adequate or surplus supply in the United States and for which our imports markets are limited. But the reciprocal trade-agreement program is one of our strongest weapons with which to counteract their offensive. It does not in itself provide the complete answer to Soviet economic penetration, but it is absolutely indispensable in the sense that, without it, nothing else we do is likely to be very effective. If we do not demonstrate to the world that we support the continuing reduction of obstacles to free-world trade, if our failure to take action weakens our friends to the point where they fall into economic dependence on the Soviet bloc, we will have lost a crucial battle in the epochal struggle of our era.

As I hope I have demonstrated, in this program there is no conflict whatever between our economic well-being and our political necessities. The wisdom of continuing the program therefore seems to me inescapable.

In my studies of these matters, I have looked back to see what eminent men in our public life have said about reciprocal trade treaties. I was particularly impressed by Theodore Roosevelt's statement, made in 1902, which I quote:

"It is greatly to be desired that such treaties may be adopted. They can be used to widen our markets and to give a greater field for the activities of our producers on the one hand, and on the other hand to secure in practical shape the lowering of duties when they are no longer needed for protection among our own people, or when the minimum of damage done may be disregarded for the sake of the maximum of good accomplished."

Gentlemen, everything in life is a matter of degree. I said earlier that in this trade problem the only possible thing that can be done today in this country is to exhibit a little give and take and use a moderate approach. This is not something either black or white, and we shall lose as a Nation if we insist on approaching it in these terms. The bill you are considering embodies the practical and moderate approach I advocate.

* * * * *

In conclusion, may I leave with you the thought which I have emphasized frequently today: Let those who advocate the defeat or weakening of the trade agreements program count all the cost.

Even though some of them may think they are shielding some business from some competition, their action, if successful, would jeopardize the job security of more than 4½ million American workers whose living depends on world trade. Such a threat would be wrong at any time, even more so in a period of business downturn with larger than seasonal unemployment.

The trade program will protect millions of American jobs. More trade will make more jobs.

Because of all the reasons set forth today, I have every confidence that the urgently needed trade legislation will be adopted by the Congress.

Fashion Foundation of America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANCIS E. DORN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 19, 1958

Mr. DORN of New York. Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure to take official cognizance of the program of the Fashion Foundation of America, organized to give recognition to designers of America by citing persons, places and products—encouraging better living through better design.

The Fashion Foundation of America believes the United States fashioners are the best equipped to meet the demands of American men and women in all fields of endeavor. Too often our talented artisans are overlooked because there are those who would have us believe it is no good unless it has a foreign label.

The American women are the best dressed in the world. The Fashion Foundation of America, in selecting the following America's best dressed women for 1957–58 paid special tribute to Mrs. Dwight D. Eisenhower for her modest but definite fashion leadership at official State functions:

Public life, Mrs. Dwight D. Eisenhower.
Ambassador of fashion, Mrs. Richard Nixon.
International set, Irene Albert.
Stage, Rosalind Russell.
Author, Duchess of Windsor.
Business, Helen Neushaefer.
Screen, Elizabeth Taylor.
Television, Denise Lor.
Supper clubs, Lena Horne.
Opera set, Mrs. Lauritz Melchior.
Hostess, Perle Mesta.
Press, Kathryn Cravens.
Saleswoman, Julia Meade.
Concerts, Elaine Malbin.
Sports, Mrs. Leon Mandel.
All-American, Mrs. Robert Meyner.

The following received Fashion Foundation of America medals symbolic of America's best dressed honors for 1957–58 in the men's division as announced by Ben Russell, prominent New York custom tailor, as chairman:

Statesman, Dwight D. Eisenhower.
Society, Henry Ford.
Press, Roy Howard.
Business, Jerome K. Ohrbach.
Producer, Bob Finkel.
Television, Jack Benny.
Host, Wilbur Clark.
Music, Sammy Kaye.
Stage, Robert Preston.
Screen, Cary Grant.

The following persons and products are among those cited for the gold medal award of the Fashion Foundation of America for 1958:

Oldric Royce, New York designer who left European capitals for America in 1939. Cited for originality and inspiration to youth in women's wear field.

Jesse Schwayder, of Denver, Colo., founder of Samsonite luggage, for his revolutionary luggage, ever mindful of

style and design above functional requirements.

Sam Rudofker, of Philadelphia, Pa., for After-Six Formal Wear, design and originality in the men's formal wear field.

H. B. Atwater, of Minneapolis, Minn., for Scott-Atwater outboard motors, outstanding design in the outboard motor field.

National Savings Banks

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 3, 1958

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, the president of the Washington Heights Federal Savings & Loan Association, Floyd Cramer, addressed the Mortgage Bankers Association of New York on February 19, 1958. On that occasion Mr. Cramer favorably commented on my bill H. R. 4296, which would create a National Mutual Savings Bank System. I am pleased to include Mr. Cramer's remarks, as follows:

REMARKS BY FLOYD CRAMER BEFORE MORTGAGE BANKERS ASSOCIATION OF NEW YORK, FEBRUARY 19, 1958

There is now before the Congress a bill which would create national savings banks. This bill, offered by Congressman MULTER, of Brooklyn, was also before the Congress in slightly different form a year ago. There was also a similar bill in 1949. The present bill is of interest largely because the Savings Banks Association of New York State has proposed that the Federal Government permit the charter of national savings banks with their supervision being under the Federal Home Loan Bank Board. This is the Federal agency which supervises Federal savings and loan associations and all other institutions whose accounts are insured by the Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation. The Multer bill would also permit the conversion of Federal savings and loan associations into national savings banks.

In a sense the Multer bill and the proposal of the Savings Banks Association of New York State indicate a sort of consolidation of the savings and loan business with that of the savings-bank business. This would be the ultimate result if proposals of this sort were ultimately carried out. It would also probably result in a clear line of distinction being drawn between commercial banks and mutual savings banks. It would, in all probability, more clearly define the status of commercial banks on the one hand and thrift institutions on the other.

What are some of the results to be expected from such a move? Would it be in the public interest? Would such a combination of thrift institutions work to the detriment of commercial banks? Would they promote more thrift? Would that make more mortgage credit available and would it be at better terms to the public? These are questions the American public is entitled to ask and they are questions which will in all probability be put forth by Members of Congress before such legislation is forthcoming. It is too much to expect that the Congress of the United States would be in sense create another banking system without a thorough study of the entire matter. Such a study will take time and this probably means that no national savings banks legislation will occur for some time.

On the other hand, students of the proposal see much benefit to the public and to our national economy specifically from such a move. While it probably would not make more mortgage credit available at once there is reason to believe that it ultimately would do so. A consideration of the thrift institutions of the United States into savings and loan associations and savings banks with supervision by a Government agency primarily concerned with home financing most certainly would be conducive to more mortgage credit in the long run. National savings banks, Federal savings and loan associations, State chartered mutual savings banks and State chartered savings and loan associations with their separate charters but associated with one another as one industry would produce an exchange of ideas conducive to the better promotion of thrift and the better employment of such funds as better yields which would probably be more and more in mortgage loans. Furthermore there is every reason to believe that our present economy no longer needs a type of thrift institution whose funds are scattered for investment purposes such as was done by savings banks in the last century.

These thrift institutions, in their process of promoting more thrift and providing more mortgage capital, might initially frighten the commercial banking industry. There is no reason to believe, however, that commercial banks would suffer any loss of business in the long run from this competition. The role of commercial banks in a dynamic economy is a good one. If confined largely to the commercial fields they can still rise to heights of importance hitherto unknown in our country. Certainly the building societies and the mutual savings banks of Great Britain have long since played a more important role that is now being proposed for the thrift institutions of this country. The commercial banks of that country are quite satisfied with their situation and surely no one can seriously contend that the commercial banks of the British Isles are unimportant in British economy.

The Alleged Inherent Right of the Executive To Withhold Information From Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANTE B. FASCELL
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 10, 1958

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, for years the executive branch of the Government has encroached upon the field of lawmaking—all in the guise of inherent power.

Without constitutional direction, without statutory permission, without judicial sanction, the executive branch has slowly and surely introduced into our governmental structure a great mass of orders, rules and regulations designed to have the force and effect of law.

Upon occasion the President has even attempted to fashion law by letter, by press conference, or by mere oral communication. A particular example of this unusual lawmaking power came to light in our study in the Government Information Subcommittee of the Committee on Government Operations.

On May 17, 1954—during the Army-McCarthy hearings—President Eisenhower directed a letter to the Secretary of Defense concerning that Department's problems with supplying information to a congressional committee, the Senate Committee on Government Operations.

In effect, he said to the Secretary of Defense: You will instruct employees of your Department that in all of their appearances before the subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Government Operations regarding the inquiry now before it they are not to testify to any such conversations or communications or to produce any such documents or reproductions.

This was a mere letter of instruction. Yet at a hearing before our subcommittee on November 14, 1956, that mere letter was construed by legal counsel in the Department of Defense as the law.

Specifically, we were told:

Well, the May 17 letter is a statement of the law. I think you could analogize it to a decision of the Supreme Court. For example, the Supreme Court addresses itself to specific cases which are before it, but when it renders a decision on a specific case it enunciates law, and that law is relied upon by lawyers generally as an expression of what the law generally is.

The May 17 letter expresses the President's position with respect to a certain type of subject matter, and I do not think we could expect him to reinstruct us on each succeeding occasion once he had indicated what the position of the executive branch of the Government was to be (hearings, p. 1815).

Amazingly enough our subcommittee's hearing record indicates that this letter of May 17 has been cited by 19 agencies—House Report No. 2947, page 281—as authority for actions taken by other departments—other agencies. Similarly other committees of Congress have had this same letter or, the memorandum from the Attorney General attached to it, cited authoritatively about 11 times.

Why is this letter of May 17 cited so widely and so often interpreted as the law? We have been able to find no memorandum directing it to the attention of other heads of executive departments or executive agencies—hearings page 1821. It appears to be simply a letter to the Secretary of Defense.

But it was directed to departments and agencies we are told. Counsel within the Department of Defense explains:

The very day it came out the whole matter was given publicity by a press release * * * the press release was transmitted throughout the Government (hearings, p. 1821).

A great deal of information is so informally communicated they say.

A letter—a press release—a writing from the President's Office—anything enunciating a principle is enough we are told. "It is binding." In this particular instance the Defense Department attorneys tell us that it is bound by the President's letter of May 17, and its interpretations as expounded in a press conference of July 6, 1955, a letter from Sherman Adams to Hon. WILLIAM L. DAWSON on July 2, 1956, and a letter from Mr. Gerald Morgan to Mr. Clark Mollenhoff, of the Des Moines Register, on October 26, 1956—hearings, page 1830.

And so it appears that if the President chooses to enunciate a principle, it makes

no difference how it is communicated, the Defense Department is bound by it—hearings, page 1831—other departments and agencies are bound by it—"it enunciates the law."

If we are to silently submit and not object to these methods and these interpretations of so-called binding law we are abdicating our legislative power vested in the Congress of the United States by the Constitution.

If we submit to this unqualified, unsupported, unfortified claim of "inherent power" in the Executive, the day will come when Congress will not have to come to Washington. The Executive will fully legislate as well as administer.

Therefore, my distinguished colleagues, I repeat what the House Government Information Subcommittee reported, and unanimously approved by the 30-member full Committee on Government Operations, in its report to the House in July 1956:

The most flagrant abuse of so-called legal authority is the misuse of the May 17, 1954, letter from the President to the Secretary of Defense at the time of the Army-McCarthy controversy. Regardless of the questionable legal basis of the Attorney General's memorandum on which the President acted, the letter was, by its very terms, a specific instruction to the Secretary of Defense for a specific purpose and to a specific committee of the Senate. It seems inconceivable that 19 Government departments and agencies would cite this letter as a shadowy cloak of authority to restrict or withhold information from the Congress and the public. This flimsy pretext of so-called legal authority only serves to demonstrate to what extent executive departments and agencies will go to restrict or withhold information.

The letters discussed are as follows:

THE WHITE HOUSE.

The honorable the SECRETARY OF DEFENSE,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: It has long been recognized that to assist the Congress in achieving its legislative purposes every executive department or agency must, upon the request of a congressional committee, expeditiously furnish information relating to any matter within the jurisdiction of the committee, with certain historical exceptions—some of which are pointed out in the attached memorandum from the Attorney General. This administration has been and will continue to be diligent in following this principle. However, it is essential to the successful working of our system that the persons entrusted with power in any 1 of the 3 great branches of Government shall not encroach upon the authority confided to the others. The ultimate responsibility for the conduct of the executive branch rests with the President.

Within this constitutional framework each branch should cooperate fully with each other for the common good. However, throughout our history the President has withheld information whenever he found that what was sought was confidential or its disclosure would be incompatible with the public interest or jeopardize the safety of the Nation.

Because it is essential to efficient and effective administration that employees of the executive branch be in a position to be completely candid in advising with each other on official matters, and because it is not in the public interest that any of their conversations or communications or any documents or reproductions concerning such advice be disclosed, you will instruct employees of your Department that in all of their appearances before the subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Government Operations regarding the inquiry now before it they are not to testify to any such conversations or communications or to produce any such documents or reproductions. This principle must be maintained regardless of who would be benefited by such disclosures.

I direct this action so as to maintain the proper separation of powers between the executive and legislative branches of the Government in accordance with my responsibilities and duties under the Constitution. This separation is vital to preclude the exercise of arbitrary power by any branch of the Government.

By this action I am not in any way restricting the testimony of such witnesses as to what occurred regarding any matters where the communication was directly between any of the principals in the controversy within the executive branch on the one hand and a member of the subcommittee or its staff on the other.

Sincerely,

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

OCTOBER 26, 1956.

Mr. CLARK R. MOLLENHOFF,
Des Moines Register and Tribune,
National Press Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CLARK: At the press conference on September 27, 1956, you asked the President whether all employees of the Federal Government, at their own discretion, can determine whether they will testify or will not testify before congressional committees when there is no security problem involved.

In the President's letter of May 17, 1954, to Secretary Wilson, the President set forth the general principles that are to govern all employees in the executive branch concerning their testimony, or the production of documents, relating to their conversations or communications with, or their advice to, each other on official matters. In his press conference of July 6, 1955, the President further amplified the principles set forth in this letter as follows:

"If anybody in an official position of this Government does anything which is an official act, and submits it either in the form of recommendation or anything else, that is properly a matter for investigation if Congress so chooses, provided the national security is not involved.

"But when it comes to the conversations that take place between any responsible official and his advisers, or exchange or mere little slips, of this or that, expressing personal opinions on the most confidential basis, those are not subject to investigation by anybody. And if they are it will wreck the Government."

In so writing to Secretary Wilson, and in further amplifying these principles, the President was exercising a right, which is his, and his alone, to determine what action is necessary to maintain the proper separation of powers between the executive and legislative branches of the Government. In the orderly administration of the Government, the head of each executive agency directs the manner in which these principles are enforced.

The underlying reasons for these principles are set forth in the President's letter of May 17, 1954. It is essential to efficient and effective administration that employees of the executive branch be in a position to be completely candid in advising each other on official matters. It is essential, if channels of information are to be kept open, that confidences among employees should not be breached.

It will continue to be this administration's policy to keep the Congress and the people fully informed of what is being done in the executive branch. An employee is not free merely to exercise his own discretion but in the final analysis information will be withheld only when the President or agency heads acting under the President's authority or instruction determine it is contrary to the public interest to disclose it.

All of the above, of course, is subject to the Executive order dealing with the classification of information in the interest of security, and to the various statutes and regulations of the department and agencies relating to information to be held in confidence.

I hope this answers your inquiry.

Sincerely,

GERALD D. MORGAN,
Special Counsel to the President.

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, July 2, 1956.

Hon. WILLIAM L. DAWSON,
Chairman, Committee on Government Operations, House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. DAWSON: This will acknowledge your June 25 letter to the President about a book by Robert J. Donovan.

Your letter refers to minutes of the Cabinet and to verbatim reports of Cabinet meetings. Cabinet discussions are not so recorded. When the Cabinet acts on a matter, a memorandum is prepared. This is called a Cabinet record of action. Some of these memorandums relate to classified matters affecting national security; many do not. However, regardless of classification, all Cabinet actions constitute advice to the President. I cannot agree with your observation that the privileged nature of advice to the President is "dissipated" by the publication of Mr. Donovan's book, whatever it may concern.

Obivously, I cannot agree with the implication in your letter that your committee and its subcommittees may examine Cabinet records in instances where it is felt that certain information may not have been made available by department or agency officers.

Final official action taken by an executive department or agency on any subject is the very proper concern of Congress and the public. In this connection, the President's record for prompt and full publication of the business of his administration needs no elaboration. It has been, and shall remain, the purpose of this administration to keep Congress and the public fully informed of our actions and the reasons which underlie them.

It has, of course, been necessary on occasion, for reasons of national security, to give some of this information to committees of Congress on a classified basis. But in any event, the Congress and the public have been kept informed of the actions of this administration, and I can assure you, they will continue to be so informed.

It should also be borne in mind that the public interest demands orderly and efficient operation of the executive branch of the Government. This order and efficiency could not be maintained if officers and employees were not in a position to be completely candid with each other in discussing their official business. Therefore, while final actions of Government should be made known, it does not necessarily follow that the public interest is also served by divulging the discussions, recommendations, or advice of subordinates.

I note your reference to a passage in Mr. Donovan's book which apparently discusses a Cabinet meeting abo[illegible] advisory committees. I am [illegible] with the passage, and in an[illegible] not presume to assess its ac[illegible]r, I can assure you that your [illegible]dvisory committees commends its[illegible]epartment or agency making us[illegible]committees. In any such instanc[illegible] responsible officers of the department [illegible] stand ready to answer the questions [illegible] committee, and all appropriate comm[illegible]

of Congress, on whatever final action that department or agency may have taken.

This cooperation, as you are aware, is not limited to questions about advisory committees. I want to again assure you that on all official matters, each department and agency shall continue to give Congress and its committees the same cooperation, and the same information we have repeatedly given about final actions and the general reasons which underlie them.

Sincerely,

SHERMAN ADAMS.

Dwindling Military Reserve Strength

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALBERT W. CRETELLA
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 10, 1958

Mr. CRETELLA. Mr. Speaker, there have been recent proposals put forward by the Department of Defense for cutbacks in the strength of the National Guard. I do not need to go into the many reasons for the existence of the National Guard, and the fine service it has been performing throughout the years. Below is a letter from the commanding general of the 43d National Guard Infantry Division, Gen. Edmund R. Walker, which, I think, deserves the attention of all Members of this body:

HEADQUARTERS 43D
INFANTRY DIVISION,
Brainard Field,
Hartford, Conn., February 24, 1958.

Hon. ALBERT W. CRETELLA,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. CRETELLA: Throughout the last 6 months, reports have continued to reach me that new cutbacks are planned in the National Guard. A year ago, as you will remember, the strength level authorized was cut to 400,000 men, with new recruits to be drawn only from those who would participate in the 6-months training program. This was accompanied by assurances that the strength would not be allowed to fall below the 400,000 level.

Nothing official in the way of a change has since come to me. Budget estimates, however, and comment thereon have indicated that changes are contemplated, and the testimony of Assistant Secretary Milton is not encouraging. As a citizen-soldier, I am profoundly disturbed by the pattern of dwindling military reserve strength. I have been associated with the military since I first enrolled in the ROTC program at the University of Connecticut more than 26 years ago. I have spent some 7 years of my life on active duty. I have followed military affairs closely and I should like to appeal to you to examine closely any further plans to reduce the troop basis of the National Guard.

A National Guard organization, such as the 43d Infantry Division, is an insurance investment. It is maintained at a fraction of the cost of a Regular division. It is usually issued less than 50 percent equipment pending mobilization. The capital investment in an active division was once estimated at some $140 million and annual turnover at $96 million; that in a guard division is at least one-tenth that figure, as critical items of supply are withheld and ordnance is limited to that needed for training. The payroll authorized a guard division is limited according to the manpower ceiling.

At the same time, a guard division is a working organization. It is not a paper outfit. Its men are trained to work as a team. When we go to camp, we are self-supporting—the active Army does not cook for us or issue blankets and sheets to us. When, therefore, there is need for Army strength, it is the guard that is called to double or triple the number of divisions on active duty. In 1941, some 18 guard divisions were mobilized to double the number on active duty. In 1950, the 43d was 1 of 4 guard divisions immediately summoned (in all, 8 were federalized) to become, as Gen. J. Lawton Collins told us that fall, the general reserve of the United States Army. And you will recall that Gen. Douglas MacArthur testified to Congress that he had asked, in December, immediate reinforcement by the four guard divisions. Despite the fact that everyone—Department of the Army included—wanted these divisions, which had thousands of untrained selectees added to their ranks, to complete as much of the training cycle as possible, these units could have moved overseas then because of the training concept of the National Guard, which stresses ready, working units.

This is not to disparage the Army Reserve, which, like the guard, is a valuable reservoir of training skills, and has provided thousands of individuals an opportunity to keep up their military usefulness to the Nation. Yet I would also point out to you that the States help support the National Guard, through armory contributions, uniform allowance, and other funds, while the Reserve is totally a Federal function. It seems strange that Washington, at a time when it is considering reallocation of the burdens of Government, would strengthen a federally supported agency while weakening one whose costs are shared at State level.

Perhaps it would be well, too, to consider the guards' value to Connecticut (as well as Rhode Island and Vermont, so far as the 43d is concerned). This was proven as recently as August 1955 and thereafter when the guard units were summoned to restore order in flood-stricken communities and provide assistance to civil authorities. Without a disciplined working force, the problem would have been much more severe than it was. Our units cooked food, handled inoculations, patrolled streets, cleared debris, and did many other things until help could arrive and civil authorities resume full responsibility. Our own 43d division helicopter was the first into the Farmington River Valley area, and its pilot is credited with saving at least 12 lives.

The apportionment of National Guard divisions that was worked out in 1925 authorized two in the New England area. If 1 of these divisions should be eliminated, that would leave 3 States without adequate military forces in case of a serious problem. The Guard units are dispersed and able to handle a crisis where order must be imposed at once. To say that a troop basis of the Guard can be reduced in numbers by eliminating divisions—as the active Army does it—is unrealistic to say the least. The entire geographical balance is upset. And it is noteworthy that there is no regular division in the entire First Army area to backstop the reserve mission.

As you undoubtedly know, the 43d has been mentioned as 1 division that might be eliminated. This supposition is based on certain criteria reported to have been suggested by Army planners. They include, among others: (a) strength, (b) Army area, (c) divided State authority, and (d) absence of historical tradition.

Let me discuss the strength factor. The present three-State strength of the 43d is roughly 7,500. This compares with about 8,500 when the division was ordered to active duty in 1950. At that time the division ranked among the top third of the Guard units in the country, having started on an equal basis with all, been among the first to complete its organization, and having recruited vigorously.

On the return home of the division cadre in 1952, however, all that had gone. All men had served their obligation and been released. The inactive Guard divisions had continued their recruiting and built their strength totals to excellent figures. The 43d started from scratch in an area noted for high industrial activity and scarcity of manpower. There were artificial limitations placed to prevent the Guard nationally from exceeding its budget figures. These have varied, but the limitations, plus new ones, with respect to training, have handicapped recruiting.

Nevertheless we have worked hard and, I believe, well. We drew back many of those who had served on active duty for 2 years. This represented an outstanding cadre. I may point out that during our tour, we had sent 3,900 officers and enlisted men to service schools, in addition to guiding all through a paced training program. Recently, since we have had the opportunity to participate in the 6-months training program, we have had more than 600 volunteer to take part.

The present strength of the 43d, therefore, includes a high number of recently burnished skills. The training of these men represents a significant investment for the Government. The time they have put in, often over and above any paid hours, is a significant investment for them, too. Both total an impressive equity for the country.

The other criteria, so far as they point to the 43d, are disputable. The geographical basis of elimination must be weighed against the value of dispersed armed Reserve strength. First Army area is one of high industrial importance, and certainly New England needs more than one division in place. And, note again, there are no regular divisions stationed in First Army area as there are elsewhere.

As for divided State authority, admittedly the allotment of 43d Division units among Vermont, Connecticut, and Rhode Island offers administrative complication. But these States have always loyally supported the 43d Division, and I cannot imagine administrative ease for the Pentagon being a controlling factor in the elimination of trained units.

Nor should the 43d Division have anything to fear in the way of historical tradition. From the train bands of 1639 to the Presidential Unit citations of 1945 and to the first National Guard division to go overseas to the European theater and NATO in 1951, New Englanders have compiled a fine record. The high basic combat readiness rating of the 43d in 1951 when it departed Hampton Roads, and the outstanding record it compiled in Europe until the breakup of its National Guard and selectee core in 1952 attest to that.

Basically, however, the issue comes down to one of what kind of reserve the country needs and must have. I realize that the uncertainties of a shifting weapons technology lead some to believe that the reserve is secondary. To my mind this argument is totally wrong and could be disastrous. A sudden blow at key centers would make more vital than ever a dispersed, trained armed force to restore order and form the base for future action. That is a traditional role of the National Guard.

The premiums paid on the insurance represented by the National Guard—and perhaps, since our headquarters are in Hartford—I lean unconsciously too much on the insurance analogy—are not high. The percentage of the gross national product allotted to our security and defense, roughly 10 percent, is not high, either, compared with the loss of that gross national product in its entirety if we should lose a war with the

Soviet Union. As a citizen-soldier, I am greatly concerned at anything that looks like tampering with the reserve troop structure. I hope you will take a long look at any such plan if it should be presented to you.

Thank you for your kindness in reading this letter. Let me invite you, if you should have the time in Hartford some Monday night, to visit our division headquarters at Brainard Field and see the pattern of National Guard activity from there—or from any of the 43d Division units in the State. We expect to be training at Camp Drum, N. Y., from June 20, to July 5, and would welcome you there, too.

Sincerely yours,

EDMUND R. WALKER,
Major General,
Connecticut National Guard.

Tax Cut Could Be Best Weapon in Battle Against Recession

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MELVIN PRICE
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 10, 1958

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, a number of measures have been taken or proposed for reversing the recession that has sharply reduced production in many industries, brought unemployment to over 5,000,000 workers, cut the paychecks of millions more in the labor force, and added heavy financial burdens to State and local governments as unemployment compensation coverage runs out for thousands of the jobless.

It is a bit difficult to know how the administration really views the recession. On February 12, the President said "every indication is that March will commence to see the start of a pickup in job opportunities. That should mark the beginning of the end of the downturn in our economy." A week later, however, Gabriel Hauge, his economic assistant, said there was a "mistaken impression" that the President had "predicted a business upturn in March."

The administration has failed to realize that economic slumps can snowball, growing progressively worse while the Government stands hesitant or takes only faltering steps to halt the recession's growth.

There are many economists who believe that a reduction in income taxes would have the effect of helping halt the recession by increasing consumer spending. Reductions effective in 1949 stimulated consumer spending and were a bulwark against the recession of that year. In 1954—another year of recession—tax concessions were translated almost dollar for dollar into an increase in consumer buying and business sales, which were a major supporting factor in the economy.

The senior Senator from Illinois, PAUL DOUGLAS, has introduced alternative bills reducing Federal taxes. One of these would increase the personnal exemption from $600 to $700; the other would cut the tax on the first $1,000 of net income from 20 to 15 percent. A number of excise taxes would also be decreased by these bills. The total tax remission would be about $4.4 billion.

These tax-cutting legislation and simflar proposals deserve serious consideration now. In line with the objectives of this legislation is the following editorial from Labor's Daily of March 8, 1958:

RECESSION CAN BE STOPPED

Prof. Gustav Cassell, of Sweden, said many years ago that any country could get out of a depression if it just waited long enough—until sufficient industrial plant and equipment had rusted out and worn out. Then, he said, capacity would fall short and a reinvestment advance would begin, enlarging incomes, and pushing the economy upward.

Cassell didn't recommend this policy. He was an early advocate, even before John Maynard Keynes, of England, of government spending and taxing policy to stabilize the economy. Under his leadership, Sweden had a successful economic stabilization policy long before most western governments began to assume such responsibility. The United States did not adopts its Employment Act, assigning such responsibility to the Federal Government, until 1946.

Today, no modern government dares fall back on the archaic natural remedy for depression. Democratic governments cannot stand idly by as unemployment mounts.

The United States is now in a recession which has been gathering impetus for several months. The first signs of it appeared in the middle of 1957. Some leading Government and private economists thought that the Federal Government should start acting as early as last August. Among these was Arthur Burns, the former chairman of the President's Council of Economic Advisers. Burns differed with the Federal Reserve Board on money policy—that is, he thought credit should have been loosened earlier than it was.

The Federal Reserve Board and the Eisenhower administration are worried about overdoing recovery measures and thus bringing on a new burst of inflation. This is the reason the Fed has been slow and cautious about easing money. This is the reason why the administration has not yet recommended a tax cut nor proposed anything more than a mild step up in public-works spending. The President and his advisers are counting on somewhat larger defense spending to pull the country out of the slump.

Those who take the cautious view about antidepression measures believe that the 1958 recession is shaping up much like the recessions of 1949 and 1954. These downswings were moderate and recovery was quick. Here is a table showing the changes in the gross national product (GNP) in these recessions, compared with the figures for the current dip. The GNP is the total value of production of goods and services at current prices.

	GNP in billions at annual rate
1949 recession:	
4th quarter 1948	264
1st quarter 1949	256
4th quarter 1949	255
2d quarter 1950	270
1954 recession:	
2d quarter 1953	370
4th quarter 1953	364
1st quarter 1954	358
4th quarter 1954	364
1958 recession:	
3d quarter 1957	439
4th quarter 1957	433

A study of the major components of the GNP leads many economists to believe there will be a leveling off, or perhaps a small pickup, in the second quarter of 1958. But this is only a guess, and in the present critical stage of the recession, a change in consumer and business spending plans would turn the economw farther downward.

Even if a leveling off does occur, this would mean that the economy was failing to make sufficient progress to maintain full employment. Suppose the GNP measures $430 billion (annual rate) next quarter. This would be $16 billion less than would have been produced if the progress of the last few years had been maintained (not counting the rise in prices).

Since the size of the work force is continuing to grow, this would mean a further increase in unemployment. Arthur Upgren, professor of economics at Macalester College in St. Paul and one of the country's leading economists, figures that a leveling off in 1958 would mean about 2½ million more unemployed this year.

What can be done about it? Those who are comparing this recession with 1949 and 1954 may have forgotten that the Federal Government acted promptly and vigorously in both these instances.

In 1949 taxes were reduced (over President Truman's veto). This was a leading factor in the rise in GNP of $21 billion in 6 months—and entirely before the outbreak of the Korean war. Tax revenues actually increased, despite the lower rates, because business picked up so fast.

In 1954 taxes also were reduced sharply, and the Federal Reserve Board made credit easier. Again tax revenues increased as economic activity expanded. GNP increased by $52 billion from 1954 to 1956.

In both these recessions, therefore, quick tax reduction was effective, and it cost less than nothing, because total revenues rose substantially.

Government antirecession policy is a very inexact and clumsy science so far. Yet there are a few things which have been learned in recent years in keeping United States recessions small. One is that prompt tax reduction is effective.

If tax reduction is postponed too long, it will be necessary for the Government to pull more drastic antirecession tools out of the bag. Spending for public works would have to be stepped up sharply. As the recession deepened, the difficulty of pulling the Nation out of the doldrums would increase.

For this reason, it is much better to err on the side of inflation at this stage of the recession (and considering our limited experience and knoweldge about stabilizing the economy) than to wait and let unemployment grow. The methods may be crude, but we do know how to keep a recession from advancing. Tax cuts in time may do the job. They ought to be tried soon before more radical measures become necessary.

Mr. and Mrs. United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALBERT H. BOSCH
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 10, 1958

Mr. BOSCH. Mr. Speaker, is the Congress to be divested of all its powers? It appears from a number of recent decisions of the Supreme Court that we must reassert our authority and duties as set forth in the Constitution—now there is the threat to the control over the purse which the Congress has always had, and I pray that we will maintain that control.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include the column of Walter Winchell,

which appeared in the March 5, 1958, edition of the New York Mirror. This column is a tribute to our colleagues, Hon. LESLIE ARENDS, of Illinois, and Hon. CARL VINSON, of Georgia.

The article follows:

MR. AND MRS. UNITED STATES

Only a very few experts realize it—but our country is on the verge of the greatest constitutional crisis in its history. The headlines are misleading the country into believing that it is a fight over the reorganization of the Defense Department. That is merely the surface struggle. Beneath it is the offered new concept that Congress can sign a blank check for any Government department including Defense without directing where it goes. The issue, therefore, is not whether any department gets a blank check—but whether Congress has the constitutional power to give it at all. There are men on both sides of the aisle—on Capital Hill today—Republican and Democrat—who will tell you that the first blank check Congress ever signs for any Government department will not be an appropriation bill—it will be the death warrant of the Congress itself.

That's why the coming fight on the Hill will be to the death—the death of our oldest constitutional principle—or the death of the new usurping one. The fight will not be at the barricades nor at the bloody angles. It will be by debate and vote. But the effect on our country will not be less deadly. Because, if the Congress loses, it will, like the Reichstag, have voted itself out of useful existence.

It is an American tradition that every crisis produces the man to solve it. This crisis is so deep that it has produced two: Congressman CARL VINSON, Democrat, of Georgia, chairman of the House Armed Services Committee, and Republican whip LESLIE C. ARENDS, of Illinois. These statesmen have dropped all party lines to defend the basic principle that the American Government belongs to the American people. The thankless and desperate fight they are waging will bring them no monuments. If the fight is won, America will continue as a country having Armed Forces; if they lose, it may follow the European pattern where the Armed Forces think of themselves as having a country.

The amazing thing is that the American people are not amazed at the turn of events. Why do we have to have a Vinson to tell us that the Weimar Constitution of Germany was patterned on ours and that Hitler was able to twist it into the Nazi swastika by simply giving the chief of the army High Command unlimited funds beyond the control of the Reichstag? On that issue you would think 350,000 white crosses and Stars of David speak for themselves. And why does Senator SYMINGTON have to yell that the refusal of the Defense Department to apply the sums voted for the purpose Congress intended is already here and that it is the most deadly threat to civilian control in this 20th century? Our admittedly defenseless skies prove his point.

Why does a selfless American like LESLIE ARENDS, Republican whip, put aside all other consideration to uphold the banner of congressional control? The answer is the same for them as it is for you. They have children and grandchildren and they know the second the purse strings go out of the hands of Congress, they will become the hangman's rope around the Statue of Liberty's neck.

Already the present state of the Constitution is enough to wither the statues of the Founding Fathers. For example, the Constitution provides that the Congress alone shall declare war. But the fact is, the Congress has never declared war: In every case, it has declared that war already existed because the executive branch had thrown the Armed Forces into action. Again, it will astonish most Americans to learn that the State Department consented to Japan's grabbing of Korea back in 1904. By constitutional threat? No, by secret executive agreement—and it took 100,000 American casualties to correct that lapse of constitutional law.

Moreover, it will shock most Americans to learn that the published national budget—once the absolute bedrock of integrity—is now false. Why? Because with the consent of a few leading people, hundreds of millions of dollars are concealed under false titles for secret intelligence purposes. All of these devises may spell out the terrific pressure of the times, but they also spell out that the American people are losing control of their Government. And if Congress abdicates control of its appropriating power, it will be only a matter of time before the American people lose control of their Government completely.

This writer can well sympathize with them. When, 10 years ago, this column urged 70 air groups, and Congress appropriated the money for them, the great brains across the Potomac cut them down to 41 on the ground that full defense might lead to rationing. Now 120 aren't enough. The same school of thought now wants to give one man as yet unnamed (and by statute yet unborn) the power to cut the fleet, whittle away the Army, abolish the National Guard, ground half of the Air Corps and skeletonize the Marines without a word of public debate. The method is all too deadly simple. All you have to do is to secretly cut the appropriation, by someone not responsible to the people. It is a quiet death by comma and semicolon, see what I mean? Ironically enough if precedent holds true, the unknown person and his few unknown assistants (who will make these decisions behind closed doors) as of this time probably have not had two weeks of actual combat experience between them.

After 20 years in this struggle, this reporter can tell his fellow Americans the only really hard lessons the 20th century teaches: When it comes to war, there is no second money. You can't place or show in the power game. You either win or lose. And no body of people have a better understanding of this than the civilian Congress—that body of Government closest to the people.

His opposition is trying to point Chairman VINSON as a man who wants to keep closest to the Nation's pocketbook. His long and magnificent record however shows he is closest to the American people's heard. His integrity speaks for itself: What he would die to protect from the country's enemies he most certainly would never vote away to even its closest so-called friends—because he believes it belongs to the American people.

This is still a free country. You don't have to stand around with your hands in your pockets while the Honorable VINSON, ARENDS, SYMINGTON and KILDAY fight for your rights. You can use your mitts, too, and this reporter intends to. To the Honorable CARL VINSON, LESLIE ARENDS, STUART SYMINGTON and PAUL J. KILDAY: To the best of my ability, I'll held defend your powers of appropriation as part of the same great document which guarantees me a free typewriter. And by virtue of no power whatsoever in me vested, I hereby appoint you to the most honorable title any American could wish: Fighting Watchdogs of the United States Constitution.

Tribute to Cardinal Stritch by Washington's Archdiocesan Newspaper

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BARRATT O'HARA
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 10, 1958

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, in the city of Chicago, where he is deeply beloved, the appointment of Samuel Alphonsus Cardinal Stritch to the post of proprefect of the Vatican's Sacred Congregation for the Propagation of the Faith, there is both joy and sadness.

Chicago rejoices in the signal honor which has come to us and the church in America, for Cardinal Stritch is the first American prelate named to the Roman Curia and head of one of the departments of the church's central administration. But joy is tempered with sorrow for we shall miss the great spiritual leadership which his eminence has given us.

In a formal statement in the New World, official weekly newspaper of the archdiocese of Chicago, Cardinal Stritch said he "would have to take up my residence in Rome for the discharge of the duties of this important office in the Roman Curia," that he felt humbly thankful for the honor done the American church and particularly the clergy and laity of the Chicago archdiocese, but that his "heart was heavy with the thought I must leave you, whom I love with the tenderest fatherly affection."

I am extending my remarks to include an editorial from the Catholic Standard, Washington's archdiocesan newspaper, on the appointment of His Eminence.

The editorial follows:

APPOINTMENT OF CARDINAL STRITCH

When the young seminarian, Samuel A. Stritch, left his home in Nashville in 1903 to continue his studies at the North American College in Rome, the church in the United States was still in a missionary status. It was still under the jurisdiction of the Congregation of the Propagation of the Faith.

While he was still a seminarian in Rome, the church in the United States was removed from its missionary status. Since his ordination in 1910, the cardinal has been associated with almost every great movement affecting the church and our country since then.

Consecrated the bishop of Toledo in 1921 at the age of 34, and later transferred to the archdiocese of Milwaukee, he has experienced the difficulties administering dioceses in industrial areas during the days of the depression. As chancellor of the Catholic Church Extension Society, he has met the problems of forwarding the building of churches in the sparsest mission areas of the country.

Just as World War II engulfed the world, he was appointed to two key posts—ordinary of the archdiocese of Chicago and chairman of the administrative board of the National Catholic Welfare Conference. In these positions, he has helped to solve great problems.

If, as the cardinal said of his appointment, his holiness "principally had in mind honoring the church in the United States," the choice was very felicitous and the great wisdom of the holy father is again demonstrated.

Address by Hon. Theodore Francis Green, of Rhode Island, at Dedication of Navy Pier, Davisville, R. I.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. THEODORE FRANCIS GREEN

OF RHODE ISLAND

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, March 11, 1958

Mr. GREEN. Mr. President, on Wedneday, March 5, at Davisville, R. I., I delivered an address at the dedication of the new Navy Pier at the United States Naval Construction Battalion Center. I ask unanimous consent to have the address printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS BY UNITED STATES SENATOR THEODORE FRANCIS GREEN, AT DEDICATION OF NAVY PIER, UNITED STATES NAVAL CONSTRUCTION BATTALION CENTER, DAVISVILLE, R. I., MARCH 5, 1958

Captain Husband, Governor Roberts, Admiral Peltier, Admiral Crommelin, and other distinguished guests, this is one of the most gratifying birthday celebrations I have ever had the pleasure of attending, and I have attended quite a number of them, as you know.

This occasion is gratifying to me for several reasons. As an American citizen, I have a vital interest in the progress of our National Defense Establishment. And I'm sure you will all agree that this pier represents its material progress.

Then, as a member of the United States Government, I am gratified because today I am privileged to see personally the realization of one of the many projects which we in the Congress are studying, considering, and supporting in the cause of a stronger America.

And certainly as a native of Rhode Island I am gratified to see this new facility added to the naval installations in this area. It is at once a vindication of my faith in this State and evidence that the Navy has the good sense to agree with my judgment.

For all these reasons, it is a great pleasure for me to have been invited to dedicate this new pier at the Naval Construction Battalion Center. At the same time I feel fortunate in having the opportunity to welcome all of you who have come here to visit or to work in Rhode Island. I hope you will thoroughly enjoy your stay here and come back often.

As you can see, I am a solid booster of the State which I have the honor to represent in the United States Senate. I could wish for no greater honor than to have been chosen by my friends and neighbors to occupy my present position. And I feel sure that you ladies and gentlemen who have come here to live in line of military duty will soon come to know and love the State as I do. I hope so because there is a deplorable tendency in some of our larger States to ridicule Rhode Island merely because it is small. However, as you get to know us better you will see that this is rather like the stomach poking fun at the heart.

Just as I am a booster for my home State, so I am also a booster for the Navy. (Some people seem to think I am one of the original ones.) At any rate I have always been proud to proclaim myself as a big-Navy man. I have never, and I do not now wish to disparage any segment of our defense team But I am convinced beyond any doubt of the indispensable role of our seagoing forces in the defense of America.

It seems to be an old American trait to climb on bandwagons. It certainly is true in politics. And apparently it is equally true in military planning. At any rate we find ourselves today surrounded by enthusiasts who would have us abandon various parts of our military establishment and concentrate on the one service or branch in which they are interested. They would have us pin all our hopes on the airplane, or the missile, or indeed, even the push button. They assure us that, if we dwell upon this or that enthusiasm of theirs, we shall be sublimely impregnable, regardless of where, how or when we are attacked. Indeed, as I listen to their rhapsodic forecasts, I sometimes wonder if we have not already a number of men floating about in space oblivious of gravitational and other considerations.

Certainly these men cannot have studied all the implications of present-day military developments or of our situation in relation to those developments. As for me, I would not pretend that the Navy, or any other single service, can alone protect us from our enemies. But I certainly would suggest that no sensible military man can look at the two wide oceans that bound our Nation on the east and west and then dismiss lightly the mission of the United States Navy. I believe that the Navy is, and must remain in the foreseeable future, our first line of national defense.

If one is realistic enough to look the facts of military life in the face and recognize the genuine need for a well-rounded defense composed of all our military branches, he must inevitably be realistic enough to recognize also that the only way we can be truly impregnable is to keep that military strong, modern and alert.

Here, I think, we run into another kind of enthusiasm which is equally unrealistic and equally dangerous. This is the tendency to concentrate our interest upon that part of the military which attracts the headlines in the press.

It is perfectly natural that the firing of a new missile, the setting of a new airplane speed record or the launching of an atomic submarine should capture the imagination of the public. These are dramatic events, full of tension and excitement, if they do not end in a flop.

But in our attempt to be realistic about our military preparedness, we must never allow the dramatic to obscure the quiet, steady, behind-the-scenes aspect of military activity. We must remember that it is the steady, efficient flow of logistic support that makes possible the success of the headline-stealing devices we admire so much. Indeed, the performance of you men who do the construction, supply and other noncombatant work of the military, has won more battles than we ever give you credit for.

I recall that a certain large graving dock was completed at the naval base at Pearl Harbor. It was a fine accomplishment, as those of us who have been interested in its progress recognize. But none of us knew how important an accomplishment it was until, exactly 1 week later, Japanese planes swooped out of the west and crippled a major part of our Pacific fleet. Suddenly the new dock became an enormously important part of our naval establishment. Immediately it began receiving damaged ships for repairs which would have required a much longer period to complete had it not been for such a facility. Certainly this dock played a material part in our eventual success in the Pacific war.

Today we are celebrating the completion of another facility which will provide important support to the fleet, and especially to those elements of it which are considered with Construction Battalion operations. When one considers the degree of activity that prevails here even in peacetime, it does not require much imagination to realize how important such a berthing facility as this would be in time of war to the Seabees, and consequently to the Nation.

Such an addition to the Naval Shore Establishment would be an important event in any case. The fact that it will be principally identified with Seabee operations, however, lends further interest to it as far as I am concerned.

I feel a very deep, almost parental, pride in the accomplishments of the construction men. For even if the Seabees were conceived in Washington, D. C., certainly Davisville, R. I., played an important part in their early training.

It was here at Quonset Point that the first advance base depot was established. And it was at that depot that the famous Camp Endicott was established in June 1942. This was the camp where many a man made the transformation from civilian construction worked to Navy Seabee. And it was from this camp that many thousands of these Seabees embarked for distant parts of the earth.

I was extremely interested in these construction battalions because I had had a number of conversations with Adm. Ben Moreell, then Chief of the Bureau of Yards and Docks, concerning the projected units. I had also had a number of talks with the wartime President Franklin D. Roosevelt on the subject. And when additional funds were needed to enlarge the base at Quonset Point for the Seabee training facility, I had had the honor of introducing a bill in the Senate to appropriate a million dollars for the purpose.

I'm sure you can understand then, why I felt proud when I saw these construction men, whose name, "Seabees" had been coined in Rhode Island, and who wore a device designed for them by a Rhode Island artist, embarking from Davisville.

But my pride, and that of all of us here in Rhode Island, increased a hundredfold when the stories began to fly back from those distant points of operation of this new band of men for whom, seemingly, nothing was impossible. For them, it was said, every problem was merely an exercise in ingenuity. Of them it was reproted that their motto, "Construimus, battuimus"—"We build, we fight"—was no empty phrase. While some of them were manning causeways in the landings in Sicily and Europe, the greater number were striding across the Pacific, building the road to Tokyo. It was said that they inspired the Marines they teamed with, astonished their military commanders, and utterly bewildered the Japs with their construction feats. No wonder then, that the public was intrigued with these American master builders, and built in turn a legendary fame around them.

We had other things to be proud of, too, here at Davisville, although most people didn't find out about them until the war ended. It was here at Davisville that the famous pontoon designed by a Civil Engineer Corps officer was tested and developed for a score of uses vital to the war effort. Here, too, the English nissen hut was altered and, as the quonset hut, adapted for use in many sizes and in all kinds of places.

There were even some developments made here at the advance base proving ground which never reached the field of operations. A pontoon floating airfield was one example of these. I suppose this is what some of our more expansive friends mean when they announce that we won the war with something to spare. I fear they are stretching things a bit. At any rate, as you see, Davisville has had a long and happy acquaintance with the Seabees.

We thought this relationship might have ended permanently when the camp was disestablished in 1946 as a Seabee installation. But we were happy when the base was reestablished in 1951 as an advance base depot. And then in 1954 we received the good news

that the installation here was to serve as the east coast construction battalion center. I think I speak for all local residents when I say that we feel the eastern Seabees are now at home where they belong.

I said earlier that the importance of logistics must not be forgotten if we are to build a strong and efficient military. Let me assure you that the work being done by today's Seabees is in the great tradition of their wartime predecessors. The construction battalions have shown that they are a vital part of the Navy and that no matter what the military developments of the future may bring forth, there will always be a need for the skill, the training, and the innate ingenuity of the American construction man.

It is with this feeling of pride in the Navy's construction forces in the past and in the present, and of confidence in their devoted and skillful performance in the future that I dedicate this pier to their success and our country's protection.

Address Delivered by Hon. Ralph W. Yarborough, of Texas, at the Jefferson-Jackson Dinner at Baltimore

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. RALPH W. YARBOROUGH

OF TEXAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, March 11, 1958

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, I have been requested to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD my remarks at the 7th annual Jefferson-Jackson Dinner at Baltimore, Md., last Saturday evening, March 8, 1958. This annual Maryland Democratic meeting was sponsored by the Young Democratic Clubs of Maryland. I ask unanimous consent that my Baltimore address be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TEXT OF ADDRESS BY UNITED STATES SENATOR RALPH YARBOROUGH, OF TEXAS, FOR DELIVERY BEFORE A MARYLAND STATEWIDE DEMOCRATIC DINNER AT BALTIMORE ON SATURDAY, MARCH 8

Mr. Chairman, fellow Democrats, fellow Americans, it is a rare privilege for a representative of one of the Southwestern States to be a guest here at your own State family meeting, and, representing, as I do, the State of Texas in the United States Senate, I count it an honor to be invited to the State that has sent to the Senate such alltime great Senators as Charles Carroll of Carrollton to the first Senate, and Millard Tydings in our own generation. I am indebted to you for your generous words and hospitable greeting.

It is a particular pleasure to have the opportunity to meet with you young Democrats of Maryland. I always enjoy getting together with young Democrats because you have the fire, the enthusiasm, and, yes, you are the best fighters for the true principles of our party. It is amusing to hear the older, calmer members complaining that "those wild-eyed young Demos are raising sand" about something or other. I say, more power to you. Stir the sand until you blow up a storm.

I'm also happy to see many senior Democrats here tonight. Someone whispered to me to be careful what I said, that in this audience you had every variety of Democrat known to man. That doesn't worry me. When I hear of factional fights among loyal Democrats, I'm reminded of that famous quip of Will Rogers.

He said he wasn't a member of any organized political party, that he was a Democrat. There's some truth in that. The time I'll start worrying about our party is when all of its factions begin agreeing on everything. After all, the Mason-Dixon line is a land boundary, not a party line.

Of course, I understand that your fight here in Maryland is quite differen from ours in Texas. You know that for the past several years we Texans have been plagued with people who are half Democrat and half Republican. They filed as candidates under the party labels of both parties—crossfiled, they call it down there—and run on both party tickets as both Democrat and Republican. Some call them "Demicans," others call them "Republicrats."

I don't know whether you have seen this hybrid political animal. He has a Republican elephant trunk and a Democratic donkey tail, making a rather odd spectacle. Someone has observed this animal is not of much worth to either party because he can't tell his trunk from his tail. As I say, I hope you are not bothered by any such animals around here.

It is a real thrill to visit here in Maryland, a State so rich in history and tradition, recognized in the beginning as the land of sanctuary because of its determination for freedom of religion. Your forebears were the proud people who committed the first act of open rebellion against England in repudiating the unjust stamp act. It was William Pinkney of Annapolis, who as attorney general prepared the declaration of war against Great Britain in 1812. The founders and forefathers in this State made a tremendous contribution to success in the Revolution and in the War of 1812.

Fifty years later, your people and mine—even to the heart of families—were ripped asunder by the terrible tragedy of Civil War. My first knowledge of Maryland came to me in the little east Texas Piney Woods country town where I grew up. As a boy, I listened to the old men, some of whom were in a company of Hood's Brigade, which was Gen. Robert E. Lee's favorite in the army of northern Virginia. They talked of the terrible ordeal of the fierce fire at Sharpsburg's battle; they spoke of how good the sweet, green corn of Maryland tasted to a starving man; they grieved over Antietam's Field, where 22,000 Americans died in a single hopeless day.

While every American thrills to Baltimore's history and the heroic defense that gave us The Star Spangled Banner, Texas has a peculiar reason for being grateful to Francis Scott Key.

When Sam Houston was hailed up for trial before the House of Representatives of the United States for beating up a Congressman, because the Congressman had slandered him in a speech on the floor, Francis Scott Key, then a prominent Washington lawyer, came to Houston's defense. Houston's fortunes were then at a low ebb. Separated from his wife, he fled the governorship of Tennessee to live with the Cherokees. Key won an acquittal for Houston, who then went to Texas.

Houston later said that at the time of the trial he was in the depths of despondency. His life seemed utter failure. Had he been taken in a justice court and fined as a common criminal, it would have ended him. But the trial was a triumph for Houston on a national scale. He felt like a new man; the burden of misfortunes seemed to end with that acquittal, and he went forth a new man to the greatest days of his life.

So tonight I give thanks to Baltimore. Francis Scott Key has lighted the fires of hope in many hearts over the years, but none that meant so much to us in Texas as the hope he stirred up in Sam Houston. That hope became San Jacinto, the Lone Star Republic, and finally annexation.

History, to me, is interesting, enlightening, and inspiring. Historians tell us that the real value of history is to give us a better understanding of the present, because history repeats itself. With this thought in mind, I want you to consider how this country's economy appears to be in danger right now; its economic history of 25 years ago is trying to repeat itself. Certainly, if the high interest rate, tight credit, hard money policies of the administration are not curbed the Republican record of 1929 will repeat itself.

I'm not an alarmist, but I'm a realist. Over 5 million Americans walk the streets out of work, and unemployment figures are still climbing. Nearly 50,000 men and women here in Maryland are out of work. Across the Nation 7½ percent of the labor force under Federal unemployment insurance is without work. In my State alone, 106,000 men, women, and children are now receiving food relief supplies.

Small business bankruptcies are at an alltime high; farm income has been constantly cut under Bensonized policies and thousands of small farmers have been moved off their land into cities where they add to the unemployment crisis.

Under the typical Republican plan, which shows that party's undying love and affection for ultrabig business, the giant combines and cartels grow richer and richer while the people become poorer and poorer.

Prices to the farmers for his products go down, but prices the housewife pays in the market place go up and up.

We have an economic anomaly; an inflation in a recession; an inflation in the price of groceries and goods, and more and more workers are unemployed and unable to buy groceries and goods. And the Chief of State advises the hungry, moneyless, unemployed to end the depression by buying more goods and groceries. Men without money are told to spend; people without food are told to eat more; laborers out of jobs are told to work. In short, a country without a head of state is in a dilemma.

Through it all, this administration has sent out two great and unforgettable statements to the American people. Former Defense Secretary Charles Wilson declared that what's good for General Motors is good for the country. You know, he later returned to the firm which netted over $850 million in clear profits last year. The other remarkable statement came from that great Republican Party spokesman who said the unemployed have the right to suffer. I want to make it clear, here, that that is a right guaranteed only by the Republican Party.

The hard, cold fact of life is that the Republican elephant, which has a shockingly short memory for campaign promises, performs only on command from his special interest trainers. The voice of the people goes unheard. Speaking of Republican campaign promises, I remember how their candidate in 1952 was going to cure inflation. During a whistlestop swing, the Republican speaker illustrated the inflation trouble by taking out a 2-by-4 board and holding it up to the audience saying:

"Here's how much board you could buy for a dollar in 1939."

Then he would take out a hand saw and cut the board in half. He would hold up one piece of the board and say: "And here's how much board you can buy for a dollar now."

The way the cost of living has continued to spiral, I gave some thought to sawing up

a board here tonight to show they didn't keep that promise. But times are getting so tough for Democrats, I couldn't find anyone with a board or who could afford a saw.

But I'll have to admit one thing the Republicans have accomplished. Never, even in the heyday of our Democratic administration, were we Democrats able to keep a full-blown inflation and recession going at the same time. The Republicans have got 5 million people unemployed, and millions of other old-age pensioners and retirees living or rather starving on bare survival incomes, while milk is nearly a dollar a gallon and hamburger meat is 50 cents a pound and more.

The pathetic part of the picture for the people is that this forgetful Republican elephant is tiptoeing around, afraid to act for the people. He's afraid he might make a move which would not please former Secretary of the Treasury Humphrey's bird dogs. It's either that, or else the Republican high command doesn't know what to do.

Well, the Democrats know what to do. We learned from our great leader, Franklin D. Roosevelt. In the most perilous period of our history, he taught the Democratic Party how to fight a depression, find jobs for all the working force, build homes, produce food, and live a good life.

Of course, America is in nothing like the economic chaos this country was in when President Roosevelt's firm hand took the wheel of government. Thanks mainly to the Democratic Party's guidance and its continuing programs, we have strong hope and reason to believe that another nation-breaking depression will never occur. But need we take chances? Five million unemployed is 5 million too many. This is no time for Ferdinand to sit around and sniff the flowers: This is the time to charge. You know some of the current Republican statements run very much like this:

"Any lack of confidence in the economic future or the basic strength of business in the United States is foolish." But that is not a current Republican quote. It was made by President Hoover in 1929. By the end of his administration, 5,000 banks were closed and 13 million people were without work.

We all know how, under the courageous and inspired leadership of President Roosevelt the country built back to sound economic strength. We know that, principally due to his leadership and that of President Harry Truman, our living standards rose to be the highest ever enjoyed by any people in the world. We became the Nation where most families have a car, a refrigerator, a home. But most is not enough.

Jefferson acquired Louisiana Territory, Jackson held the Union together in his day. Roosevelt whipped a depression; Truman contained communism.

Our goal is plenty for all people. Today, in a land of great food surpluses, many hunger. In our land of vast wealth, nearly one-third of our people live in dank, wet, unhealthful shacks. Thousands need for warm clothing. Three basic physical needs of man are food, clothing and shelter. Millions now lack at least 1 of these 3.

As Democrats in the tradition of Presidents Jefferson and Jackson, and Roosevelt and Truman, and others before them, we still face a great challenge. We are still dedicated to fight for a more abundant life for all Americans. We are not the party of pendent pessimism. We know that more jobs and a decent living for millions is many times more important than tight credit for timid lenders.

In a religious society which knows that God notes even the sparrows' fall, we Democrats know that we will never quit fighting as long a child is hungry. While our elderly people end their days in misery and want, we cannot rest. Democrats believe in people; Republicans put their trust in ledger sheets. Our party must always stand and fight for and defend those whom Franklin D. Roosevelt called the forgotten people.

This is no time for timidity or retreat or compromise. This is the time for Democrats of conviction and conscience to stand up for the rights and interests of the average man. By average, I mean that great bulk of Americans of moderate or modest means who constitute the main stream of American life. Following the firm, tried and true principle of fair, honest, concerned government, our party of the people will se the recent tide of Democratic victories grow and spread.

You know the overwhelming Democratic victories of Mayor Robert Wagner of New York; Gov. Robert Meyner of New Jersey. Why, Governor Meyner whipped the whole Republican national administration single handed. His opponent was endorsed by the President, and then Vice President NIXON and three Cabinet members went to New Jersey and campaigned against Governor Meyner, but they couldn't beat him. Of course, the turning tide really came to view last August when the people of Wisconsin elected the very able Senator BILL PROXMIRE. We will elect more Democratic Senators and Congressmen this year, and a Democratic President in 1960.

Maryland has always played a leading role in the main stream of American life. That main stream is running Democratic.

Just how many Democrats we elect will depend on sharp, energetic, farsighted, thinking Democrats like you, for you must take a lead in the fight. I say you should lead the fight because you young men and women can organize the precincts, knock on doors, get out the vote, and tell the people where we stand. All of us—working for a Democratic administration with a goal of plenty for all people—can win. We can win right here in Maryland, too, just like we can win across the Nation. I know that when the firing starts the young Democrats of Maryland will be right up there on the firing line, and I'll predict right now that you'll give a good account of yourselves.

The party of Jefferson and Jackson, of Wilson and Roosevelt and Truman is being called back to power by the people. Maryland, my Maryland. Hear that call.

Heed the call to greatness. You gave the land to the whole Nation for the Nation's Capitol. Now give your full measure of leadership in men to match the land you gave. That is Maryland's just place in history.

God bless you all.

Salute to General Motors and Its Anderson Divisions on the Occasion of Its Golden Milestone Anniversary

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN V. BEAMER

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 26, 1958

Mr. BEAMER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I include an address given by Robert J. Beck for and on behalf of the Indiana Chamber of Commerce in the salute to General Motors and its Anderson divisions on the occasion of its golden milestone anniversary.

This address was delivered on Thursday, March 6, and I had the privilege of attending this special occasion as one of the guests. Mr. Beck has shown the value of the free-enterprise system and the results of community efforts as exemplified by the General Motors' plants in their community.

SALUTE TO GENERAL MOTORS AND ITS ANDERSON DIVISIONS ON THE OCCASION OF ITS GOLDEN MILESTONE ANNIVERSARY BY ROBERT J. BECK

Distinguished guests, kind hearts and gentle people of Anderson, Mr. Skinner, our chamber of commerce welcomes you to Anderson.

This 50th anniversary has meant for you, we are sure, a great many celebrations like this one. You have traveled here, there, and yon, and on every occasion you have heard the same. I doubt, though, that on any evening you have been exposed to more sincerity than is present here tonight.

Your appearance in our town always acts as a breath from the outside world for we are, when measured by the length and breadth of the General Motors domain, a small and provincial community. If you will use the next few minutes to regard us so, we should like to tell you how we feel toward the great corporation you represent and, if you please, toward our fellow citizens, your employees, through whom we have come to know General Motors policies. We feel nostalgic.

I have been in Anderson only 26 years. But in this space of time I have come to know many oldtimers who, if they had my assignment this evening, could go back, way back, to the very beginning of General Motors in Anderson.

I see some of these people here tonight. People who, in 1918, were driving with pride local products like the Nyberg, the Dolly Madison, the De Tamble, and the Lambert. People who knew the Remy brothers; people who lived through the formation of the romantic, if costly, industrial empire, making of Stoughton Fletcher and W. C. Durant. People who worked with, or for, J. D. Mooney, I. J. Reuter, C. E. Wilson, and later, F. S. Kimmerling.

If these oldtimers were turned loose here tonight, the air would be filled with stories of rugged individualism in a background of colorful industrial romanticism. It would thrill us all to hear of the hurdles jumped, the impossibilities accomplished; but the thing that would impress us most would be the informal and easy way the oldtimers referred to these men—their friends—as "J. D.," "I. J.," "C. E.," and "Fred."

These first-name references, if you heard them uttered, would leave you, as they have me, with the impression of genuine comradeship. These are not facetious nicknames. They carry no implication of disrespect. They are terms of admiration, of high regard and endearment.

This fact, ordinary as it may seem, is significant. It is evidence of sincere and rich communicaiton. It represents a web of community relations which, when measured fairly, is the reason for General Motors' success in Anderson, and Anderson's successful growth as a Hoosier town.

Bees accomplish nothing save as they work together. Neither do men.

This is the high-level pattern of General Motors policy that we have come to know. It is what fills this room tonight with people who knew Fred Kroeger as Fred, Frank Prescott as Frank, O. V. Badgley as Ollie; who knew Frank Burke as Frank, and knew H. D. Dawson as Hi.

Every honest trade has its noblemen. We in Anderson have been blessed in the past with some of the noblest men in the auto trade.

Therefore, we can but feel nostalgic here tonight as we look back over the 40 years since Remy Electric began its career with General Motors, and over the 28 years since

Guide Lamp came down from Cleveland. We are inexpressibly grateful.

Grateful to you, sir, and to your predecessors in the policy direction of the GM accessory divisions in Anderson.

By its continuity of purpose, by its prudent management, by its helping hand, General Motors has sculptured an image of all-round good citizenship in our community which has set Anderson apart from most other smokestack towns.

Way back there somewhere up where you live said to somebody down where we live, "Let's go. Here is what you should have to make it better for everybody. We'll help you get it. But, let's go."

There was a man in my shop the other day who joined Delco in 1924, in the days of C. E. Wilson. He was hired with his stable of 28 mules to raze the old dilapidated orphans' home just south of the railroad tracks on Columbus Avenue and to help with the dirt and mortar in the construction of plant 4. He was hired in 1924 and retired in 1950. I said to him:

"Jim, what makes these General Motors divisions here in Anderson click?"

"Why, Mr. Beck," he said, "that's easy. It's the way everybody up above helps everybody down below. It's the way the boss solicits your ideas and the way he encourages your initiative. I can see C. E. now, as though it were yesterday. I'd be out knockin' my mules and my drivers around and he'd come up and say, 'Jim, what do you need today?' I'd tell him and he'd say, 'I'll see that you get it.' And he would. And before he'd take off, he'd say, 'Got any ideas, Jim?' If I had any that were worth a damn he'd use them. That way, between us, we got the job done. That's the way it was then. That's the way it's been ever since."

That spirit of accomplishment through the use of team play, as all of us here tonight know, has spilled over and inundated our town.

Every enterprise for good in this community has felt the impact of the fine citizens on your payroll, Mr. Skinner. Their contribution to our churches, to our Community Chest, the Red Cross, the YMCA, our Boy Scouts and Girl Scouts, our YWCA, our good government organization, our proposed airport and new hospital, our PTA groups, our college, and our chamber of commerce has, believe me, been beyond the call of duty.

And when I say "contribution," I mean sacrifice in time and energy with emphasis on details. I mean money. I mean imagination, enthusiasm and real devotion.

And when I say "the people on your payroll," I mean all the solid folk of whom there are thousands who work with their hands and their brains. I mean everybody from your general manager, who sets the pace; to his staff, who implement his ideas; to the plant superintendents and their foremen; to the toolmaker, the diemaker; to the line. It is straight across the board that we feel grateful.

Our people have learned a great deal of good citizenship from the policies of General Motors. We have learned that two heads are better than one. We have learned that there are no freeways to the destination of desire.

The greatest engineering is the engineering of men. It is this priceless attribute of General Motors toward their people and of their people toward their community that I have chosen for emphasis. It is this attribute that we in Anderson have found so beneficial over the years.

I would be remiss, however, if I failed to mention with equal gratitude the economic good that General Motors has brought to Anderson.

We all know (it has been reported in the press) that the payrolls of Delco and Guide in Anderson have been as high as $111 million a year and that, in addition to this stimulant to our economy, millions of dollars are spent annually by Delco and Guide in the purchase of supplies and services from Anderson's smaller industries and business and professional establishments.

It has been said that business is the selfish exploitation of society. There may be those present here tonight who do not subscribe to this cold premise and who prefer to look upon their particular livelihood as one of indispensable service to their fellow men. In either approach, selfish or altruistic, the fact remains that there is one impelling motive that gets us all up and at it every morning. That motive is profit.

For most of us profit stems from volume. Volume stems from purchasing power. In our town, purchasing power stems from General Motors. Let's face it.

We do face it, Mr. Skinner. And we take this occasion to convey our collective gratitude to the General Motors Corp. for keeping the Guide and Delco divisions in Anderson, and for enlarging them here over the years.

There are but a few minutes left to speak of the future. But I must speak of the future. It is part of my assignment. This is, after all, an anniversary, not a funeral.

There are textbooks in my empirical trade that tell you that all industry goes through the same cycles as man: infancy, youth, maturity, and senility. Some great corporations in America give the lie to this theory. General Motors is one of them.

General Motors and convenient, economical transportation are here to stay. I would guess that even if technological progress made the motor car obsolete, even if the scientists made it possible and preferable for us to float through the air, General Motors would manufacture the wings to get us up to the floating stage and back to the ground again.

As we get together here tonight we find ourselves in the midst of a disquieting economy. We find the automobile industry in a sticky state. But we find General Motors just where we would expect to find them, in a fighting mood, out to encourage their segment of the economy by higher transportation standards and better values. In the fight for recovery, their contribution will weigh heavily. It might even turn the trick completely. But if it shouldn't, this great corporation will know how to live with adversity. Their outstanding performance in 1957 when, by cost control and efficient administration, they were able to earn $2.99 per share with production of only 45 percent of the motor vehicle market, as against $3.01 per share in 1956 with production of 50 percent of the motor vehicle market, should answer that question for anyone bold enough to raise it.

There is an old saying in Wall Street that goes like this: "The man who knows what the market is going to do, still has seven payments to make on his car."

The same, of course, could be said of me if I attempted to forecast the future economy of Anderson or, for that matter, the part that the General Motors divisions here will play in that economy. (I couldn't qualify under the adage anyway. My Buick is paid for.)

I can, however, think of two approaches that we may take toward our future. The one is to do nothing about it. This approach is based on the philosophy that the future is hidden even from those who make it.

The other is to do something about it. This approach stems from the philosophy that contends that when we look forward to something we want to come true, we can often make ourselves make it come true.

You may be sure that, of the two, they will take the do-something-about-it approach at Guide and Delco.

How do I know that? I know it because, as I have said, it is the crux of General Motors policy.

I know it, too, because of the men who will make it so, Clarence A. Michel (long known to us as Mike) and Donald A. Boyes (soon to be known to us as Don).

Clarence A. Michel came to us with Guide from Cleveland. He is the brightest name in lights. His engineering accomplishments are the very essence of future progress. He has engineered headlamps since 1919 and each of his accomplishments has given progress to General Motors and to Anderson. He has been general manager of Guide since 1941 and there isn't a man in this room who hasn't felt the impact of his contribution to our community. Under his supervision we find many of our solid citizens like the one I read of just the other day, who was retired from Guide on February 1. This man had given 46 years to General Motors, but what is more significant, 2 of his sons, 1 of his daughters and his 4 sons-in-law are employees of General Motors in Anderson. The article went on to say that this man's family's combined General Motors service totals more than 125 years. The place you have to work in has to be good; the people you work for have to be understanding to bring about that kind of continuous loyalty. Things like that don't just happen—they are planned. With C. A. Michel around we will continue doing what it took to get started. From the progress of his past comes the promise of our future.

Last September 6, most of us passed along a reception line at the country club to meet our newest comer. He was introduced to us as Mr. Boyes. It was then like a wedding party during the first passing of champagne. And now, 6 months later, here we are smack dab in the middle of 2 major community problems, the construction of much-needed hospital facilities and a much-needed airport. And who is working at our side? Don Boyes, of course. He is following in the footsteps of his predecessors—he is following the General Motors' policy of good citizenship, that has been so apparent in Anderson for nearly 40 years. As general manager of the Delco division, he shall be our friend and we shall be his friend and accept his counsel. His accomplishments, like those of Mike's, are a symposium of successful engineering— engineering of product and men as well. With Don Boyes around we shall continue doing what it took to get started.

From the progress of his past will come the promise of our future.

George Bernard Shaw once said, "We are made wise not by the recollection of the past, but by the responsibilities of the future."

We are sure, Mr. Skinner, that no good future will come out of cowardice. We expect no cowardice from General Motors. You need expect none from us.

We promise to try to keep General Motors' residence in Anderson clean and in good repair. We promise to keep it well policed and well lighted. We know that youth, bashful or bold, will make us seniors very unnecessary in the future. To this end we dedicate our efforts in behalf of good schools and healthful recreation. We shall try, Mr. Skinner, to make Anderson a place where General Motors can stay and grow, a place to which Detroit may point with pride.

Please convey our sincere felicitations to General Motors on this its golden milestone anniversary. May the good Lord bless you, sir, and all of your associates.

A New World Bank for Backward Areas Makes Sense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THEODORE FRANCIS GREEN
OF RHODE ISLAND
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, March 11, 1958

Mr. GREEN. Mr. President, I present for the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "A New World Bank for Backward Areas Makes Sense," which appeared in the Providence Journal of Saturday, March 8.

This editorial, commending the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY] for his proposal for an international bank which could lend at lower rates and with less security than the present World Bank, I believe will be of interest to the Members of the Senate.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A NEW WORLD BANK FOR BACKWARD AREAS MAKES SENSE

The proposal of Senator MIKE MONRONEY of Oklahoma to establish an international bank which could lend at lower rates and with less security than the present World Bank deserves serious consideration.

Since World War II, the United States has borne the heavy responsibility of financing the needs of both industrially mature and economically backward nations. The Marshall plan met the urgent fiscal and industrial needs of war-battered countries, and it saved vital areas of the free world from Communist penetration.

The Marshall plan well achieved its purpose. But after that objective had been accomplished, other far-flung areas of the world were dependent on American economic aid. Through the years, by outright financial grants, sales of commodities for foreign currencies, and loans made at low interest rates on doubtful security, this country has kept strategic regions of the world in the camp of the free nations.

If Mr. MONRONEY's concept could be translated into concrete action by the United States and the other 59 countries that are members of the World Bank, it might successfully substitute concerted aid to needy areas by 60 nations for their present almost sole dependence on various forms of American financial and economic assistance. Such action might lift a considerable burden from the shoulders of American taxpayers and end a situation wherein recipient nations are self-stigmatized as objects of our charity. They could receive their aid in the form of commercial loans from a firmly established international source.

Some doubt naturally exists as to whether all the member nations of the present World Bank would be able now to furnish their share of the capital of the proposed new institution. In some cases, possibly including even such principal countries as Great Britain, hard currencies are not readily available. They must be conserved for essential national purposes. Presumably this is one of the more difficult problems which Mr. MONRONEY himself has indicated remain to be resolved.

Mr. MONRONEY suggests that this second World Bank should start with a capitalization of a billion dollars. The United States would furnish 30 percent of this amount. The remainder, in varying proportions, would be supplied by the other 59 member countries of the existing World Bank. To serve its intended purpose, loans made by this new institution would bear low interest rates and would be offered on less rigid and secure terms than the charter of the existing World Bank permits.

The proposed new bank, therefore, would not replace the present bank. In some circumstances the new institution would assume entire responsibility for financing the demonstrated needs of an economically backward area. In other circumstances it might supplement an initial loan made by the present World Bank. In such conditions it would function as a sort of second-mortgage institution, assuming all the risks that such financing implies.

The Monroney proposal might relieve this country of a large part, if, indeed, not all, of its present wisely assumed responsibility to furnish foreign aid. Further, it could help in very substantial degree to cover deficits of foreign countries in their trade with us. Last year we sold these countries goods in a total amount that exceeded their combined sales to us by nearly $9 billion.

This immense deficit must be covered by some means. Unless a foreign nation has adequate export credits in its trade with countries other than the United States, it must borrow from some source. The rub comes when a nation, beset by unfavorable internal economic conditions, cannot readily borrow abroad.

The international institution proposed by Mr. Monroney is designed to accommodate such a needy nation. In so doing it would not only serve that nation, but its service would be of inestimable benefit to the rest of the free world, including particularly the United States.

Recession Remedies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MIKE MANSFIELD
OF MONTANA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, March 11, 1958

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, the official unemployment figures for February have just been released. They total 5,173,000, a 16-year high.

It is obvious that the situation calls for action. Fortunately, the congressional leadership has already outlined a program which would make a start toward putting people back to work.

On March 9, the Washington Star, one of our most responsible and respected newspapers, editorialized on the program advanced by Senate Majority Leader LYNDON B. JOHNSON. I ask unanimous consent that this editorial be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Star of March 9, 1958]

RECESSION REMEDIES

The Government is expected to announce on Tuesday that unemployment rose by some 600,000 in February, bringing the jobless total to at least 5.1 million. Percentagewise, this is far below the depression peak. It is the highest unemployment total in 16 years, however, and determined counteraction is clearly indicated.

Presumably, the administration will reveal its program for dealing with the situation within the next few days. Meanwhile, Majority Leader LYNDON JOHNSON has made two recommendations which strike us as being eminently sensible.

One is that every effort be made to accelerate civil and military construction programs for which funds have already been authorized and appropriated. The second is that we begin at once to plan a well-considered program of public works—a program to be brought into play if the recession, or depression, or whatever one may wish to call it, gets worse instead of better.

Senator JOHNSON has not advanced these recommendations in any spirit of panic. Nor, in our opinion, was he motivated by considerations of personal or partisan politics. He was unwilling at this time, for example, to endorse pleas for a tax cut, although there is little doubt that this would be a politically popular thing to do. His objective, apparently, is to initiate a program of action which will help the economy pull out of the prevailing slump, lay a sound foundation for more vigorous action if the economic situation continues to slide, and, meanwhile, to discourage extreme remedies which do not seem justified by the facts available today. All of this strikes us as being a manifestation of constructive opposition leadership in the Senate.

The People Must Speak

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN STENNIS
OF MISSISSIPPI
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, March 11, 1958

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, in a recent issue of the New Age there appeared a Constitutional Day message, entitled "The People Must Speak," by the Honorable Luther A. Smith, sovereign grand commander, Ancient and Accepted Scottish Rite of Freemasonry, Southern Jurisdiction, United States of America.

I think this statement deserves the special attention of the Members of the Congress and the people of the Nation, and I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE GRAND COMMANDER'S MESSAGE

THE PEOPLE MUST SPEAK

We are preparing to celebrated on September 17 the 170th birthday of the Constitution of the United States, which is an appropriate occasion for "We the People" to give serious thought to a grave problem which confronts us, and which we alone can solve satisfactorily. Strangely enough, the problem is a constitutional one. Do I hear the suggestion that such matters are settled only in Washington? Well, that is an erroneous idea. It is quite true that the Capital is full of those who have been selected or elected to look after the interests of the people—the President, the Congress, and the Judiciary and many others—but they are confused and frustrated while the problem gets bigger and bigger. They have lost the way. The ancient landmarks of the Founding Fathers have been removed.

The Constitution was written in the language of the people and they had no trouble in understanding its meaning and needed neither lawyer or judge to explain its provisions. In fact, they did not require the Supreme Court judges to be lawyers. The meaning of the basic law was so obvious

that businessmen, farmers, and merchants could be judges. The Constitution is the people's document, and they know its true meaning and the theory upon which the government was founded. Otherwise, they would never have approved it.

It established an equilibrium of power between the Federal and State Governments, and the formula they used is the sign of the genius of its founders and the secret of its successful operation for a century and a quarter. They were jealous of the rights and privileges of the States and fearful of the power of a central government. They granted to it only such powers as were necessary for it to be a self-respecting, independent nation and to enable it to guarantee free commercial intercourse and communication between the States, also to coin and issue money and grant patents. It was very clearly specified that the powers not specially granted to the Federal Government were retained and held by the States or the people. The central government could not meddle in the domestic affairs of the several States; thus, the individual liberty of the people was secured, which was the primary purpose of the Constitution.

But, largely because of the two world wars, the Federal Government has become a colossus of power and authority over the people, and through gradual encroachments the States are losing to it control over their internal affairs. In many areas of business the Federal Government is competing with its citizens, and its heavy tax assessments are gradually destroying the incentive to private enterprise. Millions of able-bodied citizens possessed of valuable skills are being forced out of business, government, industry, and commerce, and are being supported by funds derived directly or indirectly from taxation. Because of this, irreparable damage is being done to self-respect, thrift, and independence, and therefore to the basic principle of our liberty.

The tentacles of the Federal octopus of power are reaching into the vitals of the American way of life to weaken and perhaps destroy it. The massive force of the people alone can cause a reversal of the vicious trend toward the consolidation of all political and economic power in the government in Washington. But they must speak with a mighty voice calling for a disgorging of the usurped authority by the Federal Government and the restoration of all the old constitutional landmarks and equilibrium of powers fixed by our forefathers. Constitution Day is an auspicious time for the people to make a heroic start. It is their Constitution and the officials in Washington are their servants and will react quickly if they are made to understad that the people mean business. Let the people speak.

LUTHER A. SMITH, 33°,
Sovereign Grand Commander.
SEPTEMBER 1957.

Meader Attacks Rule on Secrets

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM E. PROXMIRE
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, March 11, 1958

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, one of the most dangerous developments of the period after World War II has been the growing secrecy in the conduct of Government. Every one of us knows how the tendency to classify everything forces recourse to new classifications to cover those few items that really must remain secret. But perhaps the most sweeping claim for secrecy in Government yet made was advanced last week by Attorney General Rogers who said before a committee of the Senate that the President can withhold information from Congress whenever he decides the public interest requires it.

This absolute discretion on the part of the President was flatly denied by Representative GEORGE MEADER, Republican, of Michigan, on the floor of the House of Representatives. Mr. MEADER is quite right, in my opinion, in calling the inherent power of executive privilege claimed by the Attorney General a nonexistent, imaginary thing.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, an account of this exchange over a fundamental question which appeared in the Washington Post and Times Herald this morning under the heading "MEADER Attacks Rule on Secrets."

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MEADER ATTACKS RULE ON SECRETS

A Republican Congressman yesterday urged Congress to strike down Attorney General William P. Rogers' assertion that the President can withhold information from Congress whenever he decides the public interest requires it.

Rogers told the Senate Constitutional Rights Subcommittee last week that the President has an inherent power of executive privilege derived from the doctrine of separation of powers. This has been often exercised but never tested in court.

Representative GEORGE MEADER, Republican, of Michigan, like Rogers a former counsel to a Senate investigating committee, told the House Congress would destroy itself if it let the administration get away with the idea that it could tell Congress only what it wished to.

MEADER called executive privilege a "nonexistent, imaginary" thing which appears nowhere in the Constitution, in court decisions, or in law. He conceded there "may be a limit" to the power of Congress to investigate the executive branch. But he isn't prepared to admit it until the courts so rule.

Meanwhile, said MEADER, Congress should show "forbearance" in demanding information in sensitive areas like national security and diplomacy. But Congress should press for information needed to legislate effectively, he said.

If the executive branch can tell Congress only what it wants, said MEADER, the executive will "become the master, not the servant, of the people." He said Rogers' thesis gives the executive power to withhold all information from the elected representatives of the people, or to tell them only that part of the "total picture which the executive wants the public or the Congress to know."

This, said MEADER, permits a "rigged, distorted, slanted" foundation for forming public opinion and gives the executive a "greater power over policymaking than is healthy." It would reduce Congressmen to "figureheads," he said.

Rogers had cited actions of Presidents from Washington on in withholding information as precedents in establishing the principle of executive privilege. That can work both ways, said MEADER. He cited instances where Congress had demanded information from the Executive and got it at the point of a subpena.

MEADER said that while Rogers was counsel to the Senate subcommittee investigating 5 percenters and other matters the subcommittee subpenaed executive branch information and wrote a strong report insisting on the right of Congress to get it.

"Curious things seem to happen to individuals when they move from one end of Pennsylvania Avenue to the other," said MEADER.

Rogers' answer to that last week was that when he was a Senate investigator he had wanted to challenge the executive privilege principle in Court—until he did research on the law and decided he didn't have a leg to stand on.

MEADER told the House he believed Congress could legally enact a law requiring every agency it had created to give Congress every document and bit of information it possessed. This would apply to every executive agency except the Presidency. MEADER said it would apply to the important constitutional powers of the President—such as those to execute the laws, command the Armed Forces, and conduct diplomatic relations.

MEADER also conceded that Congress probably could not overrule a decision of the President within his constitutional area. But there are sound reasons, he said, for Congress to know why and how the decision was reached. "It is difficult to see how mere knowledge of the facts * * * could constitute legislative invasion of the executive power."

The main job of Congress is to form public policy and deal with operating problems of Government, said MEADER. Its capacity to legislate intelligently is undermined to the extent that its power to learn the facts is impaired, he said. "By asserting an executive privilege to deny to Congress facts and information which Congress believes is to attack the legislative power itself."

A bill to knock one prop from under Government secrecy is waiting action on the House floor. It would not touch the inherent power of executive privilege. It says simply that a 1789 Government housekeeping act, often cited by departments in withholding information from the public, does not authorize secrecy.

Morals Along the Potomac

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WAYNE MORSE
OF OREGON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, March 11, 1958

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have published in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Morals Along the Potomac," from the Los Angeles Evening Mirror News.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Los Angeles Evening Mirror News of March 5, 1958]

MORALS ALONG THE POTOMAC

Resignation under fire of FCC Commissioner Richard Mack highlights a condition that infects both political parties in Washington.

Mack happens to be a Florida Democrat appointed by a Republican administration. But the situation for which he has—rightly or wrongly—become a symbol has existed for generations.

And it undermines the whole concept of political morality.

Mack wrote President Eisenhower that his conscience was clear. He said he saw nothing wrong in his actions—which included taking nonrepayable loans and stock interests in business from a politico interested in affairs before Mack for decision.

Under the prevailing code of operating before Federal regulatory commissions, this seems to be accepted practice. Commission members are wined, dined, and gifted by interests with an ax to grind, and apparently it's considered part of the job.

These flexible conscience boys are an old Washington phenomenon. They were the spoilsmen of Andy Jackson's day, and the 5-percenters of a more recent regime.

The public interest takes an awful beating when such amoral types are in positions of power. You can almost imagine a surprised official of the Mack persuasion saying, "Why, what's the public interest?"

The present problem of the regulatory agencies is simple. They can make awards which mean millions of dollars to those who get the awards.

An exclusive right to operate a TV station in a thriving town is worth millions. A franchise to operate an airline on a fat route is also a seven-figure prize.

When such licenses are up for grabs, it's small wonder that members of the awarding commission get the sweetheart treatment from those who want the licenses and franchises.

Is reform possible?

By law, the regulatory agencies perform (or should) quasi-judicial functions. They hear evidence and make awards of licenses (or should) on the basis of merit and the public interest.

Yet these quasi-judges admit accepting loans, gifts, favors, and luxury vacations from those who have matters before the commissions.

Any Federal judge who accepted such cheap windfalls would be instantly disgraced, and rightly so.

The Federal judiciary—praise be—has a tradition of incorruptible integrity.

MATTER OF ETHICS

Legal ethics make it a gross indiscretion for a litigant even to speak to a judge, except in the presence of opposing counsel, while any matter is before the court.

Contrast that with the lack of ethical standards that permits a member of a regulatory commission to become the gift-showered "sweetheart" of anyone seeking an award.

Incidentally, there's also a 15-year prison term, plus a 20,000 fine, waiting for anyone who seeks to influence a Federal judge.

Here's the germ of an idea for reform of the regulatory agencies. If the will is there, Congress could speedily correct this degenerating system, instead of getting periodically indignant when things begin to smell out loud.

Top members of regulatory agencies should be given judicial status, and made subject to the same rigid ethical codes, as Federal judges. (We already have special Federal courts for hearing tariff appeals, with judicial status for the hearing officers.)

Any franchise applicant who attempted the wine-dine-gift routine with a member of the special regulatory judiciary would be subject to the same stern penalties as a litigant who tried to play footsie with a Federal judge.

Such simple legislation would end the recurrent spectacle of venal huckstering in the high places of Government. It is a reform of our quasi-judicial agencies that is long overdue.

Confusion Compounded

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 11, 1958

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, in my extension of remarks, I include an interesting article Confusion Compounded, whitten by Marguerite Higgins, and appearing in the Boston Globe of March 6, 1958.

The closing paragraph of the article is a pointed observation in the form of a question. "Is it too much to ask that the men around the President be as versed in the facts about modern communism as they are about modern Republicanism?"

CONFUSION COMPOUNDED

(By Marguerite Higgins)

WASHINGTON.—Somebody is giving President Eisenhower incredibly bad advice on the state of affairs inside the Soviet Union in at least one crucial matter: The question of who leads Soviet thought and what constitutes an influential Soviet citizen.

So puzzling have been the President's recent pronouncements that it has startled Washington into musing whether the workings of the Soviet system are really comprehended at the top levels of the Government.

This disturbing train of questioning grew out of the President's latest letter to Soviet Prime Minister Bulganin in which Mr. Eisenhower said that cultural exchanges between the East and West should not be limited to scientists and technicians but should also include leaders of thought and influential citizens within the Soviet Union.

Just who are these influential citizens and leaders of thought?

At the State Department which was a logical place to ask the question since Secretary of State Dulles drafted the original of the answer to Bulganin, it was acknowledged that this phrase might possibly be construed as a wedge for an invitation to party boss Nikita S. Khrushchev and Bulganin but that the real targets were secondary figures, such as Soviet deputy premiers or the editor of Pravda.

The puzzle got even more puzzling when President Eisenhower went out of his way in a prepared speech at a foreign-aid rally here last week to say that he had only meant nongovernmental Soviet leaders of thought.

His aim was apparently to dispose of the suspicion that he had meant to invite Messrs. Khrushchev and Bulganin for a private Summit meeting—a meeting sure to create much consternation within the western alliance.

This aim was certainly served but left the question of just whom he did have in mind as murky as ever.

The next day at his press conference, the President stated that "It is possible that my wording was not as accurate as I had hoped."

He went on: "I was talking about leaders of thought, and not through the people carrying official responsibility."

Observers here are wondering precisely which nongovernmental and nonofficial personality in the Soviet Union is in a position to influence thought?

A scientist?

But the President already stated that the influential people he had in mind were to be in addition to scientists and technicians.

The editor of Pravda?

The most famous recent editor of Pravda, the Communist Party newspaper, was Dmitri Shepilov, who later became Soviet foreign minister and even later was booted out of his job for antiparty activities.

Even in his Pravda days, Shepilov wouldn't have qualified as nongovernmental or nonofficial because he was at that time an alternate member of the Communist Party Central Committee and a member of the Supreme Soviet (Parliament).

It is also 99 percent sure that virtually every influential Russian holds some official capacity either in the Soviet government or—far more important and far more influential—in the Soviet Communist Party. That goes for editors, factory managers, poets, even for Galina Ulanova, Russia's magnificent prima ballerina. Miss Ulanova, in addition to being an honored member of the Soviet Communist Party, is a member of the Soviet City Council.

The facts are, of course, that there are simply no nonofficial or nongovernmental leaders of Soviet thought extant behind the Iron Curtain.

So under the President's definition there just aren't any Russians who qualify for such exchange visits.

Is it any wonder then that a western diplomat echoing the talk around town, said last week, "How can a country who understands as little as this about the opponent in this terrible struggle presume to lead the rest of us in dealing with the Russians?"

Men like Khrushchev, Foreign Minister Andrei Gromyko, Anastas Mikoyan are hardened professionals in the deadly game of world politics.

You can bet a ruble that they know precisely who constitutes an influential American citizen. The Russians are nothing if not thorough in sizing up a potential enemy.

Is it really too much to ask that the men around the President be as versed in the facts about modern communism as they are about modern Republicanism?

Two Hundred Eleventh Anniversary of the Birth of Count Casimir Pulaski

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN O. PASTORE
OF RHODE ISLAND
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, March 11, 1958

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the text of the proclamation issued by Gov. Dennis J. Roberts of Rhode Island, in honor of the 211th anniversary of the birth of Count Casimir Pulaski.

There being no objection, the proclamation was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PROCLAMATION: GENERAL PULASKI'S BIRTHDAY ANNIVERSARY

This year marks the 211th anniversary of the birth of Count Casimir Pulaski, one of the patriots a grateful Nation has enshrined in its heart as a selfless man who came from across the seas and aided in the achievement of our independence during the Revolutionary War.

He left his homeland to fight in our cause and who for that cause laid down his life. In the valiant assault upon the city of Savannah at the head of the Pulaski legion of cavalry he received a mortal wound.

He was a distinguished and aristocratic Pole who had achieved the rank of brigadier general before his untimely death at the age of 31 years and he has left to posterity an inspiring example of fidelity to principle which we should cherish and emulate.

And now, therefore, do I, Dennis J. Roberts, Governor of the State of Rhode Island and Providence Plantations, proclaim Tuesday, March 4, 1958, as General Pulaski's Memorial Day, inviting our citizens to attend suitable commemorative ceremonies as a mark of respect to the memory of this father of American cavalry.

In testimony hereof, I have hereunto set my hand and caused the seal of the State to be affixed this 24th day of February, in the year of our Lord 1958, and of independence, the 182d.

DENNIS J. ROBERTS, *Governor.*

By the Governor:

JOHN A. NOTTE, Jr.,
Secretary of State.

Vital Work of the Civic Committee of the People-to-People Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, March 11, 1958

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I send to the desk a summary of the fine work of another of the many committees comprising the people-to-people program.

This particular group is the civic committee, consisting of leading municipal officials and other prominent citizens in numerous American communities which are solidifying their ties with foreign communities.

Hosts at the Washington get-together were many of our top officials. And in turn, host for the District area itself was the able President of the Board of Commissioners, the Honorable Robert McLaughlin, who has always been especially active in contributing to improved international relations, in addition to his fine work on the local scene.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of the release describing the meeting of the civic committee and a list of the participants be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the release and list were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JOINT MEETING, CIVIC COMMITTEE, PEOPLE-TO-PEOPLE PROGRAM, AND COMMITTEE ON INTERNATIONAL COOPERATION, AMERICAN MUNICIPAL ASSOCIATION

WASHINGTON, February 25.—Prominent citizens including mayors and city managers of some 30 municipalities will meet here Thursday and Friday, February 27-28, to discuss the role America's cities can play in the people-to-people program.

The civic committee of the people-to-people program, headed by Mark Bortman, chairman of the Boston National Historic Sites Commission, and the American Municipal Association's Committee on International Municipal Cooperation, headed by Robert E. McLaughlin, President of the Board of Commissioners, District of Columbia, are cooperating in town affiliation activities. This is one of the people-to-people projects designed to bring closer together American communities with cities in other parts of the world.

The forthcoming meetings will be primarily concerned with formal organization and discussion of measures to facilitate and expand action on a municipal level, and program action now underway.

Among the speakers at the sessions in the international conference suite, 1776 Pennsylvania Avenue, will be Commissioner McLaughlin, George V. Allen, Director of the United States Information Agency, and Chief Justice Robert G. Simmons, of the Nebraska Supreme Court. The chief justice will speak on Overall Objectives of the People-to-People Program. Al Capp, chairman of the cartoonist's committee, will speak at a luncheon on Thursday.

Vice President RICHARD M. NIXON will address a luncheon gathering at the Sheraton-Carlton Hotel at 12:15 p. m. Friday.

Among the cities to be represented at the meetings here Thursday and Friday are the following, which are affiliated with cities in other nations:

Coral Gables, Fla.; Cartegena, Colombia; Savannah, Ga.; Guatemala; Montclair, N. J.; Graz, Austria; Western Springs, Ill.; Rugely, England; York, Pa.; Arles, France; Lexington, Ky.; Deauville, France; Dallas, Tex.; Dijon, France; Louisville, Ky.; Montpellier, France; Worthington, Minn.; Crailsheim, Germany; Hagerstown, Md.; Wesel, Germany; Detroit, Mich.; Rotterdam, Holland; Columbus, Ohio; Genoa, Italy; Boston, Mass.; Rome, Italy; San Jose, Calif.; Okayama, Japan; San Francisco, Calif.; Osaka, Japan; San Diego, Calif.; Yokohama, Japan.

AGENDA

February 27

9:30 a. m.: Invocation, the Very Reverend Monsignor Francis J. Lally, editor, The Pilot.

9:35 a. m.: Meeting open, Mark Bortman, chairman, Civic Committee.

9:40 a. m.: Welcome to Washington, the Honorable Robert E. McLaughlin, president, Board of Commissioners, Washington, D. C.

9:50 a. m.: People-to-people film, President Eisenhower.

10:25 a. m.: Overall objectives of the people-to-people program, speech by the chief justice, Supreme Court of Nebraska, the Honorable Robert G. Simmons.

11 a. m.: Forum, Mr. H. Price Webb, director, Department of Adult Education, San Jose, Calif.

1 p. m.: Lunch at the Sheraton-Carlton Hotel.

1:30 p. m.: Speaker, Al Capp, chairman of cartoonists committee.

2 p. m.: Return to international conference suite.

2:15 p. m.: Speech, Ambassador George V. Allen, director, United States Information Agency.

2:35 p. m.: Extent of present international programs carried on at the community level. Open discussion chaired by Mayor Charles Dail, San Diego, Calif., and Mayor Winslow F. Burhans, Hagerstown, Md.

5 p. m.: Session adjourned.

February 28

10 a. m.: Determination of future activities:

1. Program objectives.
2. Structural organization.
3. Financing.

12:15 p. m.: Luncheon at the Sheraton-Carlton Hotel. Address by Vice President of the United States, RICHARD M. NIXON.

2 p. m.: Adjournment.

Following is a list of those who will attend the meetings at the International Conference Suite, 1776 Pennsylvania Avenue:

Edwin H. Armstrong, 1704 North Main Street, Santa Ana, Calif.

Miss Catherine L. Beachley, board of education, Hagerstown, Md.

Daniel Bloomfield, 80 Federal Street, Boston, Mass.

Mark Bortman, 183 Essex Street, Boston, Mass.

James Boyce, Associates for International Research, 8 Eliot Street, Cambridge, Mass.

Frederick W. Brittan, International Latex Corp., Dover, Del.

Dr. George Brodschi, director, international center, University of Louisville, Louisville, Ky.

Joel I. Brooke, Elmo Roper & Associates, 30 Rockefeller Plaza, New York, N. Y.

John D. Brown, City Greeter, City Hall, Boston, Mass.

Mayor Winslow F. Burhans, Hagerstown, Md.

Thomas J. Carty, Stone's Express, 144 Second Street, Cambridge, Mass.

Mrs. Phyllis Case, 225 Bay State Road, Boston, Mass.

Mrs. Theodora Cashel, 1011 Sixth Avenue, Worthington, Minn.

Earle Cocke, Jr., Delta Air Lines, Inc., Atlanta, Ga.

H. Walton Cloke, coordinator of public relations, Daiser Industry, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.

Phillips Davies, Esq., Russ Building, San Francisco, Calif.

Mayor Charles Dail, San Diego, Calif.

Rev. John Vedder Edwards, National Presbyterian Church, Washington, D. C.

Dr. Leon H. Fradkin, 501 Bloomfield Avenue, Montclair, N. J.

Rabbi Moses N. Friedman, 145 West Cottage Place, York, Pa.

Sterling Fisher, director, public relations, Reader's Digest, Pleasantville, N. Y.

Thomas Y. Gorman, WEEI, 182 Tremont Street, Boston, Mass.

H. DeForest Hardinge, Hardinge Co., Inc., 240 Arch Street, York, Pa.

Patrick Healy, Jr., executive director, American Municipal Association, 1624 H Street NW., Washington, D. C.

H. H. Hillyer, president, South Atlantic Gas Co., Savannah, Ga.

Mayor Dale H. Heinly, Santa Ana, Calif.

Mrs. Ellen Harris, Denver, Colo.

Parker James, John Donnely & Sons, 3134 Washington Street, Roxbury, Mass.

Roger Kennedy, Dallas Council on World Affairs, 2419 Maple Avenue, Dallas, Tex.

The Honorable David McKendree Key, 2543 Waterside Drive NW., Washington, D. C.

Miss Margaret Mary Kearney, education director, WCAU, Philadelphia, Pa.

Howard G. Knowlton, 4712 Central Avenue, Western Spring, Ill.

Very Rev. Msgr. Francis Lally, The Pilot, 49 Franklin Street, Boston, Mass.

Harry Lindquist, 153 Waverly Place, New York, N. Y.

Thomas H. D. Mahoney, Ph. D., MIT Department of Humanities, Cambridge, Mass.

J. P. Marto, 30 Federal Street, Boston, Mass.

The Honorable Robert E. McLaughlin, president, Board of Commissioners, Washington, D. C.

William McCahill, President's Committee on Employment of Physically Handicapped, United States Department of Labor, Washington, D. C.

Frederic K. Mann, deputy city representative, Philadelphia, Pa.

Robert McNutt, city manager, Harper Woods, Mich.

Miss Eleanor Mitchell, Corcoran Art Gallery, Washington, D. C.

Frank Maria, 23 Adams Street, Lowell, Mass.

Norris Nash, president, Chamber of Commerce, Oakland, Calif.

Mrs. John E. Peters, 590A Orange Circle, Pasadena, Calif.

Mrs. Mary D. Poag, City Beautiful Commission, Second Avenue South and Lindsley, Nashville, Tenn.

Abe S. Rosen, deputy city representative, Philadelphia, Pa.

Miss Dorothy B. Robins, Associates for International Relations, American Association for University Women, 1634 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.

Russell Riley, Director, International Education Exchange Service, State Department, Washington, D. C.

The Honorable Robert G. Simmons, chief justice, Supreme Court of Nebraska, Lincoln, Nebr.

Mayor Russell Smith, Cambridge, Md.

W. Ivor Smith, Port Angeles, Wash.

Dr. Frank M. Snowden, Jr., Howard University, Washington, D. C.

Delmar G. Starkey, general manager, Chamber of Commerce, Columbus, Ohio.

Mrs. Ruth E. Stevens, Office of International Relations, Detroit, Mich.

Mrs. O. J. Sharp, vice president, International Friendship Council, Fresno, Calif.

Woodrow M. Strickler, vice president, University of Louisville, Louisville, Ky.

Mayor Fred A. Schiding, York, Pa.

Charles L. Todd, International Advisory Council, Inc., 45 East 65th Street, New York, N. Y.

Mrs. Muriel Tolle, chairman, San Diego-Yokohama Friendship Committee, San Diego, Calif.

Alderman Martin Schreiber, president, Common Council, City of Milwaukee, Milwaukee, Wis.

Miss Jennie Vimmerstedt, Jamestown Post Journal, Jamestown, N. Y.

John A. Volpe, 54 Eastern Avenue, Malden, Mass.

Charles H. Williston, president, Rosenheim Club, Port Angeles, Wash.

Mayor Ben West, Nashville, Tenn.

Mrs. Carla Williams, 1625 I Street, NW., Washington, D. C.

Mrs. Lyman Wagers, care of office of the mayor, Lexington, Ky.

H. Price Webb, department of adult education, San Jose, Calif.

Ira F. Willard, city manager, city hall, Coral Gables, Fla.

New Library at University of North Dakota

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM LANGER

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, March 11, 1958

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD three articles printed on the front page of the Grand Forks Herald of Grand Forks, N. Dak., relating to a million-dollar donation for the university library by the Honorable Chester Fritz. This contribution is considered the largest ever made to the university by a single donor.

As the senior Senator from the State of North Dakota, I am extremely gratified that an alumnus of the University of North Dakota made such a significant contribution and I know that all of the people of the State of North Dakota are most gratified by this event.

Also, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, the article in last Friday's Post by Mr. George E. Sokolsky concerning this gift.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Grand Forks (N. Dak.) Herald of February 15, 1958]

GIFT SAID LARGEST IN STATE—CHESTER FRITZ DONATION IS FOR BUILDING ONLY

A gift of $1 million for a new library building at the University of North Dakota was announced today.

Chester Fritz, international investment banker and former student at the university provided the gift, Dr. George W. Starcher, president of UND, announced.

Starcher said construction of the building will begin next year, with completion set for 1961. The new library will be built on a site between the present library and the law building.

GIFT CALLED LARGEST

"This is one of the greatest things that has happened to the university in its 75-year history," Dr. Starcher said.

The gift is the largest private contribution ever made to an institution of higher education in North Dakota. It was made, Fritz said, in appreciation of what my native State of North Dakota did in furnishing the foundations of my academic education.

The State Board of Higher Education accepted the gift with sincere thanks at its meeting here today. It formally designated the projected building as "the Chester Fritz Library."

PLANNING TO START

Inasmuch as the planning of the library will start this year, the university's diamond anniversary year, Starcher said the structure will long be remembered as "the diamond setting" in the anniversary.

He said the building will be modified Tudor Gothic, in keeping with the university's dominant architectural style, setting a peak of excellence for planning further expansion of the campus.

Fritz specified that the entire million dollar gift be used for the library building itself.

BUILDING GIFT SPECIFIED

"I realize that a university library must also have the necessary books and other facilities for scholarship and research, as well as a functionally planned building, yet my contribution is for the building," Fritz wrote in a letter to Dr. Starcher.

"It is my hope, however, that the State legislature, alumni and other friends of the university will provide sufficient funds to keep the library well stocked with new-book acquisitions, including rare and unusual books of special significance to North Dakota, and with the most pertinent periodicals for the various schools and colleges of the university.

"It is also my hope that these expanded library services will be a help to the State of North Dakota in carrying its share of our recently recognized world responsibilities," Fritz added.

CASH AND SECURITIES

Fritz specified that he would make the gift in cash and securities salable on the New York and/or Canadian stock markets.

In his letter to Dr. Starcher, Fritz said the offer was made in recognition of the important and growing service of the university to the entire State and in the hope that it will enlarge the educational opportunities and the cultural horizons of generations of subsequent students at my alma mater.

"An adequate library tends to raise the level of total scholarship of a university and adds immeasurably to the greatness of the university," he added.

STARCHER AGREES

President Starcher expressed agreement with Fritz' views and said, "The library is the intellectual center of the campus and gives a university much of its claim to distinction.

"The completion of the library will raise the University of North Dakota to a new height of academic prestige among the educational institutions of the Nation."

In a letter of appreciation to Fritz, Starcher said the library "will become a monument to your ideals—not a cold, silent memorial, but a living, growing fountain of knowledge, wisdom and inspiration, made possible by your self-denial, hard work and foresight.

"A realization of the endless service perpetuated through your generosity must be a source of continuous personal satisfaction for you. The Chester Fritz Library will stand for years to come as a guide to the objectives you have always believed in."

GOVERNOR DAVIS HAILS GIFT BY FRITZ

Gov. John E. Davis joined university and board of higher education officials today in hailing the million-dollar gift of Chester Fritz for a new library at the University of North Dakota.

"It is wonderful to learn of this interest in the university of a former student who has made a success of his business ventures and is now sharing part of it with our great university," Davis said. "It is extremely gratifying to know that an alumnus is so interested in the future development of the university that he is making this cultural opportunity available to future citizens of our State. This library will be a lasting tribute to his loyalty to both the university and the State."

Other statements of appreciation:

J. Lloyd Stone, university alumni director: "Many loyal alumni have often mentioned that they feel under obligation to the university for the education they received here. Surely the new Chester Fritz Library will stand as a memorial to one who has paid his debt in measure overflowing so that students in years to come might enjoy finer educational opportunities. This gift will serve as a challenge and an inspiration to alumni in future years."

Durward Balch, Minneapolis, president of the alumni association board of directors: "This gift to build the Chester Fritz Library is deeply appreciated by all of us interested in the university. It is the largest contribution from an alumnus to date, and * * * it is also a recognition that the University of North Dakota is one of this country's fine universities."

Dr. George W. Starcher, University of North Dakota president: "Its exhilarating influence will raise the sights of all of us at the university."

FRITZ LONGTIME SUPPORTER OF UNIVERSITY

Chester Fritz, whose gift of $1 million for a new library building at the University of North Dakota was announced today, has long been a supporter of the university.

Since December 1956, he has contributed more than $100,000 for scholarships. Before that he had contributed approximately $32,000 for other university projects.

The Chester Fritz Scholarship Fund, established in 1956, provides for a gift of $5,000 yearly in perpetuity, providing 6 annual scholarships, with preference given to North Dakota residents.

Born in Buxton, N. Dak., Fritz began his education in a one-room rural school in Traill County. He continued his grade schooling in Fargo and graduated from high school in Lidgerwood in 1908. He then entered the university, studying there for 2 years and completing his work for a baccalaureate degree at the University of Washington.

After graduating from college, Fritz took a position with an American industrial firm, whose business extended across the Pacific, and in 1915 he made his first voyage to the Orient.

Since then he has traveled around the world many times. For 34 years he had headquarters in China. During World War II, when the Japanese moved into China, he was interned in Shanghai and repatriated in 1943.

Since 1928 he has been a member of an investment banking firm having offices in both hemispheres. He and Mrs. Fritz now live in Italy, but he considers North Dakota his home State.

In 1951 the university conferred on Fritz the honorary degree of doctor of laws, in recognition of his special merits as a businessman of personal and professional integrity and for his contribution to international understanding.

He was awarded the University of North Dakota Alumni Association distinguished service citation in June 1957.

[From the Washington Post and Times Herald of March 7, 1958]

THESE DAYS

(By George E. Sokolsky)

AN AMERICAN ABROAD

An item of news will on occasion arouse nostalgic memories of exciting days decades ago. So it was when I read in the Grand Forks Herald that Chester Fritz has given a million dollars to the University of North Dakota for a library. The newspaper account said that this large sum was given "in appreciation of what my native State of North Dakota did in furnishing the foundations of my academic education."

I recall almost to the day when I first met Chester Fritz. He had come to China some years before as a flour salesman for a west-coast firm, but he became interested in foreign exchange and was working for the American Metals Co. This was more than 30 years ago.

Foreign exchange is one of the most interesting and most complicated of human occupations. It is only for professionals; the amateur can sometimes win if he has a stroke of luck, and luck comes only once. To succeed in maintaining a position in foreign exchange one must know about everything that is going on in the world. An error of judgment as to what is likely to occur in 30 days or 90 days can wipe out a fortune. When the world is normal, all export and import houses, all banks, and even governments, engage in foreign exchange because of the phenomenon that currencies do not always have the same value. The buyer and seller of goods in some other country tries to protect himself against loss through exchange fluctuations. Sometimes such fluctuations can be sufficient to wipe out a profit altogether.

So, Chester Fritz, born in Buxton, N. Dak., graduate of the University of Washington, found himself in China in 1924, forced by his job to learn foreign exchange and becoming one of the masters in this field. In due course, he and some Shanghai friends organized the firm of Swan, Culbertson and Fritz. The three partners were very young, very enthusiastic and set out to compete with the large British banking houses then existent in Shanghai. It was not long before they had created an altogether new field of endeavor, arising out of unsettled conditions in China, namely, that rich Chinese were purchasing, through them, huge quantities of American securities and American currency as a means of protecting themselves against an inevitable future.

After an internment during World War II by the Japanese, Fritz began his world travels, searching out all the odd and end spots to make sure that he missed nothing. He finally settled in Rome, returning to the United States at intervals.

I once asked Chester Fritz what he would do with his money. He told me he would leave it all to his native State. He was not married then and I said to myself that someday he would have a family and then he would change his mind. Fritz is married now, but apparently he has not changed his mind.

In many ways, the Horatio Alger story never dies. Chester Fritz, the boy, could not imagine $1 million. Chester Fritz, the man, gives such a sum to a university at which he studied for only 2 years. Here is a success story that is worthy of note in these days when young men seek a security guaranteed by law. Fritz never had any kind of security in his life, every moment of which has been a gamble against historic forces.

Self-effacing, shy, in many ways lonely, Chester Fritz, like the Chinese among whom he lived so long, has built himself a memorial while he still lives.

A Bill To Permit a Child To Continue To Receive Social Security Benefits After Age 18, in Order To Continue His Education

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL A. FINO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 11, 1958

Mr. FINO. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing a bill to allow a child to continue to receive social security benefits after reaching the age of 18 in order that he may continue his education. The 1939 amendments established the important concept that the child of an insured individual who dies or retires is entitled to receive a benefit. The benefit, however, stops at age 18 on the assumption that the child is no longer dependent on his parents at that age.

In the 1956 amendments to the Social Security Act, the Congress recognized that dependency does not necessarily cease at 18 when it provided for the continuation of such benefits after that age in the case of a permanently disabled child who could not be expected to find work. My bill is further recognition of the fact that an arbitrary age line does not meet the needs of modern society. It is clearly in the national interest to provide incentives for our children to continue their education beyond high school. The truth of the matter is that dependency and school attendance go hand in hand.

I therefore propose to continue the social-security benefit in the case of a child who is going to school.

Mr. Speaker, recent events in the field of space satellites and guided missiles, as well as in other fields of scientific progress, have awakened us in the United States to the need for increasing and improving the education of our youth, if we are to maintain our technological and cultural position in the world of the future.

The United States Office of Education stated in a recent publication that "Thousands of America's best young minds—potential scientists, teachers, and leaders in many fields—are foreclosed from college training each year." A study conducted by the educational testing service of Princeton, N. J., indicates that approximately one-half of the top 30 percent of the Nation's high-school graduates do not go to college. Unfortunately, this group includes between 60,000 and 100,000 highly able secondary school graduates with aptitude and interest for college who fail to continue their education solely for financial reasons.

In my own State of New York nearly 22,000 high-school graduates in the upper half of their class failed to go to college in 1953, nearly one-half of whom indicated a desire to go to college.

Mr. Speaker, there are a number of bills now pending before Congress directed toward finding a solution to this difficult problem. My bill, being of somewhat limited scope, is, of course, not intended to supply the answers to the many questions which will be raised by the challenge to our educational system. I believe that it is, however, one simple and logical step toward the solution we are seeking.

Aside from the bearing which the issues of national security may have upon it, I believe that this legislation is justified on its own merits. For we have already approved similar provisions in prior veterans' legislation concerning the benefits of the children of veterans. These provisions are now contained in section 101 of the Veterans' Benefit Act of 1957, under which the child of a veteran may continue to receive benefits after reaching 18 if he is pursuing a course of instruction at an approved educational institution.

An analogy may also be drawn from the definition of a dependent in section 151 (e) of the Internal Revenue Code, under which a taxpayer may claim a child as an exemption if he is 18 years old or younger, or if he is a student, regardless of the income of the child.

Mr. Speaker, the estimated cost of my bill is negligible, being slightly more than one-twentieth of 1 percent of payroll. The bill also contains safeguards against abuse by requiring that a school be properly accredited and by directing that regulations be prescribed to assure regular attendance by the student.

Standing alone, the proposal certainly would not supply any young person with sufficient funds to acquire an education. But it might decide the fate of a great number of youngsters in cases where it would supplement the resources of those who, without it, could not afford to continue their schooling beyond the age of 18.

Improved Methods of Stating Budget Estimates

SPEECH

OF

HON. ALBERT P. MORANO

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 5, 1958

Mr. MORANO. Mr. Speaker, I have always been a firm supporter and ad-

vocate of the recommendations of the Hoover Commission.

I believe the legislation now before us is an integral part of the distinguished Commission's recommendations for effecting economy and efficiency in our Government operations.

Regardless of what criticism may be offered, the bill as amended, will at least offer an opportunity to explore an area where some savings can be made.

Actually, the legislation does not limit the power of Congress in the matter of appropriations. It will give both the Congress and the executive branch improved control by requiring that the budget include a limitation on annual accrued expenditures.

I do not believe that any of us in this Chamber have been spared demands of taxpayers for a more business-like system of apportioning and spending their tax dollars.

The legislation which is to be considered—with the Wigglesworth amendment—will do much toward providing the taxpayer with the assurance that he is getting an honest dollar's worth for his tax dollar.

I shall support H. R. 8002 as amended in the interest of improved fiscal procedures in Government and in the interest of efficiency and economy.

The Pacific Northwest and American History

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD L. NEUBERGER

OF OREGON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, March 11, 1958

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, few realms in our country have a more vivid or illustrious historic background than the Pacific Northwest. For this reason, many residents of my native State of Oregon were disturbed when the noted historian and editor of American Heritage magazine, Mr. Bruce Catton, wrote an article for This Week magazine which listed 30 places where American history was made, but mentioned not one place in the Pacific Northwest.

This neglect of a great historic region profoundly disturbed a distinguished Portland physician, Dr. E. G. Chuinard. Dr. Chuinard addressed to Mr. Catton a humorous, but pointed letter, of protest, which has been made the subject of a pertinent and lively editorial in the Oregon Daily Journal of Portland of March 3, 1958.

I believe that many of my colleagues will be interested in reading this editorial, because it is my recollection that last year some of my colleagues from intermountain States were disturbed by so-called snub in Harper's magazine. Now we of the Pacific Northwest are disturbed similarly by a snub by Bruce Catton.

Because Mr. Catton is one of the wisest and most eminent of American historians, it is my hope that he will think twice of his omission and that his next list of 30 places where American history was made will include at least 10 or 15 localities in the region of Lewis and Clark, the Astor Party, the Pacific Fur Co., Fort Clatsop, Fort Vancouver, Champoeg, Wallowa Lake, and much other hallowed ground.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CHALLENGE TO MR. CATTON

President Polk evidently made a grievous error in jettisoning the campaign slogan of Fifty-Four-Forty or Fight which helped to elect him.

If he had not succumbed in 1846 to the lure of a peaceful settlement of the controversy with Britain over the boundary between the Oregon country and Canada, what a nice bloody war might have resulted. And how the historians—back East—would relish including in their ponderous volumes the story of the Battle of Juan de Fuca Straits or perhaps even the Battle of Fort Vancouver. And nowadays they would be recommending that easterners visit the spot where Gen. Winfield Scott or Gen. Zachary Taylor, later to be heroes of the Mexican War, had defeated the British regiments which had challenged the impudent Yankee battle cry. Yes, evidently it was a serious error of judgment that caused Polk to forget a third war with the hated British.

At least that seems to be the tongue-in-cheek viewpoint of Dr. E. G. Chuinard, loyal Portlander, who buckled on his armor to battle Bruce Catton, Pulitzer prize-winning historian of the Civil War and editor of American Heritage magazine. This Week magazine, distributed in the Journal's issue of February 16, included an article, See America With Bruce Catton's Lifetime Travel Plan, with the subhead, "Thirty Places Where American History Was Made—How Many Have You Seen"?

In a letter to Catton, the doughty physician wrote: "In the 30 places listed in your article, you mentioned not one place in the Northwest.

"Granted that these places, like San Francisco, are interesting but they have little American historical import in comparison with Fort Clatsop and Champoeg, Oreg. The historical significance of these latter places is that they helped hold an area for the United States that is larger than all of New England, and helped hold the Columbia River, whose potential permanent wealth far exceeds that of the Comstock lode and the gold of Sutter's Fort."

But the valiant physician doesn't stop there:

"You might be interested to know that the plat for the city of San Francisco, which rates among your 30, is in the courthouse at Oregon City, Oreg.—because at the time of granting the charter the only United States district courthouse on the Pacific coast was at Oregon City; here was the only organized seat of government west of the Rockies.

"Perhaps this great Northwest has missed its due recognition because it was secured for the United States so peaceably; Champoeg lacks the glitter of the Alamo."

Oregon is accustomed to eastern historians' snubs. Nor is this the first time that Catton, eminent historian that he is, has ignored Oregon's contributions to national history. In his superb (except for the blank spot on Oregon) American heritage Book of Great Historic Places, issued in 1957, the Pacific Northwest is left to the concluding chapter.

The sting that any Northwesterner must feel is not alleviated by the handsome color plates of the section dealing with the great trails, which does a rather satisfactory job of the Lewis and Clark Expedition. However, on the accompanying map, Portland and Astoria are the sole cities named in Oregon. There is no Fort Clatsop, where Lewis and Clark spent a long winter planning their return with word to President Jefferson they had mapped half a continent. Fort Vancouver is not even listed, although the Federal Government is now making tardy amends for its neglect of Dr. McLoughlin's headquarters.

In an agate-type directory of Oregon's historical spots, Champoeg is mentioned as on the site of the first settlement in the Willamette Valley, south of Portland. Of the supremely significant action taken at Champoeg on May 2, 1843, which established the first American civil government west of the Rockies, the book is silent.

Dr. Chuinard, after extending my sincere regards (to Catton) for what you have done to spur Americans intests in America, continues in this vein:-

"Not one place in the Northwest mentioned (in This Week) 1959 is Oregon's centennial; that would be a good time for you to become acquainted with us in the Northwest, and our history and scenery. We'd like to have you come; I'll wager that, hereafter, you'd include the Northwest in your articles of history."

Hurray for the belligerent doctor. If more Oregon people follow his lead, the sooner justice will be done the proud and significant events in national history that occurred in the Northwest.

The Great Contributions of the Order of DeMolay

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, March 11, 1958

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I was pleased to read in the newspapers of my State that the governing council of one of the very fine youth organizations in our land had met in Milwaukee, Wisconsin's largest city, to program further fine efforts on behalf of the Nation's young men.

I refer to a meeting of the Order of DeMolay, which took place at the Scottish Rite Cathedral, in Milwaukee, and which heard from Mr. Frank S. Land, founder and secretary general of this splendid organization.

The sessions heard, as well, from Mr. Walter O. Helwig, Wisconsin executive officer for the DeMolay, and from George M. Saunders, grand master.

Out of the inspirational training programs of DeMolay have come innumerable young Americans who have demonstrated the value of DeMolay leadership. They include 7 State governors and 10 generals.

I salute all those adults and young men in the Masonic brotherhood who, since 1919, have contributed to this organization.

I send to the desk two brief articles from last week's Milwaukee Journal which describe the meeting in Milwaukee, and ask unanimous consent that

they be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PARLEY HELD BY DEMOLAY—LEADERSHIP IS TOPIC

The big problem in youth organizations today is to enlist adult leadership, the founder of the Order of DeMolay said here Thursday.

Frank S. Land, Kansas City, Mo., who founded the Masonic group for boys in 1919 and has been secretary general since, addressed the opening session of a 3-day meeting of the organization's governing council at the Scottish Rite Cathedral, 790 North Van Buren Street.

Land said youth organizations did not have trouble attracting members if they had a strong organization of adult leaders.

Many former DeMolays, he said, are in positions of influence today. They include 7 State governors and 10 generals. He said the organization, with chapters in every State and many foreign countries, was expanding greatly.

Friday's program was to include a speech by George M. Saunders, grand master.

The governing council of 150 is expected to be expanded to 200 Saturday. New officials also will be elected.

The council is composed of adults. Several hundred boys, including 22 State master counselors, are attending the meeting as observers.

HEAD ELECTED GRAND MASTER BY DEMOLAY

Clarence W. Head, of Pittsburgh, Saturday was elected grand master of the Order of DeMolay at the closing session of the order's governing council meeting. The council wound up a 3-day meeting Saturday at the Scottish Rite Cathedral, 790 North Van Buren Street. Head, assistant treasurer of the Aluminum Company of America, succeeds George M. Saunders, of Chicago.

Frank S. Land, founder and secretary general of DeMolay, announced election of five new members to the order's governing body. They are Sherman Adams, assistant to President Eisenhower; John G. Diefenbaker, Canadian Prime Minister; Robert W. Moore, Salt Lake City, Utah, a manufacturing company sales representative; Russel E. Hopgood, Jackson, Miss., clerk of the Mississippi court of appeals, and Senator FRANK CARLSON, Republican of Kansas.

Five DeMolays who risked their lives in water and fire rescues last year were given medals of valor. They are David B. Gaudes, 16, Manchester, N. H.; David G. Sherwood, 16, Canon City, Colo.; Bessie C. Browning, 18, of Brownwood, Tex.; Newton Saarinen, 19, Maynard, Mass., and Scott E. Streator, 16, Winona, Minn.

Next year's council meeting will be held in Kansas City, Mo.

Hard Swiss Learning

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WINT SMITH
OF KANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 11, 1958

Mr. SMITH of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, the Omaha World Herald is one of the great newspapers of America. It still carries the torch for the fundamentals that made America great. Recently it published an editorial that has a down-to-earth philosophy in regard to a new look at our educational problems. It is self-evident that the social engineers and progressive planners of education will find little in this editorial that conforms to their ideals of the new welfare state.

HARD SWISS LEARNING

Admiral Hyman Rickover and others who have spoken favorably of the European educational methods used in Soviet Russia's schools have received considerable criticism. It has been easy for defenders of soft, effortless education to evade the argument and switch the discussion to the horrors of communism.

But how does this same hard learning work in other countries? In Switzerland, for instance, which is certainly a democratic country, strongly anti-Communist, sternly neutral in its dealing with all foreign governments?

Dr. Harold L. Clapp of Grinnell College writes in the quarterly review, Modern Age, about his firsthand knowledge of Swiss education. He and his family spent a year in Geneva and two of his children attended a grassroots, smalltown public school.

The Swiss, Dr. Clapp says, waste no time in idle chatter about education for a democratic society. They discipline the mind, and the disciplined mind takes care of the democracy.

Even a first grader keeps a separate notebook for each subject, makes all the entries himself—in ink. The same kind of neatness applies to what goes into the mind as well, says Dr. Clapp. No sleazy grammar is permitted. Materials are organized. Expression is precise.

In what corresponds to our third grade, geometry is introduced. They call it geometry, too, says Dr. Clapp, not block play or shapey-wapey. Vocabulary and spelling come under logical subject headings. Each year under each heading they add more grownup words until in sixth grade the young Swiss is expected to have a vocabulary of 7,000 words and be able to define such terms as despotism, autonomy, and protectorate.

Ten-year-old fifth graders read Moliere, Flaubert, Maupassant, Gide, and Giono which, says the Grinnell professor, would be a little like expecting American youngsters of that age to read selections from Shakespeare, Thackeray, Dickens, Henry James, and Steinbeck instead of Dick and Jane.

"Not too long ago," Dr. Clapp recalls, "this kind of fare was standard procedure in our schools. I dare you to test your little fourth grader Willie on an old fourth-grade McGuffey or Appleton reader."

In Switzerland there is a definite program for stretching young minds and for straining after literature at a tender age. The idea is that words give power and the more words a youngster knows the more he can accomplish.

Swiss arithmetic is also tough. Sample fifth-grade problems: It takes 384 square centimeters of paper to cover a cube. What is the volume of this cube?

This businesslike education trains a truly liberal Swiss people. Their youngsters don't emerge as regimented neurotics, says Dr. Clapp, but as tough-minded, tough-bodied, rosy-cheeked and relatively happy citizens. The young Swiss grownup is a man or woman who values freedom, knows how to run a representative government, and lives a full and happy life without ever spending a single minute of school time on life adjustment.

Dr. Clapp does not suggest that America should swallow the Swiss system whole, but only that we should learn something from it. For unless we strengthen our school programs promptly and mightily our children are going to be hopelessly outclassed in the forums and market places of the world.

We think there is wisdom in those words.

The Forward Look—An Address Delivered by George W. Lee, Grand Commissioner of Education, Before Elks Midwinter Conference in Philadelphia, January 30, 1958

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. B. CARROLL REECE
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 11, 1958

Mr. REECE of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, Lt. George W. Lee, Memphis, Tenn., who is grand commissioner of education, Improved Benevolent Order of Elks of the World, delivered an address before the midwinter conference of the Elks in Philadelphia, January 30, 1958, which attracted much favorable attention, and in order that it might be more widely available I am inserting it in the RECORD. The work of Lieutenant Lee in business, civic, religious, and political life, has been an inspiration to the young people who have followed his distinguished career. He has made many contributions toward better citizenship and greater understanding among our people.

The grand exalted ruler, officers, and members of Elkdom assembled, in taking a retrospect and a view of the American scene, I would suppose the ultimate purpose of education in a democracy is the development of a common heritage and a common citizenship. I am further convinced that such an unity of educational purpose must be established if our democratic processes are to expand. In this illimitible common ground, social, and racial differences will tend to disappear when equal opportunity is made available to all: and an inspiring and dynamic democracy will constitute the divine fire that will illuminate our presently fearful future.

In order to understand the supreme importance of a common heritage and a common democratic citizenship we must examine the composition of our American citizenship. About two-thirds of our people are of British descent and our civilization in its essence is profoundly influenced by its English part. Yet we must realize that a third of our population is not of British descent but stems from Oriental, African, and Latin inheritances. While the United States fortunately presents no cultural conflict like that in Canada or in Belgium, nevertheless tensions exist, and the word minorities have crept into general usage—a nonmeaning, nonexistent term in the United States of 75 years ago. To make possible the fading away of these conflicting and dangerous tendencies I lay great stress on the development of an expanding democratic citizenship.

To our public school systems and to our colleges and universities must we look for the creation of our essential national unity and harmony. To these cultural bodies in the years to come must be entrusted the intellectual and social materials out of which a democratic way of life may come into being—a way of kindly yet vigorous life against which the marshaled forces of communism cannot prevail. But are these institutions developed and ready to assure national leadership in the creation of a democratic citizenship—a citizenship that must justify itself in its beliefs and attitudes to a neutral world of more than a billion people subject to the tremendous firepower of Communist propaganda?

Let us then examine our public school system and make an effort to assess its present values. For that system has a vital responsibility in preparing us to live in a world in which Russia is so successfully powerful.

Our secondary school system is not as effective on educating instrumentality as we are led to believe. Our pride in our free democratic public school system has tended to blind us to its obvious defects. And moreover, we must note the term, our free public school system, has one meaning in a wealthy eastern suburb and a very different one in a southern backwood rural community.

Speaking generally—New England and New York-New Jersey areas have a marvelous group of private secondary schools; whose traditions are of the finest and whose cultural influence on its student body is unchallenged. But these schools as a rule are open only to the very wealthy.

Elsewhere in the United States our school system offer remarkable diversities, middle and upper middle class suburban schools are often excellent, and, in small cities with a strong educational tradition, and a relatively homogenius school population standards are unusually high. In the large cities, however, imperiling diversities show up. In an upper class neighborhood the schools are usually satisfactory but in such areas you find the public school at its worst.

Contrary to the general impression over public school system for the past 40 years has been continuously lowering its scholastic standards. The stern intellectual disciplines of Latin, Greek, algebra, geometry, and trigonometry are now rarely met. Nor is physics, chemistry nor biology seriously taught, but the cinch courses such as the domestic sciences, the manual arts, music, dancing, the orchestra, the band are all credit-giving, time-consuming, intellectually bankrupting courses. Now I don't mean that in a secondary school curriculum that there is not a place for such subject matter—what I do mean is that these cinch subjects should not be permitted to eliminate the important mathematic, scientific, and language disciples.

Then again there is the question of the quality of teaching. For more than a half-century the abler university graduate has gone into the professions or into business, the less ambitious into teaching. Salaries have not proven too attractive, yet many seem to be in this profession for money only. And then there are proportionately far fewer dedicated persons in the teaching profession than let us say 60 years ago.

The profession itself is unscholarly. A profound scholarship based upon reading into one's special field year in and out is not now too often found at least in the public school system. And then, too, the number of subjects taught by those who have no special knowledge is of everyday observation. And finally many in what should be a dedicated profession teachers often ape the habits and sometimes the dissipations of the well-off middle classes whose mode of life they can never hope to attain. But we who stake our whole future on democratic progress must solve both the scholastic and the economic problems of the teacher whose determined leadership can guarantee a successful democratic approach to our serious but conquerable problems.

Our universities present a similar picture, a few excellent colleges with high academic standards, the remainder from good to impossible. In these institutions the lowering standards of admission in conjunction with the elective system has reduced us to our inferior position. University education is not pursued seriously enough in the United States today.

Now the Negro anxiously desires the best possible education. Yet in our democracy even he is denied the best and most often must accept the worst. In the South the whole process of Negro education is regarded as an undesirable happening.

Our Elks department of education demands the best in education both in the public school system and in our colleges. We are demanding stiffer standards; we are asking for better equipped teachers; and we shall insist that the stigma of segregation become only a memory.

But with these demands upon our fellow citizens we do not stop, we could not if we would. Because the world of Africa is explosive, dynamic, shaking off centuries of sleep. The commonwealth of Ghana is a Negro state, its head, Dr. Nacrumka, is a world statesman, a man whom Queen Elizabeth of England would gladly receive with the other Empire statesmen at Buckingham Palace. Now, in Africa we Elks have a God-given opportunity to ally these developing colored states into our democratic orbit by extending to them our opportunities. I suggest scholarships be granted in American institutions of higher learning in order that we may attract through the influence of the graduates whom we have sponsored the loyalties of these great people to our democratic institutions. We must not forget that our 200 million African brothers should share in the blessings that a Washington, a Lincoln, and an Eisenhower, through their unshakable trust in human goodness have made avialable to us.

In the United States I am urging a physiological approach to civics rather than the anatomical approach as has been our educational policy over the years. Let our public schools set a shining example of racial and social collaboration—let us encourage the hope that anthropological differences in color and physiological variations in attitudes can all be resolved in the brilliant sunshine of a democratic tomorrow.

A common citizenship is the rock foundation on which we must build. In that common citizenship differences based on color, class, or caste must disappear. In that common citizenship the great democratic hopes of the past 150 years must be realized and accomplished. In establishing this common citizenship we are keeping the faith with the scores of great Americans and Europeans who have devoted their lives to the cause of freedom; a Lincoln, a Gladstone, a Douglass, a Finley Wilson flash to my mind among so many heroes of democracy.

And now with the Russian Communist fiend endeavoring by threats, through propaganda and by brainwashing to capture the yellow and black worlds for boshevism—we in the United States must move forward into this breech by demonstrating in our numerical life the strength of democratic idealism.

Our program for 1958 calls for a tightening up of our high-school curriculum, which will bring about special emphasis on a course in human relationships that will enable young Americans to create those great bridges over which they must cross in order to reconcile and to adjust divergencies in race and religion and in the neighborhood atmosphere.

Our objectives are to help remove all barriers in education through the development of a huge scholarship fund for the purpose of extending aid to children of all races, who suffer from race, tradition, poverty. In a day like this, it is highly important that young Americans, who are eager and willing to learn, be recognized and rewarded.

Today we know that human talents essential to the advancement of man are not restricted to race or country. In every race there are young men and women of great ability who, when given the opportunity for education, can help further the advancement of knowledge and contribute to the progress of our great country.

Young men and women, whether they be Jews, Negroes, Catholics, Irish, English, or Italians, have within themselves the potentialities to rise from the dust of the day's long road to the pinnacle of a laughing star.

The country faces a severe shortage of engineers and technically trained personnel, while on the other hand it is predicted that in the decade from 1950 to 1960, the Soviet Union will graduate 1,200,000 scientists, compared to 900,000 in the United States. Unless we remove all barriers in education, Russian scientific manpower might well outnumber ours in many key areas. We cannot afford at this time to set up barriers that will discourage young people who might become scientists when Russia is extolling the scholars and the scientists and devoting its financial strength for scholarship aid. The genius children of our community must not be lost as casualties in the battle of race and tradition or in the blight of poverty.

In the past, our department has played its own particular and peculiar role, to stimulate a deep and widespread spirit of American democracy.

In 1955 our department fought to keep the light of freedom burning by presenting scholarships to Ethel Louise Belton, Spockwood T. Bolden, Jr., Dorothy Davis, Linda Brown, and Harry Briggs, Jr., the children who were named as chief plaintiffs in the long legal drama that led to the Supreme Courts' decision outlawing segregation in the public schools of the Nation.

In 1956, our Department moved into Clinton, Tenn., to give emotional strength to the mothers of those 12 schoolchildren who braved the dangers of mob violence and showed up for rollcall at the first integrated school in that State. The young leader of that group, Bobby Cain, is now attending A & I State University, on an Elks scholarship. In the same year, our department moved into Mississippi, where 500 students rose in revolt against fascism and Uncle Tomism and young Ernest McEwen, their leader, is now in the University of Michigan on an Elks' scholarship.

A part of our 1958 scholarship program for heroes will include the nine brave children, who stand today on the rock as heroic figures, armed with the unquenchable faith in God and man that all people wish to be free and will struggle against odds to win freedom.

The grand exalted ruler, Robert H. Johnson, has commissioned Lionel Hampton, famous band leader, chairman of the Elks scholarship campaign. With his aid we will conduct benefit shows in such large cities where we have strong educational committees, capable of promoting giant benefit affairs for the scholarship fund.

We have already promised college scholarships to the nine Little Rock children and we plan to do the same thing for others attending desegregated schools in tension areas, where courage is demonstrated under trying circumstances.

On our scholarship roll for 1957 and 1958, we are extending aid to 53 young Americans in colleges and universities of America, Canada, and Mexico.

Thus, we move forward to the day when America can truly say—may the words of our mouths and the meditations of our hearts show forth everywhere our dedication to human brotherhood under God.

The Bar Admission Cases, a Strange Judicial Aberration

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. E. C. GATHINGS
OF ARKANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 11, 1958

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Speaker, it is a great privilege to live in a land where constructive criticism against one or all

of the departments of government is in keeping with the rules of propriety as well as accepted procedure.

In the March 1958, issue of the American Bar Association Journal is an article that will appeal to all attorneys and will be of interest to every American citizen. The Honorable William H. Rehnquist of the bar of the State of Arizona writes on the bar admission cases, which he terms "A strange judicial aberration." Mr. Rehnquist's article will be of greater interest to readers when it is remembered that he served as law clerk to the late Justice Robert H. Jackson after receiving his bachelor of laws degree from Stanford. The article points up with care and persuasion the fallacy of the high Court in recent decisions in going overboard to protect human rights.

Mr. Rehnquist's account of these constitutional transgressions in the cases of Schware against Board of Bar Examiners of the State of New Mexico and Konigsberg against State Bar of California follows:

THE BAR ADMISSION CASES—A STRANGE JUDICIAL ABERRATION

(By William H. Rehnquist)

Communists, former Communists, and others of like political philosophy scored significant victories during the October 1956, term of the Supreme Court of the United States, culminating in the historic decisions of June 17, 1957. In 2 opinions handed down in early May 1957, the Court held that 2 applicants to take State bar examinations—1 an admitted ex-Communist and 1 identified as a Communist—had been deprived of constitutional rights by their respective State bars when the latter refused to let them take the examination. Neither *Schware* v. *Board of Bar Examiners of the State of New Mexico* (77 Sup. Ct. 752), nor *Konigsberg* v. *State Bar of California* (77 Sup. Ct. 722), was considered by most newspapers to be of the same front page importance as some of the later decisions of the Court; but for the reasons discussed below, these two bar admission cases may be the most remarkable of the entire term.

In Schware, the New Mexico bar examiners had determined that Rudolph Schware, an applicant for admission to the New Mexico bar, had failed to show the good moral character which New Mexico (and almost every other jurisdiction) requires for admission. This ruling was upheld by the State supreme court (291 P. 2d 607, rehearing denied, 291 P. 2d 629). In Konigsberg, the California examiners found that Konigsberg had failed to show affirmatively either that he was of good moral character or that he did not advocate the overthrow of the State or Federal Governments by force or violence. The State supreme court by minute order denied further review. A majority of five of the Supreme Court of the United States held that these factual determinations were not rationally justified. In Schware, the remaining 3 of the 8 participating Justices concurred on a separate ground; in Konigsberg, the same 3 dissented, 1 on jurisdictional grounds and the other 2 on the merits. This article is concerned only with the opinion of the Court, written in each case by Mr. Justice Black.

What do the reported opinions tell us of the facts?

Schware was born in 1914 in New York City. Finishing high school in 1932, he joined the Communist Party. He left it for a short period in 1937, rejoined and finally left it in 1940. He testified that the reason he joined was his dissatisfaction with the lack of vigor of the socialist movement during the depths of the depression. In the years following his graduation from high school, he was active as a labor organizer in a variety of jobs. During this time, he used two different aliases, both Italian names. He gave three different explanations for why he had done this: (a) To enable him to be a more effective organizer among predominantly Italian workers, (b) to obtain employment in the shipyards, where Jews were not often employed and (c) upon being arrested in connection with the waterfront strike in California in 1934, so that he would not be fired as a striker when he returned to work.

Schware had been arrested at least twice during the 1934 California strike on suspicion of criminal syndicalism. He had been arrested and indicted, in 1940 for violation of the Neutrality Act, in connection with his activities in recruiting soldiers for Loyalist Spain. He was arrested in 1941 while driving a car to the west coast on suspicion that the car was stolen. None of these charges was ever prosecuted to conviction.

In 1944, some 4 years after he, according to his own testimony, had left the Communist Party, Schware had written a letter to his wife. The letter, which he offered in evidence, contained the following passage:

"Jim Crow is on a par with anti-Semitism, anti-Catholicism, anticommunism. All the above 'antis' I mentioned are most dangerous and stupid mistakes for Americans to make."

Finally, in response to written request on the application for such information, Schware had furnished practically none of the names of persons by whom he was employed or street addresses at which he had lived during the years 1932 through 1944.

Schware produced a number of testimonials, both oral and written, to his good moral character. Concededly they would support a finding of good moral character had one been made; since the trier of fact made no such finding, this evidence would not appear to bear on the constitutional question.

On the basis of this testimony, the New Mexico bar examiners concluded that Schware had not carried his burden of proof on the issue of good moral character. He then appealed to the Supreme Court of New Mexico, which said in its opinion:

"On the basis of these considerations we must approve the recommendations of the bar examiners. * * * They questioned petitioner, heard him, and observed his demeanor."

THE KONIGSBERG CASE—THE FIFTH AMENDMENT

Konigsberg had three hearings before the California board of bar examiners. The position he finally took in these hearings was that he would deny that he advocated the overthrow of the Government by force and violence, but would answer no other questions on this subject. He specifically refused to answer whether he was now or ever had been a member of the Communist Party. He ascribed his refusal to answer to his claimed constitutional right to remain silent (not the privilege against self-incrimination). He was repeatedly told by various examiners that his recalcitrance would make it difficult or impossible for the committee affirmatively to certify him as meeting the two standards required for the California bar. At one point, Konigsberg intimated that he feared a perjury prosecution if he denied membership in the Communist Party; the following exchange took place:

Mr. STERLING. You are afraid if you answer the questions as to membership in the Communist Party in the negative and say, "No; I am not a member and I never have been," assuming you made that answer, you are afraid that we could find half a dozen people that were on a perjury trial and the jury believed them and not you, you committed perjury.

Mr. KONIGSBERG. I am saying that no matter what answer I gave whether I was or wasn't, undoubtedly there would be several whom you could get to say the opposite, and as I said before——

Mr. STERLING. Subjecting you to a perjury charge?

Mr. KONIGSBERG. Yes.

A woman who was a former Communist Party member testified in Konigsberg's presence that in 1941 he had attended meetings of the party unit to which she had belonged. Konigsberg had written editorials in a local newspaper which criticized in strong language American participation in the Korean war and the action of the Supreme Court in refusing to review the conviction for contempt of the so-called Hollywood Ten.

Konigsberg produced numerous testimonials from persons who had known him all of his adult life as to his good moral character. As with Schware, these testimonials would have amply supported a finding of good moral character had the trier of fact so found.

On the basis of this evidence, the California bar examiners concluded that Konigsberg had failed to show either that he was of good moral character or that he did not advocate the overthrow of the Government by force and violence. The Supreme Court of California rendered no opinion in denying him a hearing.

How did the Supreme Court of the United States reach the conclusion that these two applicants had been denied their rights under the 14th amendment's due-process clause by their respective State bars?

Both Schware and Konigsberg had contended that certain specific actions of the examining boards or rules governing admission to the bar were unconstitutional as applied to them. Schware argued that (1) the New Mexico examiners had used confidential information to which he was denied access, and (2) New Mexico could not validly consider membership in the Communist Party, at a time when that party was lawful in the State, as a ground for denying admission. Konigsberg claimed that (1) California could not impose a categorical requirement that a bar applicant must not advocate the overthrow of the Government by force and violence, and (2) he had a constitutional right to remain silent in the face of the examiners' questions about present and past membership in the Communist Party. The Supreme Court majority found it unnecessary to decide any of these questions, and it may be inferred that for purposes of argument it overruled them.

Nor does the Court disallow either of the standards for bar admission involved in these cases: good moral character and nonadvocacy of violent overthrow. Schware states generally that the qualifications required by the State for admission to the bar must have rational connection with the ability to practice law, 77 S. Ct. 756, but does not suggest that either of these requirements run afoul of such a rule. The Court also declares that States may not apply permissible standards so as to exclude an applicant when there is no rational basis for a finding that he fails to meet these standards, or when such a finding is invidiously discriminatory as to the applicant, citing *Yick Wo* v. *Hopkins*, 118 U. S. 356, 6 S. Ct. 1064. Yick Wo struck down discriminatory administration of a local ordinance, the pleadings showing that all Caucasian applicants received discretionary exemptions from the ordinance's effect while no Chinese applicants received such an exemption. In neither Schware nor Konigsberg do the opinions suggest that there is any evidence in the record showing that these applicants were treated differently by their respective examiners from other similarly situated applicants, or that any class to which they belonged was the object of invidious discrimination.

The one proposition, of the two for which it is apparently cited by the Court, for which Yick Wo stands, then, is not involved in these cases. The Court actually proceeds on the premise that there is no basis in fact for the finding of the bar examiners, rather than on the premise that the respective States have applied more rigorous standards to these applicants than to others.

This approach, in itself, is something of a novel one; the one case cited for it, Yick Wo, does not appear to deal with it. Even in its statement this new due process sounds little different from the test which State appellate courts apply to review jury verdicts in the type of cases which constitute the staple of their business. In almost every lawsuit, the losing party is deprived of either life, liberty, or property, and this deprivation is based on a factual finding by a judge or jury. If the losing litigant can show to the satisfaction of some court that a factual finding is not rationally justified, *Schware*, 77 S. Ct. 760, or that there are not substantial doubts, *Konigsberg*, 77 S. Ct. 728, to support a negative finding, does he then have a constitutional case? Unless there is some reason why being denied admission to the bar is a constitutionally more serious deprivation than being imprisoned or suffering a large adverse money judgment, or unless former Communists and suspected Communists are a specially favored class who alone may invoke this new due process, logically the Court has made almost every case a due-process case.

The Supreme Court has long held that when a constitutional claim depends on a finding of fact in a court below, it will review the record to see if the evidence supports the factual finding of the lower court. *Local Union No. 10* v. *Graham*, 345 U. S. 192, 197, 73 S. Ct. 587, 97 L. ed. 946 (cited as "cf." in *Konigsberg*, note 17), which in turn cited *Milk Wagon Drivers' Union* v. *Meadowmoor Dairies*, 312 U. S. 287, 293, 294, 61 S. Ct. 552, 555, 85 L. ed. 836. But this factual review has in the past been ancillary to the decision of an independently presented constitutional question; in *Schware* and *Konigsberg* it is the constitutional piece de resistance.

The novelty of the doctrine is not limited to its statement; even more surprising is its application in these two cases. Many lawyers used to traditional rules of appellate review will be surprised at the manner in which the Supreme Court canvassed the facts in each case.

In Schware, the trier of fact had before it admissions by the applicant of previous membership in the Communist Party, use of aliases and criminal charges. In addition, Schware, whether intentionally or not, had effectually prevented further checking of his story by failing to furnish names of employers and addresses at which he had lived. In view of the fact that Schware had an affirmative burden to prove good moral character, would not many impartial observers say that New Mexico's refusal to accept an applicant who made no explanation of such a record would be far from arbitrary or irrational?

Schware did offer explanations of many of these incidents, which, if believed, would tend substantially to mitigate their gravity. But the Supreme Court treats these self-serving explanations by Schware as if they were entitled to the same weight on appeal as the admissions by him which reflect on his character. The Court's opinion states as facts the various reasons Schware assigned for his conduct. The usual rule of appellate review is that the trier of fact is at all times free to disbelieve the whole or any part of the testimony of an interested party, which Schware surely was here. It could hold his admissions against him and yet decide to believe none of his explanations, either because of his demeanor or because of his naturally strong motive to dissemble if dissembling were necessary to carry the day for him. The opinion of the highest Court of the land, which on such a basis reverses a finding by the trier of fact against the party having the burden of proof, is either a drastic departure from these settled principles, or a constitutional overriding of them which is neither adverted to nor justified in the opinion.

The California bar examiners had before them the identification of Konigsberg as a Communist in 1941, together with his extreme recalcitrance in answering any questions about membership in the Communist Party, and his editorials (which, while standing alone would by no means brand the author a Communist, were nonetheless wholly consistent with his having been a Communist much later than 1941). Again, would it not appear to impartial observers that when an applicant, confronted with such a record, stands mute and completely refuses to answer questions clearly relevant to the standard which the Court says, at least arguenda, California might apply, his rejection by the examiners was not irrational?

The Court's opinion, however, while it did not hold that Konigsberg was entitled to the constitutional privilege of silence which he claimed, stated:

"We find nothing in the record which indicated that his position was not taken in good faith. Obviously, the State could not draw unfavorable inferences as to his truthfulness, candor, or his moral character in general if his refusal to answer was based on a belief that the United States Constitution prohibited the type of inquiries which the committee was making."

The two cases of its own which the Court cites for this latter proposition appear to deal only with the permissible inferences from a valid claim of the constitutional privilege against self-incrimination. They appear to leave untouched the question of inferences from an invalid or unwarranted claim of privilege. But even if it is to be from now on a Federal constitutional rule that no factfinding tribunal may draw an adverse inference from the refusal of a party to answer pertinent questions based on an erroneous but honest belief that he was constitutionally privileged in so refusing, see *Barsky* v. *Board of Regents* (347 U. S. 442, 457, 74 S. Ct. 650, 659) (dissenting opinion of Mr. Justice Black), the inquiry still remains as to who is to decide whether the refusal was in good faith. The Court's opinion says that there is nothing in the record which suggests lack of good faith. Again, as pointed out in the dissenting opinion of Mr. Justice Harlan, such questions are traditionally for the trier of fact, which has the opportunity to observe the witness while he testifies. To many whose acquaintance with ordinary factfinding is greater than with constitutional law, the Court's opinion does not satisfactorily explain why the California examiners were not allowed to disbelieve Konigsberg's essentially self-serving statement as to why he refused to answer. Such explanation would seem all the more necessary in view of the colloquy between Sterling and Konigsberg with regard to a feared perjury prosecution set forth above. Motive may be immaterial when the claim of privilege is justified, but when the Court's own statement requires an erroneous claim of privilege to be made in good faith, it is difficult to see why the trier of fact is not allowed to determine the question of good faith.

THE FINAL EFFECT, A TRIAL DE NOVO

In short, what the Supreme Court of the United States has done in each of these cases is to give the applicants a de novo trial on the basis of the printed record. It has chosen to believe every self-serving statement made by each applicant and on the basis of such facts to hold that the findings below were not rationally justified. One must go back 37 years to the case of *Ohio Valley Water Co.* v. *Ben Avon Borough* (253 U. S. 287, 40 S. Ct. 527), to find even a color of precedent for such a procedure. The rule laid down in Ben Avon Borough, which in the light of these cases seems quite restrained, was only that where a utility charged that governmentally fixed rates confiscated its property, it was entitled to a trial de novo in some court on the issue of confiscation. Even Mr. Justice McReynolds, speaking for a divided Court, did not suggest that the de novo trial should take place in the Supreme Court of the United States.

Nor has the recognized doctrine of review of the record where a constitutional claim depends on a lower court's finding of fact, Local Union No. 10, Milk Wagon Drivers' Union, supra, ever gone to such lengths. In the past this rule has meant that the Court would, in contrast to its usual policy of refusing to canvass facts at all, review the record the way a State appellate court would. The opinion of the Court in *Milk Wagon Drivers' Union* v. *Meadowmoor Dairies*, *supra*, specifically stated in connection with the application of this rule: "It is not for us to make an independent evaluation of the testimony before the master," 312 U. S. 287, 294, 61 S. Ct. 552, 555.

It is all but incredible that the majority of the Court in Schware and Konigsberg can mean their rule of rational justification to have general application. Yet if Schware and Konigsberg are to be its beneficiaries, why not every other litigant before the Court? As suggested above, denial of the right to practice a calling is not invariably and indisputably more onerous than other adverse results commonly reached in both civil and criminal litigation. The only remaining difference between Schware and Konigsberg, on the one hand, and a hypothetical litigant who would seek advantage of the rule of their cases, on the other, is that Schware was an admitted ex-Communist and Konigsberg was accused of being a Communist. Conceding that they should be treated no worse than other litigants, is there any reason why they should be treated better? Rationally it is difficult to understand why such persons are entitled to factual review and trial de novo in the Supreme Court while the ordinary man in the street is not. Since the result reached here is not ostensibly based on any civil liberties claim, even that ground of distinction is lacking.

If the Court had chosen to give the stamp of approval to those claims of Konigsberg and Schware which it bypassed, many persons would have disagreed with the result. Nonetheless, the result would have been a principle which could have had application to all similarly situated persons. The most serious criticism of the Court's opinions in Schware and Konigsberg is not that they require such persons to be admitted to practice law—a result about which thoughtful people may disagree—but rather that they reach their result by a line of reasoning which appears to be good for these cases only. Just as surely as Schware and Konigsberg cannot rationally be limited to Communist and suspected Communist bar applicants, they cannot practically be applied to other classes of cases without making the Supreme Court of the United States an appellate court of general jurisdiction. A decision of any court based on a combination of charity and ideological sympathy at the expense of generally applicable rules of law is regrettable no matter whence it comes. But what could be tolerated as a warmhearted aberration in the local trial judge becomes nothing less than a constitutional transgression when enunciated by the highest court of the land.

J. Edgar Hoover

SPEECH
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 10, 1958

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, we in the United States have been most fortunate in being served for so many years by such a skilled and devoted public servant as J. Edgar Hoover, Director, Federal Bureau of Investigation.

No wonder that the Communists see red at the very mention of his name. No man in the United States has done more to anticipate their plays and break them up before they got started, than the very able Director of the FBI.

Due to the efficiency of the agency and the exceptional qualifications of its personnel, the Communists have been outwitted at every turn. The Communist Party in the United States has become demoralized, as its members suspect and distrust one another.

Because they never know which of their comrades are FBI undercover agents, planted in their ranks to keep tabs on every conspiratorial and subversive move.

It is no exaggeration to say that the FBI is J. Edgar Hoover, for he has imbued every member with his own passionate faith in freedom, and with the necessity of thoroughly understanding the way that the Communist mind twists and turns, in order to frustrate this menace, no matter how it may try to disguise itself.

His diagnosis of the Communist Party in the United States is complete.

There is no hidden symptom that escapes his experienced search.

Now, out of his vast practical knowledge, he brings to the people of the United States, the opportunity to detect the devious ways of communism, so that we may know how to spot it and combat them.

If J. Edgar Hoover had done nothing more than to develop the agency which he heads, into the most effective counter-intelligence weapon against communism in the whole world, we should be eternally grateful to him.

But he has done more, and in the best tradition of our democracy, by enabling us to arm ourselves with his knowledge, and, let us hope, with a part of his skill.

It is a foregone conclusion that the book which is the fruit of his rich and varied experience, is going to become a best seller.

But, more than that, it is going to render a great public service by its exposé of the enemy that lurks in the shadows.

Masters of Deceit, by J. Edgar Hoover, throws the spotlight on the secret treachery which is basic to communism.

After reading its revealing chapters, there will never be any excuse for anyone to underestimate, or to fall victim to, the tricks and stratagems of atheistic communism.

J. Edgar Hoover has ripped the mask from the Red conspiracy.

Aid for the Enemy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM E. JENNER
OF INDIANA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, March 11, 1958

Mr. JENNER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Aid for the Enemy," which was published in the Indianapolis Star on March 10, 1958.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The Indiana Appellate Court ruled the other day that a Hammond man no longer needs to pay support money to his divorced wife and son, who live in Communist Poland. One reason for the ruling was that 80 cents out of every $1 the former husband sent to Poland would have been confiscated by the Polish Government, leaving only 20 cents for the woman and her child.

At almost the same time when the appellate court ruling was handed down, another Hoosier was speaking much to the same point in Washington. Senator WILLIAM E. JENNER objected to a proposed $98 million United States foreign aid loan to Poland. The loan, he said, is a device whereby Americans are to help quiet patriotic resistance of Polish farmers to Soviet exploitation.

Unintentional support for both the appellate court and JENNER came almost simultaneously from a press service specializing in international political comment and analysis Worldwide Press Service, in a dispatch from Vienna by Siegfried Weyr, notes that the uneasy dictatorship of Communist President Gomulka has been materially strengthened by United States foreign aid. Weyr takes an unrealistically rosy view of Gomulka's national independence from the Kremlin, but his facts fully document JENNER's contention. United States foreign aid to Poland does strengthen the Soviet Union.

When Communist Gomulka came to power 18 months ago, his chief aim was to prevent an anti-Communist rebellion such as the one in Hungary. This was when, as Weyr notes, "Polish economy teetered on the edge of chaos. Stalinist overexpansion of heavy industry had created politically dangerous shortages of consumer goods. * * * Large segments of industry were close to the shutdown point. Among these was the foreign exchange-earning textile industry."

That was the time when, by the simple device of doing nothing, the United States could have allowed Poland to become startling proof before the world, including all the underdeveloped nations for whose ideological minds we are supposedly bartering, that the economic consequences of communism are ruin. Instead we gave Poland $95 million in foreign aid.

The Kremlin had the same idea our giveaway bureaucrats had. Poland, a showcase of communism, must not be allowed to collapse. Moscow added $175 million to help prevent the collapse. The results? Let Weyr sketch them in: "United States cotton, for example, appears to have saved the Polish textile industry. * * * While Russia gave Poland cotton for its daily needs, the United States supplied the necessary cotton in the form of stockpiles."

Does anyone remember any more, incidentally, that cotton is a vital ingredient of explosives, and that a country with a big stockpile of cotton has a good start on munitions manufacture?

But to return to Weyr's report: "Gomulka has had to allow the imports of consumer goods to go up. Much of the new increase is provided for in the Polish-Soviet trade agreement. * * * This is a direct result of Poland's not having been able to continue to meet its bills for western credits."

It all adds up to one inescapable conclusion: United States aid to Poland has increased trade between Poland and the Soviet Union even while it forestalled an anti-Communist rebellion which, at the very least, would have made Soviet penetration elsewhere more difficult.

Yet our giveaway artists continue to channel money taken from the wages of American workers to the direct support of the Communist dictator and the indirect support of our greatest enemy. As JENNER asked, "Who in our Government is willing to help the Soviet Union intimidate the rest of the free world?" Whoever the bureaucrats are who have sold the idea of aid to Poland to the administration, they should be hunted out. The aid should stop, and those responsible for it should be removed from positions of trust.

Inconsistency in Findings of the Army Retirement Board and the Veterans' Administration in Disability Cases

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. B. CARROLL REECE
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 11, 1958

Mr. REECE of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter from a constituent:

MARCH 6, 1958.

The Honorable CARROLL REECE,
Member of Congress,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN REECE: In the last several years, since World War II, I have been an active member of the veterans organizations here in Dickson. I have noted with much interest the various laws that have been passed for the protection of veterans and their dependents.

One particular problem which seems unusual to me is that Army disposition and/or retirement boards, and the Veterans' Administration do not always concur in the medical findings where a veteran is concerned. One particular case that I remember is that of Jesse R. Stokes, C-18754863. Jesse was retired by the Army for thrombophlebitis and is currently on the retirement roll. The Army granted him this retirement notwithstanding the fact that there was evidence of preservice existence of the disability. They found that the condition was aggravated by basic training. The veteran filed for Veterans' Administration compensation, because he wanted to go to school under the GI bill of rights for disabled veterans. The Veterans' Administration denied his claim holding that the condition was not aggravated by service.

It seems to me that there should be some type of bill introduced to require that both services be consistent in their findings. In this case the Army had custody of the veteran. They had first-hand information, and accordingly granted retirement pay; whereas, the Veterans' Administration, who only had access to the records made by the Army, still insisted that the condition was not aggravated.

Would appreciate very much your thinking on this matter. This particular veteran comes from a very fine influential family here in Dickson County. I am sure there are others who have been the victims of such interpretations.

Very truly yours,

WOODROW W. DUKE, *Charlotte, Tenn.*

Excessive Crude Oil Imports Impair Domestic Industry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. FLOYD BREEDING
OF KANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 10, 1958

Mr. BREEDING. Mr. Speaker, the distinguished Governor of the State of Kansas, the Honorable George Docking, has communicated to me the serious, adverse effect increasingly excessive imports of crude oil are having on the economy of the State of Kansas.

With the House Committee on Ways and Means currently studying the President's reciprocal trade recommendations, I believe this to be an appropriate moment to call attention to the depressing impact excessive imports of crude oil and its byproducts are having on our domestic productive capacity.

A realistic appraisal, Mr. Speaker, of our present and prospective national defense posture compels me, and I believe many other Members of the House, to lend my full support to promoting peak domestic oil production lest we be caught during a national emergency with a severe shortage of oil, the lifeblood of our defense structure.

A system of effective controls over the vast quantities of oil imports, so injurious to our domestic reserve levels and productive capacity, must be seriously considered, Mr. Speaker.

THE STATE OF KANSAS,
Topeka, March 5, 1958.

Hon. J. FLOYD BREEDING,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. BREEDING: I would like to call to your attention and stress the serious effect excessive imports of crude oil and its byproducts, particularly jet fuel, are having on the economy of the State of Kansas and its people, the domestic oil industry, and the security of our Nation.

Next to agriculture, the oil industry is the biggest industry in our State and because of excessive imports we are experiencing excessive inventories, decreased revenue because of shut-in production capacity, many jobless due to drilling activity and other industry layoffs, and many other businesses are suffering because of their dependence on the State's oil industry. Due to excessive oil imports supplanting rather than supplementing the domestic oil imports our domestic oil drilling activity in the United States of America has steadily decreased with the eventual resulting effect of decreasing our crude oil reserves which we have to depend on in case of emergency when foreign oil is choked off.

The effect of imported crude oil on product prices and in turn their effect on the operating economics of inland refineries which operate on domestic crude oil is becoming more and more serious. If the practice of importing disproportionate amounts of foreign crude oil should continue, the ultimate outcome could well mean the disappearance of a large segment of the domestic refining industry.

In consideration of the foregoing I urgently endorse the adoption of curtailment through mandatory controls on imports of crude oil and its byproducts in order to preserve a strong domestic oil industry which is so vital to the security of our Nation.

Sincerely,
GEORGE DOCKING, *Governor.*

Aircraft Nuclear Propulsion—We'll Be Second in Another Scientific Race

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MELVIN PRICE
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 10, 1958

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, it has been said that sputnik was actually of more benefit to the United States and the free world than to the Soviet Union because it spurred our efforts to keep ahead in science and technology. There is some justification for that observation, but a decision announced in the White House last week leaves me with the feeling that not all of us were prompted to take warning from the Russian achievements.

The President has ordered that work to get an American atomic airplane aloft first must take a back seat to efforts to get an operational military nuclear-powered plane. His action signals long delays. The American people might well ready themselves for another Russian first—this time with a nuclear aircraft, possibly within 18 months.

The following editorial from the Miami News of March 8 cogently states the case of our being first in the sky with an atomic plane:

WE'LL BE SECOND IN ANOTHER RACE

Most Americans will regret the decision reached by President Eisenhower against a rush program to make this country the first to fly an atomic-powered airplane. The President made known his decision in a letter to Representative MELVIN PRICE, Illinois Democrat.

The Congressman had written the President last October urging such a program. He had then just returned from a visit to Russia and was convinced the Russians were seeking to be first in the atomic plane field. Why it required from October to the present for Mr. Eisenhower to reach his decision and reply to Mr. PRICE's letter is something which only the President can explain.

Our tremendous loss of prestige when the Russians put not 1, but 2, satellites into outer space has caused many in Congress to feel we should lose no time in winning an atomic plane race. Mr. PRICE is chairman of a Subcommittee on Research of the Joint Congressional Committee for Atomic Energy.

The President's reasoning was that it would be pointless to place an atomic power plant in just any big airplane. Both plane and reactor should be designed for each other, he contended. This, he said, would take time and would divert extremely scarce talent from attacking fundamental problems that must be solved before a militarily important aircraft can be produced.

The President contended that to set a target date for producing an atomic-powered plane would be somewhat arbitrary and therefore may be unrealistic.

In other words we'll just go along about our business and some day when we get around to it we'll build such an airplane. Meanwhile, the Russians are expected to make the first atomic-powered flight in about 18 months.

It is evident that President Eisenhower still fails to realize what happened to our standing in the world when the Russians demonstrated their high technical capabilities by launching the sputniks. Nor does he appear to realize the further blow to the esteem in which Americans were formerly held if the Russians beat us to atomic-powered flight.

He apparently is still influenced by such thinking as that expressed by Charles E. Wilson, the former Defense Secretary, who said that an atomic plane, if one could be built would be a bum airplane.

We subscribe to the opinion of Mr. PRICE and his colleague, Representative CARL DURHAM, North Carolina Democrat, who issued a joint reply to the President's letter. Ours is a hopeless, hapless, helpless policy of drift and indecision in this matter.

Watch Out for the Federal Spenders in Your Schools

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RALPH W. GWINN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 11, 1958

Mr. GWINN. Mr. Speaker, John T. Flynn is one of the most respected lawyers in America. His views on educational problems, and their cause, deserve careful attention.

WATCH OUT FOR THE FEDERAL SPENDERS IN YOUR SCHOOLS
(By John T. Flynn)

It's beginning to look as if the politicians in Washington would be lost without Russia—and Russian sputniks. In fact, this Congress is getting to be called the sputnik Congress. That means that every imaginable scheme for spending your money, no matter how fantastic or how useless, is being urged by the spending-hungry politicians. And because they can't get the money out of you unless they scare you to death, it's all being hooked up with Russian sputniks.

Perhaps the most dishonest of these schemes is the one to allow the Federal Government to spend a billion or 2—as a starter—on education. This will serve 2 purposes if the politicians put it over. It will give them something else to spend your money on—at a time when the Government is hunting around desperately for new ways to spend. And it will put the hand of the politicians in Washington further into your State and local schools.

The excuse for this, of course, is that Russia got a sputnik into space before we did because she had more and better scientists to develop it. And she had more and better scientists, so the argument goes, because she has a better educational system than ours. The answer. It's always the same when it comes from politicians—spend and spend and spend—a billion here and a billion or 2 there.

Now the truth about the matter is that what is wrong with our schools is something all the billions in the world can't cure. In the last 25 years, instead of educating our youngsters in the schools, we've been turning out whole batches of them who can't read, can't spell, can't add, substract, multiply or divide. They know little of history, biology, chemistry or language—and care less. All

this is the result of the baleful system of so-called progressive or modern education, under which the kids are taught something called life adjustment—under which they must be free to do so they please and even to choose what subjects they will learn.

The President and his fellow-spenders think the results of this quarter century of undereducation can be corrected by spending a few billion dollars. What they don't know—or would like to overlook—is that Russia once tried this so-called progressive education. When the Communists took over in Russia, they instituted the system in the Russian schools. They had it there for 15 years. Then the kids educated under progressive methods started to appear for entrance before college examining boards. The examiners were appalled at how little they knew—at how badly educated they were. So the Communists in Russia threw out the progressive system lock, stock, and barrel. They went back to the old, traditional American system of educating children—with Communist overtones, of course. But just at the time that Russia was abandoning progressive education, we took it up here—under the prodding of home-grown Communists and leftwingers. They had seen what it had done in Russia. What more effective way could there be for bringing about the downfall of the American way of life than by corrupting generations of American children with this system?

That's what is the matter with American education today. And it can be corrected very simply by going back to teaching the fundamentals of education and cutting out all the frills and furbelows. We don't have to spend a billion or even a million dollars to do this. In fact, it might even save some money which could be spent much more wisely in our schools.

But the politicians—egged on by the left-wing educationists—are using Russian scientific advances as an excuse to get their hands on our schools. It cannot be repeated often enough that the Federal Government has no money to give to your schools. It has to get the money from you—the people in the States—and then hand some of it back to you to spend on your schools. But once the Federal Government takes your tax money, you won't get it back to spend on your schools or anything else without the politicians in Washington telling you how, when and where it should be spent. And before you know it, the Federal Government will be telling you what can be taught, and what can't be taught, how it should be taught and how it should not be taught, in your local public schools.

As long as you can keep the hand of the Federal politicians out of your schools, you—who build and support them and pay the teachers—have the power to clean up the mess into which the progressive educationists have gotten your schools. But once the Federal politicians start spending your money on your schools, your chance to clean up that mess is gone forever.

An Act of Heroism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK E. SMITH
OF MISSISSIPPI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 10, 1958

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call attention to an outstanding act of heroism which occurred in my congressional district last week. Ernest Crowell, a serviceman for the Delta Electric Power Association, saved three children from death in their flaming house.

Mr. Crowell's action is in the best tradition of the rural electric power associations and is typical of the best relationship which exists between the races in our area.

Under unanimous consent I include an account of this act which appeared in the Memphis Commercial Appeal:

[From the Memphis Commercial Appeal of March 6, 1958]

THREE NEGRO YOUNGSTERS RESCUED FROM FIRE—CARRIED FROM BURNING HOME BY REA SERVICEMAN

CRUGER, MISS., March 5.—An REA serviceman rescued 3 Negro children Wednesday from the flames of their 4-room frame house.

Ernest Crowell, a serviceman for Delta Electric Power Association, was driving through a Leflore County plantation near here when he noticed smoke coming from a tenant house.

Entering to investigate, he saw 3 Negro children, ages 3 months to 3 years, in the flaming interior of the house. Crowell carried them out, then went back to see if there was anyone else inside.

Before the flames swallowed the structure, Crowell had saved some of the furniture. The mother of the children, Ella Young, had left the children unattended.

Observation of "Egg Month" Gains Momentum

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUBERT B. SCUDDER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 11, 1958

Mr. SCUDDER. Mr. Speaker, I am in receipt of a newspaper clipping from the Press Democrat of Santa Rosa, Calif., under date of March 5, 1958.

Because they are taking recognition of the month of March being designated as Egg Month and because a member of the State assembly in my district has introduced a bill to provide for a tax of 1 percent on poultry feed to be used for promotional work in an effort to stimulate poultry sales, I think it of interest to publish the editorial. I desire to insert the editorial in the RECORD along with my remarks.

POULTRY PROMOTION BILL SHOULD BE PASSED

At the request of Assemblyman Richard F. McCollister, Governor Knight called a special legislative session to run concurrently with the regular budget session, to permit Mr. McCollister to introduce proposed legislation to create a California poultry promotion council.

If the legislation becomes law, a tax of 1 cent per 100 pounds of poultry feed would finance work of a promotional council in stimulating the sale of California poultry products.

At the same time, Representative HUBERT SCUDDER arose in the lower House of Congress to advise the Members that March is Egg Month—and that if everyone in the United States ate an egg a day they would be a lot healthier at less cost.

"While grains are supported as an agricultural crop and are purchased by the poultryman, he in turn must sell on the open market under a free competitive system," Mr. SCUDDER said. "The poultryman should, therefore, be encouraged in every manner possible to create a demand for his product."

The Congressman followed up his talk by treating Members of the House to a double-yolker serving of eggs at lunch on March 3.

The poultry industry falls roughly into three categories: eggs, chicken meat, and turkeys. Per capita consumption of both meatbirds and turkeys has increased sharply in the last 10 years, but production in other States has succeeded in capturing the California markets and California growers as a result are having a difficult time.

Consumption of eggs, in the same 10 years, has declined from 389 per capita in a year to 360. The egg business, as a result, is also in difficulty.

It is high time, indeed, for promotion of California poultry products. Here's hoping Mr. McCollister's bill is enacted.

Frank Schaufenbil, Exemplary Labor Leader

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 11, 1958

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, on Sunday, March 9, 1958, at Central Catholic Memorial Auditorium, Lawrence, Mass., more than 600 leaders throughout Massachusetts, gathered to honor Francis M. Schaufenbil, acting president and secretary-treasurer, United Textile Workers of America.

Among the distinguished guests were: Mayor John J. Buckley; Senator William X. Wall; Aldermen Nicholas J. Callahan; John W. Fallon; Gerard A. Guilmette and Louis J. Scanlon; Rev. Francis McDonald, Director of the Archdiocesan Labor School; Very Rev. Vincent A. McQuade, OSA, doctor of philosophy, president of Merrimack College; Kenneth J. Kelley, secretary-treasurer legislative agent of the Massachusetts Federation of Labor; Francis E. Lavigne, education director of the Massachusetts Federation of Labor; Attorney Roland R. Siskind, chairman of the Greater Lawrence Citizens Committee for Industrial Development; John N. O'Malley, executive director of the Greater Lawrence Citizens Committee for Industrial Development; and Timothy J. Scanlon, president of the Lawrence Chamber of Commerce. Also present were Hugh Thompson, George Baldanzi, and former UFWA vice president Herman Ackroyd, Johnnie E. Brown, Kenneth C. Clark, Robert E. Cole, Everett F. Dean, Roy B. Groenert, Edward Hirschberger, Burton Hyman, Joseph Krause, Roger Provost, Calvin R. Ray, Louis Rubino, Philip Salem, Frank Sogambato, William Silcox, and Charles Sobol, and myself.

John A. Callahan, president of the Massachusetts Federation of Labor was the toastmaster.

The program opened with the benediction given by Father McQuade.

Mayor Buckley and I brought greetings from the Federal and municipal governments.

John N. O'Malley made the presentation of a matched set of luggage to Mr. Schaufenbil.

The Lawrence Daily Eagle, on March 10, 1958, stated that: "attorney Siskind, guest speaker, spoke of Mr. Schaufenbil's devotion to duty, and of his many accomplishments. He praised the newly-elevated international secretary-treasurer and acting international president of the United Textile Workers of America, AFL–CIO, for his outstanding work."

The testimonial concluded with a program of entertainment, and benediction by Father McDonald.

Attorney Roland R. Siskind, one of the dynamic leaders whose initiative has contributed so much to the economic recovery of Greater Lawrence, spoke eloquently of the role that Mr. Schaufenbil played in that remarkably successful effort. It was this type of labor statesmanship that helped the workers and the community, in recognition whereof, he was called to national leadership, with a voice in the councils of international labor.

In order that Attorney Siskind's speech may have a wider audience that will appreciate and enjoy his address, I am inserting it, under unanimous consent, in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Distinguished guest, Frank Schaufenbil, Very Reverend Father McQuade, Reverend Father McDonald, Congressman Lane, Mayor Buckley, gentlemen of the city council, Senator Wall, other distinguished guests, ladies, and gentlemen:

It is indeed a pleasure to be here this evening to pay not only my personal respects to Frank Schaufenbil, but to extend from all the members of the Greater Lawrence Citizens' Committee for Industrial Development their sincerest warm congratulations for his continuing advancement in the labor world.

Most of us who have been associated with Frank have had, for many years, an innate feeling that the service and respect commanded by him in his field of endeavor would not go unrecognized too long.

Frank was born in Prairie du Chien, Wis., and was employed in a weave room of a textile mill in Prairie from 1934 to 1941. In 1939 he assisted in organizing a labor union in that mill and was elected its president. The following year he was elected president of the Wisconsin State Council of Textile Unions. In 1941 he was appointed as an organizer for the United Textile Workers of America and in the same year was elected vice president of the U. T. W. A. in the midwestern area. In 1946 he led an organizational drive in the South for the U. T. W. A. and later in the same year he was named director of the woolen and worsted department of the U. T. W. A. and was assigned to this area with headquarters in Lawrence. His work here and his eagerness to serve his organization were well known by thousands of textile workers employed in local plants.

His determination and his knowledge was again recognized in October of 1948 by President Truman, who appointed Frank to the United States Commission to the International Labor Organizations Conference in Geneva, Switzerland. He is a past councilor of the Lawrence Council of the United Commercial Travelers. In October 1957 he was the unanimous choice of the UTWA executive council for acting president and secretary-treasurer of the international union.

But, in addition to his career, he has not neglected any of his civic duties—that which is a must in everyone's life. For several years he has served on the executive committee for the united fund and on the Greater Lawrence Citizens' Committee for Industrial Development. At the present time he is a member of the executive board of that committee.

Civic pride is merely the common or garden variety of national patriotism, the kind of pride that makes a citizen feel that it is just as important to clean up his backyard as it is to head a Fourth of July parade.

The man who does not take an active interest in his hometown, who does not want to see it prosper and who will not work for its improvement or even its beautification, lacks that vital thing which makes a true patriot. We are fortunate indeed to have citizens of Frank's caliber to counteract the influence of such narrowminded men.

But even though a man has the interest of his city at heart, he can alone do little for its improvement. It is necessary for him to join with others who are likewise civic minded.

This need for cooperation has given rise in the larger cities, to the chambers of commerce, the Rotary, the Kiwanis Clubs, and like organizations, and in the smaller villages, to the booster clubs. And in our own community, this need for group participation has given rise to the many civic committees, some of which are the industrial development committee, the Burke Hospital trustees, the airport commission, planning board, traffic commission, zoning board, and so forth, and to the most recently formed task force committee headed by Mr. Richard Ward, and assisted by many able men and women of this community who are giving unselfishly of their time, effort, and money so that our downtown business area can be improved both in physical appearance and by increased retail business.

Much sport has been made of some of these groups and committees, the idea being that they exist merely as social organizations, where the members meet to exchange gossip, tell jokes, and partake of a hearty luncheon. This is slanderous, of course, but it is true that good dinners aid greatly to the success of any organization.

Associated effort, whether of the muscles or the brain, needs to be stimulated occasionally by social contact. There is a physiological reason for this. One of the great sympathetic nerves of the human system is said to be located in the stomach, and, therefore, our appetites and our sympathies are so intricately connected that when we are gathered around a well-laid table we are filled with charitable feelings toward all the world and with ambitious aspirations for our immediate community.

Any businessman is benefited by association with his competitors. Occasionally one finds a man who feels that the methods which were successful in the past must always be successful.

He is antagonistic toward innovations and then wonders why the new store on the next block is attracting customers which he had inherited from his father. But times change, new systems are adopted, new goods manufactured, and the businessman must keep pace. An automobile dealer can no longer use old methods of salesmanship any more than he can sell a 1920 model in place of a new streamlined car. The same is true in civic activities. There was a time when the only organizations a city knew, aside from its lodges and social groups, were its political circles. In the villages the only organization was a little group which met around the stove in the corner grocery to discuss everything from farmer Brown's new barn to the election of a new President.

There is an old saying to the effect that three persons united against a town will ruin it. That is not true if there is a larger group composed of men like Frank Schaufenbil, which has the good of the town at heart. It is a well-known fact that bad citizens, law breakers, are united, while good citizens are too often divided, and the bad citizens are frequently so vociferous as to give the impression that they are stronger than they really are.

In one of Billy Sunday's evangelistic campaigns it is said that he wrote to the mayor of a midwestern metropolis for the names of those who were especially in need of prayer. The mayor very obligingly sent him a copy of the city directory.

We are quite sure that few of our citizens are especially in need of prayer, but we must not be satisfied with our passive goodness. We must become more aggressive.

The country needs, more than ever, soldiers of peace, and it is here that the various civic organizations can render the greatest good. They are composed of responsible, thinking men, who have established themselves socially, financially, and professionally, and whose interests are identical with those of the city wherein they dwell. A famous military man tells us that the Nation faces a crisis in which many dangerous and insidious enemies are allied against us, the corruption and extravagances of government, and the growth of power in the underworld; that we ourselves are largely to blame for this condition because we have neglected our duty as citizens; that patriotism is just as necessary in meeting the complex problems of peace as it is in meeting the more stirring obligations of war. He adds the warning that with all our marvelous institutions we may go down like Greece and Rome unless we recognize and live up to our civic obligations. If Frank Schaufenbil by his enthusiasm and example does nothing more than to awaken the right kind of people to a realization of their duty as responsible citizens of the city, State and Nation, then he will have accomplished much. There is a place in the life of every city for many aggressive citizens and civic organizations, which seek out the needs of their municipality and vigorously apply the remedy, or render the required assistance. Any bread which we may cast upon the waters of civic betterment will return to us in the increased volume and improved character of our activity, and in the pride and joy we take in our home city.

There is one thing which is admired above all others, and that is success.

It does not so much matter along what branch of human endeavor a man's talents lie—whether art, literature, science, or business—the fact that he succeeds is all important because this fact proves that in his particular field he has greater ability than his fellow man. We respect his ability, his talent. He is a benefit to mankind, not only for his contributions to enterprises of the world, but for his example, for the inspiration we derive from him.

Many people insist that success is largely due to luck, to circumstances, not realizing that it takes sound judgment to shape circumstances to the proper end. It is true that "There is a tide in the affairs of men, which, taken at its flood, leads on to fortune." But how many of us know when the tide of destiny is at its flood?

Frank Schaufenbil tonight has met with a large measure of success, but this success is not due to luck. It is a substantial edifice founded on a solid rock of integrity and earnest endeavor, coupled with a keen perception which has enabled him to foresee opportunities and grasp them as they appeared. His success has been largely earned.

He has achieved true greatness and we rejoice that this is so. We are honored by his presence tonight and hope that our very sincere welcome and modest entertainment will give him pleasure.

It is quite customary to felicitate a man on his accession to a high office, and rightly so, for he is to be congratulated on his rise above the average worker, and he needs the good will and cooperation of his associates. But the man who most deserves this evidence of appreciation and kind regard is the one who has filled the high position, has done his work in a commendable manner, has won the esteem and respect of those who have been associated with and under him, and who is passing on to a higher position.

We feel, Frank, that you are such a man. We have enjoyed the years of close association with you. We have respected your ability and honored your integrity. Now we rejoice in your good fortune and we want you to accept this evidence of the esteem and good wishes of those who have assisted in carrying out your plans.

May the future bring you added honors and the opportunity to display the talent and ability which are yours in so large a measure.

Thank you.

Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act Must Be Amended Immediately

SPEECH
OF
HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 11, 1958

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, this date I have introduced a bill to extend the benefit period under the Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act from the present 26 weeks to 39 weeks with the cost of such extension to be borne by the Treasury of the United States in the same manner as President Eisenhower proposes to pay the cost of extending for 13 weeks unemployment compensation benefits in other industries.

At the moment thousands of unemployed railroaders throughout the Nation are now receiving an average of $40 a week from the railroad unemployment insurance fund and many of these unemployed persons have exhausted or are about to exhaust their eligibility for such benefits leaving them and their families without any income.

Mr. Speaker, in the central Pennsylvania area where my congressional district is located nearly 15 percent of the area's 91,000 labor force is unemployed including railroaders.

Since plans are already afoot to extend unemployment compensation benefits an additional 13 weeks in the various States to those unemployed outside the railroad industry, my bill is necessary in amending the Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act to provide an additional 13 weeks of benefits.

Mr. Speaker, my bill is emergency legislation and should receive prompt congressional approval, thus relieving the desperate plight of thousands of unemployed railroaders not only in my congressional district but throughout the Nation.

Foreign Aid a Colossal Failure—Should Be Stopped

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RALPH W. GWINN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 11, 1958

Mr. GWINN. Mr. Speaker, a check of the records indicates that during the period of World War II and in the postwar period to June 30, 1957, the American taxpayers have supplied more than $134 billion in aid to foreign governments and their peoples.

Last week, at the request of President Eisenhower, there was staged at the Statler Hotel in Washington a great conference of economic internationalists and liberals to drum up nationwide sentiment for a further appropriation of $3.9 billion for foreign aid now masquerading under the name of mutual security. The foreign-aid programs which started in the postwar period and became known in 1948 as the Marshall plan to put 16 European countries back upon their economic feet, have been continued beyond the projected 4 years and an expenditure of $17 billion until today countries in every hemisphere are looking to Uncle Sam's taxpayers for handouts for all kinds of purposes from the ridiculous to the sublime.

We have been regaled with speeches and articles telling us that the only way to stop the spread of communism throughout the civilized world is to get behind the so-called free nations with American grants and credits.

Now what kind of a world is this so-called free world?

Not very many of the countries we have helped with American dollars and supplies can qualify as free nations. We should realize that there is very little of the American kind of freedom under either socialism, communism, or a dictatorship, and Mr. Speaker, these are the kinds of governments we have been for the most part supporting in the postwar period.

The meeting which was held on Tuesday, February 25, 1958, was said to have been underwrittten by a group of 15 prominent Americans. Many in this group and the firms they represent, for years have benefited either directly or indirectly by Government procurement contracts for foreign aid and the like. For example as far back as August 1948, the records of the Economic Cooperation Administration for that month indicates the firm of Anderson Clayton & Co. and their subsidiaries furnished 71.2 percent of the 207,283 bales of cotton exported under the Marshall plan, and paid for by the American taxpayers. Yet among those who are sponsors of the meeting we find Mr. Lamar Fleming of this firm a headliner.

Others who underwrote the Washington conference were: Mr. George Brown of the engineering firm of Brown & Root, Houston, Tex., who have been Government contractors for years; Mr. Abraham Feinberg of the firm of Julius Kayser & Co., manufacturers of textile products; George J. Killion of American President Lines, a steamship outfit which has enjoyed Government subsidies and contracts for years. Also among the underwriters was Frank Pace, Jr., of General Dynamics, a firm greatly benefited by Government contracts.

Then there was Mr. Ernest R. Breech of Ford Motor Co., a firm that does business all around the world and maintains a factory in England to produce small cars for the domestic and export trade. Ford Motor has benefited for years from Government contracts of various kinds and presently they are engaged in several research undertakings.

As a matter of fact, an investigation in all probability would disclose that nearly every one of Mr. Eric Johnston's committee, including Mr. Johnston himself, was a party in interest because of previous or present Government contracts or subsidies.

Over the years there has been much criticism of the waste and mismanagement that has occurred in spending to $65 billion invested in foreign aid in the postwar period. Years ago I presented some facts about the building of the world's largest railway station in Rome, Italy, with the help of American dollars. I also called attention to the waste in the canalizing of the Rhone River in France.

Mr. Speaker, the Treasury records indicate we have spent or loaned more than $65 billion in the postwar period. The Treasury records further show that we now have more than $7 billion more which can be spent in fiscal 1958 and 1959. If there is need for further aid from the American taxpayers, this in itself is an admission that the foreign-aid programs have been a colossal failure and should now be stopped. With our own public debt hovering around $275 billion and likely to go higher, I am convinced the American people want no more of this foreign aid.

Mr. Speaker, there is talk around the Capitol of reducing taxes to help stop the depression which now plagues our country. Instead of reducing taxes at this time, the Congress should first be interested in reducing the spending and then after balancing the budget, get the country back on a sound basis and by so doing a reduction in the oppressive taxing could be effected.

Mr. Speaker, as of February 21, just a few short weeks ago, the unexpended balances to the credit of the mutual security programs, or foreign aid if you please, totaled $7,465,000,000. This is more than the Treasury can make available for spending in the balance of fiscal 1958 and all of 1959 combined. Therefore, we do not need either an additional foreign aid appropriation or even a further authorization to spend at this time. In fact, with more than 5 million American unemployed and millions of others working from 1 to 14 hours a week, its time we set our own economic house in order and forget about this so-called free world which is free in name only.

At this time, Mr. Speaker, I ask that as part of my remarks there may be included in the RECORD two articles from the Washington News Bulletin giving some additional facts about how our foreign-aid funds have been disbursed and in what amounts and also important in-

formation on the wages and working conditions in several of the recipient countries compared with those presently in effect in the United States.

The bulletins are as follows:

DEGRADATION OF POPULAR GOVERNMENT CARRIED TO NEW LOW POINT AS $500,000 SLUSH FUND IS SOUGHT BY NATIONAL CITIZENS COMMITTEE FOR FOREIGN AID, A PRESSURE GROUP ORGANIZED AT THE BEHEST OF EISENHOWER

(By Paul O. Peters)

Reaction is rapidly setting in to the efforts of a group of millionaires to raise a slush fund of $500,000 to be used in pressurizing the public and Congress on the need for an additional $3.9 billion appropriation for foreign aid in fiscal 1959. The 15 persons who underwrote the rally in Washington's Statler Hotel late Tuesday were reported to be:

Mr. Ernest R. Breech, Ford Motor Co.; Mr. George R. Brown of the engineering firm of Brown & Root, Houston, Tex.; Mr. Abraham Feinberg of the firm firm of Julius Kayser & Co., textile manufacturers; Lamar Fleming of the cotton merchandising firm of Anderson, Clayton & Co., Houston, Tex.; Willima C. Foster of Olin Mathieson Chemical Corp. of Baltimore, Md.; H. J. Heinz II of the H. J. Heinz Corp., Pittsburgh, Pa.; Theodore V. Houser of Sears, Roebuck & Co.; George J. Killion of American President Lines; Frank Pace, Jr., of General Dynamics Corp.; William E. Robinson of Coca-Cola; Dr. Ethan A. Shepley, chancellor, Washington University, St. Louis; Joseph P. Spang, Jr., of the Gillette Co.; Roger L. Stevens, real estate operator, New York; and Mr. Eric Johnston who was called to Washington by President Eisenhower to head up the campaign for foreign aid.

The resentment against the procedures and methods used to get a crowd together for the rally at the Statler Hotel, which the Chicago Tribune likened to a three-ring circus, seems to stem from the fact that many of the sponsors are parties in interest and have been recipients of Government contracts and/or subsidies over a considerable period of years during which more than $153 billion was poured out of Uncle Sam's Treasury in wartime and postwar aid.

When approximately 5,000 telegrams soliciting funds for the Citizens Committee for Foreign Aid were sent out on Tuesday evening, February 25, the tab for telegraph tolls said to be around $10,000 was quickly covered by contributions from persons selected by a New York professional fund raiser for that purpose.

What has not been disclosed to the American public up to the present moment is the status of funds presently available and undisbursed for the foreign aid which now masquerades under the name of mutual security.

Here are some facts:

United States Treasury Document No. 3206, issued by the Bureau of Accounts, covering the fiscal year 1957 shows at page 17, unexpended balances for the so-called mutual security programs stood at $6,124,880,172.03. Of this amount the unpaid obligations totaled but $3,223,402,809.65, leaving nearly $3 billion available.

The budget for 1959 reveals at pages 81-92 appropriations for fiscal 1958, as follows:

Military assistance	$1,340,000,000
Defense support	689,000,000
Economic and technical aid	435,183,000
Development loan fund	300,000,000
Direct appropriation, 1958	3,764,183,000
Unexpended balance, fiscal 1957	6,124,880,172
Total	9,889,063,172

In addition to the funds available as shown in this table there also was available $297,712,629 in unused guaranty authority which is a special fund set up to encourage American business to locate or build branches in foreign countries.

In addition to the funds available for direct foreign aid, the President was voted an appropriation of $15,145,000 for fiscal 1958 for cultural exchanges and the promotion of fair trade, which included participation in an international exposition at Brussels, Belgium, starting this spring.

A review of the spending over the past 10 fiscal years would reveal that many of the sponsors of this new National Citizens' Committee for Foreign Aid have been suppliers to the United States and foreign governments in the past and it is to their financial interest to keep the pot boiling until they drain the last bit of succor from the American taxpayers that is possible.

We have heretofore shown that for the fiscal year 1958 there was a total of $9,889,063,172 available for expenditure plus contract authority of over $216,000,000.

In the period from July 1, 1957, to February 21, 1958, the Treasury statement shows that but $2,423,521,158.93 has been disbursed for our foreign-aid programs. Therefore there remained, as of February 21, 1958, an unexpended balance of $7,465,542,013.

With prospects for an unbalanced budget for fiscal 1958, and even greater prospects for deficit financing in fiscal 1959, due to the depression that has settled upon our economy, there seems no basic reason for the Congress to appropriate an additional $3.9 billion for foreign aid. Surely, it is not the intention of our lawmakers to continue the giveaway programs forever.

With a $39 billion road building program here at home contemplated and many other pump-priming schemes in the works to help lift the depression from the backs of our people, more foreign aid will have to come from either increased taxes or borrowed money. Increased taxes would no doubt cause a political turnover in the Congress that would react to the good of the Republic while borrowing money to finance foreign aid would be a further accelerator of the inflation which this nation presently is unable to check.

Tomorrow we will issue a bulletin showing that the so-called free world is not in fact free, nor do these countries have a representative popular government in which the competitive free enterprise system can operate.

FOREIGN AID HAS BEEN GOING TO COUNTRIES IN ALL PARTS OF THE WORLD THAT HAVE ADOPTED SOCIALISM, COMMUNISM OR SOME FORM OF DICTATORSHIP

(By Paul O. Peters)

When President Eisenhower persuaded Mr. Eric Johnston, the president of the Motion Picture Export Association of America, a post paying $125,000 a year salary, to come to Washington and organize sentiment for the continuation of the reciprocal-trade-agreement program and foreign aid, both of which programs are under scrutiny by the Congress, he invited a new system of lobbying by mass appeal which caused the Chicago Tribune to editorialize on the degredation of popular government.

The outcome of a meeting held on Tuesday, February 25 at the Statler Hotel in Washington, D. C., was the forming of a National Citizens Committee for Foreign Aid and later a supplementary organization called the Nonpartisan Committee for International Economic Growth.

In general the appeals to unsuspecting American taxpayers came from parties who have been beneficiaries of the foreign aid programs of the past 10 years, and in general the appeal has been to fight communism and keep in from spreading by helping other countries to maintain their positions in the so-called free world.

The Members of Congress who accept this thesis of helping the free world, need to be informed as to the kinds of governments we have been helping and also the Congress needs to be reminded that there is comparatively little freedom under either, socialism, communism or a dictatorship.

In the table which follows we present the facts with respect to foreign aid (grants and credits) extended to certain nations to June 30, 1957, and a statement showing the kind of government in these nations; there is not a free nation in the list except Western Germany and possibly Turkey:

Country	Kind of government	Population	Grants and credits to June 30, 1957
Austria	Socialist-Labor	6,934,000	$1,018,000,000
Belgium-Luxemburg	Social-Christian	9,025,000	718,000,000
Denmark	Socialist kingdom	4,393,000	281,000,000
Finland	Social Democrat	4,121,000	70,000,000
France	Socialist-Communist	43,300,000	6,067,299,000
Western Germany	Conservative	48,478,000	3,890,000,000
Greece	Independent kingdom	7,206,000	1,373,000,000
Italy	Socialist-Catholic	46,889,000	2,829,000,000
Netherlands	Socialist-Labor	10,808,576	1,017,000,000
Norway	do	3,343,000	291,000,000
Spain	Benevolent dictator	28,306,000	213,000,000
Sweden	Socialist-Labor	7,126,000	106,000,000
Turkey	Democratic republic	20,935,000	510,000,000
Yugoslavia	Communist dictatorship	16,850,000	802,000,000
Czechoslovakia	do	12,340,000	191,000,000
Poland	do	24,977,000	418,000,000
East Germany	Communist	17,313,000	17,000,000
Hungary	do	9,808,000	11,540,000
U. S. S. R. (Russia)	do	109,279,000	426,000,000
England	Conservative-Socialist	50,367,741	6,842,000,000
Israel	Zionist republic	1,675,000	432,000,000
Saudi Arabia	Dictatorship	6,500,000	19,789,000
Egypt	do	20,729,000	72,000,000
Iran	Royalist-Constitution	19,151,000	301,000,000

SUMMARY

Twenty-four countries different governments received $27,915,628,000.

The grants and credits shown for the respective countries listed in this study are exclusive of military grants and credits for NATO and SEATO.

In a recent study of the economies and governments of several European countries, Mr. Glenn Green, representing Dr. George S. Benson, director of the national education program of Searcy, Ark., reported on comparative wages, work hours, and monthly income in European countries as follows:

Country	Industrial wage per hour	Work week	Monthly income yearly average
Austria	$0.29	48	$57
Belgium	.52	48	98
England	.54	48	103
France	.35	48	72
Germany (Republic)	.52	48	99
Italy	.32	48	61
Norway	.78	48	140
Netherlands	.45	48	80
Sweden	.89	48	152
Yugoslavia	.16	48	32
United States	2.10	40	350

This table should be a powerful argument against both foreign aid and the renewal of the Presidential authority to reduce tariffs under the so-called reciprocal trade agreements.

The downtown stores in Washington, D. C., feature many items imported from the countries listed (including wines, liquors, and other beverages), all of which are produced with labor drawing wages far below the amounts required to maintain the present American standard of living; and it must be recognized that for the most part the grants-in-aid of agricultural commodities to these countries act as subsidies to maintain their present living standards and prevent general dissatisfaction among the people of these nations with their economic conditions and their governments as well.

George Washington's Farewell Address enunciated the best policy for the United States.

Tribute to William H. Putnam

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWIN H. MAY, JR.
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 6, 1958

Mr. MAY. Mr. Speaker, in these days of domestic and international tension, it is fortunate indeed that our land is blessed with leaders whose vision and courage transcend the troubled events of the era in which we live. Such a leader was William H. Putnam, of Hartford, Conn., who passed to his reward on March 10, 1958, a direct descendant of one of the early settlers of our land, Israel Putnam.

William H. Putnam's great forte was his ability to achieve and inspire members of both political parties to constructive action. Throughout his life the betterment of his community has been uppermost in his mind and his joy was commensurate with the degree with which his city and his State and his country progressed spiritually as well as materially. Through enlightened nonpartisanship he was the catalytic agent which precipitated constructive community action. This great man leaves a glowing path for all to follow in striving for a better life for our countrymen and for humanity. For William H. Putnam, nothing was impossible. The greater the scope of the project envisioned, the greater his enthusiasm and the quicker it was brought into reality through his faith, his determination, and his inspiration.

We of the city of Hartford, the State of Connecticut, and the Nation owe Mr. Putnam a debt of gratitude. I submit that he is one of the greatest men ever produced by our country although his fame did not attain national recognition.

The following article which appeared in the Hartford Courant on March 11, 1958, will give an insight into his brilliant career:

W. H. PUTNAM, 80, DIES; LEADING CIVIC FIGURE

William Hutchinson Putnam is dead.

A leading civic figure for more than 40 years and the moving force behind Hartford's redevelopment and bridge-building program, he died Monday afternoon at Hartford Hospital of an acute internal hemorrhage. He was admitted to the hospital last Thursday, failed to rally after an emergency operation Saturday and died at 4 p. m. Monday.

Just a little more than a month ago, on January 30, Mr. Putnam was honored on his 80th birthday anniversary as Hartford's No. 1 citizen at a testimonial dinner attended by some 800 government, business, and civic leaders.

FUND IN HIS NAME

The William H. Putnam medical research fund was initiated at this time with the presentation to Mr. Putnam of checks totaling $10,300. The fund, to be administered through the Hartford Hospital board of directors, honors Mr. Putnam's work in obtaining a modern structure for the hospital.

As another memorial to Mr. Putnam, a bronze plaque, to be mounted near the Founders Bridge approach, was unveiled at the dinner. The plaque was inscribed, "In recognition of the lasting contributions to better life in greater Hartford by William H. Putnam."

A stockbroker who was still active as senior partner of Putnam & Co. at the time of his death, Mr. Putnam was probably best known in recent years for his work in promoting Hartford's multibridge plan and in obtaining funds for the bridge construction.

On October 15 of last year, Mr. Putnam was the first to drive across the newly opened Windsor-South Windsor Bridge, marking fulfillment of the first part of his five-bridge dream. He also participated in dedication ceremonies when the Founders Bridge opened 2 days before Christmas.

Summing up Mr. Putnam's achievements at the January testimonial dinner, Oliver B. Ellsworth, president of the Riverside Trust Co., acclaimed him as a stalwart in public finance and benefactions.

"We know him," Ellsworth said, "as a builder of highways and bridges to bring regional and municipal Hartford closer together * * * for his vision, courage and patience * * * and unending effort to open new horizons for our city."

Although Mr. Putnam's public service career began 42 years ago, it was felt by many that the scope of his service increased with the years.

Only recently, a reporter asked him why he was often seen driving around the countryside early in the morning.

Mr. Putnam answered, "I like to ride around and look at the area in and around Hartford, figuring out how we can improve things and build up the city."

CONNECTICUT NATIVE

He was born in Brooklyn, Connecticut, February 1, 1878, and, with the exception of a few years early in his career, spent his entire life in his native State.

Following his education in public schools; Mr. Putnam became a clerk in the Windham County National Bank in Danielson, a job he held for 7 years until 1902 when he switched to life insurance selling. Two years later, he entered the profession that was to be his for the rest of his life. He became a bond salesman in Boston in 1904, and a year later returned to Connecticut as a representative of William A. Read Co. of New York.

In 1912, he became a partner of the firm of Richter & Co., the forerunner of Putnam & Co., of which he became senior partner in 1921.

Mr. Putnam's active participation in Hartford's civic life began in 1916 when he was appointed a member of the finance committee of the City of Hartford. He served on the committee until 1922.

From this time on, municipal finance and Mr. Putnam's name were almost inseparable.

"It is uncertain," Ellsworth stated at Mr. Putnam's testimonial, "just how much public money he has diverted into good works over the years, but a conservative estimate probably would be about $100 million.

HAD POLITICAL INTERESTS

"As a financial man," Ellsworth continued, "Bill Putnam has not always run true to the normal conception of financier. In fact, at times, he has shown almost a sacrilegious scorn of the money argument when it has been used to delay or hamper any of his public works."

Mr. Putnam also gained prominence in these early years as State chairman in 1917–19 of the World War I Liberty Loan Commission. During the war years, he directed the floating of five liberty loans in Hartford.

Mr. Putnam also took an interest in politics in the rough-and-tumble era of political battling and during several campaigns served as chairman of the ways and means committee of the Republican State Central Committee.

While he always claimed that he didn't know anything about politics, he was considered a shrewd behind-the-scenes operator, who could out-maneuver the most astute politician while protesting his innocence in political dealings.

Mr. Putnam once listed his principal interests as "Hartford Hospital, Hartford parks and horticulture, education of women at Connecticut College, major improvements in the city of Hartford, and the welfare of its citizens."

HEADED FLOOD COMMISSION

His interest in parks brought him appointment to the board of park commissioners in 1931. He served on the commission for 17 years and was twice its president. He was later named a member of the Royal Horticultural Society of England.

Mr. Putnam took an active part in relief work when he was asked in 1939 by former President Hoover to head the Finnish Relief Fund in Connecticut. In this position, he organized volunteers to carry out the relief work.

His philanthropic activities also included membership on the board of directors of the Community Chest, which he helped found, and a term as president of the local community chest.

Mr. Putnam's association with Hartford Hospital began when he was named director and member of the executive comittee in 1934. He was president of Hartford Hospital for 7 years and also served as chairman of the board of directors.

Mr. Putnam took special pride in his association with the Hartford Flood Commission, of which he was named chairman in 1936, by the late Mayor Thomas J. Spellacy.

WAS COLLEGE TRUSTEE

He came to the commission in the days when the Connecticut River periodically stormed over its banks and when patrons of the Hotel Bond were delivered to the lobby by rowboat. The flood commission built dikes and made possible the conduit highway into the center of teh city and the North Meadows Highway.

When the Hartford Redevelopment Commission was established to increase the city's accessibility and business opportunities, Mr.

Putnam was chosen to direct it. Hartford's redevelopment between Market Street and the Connecticut River now in progress is felt to be largely the product of Mr. Putnam's perseverance in this area.

In the field of education, Mr. Putnam served as trustee and chairman of the board of Connecticut College for Women and as a member of the board of trustees and one-time chairman of the board of Suffield Academy.

He received an honorary master of arts from Trinity College in 1942 and an honorary doctorate of humane letters from Hillyer College in 1955. He has also been honored by the order of the Sons of Italy in America and in 1956, he received a "boss of the year" award from the Greater Hartford Junior Chamber of Commerce.

LEAVES TWO SONS

He was a director of St. Francis Hospital and a vestryman at Hartford's Trinity church for 25 years. He also was a member of the board of trustees of Horace Bushnell Memorial and of the New York stock exchange and a director of the children's museum and Hartford Special Machinery Co., as well as a member of the Society of Cincinnati of Connecticut, Society of Colonial Wars, the Mayflower Society and Society of Founders and Patriots. He was a 32d degree Mason and a Shriner.

His club membership included the Hartford Club, Union League, Century Association, in New York, and the Tobique Salmon in New Brunswick, Canada.

He married Adabelle C. Lyon on March 8, 1899. She died April 17, 1944.

He leaves two sons, Lyonel H. Putnam and Albert D. Putnam, both of Hartford; a daughter, Miss Marcella R. Putnam of Hartford; two grandsons, William H. Putnam II of West Hartford and Douglas T. Putnam of Cambridge, Mass.; and a granddaughter, Mrs. Robert G. Perry, Jr., of West Hartford.

Funeral services will be held Wednesday at noon in Trinity Episcopal Church. Burial will be in the family plot in the churchyard of Old Trinity Church, Brooklyn, Conn. The James T. Pratt Co. is in charge of funeral arrangements.

Protect States Water Rights

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HENRY ALDOUS DIXON
OF UTAH
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 10, 1958

Mr. DIXON. Mr. Speaker, following are some of the statements made on the subject of States water rights by vitally concerned groups:

Utah Wool Growers: "We stoutly affirm and support the theory and practice of State ownership of and all water originating within that State's boundary. We earnestly condemn any and all efforts to change or confuse the theory of rights."

National Cattlemen's Association:

"Whereas for nearly a century it has been the settled rule that Western water rights are dependent on and determined by State law; and

"Whereas since 1866 Congress has recognized such sovereign rights; and

"Whereas said State water rights are now in jeopardy because of the decision of the Supreme Court of the United States in the Pelton Dam case: Therefore be it

"*Resolved*, That we urge Congress to pass S. 863, which would by law reaffirm the rights of the States to control, supervise and adjudicate their water."

Gov. George D. Clyde, Governor of the State of Utah: "Advised S. 497 has been amended by House Public Works Committee to strike Senate approved proviso which required compliance with State water rights. Deletion recommended by Justice Department. Urge your immediate effort to restore proviso."

A Nation Changed in the 100 Days

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN D. DINGELL
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 10, 1958

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, one of the most remarkable legislative episodes in history began here 25 years ago yesterday. It has been called The First Hundred Days, and it marked a New Deal for the American people—a basic change in our philosophy of government.

For the first time an American Government actively accepted its responsibility to protect its people, to stop a depression in its tracks, to restore confidence, to create jobs, to recognize, in the words of Franklin Delano Roosevelt, the "social duty" of Government to guarantee people the opportunity to earn their living by the sweat of their brow.

The bank holiday, begun on the day following President Roosevelt's inauguration, ended 10 days later. On March 14, 1933, the Washington Star reported:

The Washington public today poured unprecedented deposits into the 20 banks licensed to reopen on an almost normal basis under approval of the Federal Government. The banks were swamped with customers opening new accounts in what was described as the most remarkable banking day in the history of the city.

Thus did vigorous action begin to disperse fear.

I was a small boy during this remarkable 1st session of the 72d Congress. My father was one of those early New Dealers, and I can recall his intense pride in the powerful effort of the administration and the Congress to drive away the black depression which had paralyzed our people.

It was Dad's great satisfaction, as a Member of Congress, to have sponsored section 7 (a) of the National Recovery Act, which recognized the right of workers to organize and to bargain collectively.

The Nation remembers those days with the fondness reserved for times of great courage. I have the honor to insert here in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an article by Mr. Relman Morin, of the Associated Press, taken from the Washington Star of Sunday, March 9. It is called A Nation Changed in the 100 Days:

A NATION CHANGED IN THE 100 DAYS

(By Relman Morin)

When he took the oath of office, the President's hand lay on the passage in the Bible which begins, "For now we see through a glass, darkly * * *."

Darkness covered all of America that day, black shadows of fear and uncertainty. "Nobody knows how far this thing will go," men were saying. A crisis atmosphere brooded over the inauguration, a sense of urgency.

Indeed, Franklin D. Roosevelt immediately invoked the wide powers provided in the Trading With the Enemy Act. He also summoned the 73d Congress into special session.

On March 9, 1933—exactly 25 years ago—the 2 Houses convened. So began the 100 days, the most extraordinary legislative period the Nation has ever known. With unbelievable speed, measures of vast consequence were rushed into law. Measures which otherwise would have gone through years of study and debate were telescoped into a little more than 3 months.

When the 100 days ended, an era of American life ended, and a new one began. The Federal Government entered a very different relationship with the individual. To some, the actions taken represent progress, to others socialism.

HOW THINGS WERE

A whole generation of Americans has grown to maturity with no direct knowledge of the great depression. It was like a blight, mysteriously spreading from mid-America to both coasts.

Did it come from abroad, as some economists said? Was it a result of farm surplus? Or the market inflation and subsequent crash? Or banking practices? Or was it simply affirming the theory that the American system is chained to cycles of boom and bust?

Whatever the answer, the United States was sick, quite sick, when the 100 days began. Every bank in the country was closed. In February, before the bank holiday, the rate of withdrawals of gold and currency shot up from $5 million a day to $15 million.

The holiday caught many people without cash. An employer might issue due bills on the grocery store in lieu of the payroll. In some places, scrip circulated, pieces of paper backed by nothing but mutual trust.

"Thousands of Americans Stranded Abroad," said a newspaper headline.

At home, breadlines coiled around whole city blocks, serpentines of shuffling men, dazed, beaten, shamefaced, or defiant.

Men—and women, too—sold apples on the corner, or panhandled. The standard appeal, "Brother, can you spare a dime?" would soon become the title of a popular song.

City governments defaulted on employees' payrolls. The shuttered bank, the cold factory chimney, the silenced freight yard—symbols of at least 13 million unemployed and probably more.

But there was a more disquieting symbol—the knot of hard-eyed farmers, some with shotguns, blocking the sheriff when he came with a court order to foreclose.

Was the Nation on the brink of revolution? Not in any organized sense. Yet hunger bred lawlessness. Frances Perkins, the new Secretary of Labor, quoted a railroad president as saying: "If a man whose family is hungry steals, I can't blame him. I think I would do the same."

Bitter, sardonic letters appeared in the newspapers. One in the New York Times, signed "Virginia Leffingwell," said the depression had taught her a valuable lesson. "I shall never again practice economy. I shall spend every cent. * * *"

On the eve of the 100 days, William Hard wrote in the Washington Star:

"The country and the Congress do not want Mr. Roosevelt, as President, to query. They want him to command. He therefore will."

It was an accurate statement.

THE ACTION BEGINS

The first bill—the Emergency Banking Act—was finished, introduced in Congress, passed, and signed into law, all in the first day of the 100 days.

In scope, it was gigantic. It gave new powers to the Treasury, the Comptroller of

Currency, the Federal Reserve, the Reconstruction Finance Corporation. It affected transactions in credit, currency, gold, silver, and foreign exchange. It provided penalties for hoarding or exporting gold. The House passed it unanimously and the Senate vote was 73–7.

The very next day, March 10, a second bill—the Economy Act—was ready to go up to Capitol Hill.

Since it provided, among other things, cuts in war veterans' pensions, the act had somewhat rougher going. But the House passed it March 11 and the Senate March 15.

Meanwhile on March 12, there was the first fireside chat. For 20 minutes, the President spoke in informal language, "I want to talk for a few minutes with the people of the United States about banking."

The next message to Congress—on amending the Volstead Act to legalize wine and beer—was only 72 words long. There was no trouble in either House.

Week after week, in rapid rhythm, Congress received and passed new laws. They touched almost every segment of the economy.

Some statistics indicate the wide range of problems:

Unemployment: The Department of Labor showed 12,830,000 jobless out of a total working force of 51,840,000. Nearly one-quarter.

Banking: From 1930 to the eve of the 100 days, 5,504 banks had closed. Their total deposits had been $3,430,000,000.

Agriculture: Farm prices had fallen 56 percent since 1929 and gross income from $17 billion to $5,240,000,000.

Railroads: Of 138 class A carriers, 38 showed a profit for 1932, 55 had earned operating expenses but not enough to meet fixed charges, and the other 45 had not met operating expenses.

Federal finances: Estimates of anticipated revenue fell nearly a billion dollars short of the budget estimate of $3,450,000,000. The national debt was over $20 billion, of which $11,345,000,000 in long- and short-term obligations was redeemable within that year. (The Economy Act carried the astonishing title, "To Maintain the Credit of the United States Government.")

Congress adjourned June 16. By that time, it had passed a farm bill, set up the Tennessee Valley Authority, established the Civilian Conservation Corps—which authorized the employment, largely on reforestation projects, of 250,000 men between the ages of 18 and 25—passed other relief, employment and financial measures, and had enacted the National Industrial Recovery Act.

Of all the measures, none excited more controversy that NIRA. It brought the Federal Government into the rough-and-tumble of business competition. When it became law, a correspondent wrote:

"At 10 o'clock this morning, the United States abruptly departed from the economic system that had grown up without change during the entire existence of the Nation."

There was a short provision, section 7–A, in the act which said in part, "Employees shall have the right to organize and bargain collectively through representatives of their own choosing. * * *"

NIRA later was declared unconstitutional, but section 7–A became the basis for a whole body of labor-management legislation.

At the end of May, the administration took stock. From questionnaires to 22 key industries, the Commerce Department reported:

Gains in steel operations, compared to the last half of March. Production and sales of automobiles 22 percent higher than the same period for 1932.

Cement and motion pictures were down from 1932. Wheat and meat prices had risen. The stock market had made some gains. There was much better feeling in the farm machine industry.

Brewers, in business again, said they were planning to spend $22 million on the east coast, and expected to create 300,000 jobs.

Had public confidence been restored? Observers disagreed.

WHAT IT MEANS TODAY

What do the 100 days mean to us today?

Banking practices were radically changed, most financial men believe for the better.

Section 7–A of NRA became the basis for the Wagner Act and other labor-strengthening legislation. The results are fiercely disputed.

Dispute rages too, over the farm laws that grew out of the AAA, and over the TVA, and other Government-developed projects.

What about the overall impact, the impact on philosophy?

Raymond Moley and Rexford G. Tugwell, both members of the original brain trust would debate that.

Mr. Tugwell cited, as some prime results:

"We have the floor which exists under the whole social-security system. We never can have a 1929 again because we will never have a situation in which people are hungry. That is something new in our time.

"We no longer accept the defeatist point of view which existed at that time. Nobody who was in power believed you could do anything about a depression. As a matter of fact, they didn't believe it was any of Government's business."

Mr. Moley, however, sees the results in this way:

"We have a planned economy generally. We have the theory that Federal spending is the way to get out of a depression. The excesses in giving relief were greater in 1950 than they were in 1932.

"He (Roosevelt) believed in the collectivist theory that the way to stimulate purchasing power, or to stimulate purchasing, was to give more money to people."

Mr. Tugwell says:

"We argued that you had to have an economy in which there were groups who could be each other's customers, or else the other fellow wouldn't be producing, and you would have unemployment. Each group had to have enough income to buy the other fellow's goods. The President called it a concert of interests."

Mr. Moley says that the chief immediate result of the legislation of the period was the deterioration of individual initiative because of some of the excesses. That led to the theory, as Harry Hopkins set it out, that the way to political success was "tax-tax-tax, spend-spend-spend."

Mr. Tugwell says:

"What's the use of talking about personal initiative? There was a breadline stretching around the block. Those men wanted to work, and we were feeding them."

THE 100 DAYS

March 9: Emergency Banking Relief Act.

March 20: Economy Act. It was designed to help balance the budget by saving of $500 million in Government expense.

March 22: Beer-Wine Revenue Act amended the Volstead Act to legalize wine and beer.

March 31: Civilian Conservation Corps Reforestation Relief Act.

April 19: Gold standard abandoned.

May 12: Federal Emergency Relief Act created an agency authorized to allot $500 million in direct relief to State and municipalities.

Agricultural Adjustment Act.

May 18: Tennessee Valley Authority established.

May 27: Federal Securities Act, designed to provide investors with information on new securities.

June 5: Gold repeal joint resolution, cancelled the gold clause in Federal and private obligations, and made contracts and debts payable in legal tender.

June 6: National Employment System Act authorized a Federal employment service in cooperation with the States.

June 13: Home Owners Loan Corporation created to refinance home mortgage debts.

June 16: Glass-Steagall Banking Act created Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, guaranteeing bank deposits under $5,000 and extending powers of the Federal Reserve Board.

Farm Credit Act, designed to facilitate credits for agricultural production and marketing, thereby refinancing farm mortgages.

Emergency Railroad Transportation Act, aimed at promoting financial reorganization and the study of improvement methods.

National Industrial Recovery Act established codes for business competition operating under Government supervision and guaranteed labor's right to organize and bargain collectively.

Title II of the NIRA established the Public Work Administration and authorized a fund of $3.3 billion for construction.

The President of a Medical Society and a Leading Nurse Educator Agree—What This Country Needs Is a Good 2-Year Trained Bedside Nurse, With Dignity of Status, and a Living Wage

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANCES P. BOLTON
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 11, 1958

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, as one who has worked for many years with nurses and other personnel intimately associated with care of the sick, I am asked, again and again, What can be done to remedy the nursing shortage? And as a legislator who has voted for Hill-Burton Federal-State matching fund legislation to increase hospital beds across the country, I am asked why, in the face of wards being closed for lack of nurses, the Federal Government is not doing something about the crucial need for 50,000 more nurses now. Of course, the Federal Government is doing something for nurses. Among other things it is giving traineeships for the advance study of teachers, administrators, and supervisors of nursing. Essential as these grants may be, however, the vital question is, Do they represent any sort of solution to the nursing dilemma?

The causes of the shortage lie deeply imbedded in practices and methods. Although more girls than ever are going into nursing, too many are leaving during and after training. Is the 3-year training period too long? What about compensation? If low pay by comparison with other occupations is causing many to leave for other more lucrative work, where is the money coming from which will permit their pay to be raised to a level which will make nursing attractive?

Is there sufficient job satisfaction? Are their skills being properly utilized? Why are nearly a fifth of the active registered nurses in the United States practicing private duty because it is the only branch of nursing left where a qualified

nurse can give total patient care at a professional level, with job satisfaction? Is too much administrative and other responsibility not associated with patient care being heaped onto too many young women who do not want it, who want only to care for the sick at the bedside?

These are but a few of the unanswered questions which led me during the last Congress to introduce a bill calling for a national commission on nursing services. It would have brought together a group of nurses, doctors, hospital administrators, educators, economists, representatives of government and—not to be forgotten—those who are the recipients of nursing services, the patient public.

The joint recommendations of such experts could have brought national attention to the total picture of patient need. They could have spoken not for doctors, nurses, or hospital authorities as such, but for and on behalf of the public which is in need of more and better nursing care.

As my colleagues know, this bill was killed in committee, in large measure by leaders of the nursing profession who feel that whatever problems exist can be solved by their own efforts.

In this connection, the findings of a questionnaire which I sent out last year to 12,000 nurses is interesting. To the question whether the problems which interfere with nurses giving adequate nursing care could be solved by nurses alone, 2,219 said "No"; only 112 said "Yes." I asked what groups would be needed to help solve the nursing dilemma. They put hospital administrators at the top of the list.

Mr. Speaker, so that the Congress may have the benefit of some expert points of view on the nursing situation, I ask unanimous consent to include with my remarks an article written by Miss Edith A. Aynes, professional education division, National Foundation for Infantile Paralysis, which appears in the March issue of Modern Hospital. It explains the four-way squeeze which nurses are caught in today, and relates a spirited debate on many issues facing the profession between a medical authority and a nurse educator.

WHAT WE NEED IS A BEDSIDE NURSE

If Florence Nightingale came back to life and went to work in a modern hospital, a student nurse said recently, she'd have somebody else carry her lamp.

Nurses who think this is an exaggerated view might consider a recent survey indicating that only 30 percent of nursing personnel in the group of hospitals studied were graduate nurses—and more than one-third of the graduate nurses were in administrative or teaching, rather than nursing, assignments.

Caught in a four-way squeeze with the demands of doctors, nurses, nurse educators, and patients pressing them from all sides, some hospital administrators blame nurses themselves for everything that is wrong on hospital floors. Others blame the Government, or industry, or hospitals without schools, which use but don't train scarce nursing talent. Still other administrators simply look the other way where patient safety is concerned and hire women they call nurses, rationalizing that a white uniform and some kind of nurses' cap is all that is required to attend patients.

With a little urging, both doctors and hospital administrators will admit that their most pressing patient care problem revolves around the nursing shortage, and they acknowledge that the greatest single item of cost in their hospitals is for nursing service. If they are completely honest, they will then tell you that even with the sums allocated to nursing service personnel, their patients are receiving the poorest nursing care in the recent history of hospitals.

Nurses will tell you, if you ask them—and listen to their answers—that hospital nursing is the least satisfying of all kinds of nursing available to them today.

Why?

I would like to start with a conversation I had recently with the president of a State medical society in the Middle West.

This doctor and a number of his colleagues handle the medical needs of a small city, and they patronize the local hospital. His problem was not new, nor were his feelings about organized nursing. What was new was his willingness to discuss—and I mean listen as well as talk—the problem in terms of nurses and nursing needs as well as the needs of doctors and hospital administrators.

His first point was that the accreditation of nursing schools was causing many small hospitals to close their schools, thus eliminating the student labor so important to the operation of the small hospital already overburdened with expenses. I countered with the timeworn rebuttal of protecting standards for the student who is seeking an education.

"But all we want are bedside nurses," he reiterated. "We don't want these highly educated women. Oh, of course, you need a few, but they aren't content to give the service we need."

I conceded that point, but asked about the student.

"Do you think you can get the high-school girl of the caliber you want to enter a training school, work for 3 years in a nonaccredited school for practically nothing, and wind up at the end of that period with a diploma that blocks further education, keeps her from working in better places—keeps her from civil service jobs, from jobs in industry, public health, and the service nurse corps?"

"I can fill my hospital right now with 25 girls who would be content with that kind of training," he said earnestly. "They want this kind of an education, and this kind of work."

"I can't believe it," I said. "If they were content with that level of education, they would go into practical nurse schools. Why don't you start one of those?"

"Because practical nurses aren't trained enough for what we want," he said simply. "You can't expect a practical nurse to give an intravenous."

"In other words, what you still want is a nurse who can take a doctor's responsibility with nothing but on-the-job training and very little pay."

"No, not that at all," he said patiently. "What we want are good, safe, beside nurses who are content to stay at the bedside."

Four hours later we found we were in practical agreement:

What this country needs is a good, 2-year-trained bedside nurse with a title that will permit her to stay at the bedside with the dignity of status and a living wage. A trained nurse with more technical training than a practical nurse's 1-year course allows, but with a course condensed from the 3-year curriculum that now graduates a product expected, upon graduation, to know not only bedside nursing with all its intricate specialties, but the art of teaching, training, and supervising everything from a bedpost to contemporary graduates. Then, in addition, she is expected to reveal the management skills required by the hospital administrator who holds her responsible for the economical use of supplies, the fire regulations, the time schedules of personnel from the maid to the graduate staff, the supervision of the hospital at night, and the narcotic count.

What is needed, it seems, is a 2-year-trained bedside nurse who can safely and independently carry out the doctors' orders, but who is not to be saddled with anything administrative. She is not to be put in charge of a ward, a department, a group of patients, of time schedules, of handling personnel or equipment, of teaching the nonprofessional in or out of the classroom; of heading patient care teams for critically ill patients. She should not have such responsibilities unless she herself desires to change her status and is willing to take further education in a formal classroom to supplement her technical nursing skills with the management skills required for such leadership positions.

My medical friend was right. He could fill his hospital with women who prefer nursing patients to nursing leadership headaches. Seventy-two thousand (nearly 18 percent) of the active registered nurses in the United States are practicing private duty because it is the only branch of nursing left where a qualified nurse can give total patient care at a professional level—with job satisfaction.

So our 2-year-trained bedside nurse would be an operator—not a chief operator.

"But she will still be an R. N." my friend said.

"No," I almost shouted. "Let's not confuse the picture any more. She must not be confused with either the professional nurse or the practical nurse, but she must be required to pass a licensing test by the State, not only for the protection of the public, but as a means of establishing her educational level. She must be recognized as a fully qualified, trained, bedside nurse."

Promising a student a white cap, a white uniform, and an R. N. after her name is almost a requirement to obtain students for any professional nursing school, regardless of what kind of diploma she gets. In order to attract anybody these days, you've got to promise them something. Just as the military did in World War II:

"Join the WAC—save the wounded—replace registered nurses."

When the emergency developed, the military had to make the best of what it could get. Women who served medical needs in the WACS, the WAVES, the SPARS, the Marines, and the Red Cross nursing programs wanted to help, and they did help. But they would have been happier and more effective if they had had some training and organization before they were flung into hospitals and clinics—with sometimes downright unfriendly doctors and nurses to look to for guidance.

You can't use mirrors to take care of people in a military hospital, any more than you can use mirrors in a civilian hospital. It takes trained people.

In the armed services, the people giving nursing service to patients are divided into several categories: officer nurses, enlisted men and women, civilian employees under civil service—both graduate nurse and nonprofessional, Red Cross nurse's aides, volunteers and others.

In civilian hospitals, the people giving nursing service to patients are also divided into several categories: professional nurses, practical nurses, student nurses (both professional and practical), attendants, nurse's aides, ward maids, orderlies, volunteers, and others.

Ward maids and orderlies correspond nicely to the untrained soldier or Wac; the nurse's aides and attendants are comparable to their counterparts in the military and to the hospital corpsman, and the medical tech-

nician compares with the on-the-job trained practical nurse.

Essentially the military has the same nursing problem as the civilian hospital—only the military is more complicated. Where the civilian hospital has only a board of trustees to convince, the military hospital has the whole Government making decisions that affect it, and military doctors—being civilian trained—are just as unfamiliar with nursing problems as are their civilian colleagues.

"We don't want a bunch of blankety-blank generals," a colonel-doctor roared at me during a Regular Army nurse commissioning session a few years ago. "We want some bedside nurses."

Yet the Army—presumably with the approval of doctors—established the Army Nurse Corps more than 50 years ago on the basis of one nurse to 10 beds: teachers of nursing to supervise the care of the sick. Soldiers were supposed to benefit from their training. Nobody ever explained to those early graduates of Florence Nightingale schools that they were teachers. With the backing of the medics and civilian nursing, the Army nevertheless commisioned the products of State-approved civilian schools of nursing, regardless of the educational standards of the school involved. With the full support of the American Nurses Association and at least the tacit approval of the American Medical Association and the American Hospital Association, graduate, registered nurses from some of the smallest schools in the United States as well as the largest, are commissioned as potential leaders on the same basis, with the same pay, privileges and responsibilities, as leadership candidates from West Point and the ROTC programs.

Whether anybody likes it or not, or approves of it or not, the hospitals in our economy and other agencies needing nurses have only one source of supply for graduate registered nurses—the eleven-hundred-some-odd civilian schools of nursing. All these schools of nursing, whether they are attached to a 10-bed hospital without an instructor, a 50-bed hospital with one half-time or full-time instructor, or to the largest universities in the country, issuing degrees instead of diplomas at graduation, produce only one level of worker—the nurse who takes the State board in her own State and becomes a good, bad, or indifferent registered nurse—a professional nurse.

Right now it matters little where the nurse works or from what school she graduated, she finds herself in a position where she must work with subordinates. In theory, since she is registered by the State, she is a better bet than the attendant hired away from the local ice-cream factory, and presumably she is capable of safeguarding the medications and treatments ordered for patients under her surveillance. But, just as in the case of the 1-nurse-to-10-beds ratio in the Army 50 years ago, she isn't supposed to let on that she knows this is her function. By some funny scheme, the nurse is supposed automatically to take care of all the patients that need her attention, and leave alone those who do not. She is automatically supposed to satisfy all the demands of the medical staff that need her level of assistance and stay out of the way for the rest. She is supposed to keep all the administrative matters under control that her crystal ball tells her the hospital administrator wants her to handle, and leave the others strictly alone.

All this she is to do without much guidance. The lack of communication and feedback between the top level of hospital administration and the nurse who is working at a foreman's job is appalling. Why should a hospital administrator listen to what a general duty nurse has to say? In the eyes of the doctor or the hospital administrator, a nurse is a nurse. Nurse's aids, practical nurses trained or untrained, attendants—anybody with a uniform—can be a nurse. If nursing leaders want to provide better qualified head nurses and supervisors and think they should educate to that level so professional nurses will be professional in fact, as well as in fancy, the doctors and hospital administrators shout: "We don't want a bunch of blankety-blank generals. We want some bedside nurses."

For a few years following World War II when the military need had jumped from 639 to 57,000 graduate registered nurses—I was optimistic that something constructive would come out of the nightmare we had gone through. Even after the war, civilian hospitals, scraped to the bone, were relying on student nurses and overworked graduates to take care of civilian patients. The situation approached chaos. Surely, I thought, somebody would do something to make sense out of the whole mess before we got into another international misunderstanding.

But everybody has been too busy. Men who learned tricks about hospital administration in the medical administrative corps scurried out to get administrative jobs in civilian hospitals. Doctors who learned about new medications and new surgical techniques scurried out to establish themselves in the best possible places in civilian communities.

Nurses, appalled at the confusion and turmoil and the lack of understanding that surrounded their efforts in both military and civilian hospitals, returned to classrooms wherever they could to try to learn the techniques of teaching nonprofessionals and the intricacies of administration, so they might make some sense out of their own profession. But nurses not only went to school, they went into public health, school programs, industry—anything that would keep them out of hospital wards.

Why?

1. Because hospital administrators, with their newly found stature, would not concede that anything administrative belonged in the jurisdiction of the nurse. She should just take care of patients.

2. Because doctors would not concede that anything professional belonged in the jurisdiction of the nurse. She should just take care of patients.

3. Because nurses, faced with both administrative and professional problems in the care of patients, had little backing and no authority to recommend organizational changes or even to complain effectively about things as they were.

Today there are flocks of untrained people under foot on hospital wards who are not capable of giving safe nursing care to patients, people who are encouraged by both doctors and hospital administrators (and a few nurses) to do procedures that nurses with consciences feel are too dangerous for untrained or semitrained people to perform unsupervised. The bulk of the nurses are not trained as teachers, they are not trained as supervisors, and they do not want to accept the nursing-care responsibility for patients when there are too few trained people to help them. They feel that any person in contact with sick patients should be conversant with new technics, new drugs, new equipment, and know the effects on the human body of such drugs and treatments. When the workload becomes impossible for them to give or even supervise the nursing care themselves, they seek work elsewhere—where a conscience off duty can rest.

After 4 hours of discussion, the president of the medical society and I were in complete agreement: What this country needs is a good, 2-year trained bedside nurse. A trained nurse who, upon completion of her training, would not be a head nurse or a supervisor; would not be a public-health nurse, or an industrial nurse, or a nurse anesthetist, or an operating-room supervisor, or an educator—and she would not be eligible for a commission in the Armed Forces.

This trained bedside nurse would have an in-between status of her own—something like a warrant officer's rating in the military. She would have periodic pay increases at intervals, up to what it takes to keep her on the job if she's worth it. She should have the opportunity to become a senior bedside nurse—a promotion comparable to the chief warrant or petty officer in the military. But if she wanted to become a professional, she would have to return to a civilian university and obtain the necessary education.

The area of nursing below the professional level should be a career in itself. Teaching, supervising, nursing administration require more than a 3-year diploma, not only for the sake of patients, but for the sake of the poor devils who have to work on nursing services and in nursing departments under the guidance of the so-called professional nurses.

The 2-year level is also an opportunity for the practical nurses to prove they can go on; whether they should be licensed by examination or by sweating out the course for 2 years would have to be settled by State boards of nurse examiners. The State board requirements for licensing should make these people realize that they not only have legal responsibilities, but also they have legal limitations on their activities. Licensure should help the individual remember that the practice of medicine is a full-fledged doctor's responsibility requiring 5 to 8 years or more of education—whether the doctor is around all the time or not.

The 2-year school of nursing would do several other things: It would answer the smaller hospital's need for cheap labor and at the same time meet the needs of many girls who cannot afford the more expensive education that goes with professional nursing. Many girls cannot meet the educational requirements, let alone the financial. This level of training would make possible the expansion of the nursing service of the Nation without danger to patients.

The nursing aspects of medical care and treatment, the ethics that surround doctors, patients and hospitals, would be stressed in this 2-year course, along with human relations. Cooperation with professional and practical nurses, not competition, would be emphasized. As a result, workers would not be subjected to the tactics of untrained nurse managers who neither know how, nor want, to train and supervise at the bedside.

Nursing is having a feeling for people—a human feeling that makes it possible for you to serve them and their often disagreeable sickroom needs around the clock, with compassion, sympathy and understanding. Teaching nursing, supervising nursing, inculcating the ethics of nursing into people and inspiring them to give that nursing care in a compassionate, sympathetic and understanding manner is an entirely different job. But you have to understand the first before you can accomplish the second.

Hospital administrators make their greatest mistake, waste the most money, in believing that quantities of people can substitute for quality in nursing.

Consider one of the prototype studies published in The Modern Hospital last year, for example. The 600 bed hospital was reported as having an average daily census of 482 patients with 51 newborn.

To give nursing care to patients and to staff operating rooms, delivery rooms, outpatient clinics, central supply departments, teaching schedules, head nursing jobs and supervision around the clock, the 600 bed hospital employed 754 people, only 30 percent of whom were graduate, registered nurses. Less than half these nurses were

general duty nurses, and even including the part-time nurses employed, they accounted for only 20 percent of the number of people employed as nursing personnel.

Of the 528 less than professional personnel, 260 were student nurses, 39 were practical nurses and 229 were other employees, identified as nurses' aides, orderlies, maids and attendants. Under these circumstances, the graduate staff, whether it is acknowledged or not, must be, of necessity, in leadership positions, even as general duty nurses. Yet surveys reveal that only about 30 percent have the required interest, personality, education and other qualifications for such responsibilities.

Thirty percent of a staff that includes all levels of workers should all be leaders—not just 30 percent of 30 percent.

Suppose the nurses who lack leadership qualities and ambitions could be designated as trained bedside nurses, and the best practical nurses, nurses' aides, and attendants could be given enough training to bring them to a 2-year level of education, and licensed as bedside nurses. This group, along with new recruits to 2-year schools, will soon make up a staff of bedside nurses who know and understand the nursing aspects of medical technics, who want to practice them and can be legally responsible for doing them right. Let this group, under the administrative guidance of the professional head nurses and supervisors, give nursing care to patients. But fire the first head nurse or supervisor who fails in her role as supervisor or teacher when the staff asks for help.

A third of the remaining force should be trained practical nurses so that the skills and abilities of the bedside nurses will not be wasted with less than the acutely ill. If your professional staff are true leaders, you will find you can probably cut the size of the paid staff to about one-half what it is today—but you will be required to back your director of nurses on matters that affect nursing service, and include your total professional staff in your communications system. Mental telepathy is not taught in enough schools to make it effective, in either direction, in the hospital.

Nearly one-half of your nursing staff is now trained to a safe level; one-third is in an understudy position, and the other one-sixth has an opportunity to progress if they want to make the effort. Any person at any level can stay at that level, if she prefers. With this kind of an organizational structure in civilian institutions, nursing service could be expanded to meet a national emergency, but instead of drafting only graduate, registered nurses and untrained enlisted men and women, a portion of each trained group could be ready for the expansion, and a like portion could remain at home. The main idea is to have an organized nursing service and get your money's worth from the people you hire at the level you hire them, both as a civilian hospital administrator and a taxpayer. If you are going to have to pay commissioned officer salaries to nursing personnel, in or out of the military, for goodness sake require the qualifications and performance that go with them. But don't leave them stranded at the top of the ladder with nothing between them and the bottom rung.

The time should be long past when we, as patients or taxpayers, can afford to pay lush salaries to haloed Florence Nightingales because they once graduated from schools of nursing and practiced nobly at the bedside of patients. Top-level performance in nursing leadership should be the criterion of high-sounding titles and big salaries, in any area of our national economy—Government or civilian. Especially when somebody else is carrying the lamp.

Propaganda for Summit Meeting

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LAURENCE CURTIS
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 11, 1958

Mr. CURTIS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, in extension of my remarks, I include my current newsletter which discusses the present propaganda in favor of a summit meeting, as follows:

President Eisenhower and Secretary Dulles have made clear America's willingness to engage in meaningful negotiations with the Soviets, but distrust of steps whose principal value might be for propaganda purposes.

"It is absolutely futile," said the President at his press conference last week, "to attempt to hold a summit meeting unless the agenda and the subjects included on it are so well prepared as to give a general belief that real progress toward easing of tensions can be accomplished."

The Soviets are now engaged in a tremendous campaign to show that they are the ones most anxious for peace. Perhaps America's reaction to the sputniks and intensified defense efforts were more than the Russians had bargained for, and they are now pouring oil on the troubled waters. Their campaign is featured by demands for a summit meeting.

The New York Times suggests a reason: "The Soviet aim appears to be to relax tensions in Europe in the hope of undermining the West's willingness to bear the burdens of defense, and of gaining acceptance of the status quo—that is, a divided Germany and Russian domination of the eastern half of the continent."

People must guard against the assumption that those who speak the loudest in favor of a summit meeting are therefore the ones who are most devoted to the cause of peace. Russian propaganda has made effective use of that assumption.

A summit meeting is simply one between the heads of state. For us that would mean President Eisenhower's personal participation. For England it would mean attendance by the Prime Minister rather than the Foreign Secretary. It is no cure-all.

After all, international agreements have not usually been made at meetings of heads of state. Neither President Wilson's participation in the Paris peace conference following World War I, nor President Franklin D. Roosevelt's talks with Marshal Stalin, evoke particularly happy memories.

The last summit meeting at Geneva in July 1955 was disillusioning. Then as now people expected great results. There was enthusiasm for the spirit of Geneva. President Eisenhower met with Marshal Bulganin and Mr. Khrushchev, Prime Minister Anthony Eden of the United Kingdom, and president of the council Edgar Faure of France. The meeting culminated in a directive to the foreign ministers which stated:

"The heads of government, recognizing their common responsibility for the settlement of the German question and the reunification of Germany, have agreed that the settlement of the German question and the reunification of Germany by means of free elections shall be carried out in conformity with the national interests of the German people and the interests of European security."

But when the foreign ministers met at Geneva a few months later, the Soviets refused to negotiate for the reunification of Germany.

When asked whether this subject should be brought up again at the proposed new meeting, Secretary Dulles replied that he saw doubtful wisdom in a second summit meeting which would in effect bury the results of the first one rather than build on it.

President Eisenhower said at his news conference last week: "We will never close the door * * * if there is any possible avenue, no matter how crooked, no matter how narrow, if * * * it will take us toward some easing of tensions in the world, one step toward peace, I am perfectly ready to start."

The attitude of the administration is in the highest traditions of America. We proceed with wisdom and caution, but will make every honorable effort. Whosoever shall compel thee to go a mile, go with him twain.

The Meaning of Mutual Security

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. A. S. J. CARNAHAN
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 11, 1958

Mr. CARNAHAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD I include the following editorial from the February 25, 1958, issue of the Arkansas Gazette published in Little Rock:

THE MEANING OF MUTUAL SECURITY

Little Rock has just been treated to a visit from a bipartisan team of Congressmen which is touring the country in support of President Eisenhower's embattled mutual-security program.

The traveling team, made up of Representative A. S. J. CARNAHAN, Democrat, of Missouri, and CHESTER E. MERROW, Republican, of New Hampshire, could be likened to one of those so-called truth squads, a development of recent political campaigns, whose job it is to clear up misinformation spread by the other side. Unlike the truth squads, as they have worked out in practice, however, the team of CARNAHAN and MERROW is not leaving a store of new misinformation in its wake.

It simply tries to give factual answers to questions about the mutual-security program, and in so doing to dispel some of the prevailing misconceptions which seek to dismiss mutual security as a giveaway program, pouring money down a rathole, and so on through a variety of verbal tricks.

Mutual security is simply that a program of overseas assistance undertaken for the benefit of both the United States and the recipient nation. Even foreign aid, although handy for headline purposes, is not quite an adequate definition.

In their speaking appearance at Little Rock, Representatives CARNAHAN and MERROW used a standard pie-cut chart to demonstrate that mutual assistance takes up only 5 percent of the administration's proposed new spending budget for fiscal 1959. If they had broken those spending figures down still further, to show the actual amount contemplated for economic assistance overseas, foreign aid's slice of the pie would have been shown to be an infinitesimal wedge indeed.

Yet when most people think of foreign aid they think of economic assistance. A bottle of milk for every Hottentot, was the contemptuous term used in the very earliest days of the mutual assistance program. The

facts, of course, are that by far the major share of every mutual security program of recent years has gone into military hardware for our armed allies.

There are imbalances in the mutual security program as presently constituted and as projected in Mr. Eisenhower's new budget. There have been examples of waste and errors in administration. By and large, however, the program has lived up to the billing Mr. Eisenhower gave it in his special message to Congress last week: It amounts to a first line of defense for America in vital areas overseas, which if lost to the Communist colossus, would deny us vital and irreplaceable markets and sources of raw materials. It has, moreover, been cheap at the price.

The mutual assistence program—with its adjunct, the reciprocal trade program—is one area where the President's early lack of vigor and resolution may cost him and the country dearly. However, it still is not too late if enough good Americans of both parties will follow the example of Representatives CARNAHAN and MERROW and weigh our overseas trade and aid programs for what they really are and ought to be.

Governments Are the Craziest People

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUBERT B. SCUDDER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 11, 1958

Mr. SCUDDER, Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I desire to insert an editorial from the Press Democrat of Santa Rosa, Calif., of March 4, entitled "Governments Are the Craziest People."

It might do us some good to know what people think of us with regard to some types of legislation which is enacted by Congress, and a thorough investigation should be made in line with this criticism. I believe that many times projects that are extremely necessary and would not add to our surplus could well take priority over certain projects that would add to the production of surplus crops that adversely affect present production.

The editorial follows:

GOVERNMENTS ARE THE CRAZIEST PEOPLE

If an individual was growing so much wheat that just the bill for storing it was a hardship, but kept hiring still more people to raise still more wheat for him, folks would be inclined to question his sanity.

Or if he decided he had too much land under cultivation and retired part of it, simultaneously building a lot of dams and canals to put other new land under cultivation, his neighbors would probably holler for a lunacy hearing in his behalf.

If he decided he should save more money for his old age, but sawed every dollar of his savings in half and threw one-half away, folks would sure enough conclude he was slightly less than normal.

Yet those are only three examples of what goes on perpetually in our Federal Government. It has accumulated basic crops beyond all reason, and many lawmakers want to restore the high parities that led to the surplus. Reclamation projects are opening new farmlands while the Soil Bank retires existing lands. Social security taxes build up a reserve for old age income while national fiscal policies constantly encourage whittling down the buying power of what a dollar will purchase.

What we can't figure out is why something that would be sheer insanity if done by an individual becomes sound policy if done by a Government supposed to represent millions of people.

The way it seems to us, if a thing would be insane if done by one person, it's 150 million times as nutty if done in the name of 150 million people.

Speech of Senator Allen J. Ellender

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL G. ROGERS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 11, 1958

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, on March 8, we were fortunate in having Senator ALLEN J. ELLENDER speak in Hollywood, Fla., at a Broward County Democratic dinner. Senator ELLENDER, as an outstanding Senator from the great State of Louisiana, and one who is recognized nationwide for his public service to the Nation, was warmly received.

Senator ELLENDER has rendered a fine service to the Nation as chairman of the Senate Agriculture Committee and as a member of the important Appropriations Committee as well. He has devoted a great deal of his time and effort in keeping abreast of world affairs and has traveled extensively throughout the world, including Russia. This travel and study has given him an exceptional background and knowledge of the administration of the foreign aid program as carried on by our Government. His observations are included in this forceful speech:

Ladies and gentlemen, I was flattered and pleased when your fine, able Congressman, PAUL ROGERS, invited me to come down here to talk to you on problems of mutual interest. I have always had a soft spot in my heart for Florida. My late wife, my only son and I often visited your many interesting sights. It has been my privilege to work closely with your two Senators, Senators HOLLAND and SMATHERS. I also knew and admired PAUL ROGERS' father, who represented this district so ably.

Florida is extremely fortunate in having such a splendid delegation representing it in Congress. SPESSARD HOLLAND, with whom I serve on both the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry and the Senate Committee on Appropriations, is one of the finest, ablest, most courageous, and hardest working Senators I have ever personally known—and I have served in the Senate for nearly a quarter century. He is devoted to the cause of Florida, in fact to that of our great country. GEORGE SMATHERS has consistently represented Florida well and ably. In his capacity as chairman of the Democratic Senatorial Campaign Committee, we depend upon him to carry us to victory—and he has done a fine job. PAUL ROGERS, although a relative newcomer to the House of Representatives, has a fine future ahead of him.

Now, it occurs to me that some of you may wonder why I choose to compliment and pay tribute to your legislators when, on occasion, we do not see eye to eye on national problems. I think it is important that the reason for this is understood and appreciated, for in it is found the basic principles upon which the Democratic Party rests.

The reason is simple.

People are different, their views and opinions vary, from State to State, even from county to county. Yet, within the framework of the Democratic Party, there is room for diversity of opinion, for differences in viewpoint. Our party is no monolithic structure, governed in its views by one man, or one clique. On the contrary, under the Democratic Party's banner gather men and women of varied opinions. I believe this is a good thing. It makes our party truly representative of the people, for we do not purge or outlaw those whose views may differ from the views of the majority.

Let me give just one example of what I mean.

There is the matter of foreign aid.

I have been a Democrat since I first sought and won public office, over 40 years ago. Generally speaking, the leaders of the Democratic Party favor a continuation of the foreign aid program, as, obviously, do the ruling circles of the Republican Party. Yet, I—for one—have been in the vanguard of those opposing the present program. By analogy, the recent announcements made by President Eisenhower, who said he would not support Republican candidates who opposed foreign aid, a move should be underway to read me out of the party.

Such has not been the case. On the contrary, some of those most vociferously in favor of the present aid program have gone out of their way to see that I have been provided a forum from which to make my views known. Their position has been—and I believe rightfully so—that the American people are entitled to the benefit of all the facts, both pro and con, and from these facts, our people can be trusted to reach the right decision.

That is why I have no qualms about telling this audience tonight, as we pay tribute to the patron saints of our party, Thomas Jefferson and Andrew Jackson, that I am going to continue to fight against the program as now administered with every ounce of strength within me.

In this regard, I do not think my views are radical, or ill founded. On the contrary, I am convinced that if we strip the ballyhoo and propaganda from around the foreign aid program, our people will agree that is has been too long continued—that it should, and must, yield to a much different concept if we are to emerge victorious from the global cold war in which we are now engaged.

Ladies and gentlemen, our country has spent over $50 billion—nearly one-sixth of our present astronomical national debt—in an effort to win the cold war by the generous application of what is apparently the only nostrum our Republican friends recognize—dollar balm.

Evidently the administration is of the opinion that since the ills of big business can be alleviated by this remedy, the same medicine should be spoon fed in liberal doses to each and every country of the world.

The abysmal record compiled by the foreign-aid program to date shows the fallacy of this theorem. But evidently the administration just refuses to face facts.

Only a couple of weeks ago, Big Chief Eisenhower and his tribal braves organized a mammoth circus in Washington to whoop it up for foreign aid. Almost everybody of any note was there, from professional politicians to professional baseball players.

I do not believe for 1 minute that the application of mass advertising techniques will make a $4 billion foreign-aid program palatable to the American people. The program may be a welcome salve to some of our dollar-hungry and greedy allies, but it is castor oil to the American taxpayer.

It would be a lot less grueling upon me, as an individual and as a Senator, if I just sat back and parroted the unctuous and pious

platitudes which oozed out of the foreign-aid conclave in Washington.

But I cannot. I have seen the program as it has been operated in the field. I know, from firsthand experience, that waste is plentiful and ill-conceived projects rampant—that we are spending vast sums of money and accomplishing little, if any, real good. In many cases we are becoming the laughingstock of the world; in others, we are downright despised.

For one thing, quite a few of the people we send overseas to administer and operate our country programs are no credit to our Government. There seems to be something about the atmosphere of foreign lands which goes to the heads of some of them. They get the idea that they are better than the folks they are sent to help. They develop an affinity for big cars, large houses, hordes of servants. Too many of them look down their noses at foreign peoples, particularly in Asia and the Middle East, because their customs are different from ours. They forget about the masses and focus their attention on the big shots, the wealthy people, and too often our programs do the same thing.

For example, I found that in Cambodia we are paying 1,000 American dollars per month to a rich Cambodian landlord for rent of his residence, in which residence we maintain a library.

We are pouring money into such countries as Saudi Arabia and Iran whose oil revenues are staggering. This money is not helping the people who most need help—the masses—but serves primarily to make the rich even richer. You will never convince me that Saudi Arabia and some of the other oil empires of the Middle East need United States dollars when King Saud can come to the United States, leaving a trail of jewels and solid gold wristwatches behind him.

You know, ladies and gentlemen, programs such as foreign aid all too frequently attract more dreamers than hardheaded realists. I am convinced that insofar as the practical use of American funds are concerned, our foreign-aid planners are much more inclined toward testing out harebrained schemes than in rendering help to backward peoples.

In Korea, there are many examples of this.

Now, if you only read the newspapers and the broad justifications submitted to Congress in support of foreign aid, you would be led to believe that our programs in that country are absolutely vital to maintain even a spark of life among the masses of people.

Let me tell you now that the practice does not jibe with the preaching.

Koreans have been rice eaters for many, many centuries. Their traditional diet is rice—they like rice, prefer rice, and most of them have never seen a loaf of bread. But some of our starry-eyed planners concocted the bright idea of changing the diet of the Korean people. As a result, we have built four flour mills in Korea.

Korea does not produce any wheat, so we have to give them the wheat to grind into flour in the flour mills we have built. The justification given was that Koreans should learn to consume wheat so that they could export rice.

This is just one example of such waste. We have also built in Korea a plastics factory, to make plastic rice bowls for the Koreans to hold the rice which our planners are teaching them not to eat. We have bought hundreds of streetcars and buses for Seoul and other Korean cities.

In Formosa, we have undertaken a mammoth GI bill of rights for retired soldiers of Chiang Kai-shek's armies. We are building rest homes for them, and have even purchased road building and similar equipment to be used by these retired soldiers in the construction of roads and buildings, a la WPA.

Afghanistan is one of the most backward countries in the world. Yet, we are undertaking to provide Afghanistan with a complete system of airways—from airports and runways to aircraft and pilots.

Afghanistan is in greater need of things other than airplanes; yet, we are insisting that they take them. But, they cannot turn down the offer of something more or less free, especially when we pay for the services of a prominent airline company to teach them how to manage airports and train pilots.

In addition, it burns me up to be told that we do not have enough money to modernize our own airports when we evidently do have enough money to build new ones for Afghanistan. Florida, like Louisiana, has a heavy interest in tourism. Each year, hundreds of thousands of our people come to this fine State to enjoy your warm breezes, to bask in your sunshine, and, of course, to spend their money. Many more could and would come if transportation methods were improved—if bigger and better airports were built, if more fine highways such as your Sunshine Freeway were constructed. These things could be done if we were not so busy doing similar things in areas which do not need them that we must skimp on important work here at home.

All of us know and understand that we cannot buy admiration or friendship with dollars. All of us should have learned by now that you can go just so far helping someone without ultimately making him so dependent upon you that he refuses to help himself.

Such has happened in Western Europe. We spent money under the Marshal plan in order to bring the Western European countries back to economic health—to strengthen them to a point where they would be of assistance to the free world. We all understood that the United States could not and cannot bear the whole burden of free world defense for an indefinite period of time without inviting economic collapse and national bankruptcy.

So we helped Europe to recover.

Today, Europe is back on her feet; as a matter of fact, she is better off than she ever has been in the past.

But are the Europeans helping us to carry the load in the Middle East, in southeast Asia, in Korea, in Formosa?

They are not. On the contrary, they are cutting their taxes, reducing their armies, and calling to Uncle Sam to make up the difference—even at the cost of raising our own expenditures and our own debt past the danger point.

We have heard a lot about the North Atlantic Treaty Alliance lately. We are being fed some slick advertising to the effect that NATO is strong and vigorous.

Ladies and gentlemen, NATO is sick; the vaunted shield of Western Europe has about the same relative strength as a wet paper bag. Almost the only ground forces available for immediate action in defense of Europe are our own 5⅓ divisions stationed there. The British have pulled many of their troops back home. The French troops are in North Africa, making war on nationalist-minded natives, using American arms—arms provided to defend Europe, not to perpetuate colonialism, and to bully smaller countries. Just the other day, Secretary of Defense McElroy undertook to justify further large-scale military aid to Europe on the basis that for every dollar we put up, Europe puts up 5. Well, that is true up to a point, but that $5 counted as the European contribution includes not only European contributions to NATO, but each country's domestic defense budget as well. If we add in our own domestic defense expenditures, as well as foreign aid, our contribution to free world defense is 3 United States dollars to very 1 of Europe's—a contribution which makes Europe's look mighty small—as it is.

We would also be led to believe that all we do is provide a few weapons to Europe, that the Europeans do the rest for themselves. That is not so. Here are the facts.

Under military aid, we defray the cost of 50 to 60 percent of Europe's military research and development work, in addition to 100 percent of our own. This is called mutual special weapons development.

Then, when weapons are developed, we help build factories in order to manufacture these weapons. This is called facilities assistance.

When the factories we have helped finance are built, then Uncle Sam places contracts with them under the offshore procurement program for the purchase of the weapons we have helped develop. These weapons paid for with American dollars, are then donated to European armies. In other words, we help develop the weapons, we help build factories to manufacture the weapons, then we actually buy and donate many of the weapons so developed and produced.

Over and above this, we donate considerable amounts of our own materials of war to the European armies.

This is not a mutual security program. Mutual means cooperative. As the late Senator Smith from South Carolina used to say, "Europe does all the co-ing and we do all the operating."

Just lately, there is a growing awareness among Americans that we are on the wrong track in our effort to win the cold war—that we are betting our money on the wrong horse and losing every time.

I think it is high time we faced up to the fact that our real enemy in the cold war is Russia. Instead of squandering our substance in such bottomless pits as are found in Western Europe, instead of undertaking to Americanize every country in the world, instead of wooing India, and other neutrals, by providing them with cash and by shipping them wares and goods by the boatload, I think we should face up to the fact that if we can create dissension within the Soviet Union, we will have won a great victory.

We have spent over $50 billion in an effort to strengthen the free world, and to weaken the Russian system. Instead of building free world strength, we have succeeded in creating only a desire upon the part of our so-called friends to lean a little bit more on Uncle Sam. Instead of weakening, the Soviet Union is growing stronger.

She is developing her internal resources; she is giving her people a better way of life than they have ever enjoyed, although it is still far below our own standard. We cannot find solace in the fact that our steel production is higher than Russia's when that of the Soviet Union is increasing at a much more rapid rate than our own, nay, when we are now using about 50 percent of our capacity. We cannot burrow our heads in the sand and feel secure because we produce more refrigerators than the Soviet Union when she has obviously progressed much further than we in her rocket research and some other fields of technology.

During the past 3 years, I traveled extensively in Russia. I found some astounding things—things which I am forced to conclude the administration deliberately kept from our people. For instance, just about 2 years ago, Mr. Dulles told Congress that Russia was on the verge of internal economic chaos—of collapse. He was dead wrong, and he must have known he was. The Russians are nowhere near economic collapse—their economy is growing and expanding. Their industrial base has become broad enough to support not only a tremendous military program, but also a fairly large consumer goods production as well.

Siberia, which most of us thought at one time was an icebox, a barren waste, a prison camp, is becoming the granery of Russia; factories are sprouting there, powered by electricity generated by high hydroelectric dams, and the vast coalfields of the area.

But, in addition to these developments which should alarm us, there are others within the Soviet Union which offer us an unprecedented opportunity. Education is the first and most important.

The Russians are going all out to educate their people. As they do so, they are creating curiosity among their people about other countries—about the way other people live. Where this curiosity has been coupled with a peek at the outside world, it has frequently resulted in the Russian leaders having to modify their system in order to accommodate the demands of their people.

In brief, there is an evolution going on inside Russia—an evolution which, if taken advantage of, will offer us an opportunity to mold the future course of Russian society.

We are seeing increasing signs of a willingness of the Red leaders to bow to the demands of their people, when these demands are too vigorous to be denied.

A most recent example involves the decision of Khrushchev, and others to abolish the so-called machinery tool stations.

In Russia, one finds two kinds of farms—state farms and collectives. State farms are owned and operated by the state; the workers are paid fixed salaries. The collectives are essentially cooperatives, composed of large areas of land owned by the government but worked by as many as 500 Russian families, on a cooperative basis.

In the past, collective farms have not been permitted to own machinery, such as tractors, combines, and so forth. Instead, collectives have had to rely on the government-owned machinery tool stations to plant, cultivate, and harvest their crops. This has frequently resulted in hardships. The MTS bosses often gave preferential treatment to some collectives. In addition, because machinery was in short supply, crops were lost.

When I was in Russia in 1955, I found much dissatisfaction among the collective farms with the machinery tool station setup. Evidently, this dissatisfaction grew to such proportions that the Kremlin decided to reverse a basic Marxist theory and permit collective farms to own their own equipment, thus giving Russian farmers a bit more independence from government control.

It is my considered judgment that if we encouraged more of the Russian people to visit the United States, and if we sent more Americans from every walk of life to Russia, we could make the Russians so dissatisfied with their present way of life and so envious of our own, that they would gradually force their leaders to change their ways.

I found, for one thing, that the Russians are convinced that communism is superior to capitalism because they have no conception of the advantages capitalism has to offer—of the abundance of spiritual and material things which we in free countries now enjoy.

All the Russian people know is that communism has brought them a better way of life than that enjoyed under the czars, which, incidentally, it obviously has, although it is far from as good as our own.

Freedom, such as we enjoy within the United States, is a force which communism can never overcome if only it is possible to plant some idea of the benefits of freedom in the minds of the Russian people. Increased exchanges of persons from every walk of life would help us plant and nurture this seed—a seed which will grow to a point where either the Russian leaders will accommodate their system to it, or face their own downfall from forces within Russia.

Let us use the traditions of freedom, of individual choice, of individual dignity we possess here at home to combat the vicious evils of communism; let us set up America as a showplace of freedom's wares, permitting all who desire to look, an opportunity to do so. In such a manner, we can—I repeat—create dissension within the Soviet Union.

Many years ago, when our Nation was in its infancy, the voices of our leaders announced a principle which I fear we have abandoned, namely, millions for defense, but not one cent for tribute. The American people are sick and tired of offering their wealth as tribute to foreign lands—as a kind of bribe, by which we hope to keep our so-called allies on our side. We should not need to bribe nations to accept freedom, and I, for one, think it is time to call a halt.

With faith in the future, with an abiding trust in the justice of our couse—we can and shall find means of fostering freedom, of destroying communism, without sacrificing our country's heritage on the altar of continued giveaways.

Certainly, such an approach would be infinitely more beneficial to our country than a continued reliance on programs such as foreign aid, which have not only failed, but which have brought us to the brink of bankruptcy—a development which the Russians like immensely. After all, internal economic collapse of our country would represent a great victory for the Communist system, and would, I believe, ultimately doom the free world to extinction.

In addition, we must remain militarly strong. We must offer no temptation to any would-be world conquerers to achieve dominance over us by military means.

We need an austere but progressive military program, one based upon sound fiscal concepts. We need more emphasis upon missile research, development, and production, and complete abolition of emphasis upon interservice rivalry and the creation of personal "empires" within our Military Establishment.

We urgently require expanded research on ways and means of defending our cities against nuclear attack, particularly attack by submarine-based launching devices designed to obliterate our coastal metropolitan areas.

In brief, we need the kind of Military Establishment which will concentrate on the meat and potatoes items of defense, and forgo the champagne and caviar—such wasteful things as internal bickering, fancy personal cars for high brass, high-priced personal aircraft—including helicopters—and the maintenance of swank residences, hunting lodges, and night clubs on military bases, or elsewhere.

It is a sad commentary upon political factors operating in Washington and elsewhere that with a military man in the White House, our Defense Establishment has not kept pace with that of the Soviet Union, the armed strength of the free world has dropped alarmingly, and the missile-testing site up the coast from here a ways has seen more fizzles than successful firings.

For quite some time, I have urged a new look at our foreign policy, but with this should be coupled a new look at things at home, as well. While John Foster Dulles drags us to the brink of war, his cohorts down the street are leading us to—and perhaps over—the brink of depression.

Tonight, and in the future, let us pledge ourselves that there will be no more such brinks, either at home or abroad. Instead, let us work for a Nation which is strong both militarily, and economically—which is respected overseas, not regarded as a laughingstock.

Let us put things in their proper perspective—forego the wasteful programs of the past for the kind which will spell success in the future. We have had a dose of so-called modern Republicanism in Washington, and we have found that it is 90 percent advertising and 9 percent talk.

One percent results is a sorry batting average in anybody's league.

Our Nation needs action, not slogans. We need a change for the better, not merely more promises that if we wait around long enough, keeping our chins high and our mouths shut, we will pull through.

American deserves better than merely the prospect of pulling through. America needs and deserves a forward look in something besides Chrysler cars.

Florida obviously believes that—as the caliber of your congressional delegation demonstrates.

I am hopeful that your viewpoint in this regard will not change, and that when the 1958 elections have come and gone, the people of Florida will not only have sent to the Congress a delegation 100 percent devoted to the principles of Thomas Jefferson and Andrew Jackson, but will have done so in such a resounding manner as to put others on notice to "Go, and do likewise."

Sudeten Germans Stress Need for Peaceful Policy of Liberation for Peoples of Czechoslovakia

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. USHER L. BURDICK

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 11, 1958

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Speaker, I believe that some words should be added to the manifestations of friendship and sympathies toward the peoples who had become victims of communism through the communization of Czechoslovakia 10 years ago. The Czechoslovak National Front President Dr. Benes signed the new Communist government on February 25, 1948, and the Parliament of the National Front approved it on March 10, 1948. In this way, the communization was legalized.

For those who study the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD as a source of wisdom, truth, and political information, I may add that Czechoslovakia was a state of many nationalities. She was founded as a new state in 1918, and contained the following nations: 6.8 million Czechs, 3.2 million Sudeten Germans, 2 million Slovaks, 762,000 Hungarians, 477,000 Carpatho-Ukrainians, and 336,000 of other nationalities.

If we express our sympathies toward those who became victims of Communist aggression we should express our sympathies towards all these nationalities.

An outstanding committee of this House, the House Committee on Communist Aggression, under Chairman Charles J. Kersten, investigated the reasons for the communization of Czechoslovakia and published its report in December 1954. I believe that the attention of every student of the communization tactics and of the communization of Czechoslovakia should be called to this excellent report for which the praise belongs to the distinguished members of this committee. Any remembrance of the 10th anniversary of the communiza-

tion of Czechoslovakia without mentioning the findings of the House Committee on Communist Aggression certainly gives an incomplete picture.

I should like also to add that after the Czechoslovak Republic was restored in 1945 by Benes who returned to Prague with the Communist-led Government of the national front, the Sudeten Germans and a great part of the Hungarians were appropriated and expelled. The expulsion of such a big segment of population which owned a great part of the entire industry and agriculture on the territory of Czechoslovakia and which was absolutely anti-Communist, was perhaps the most important reason for the success of the communization of Czechoslovakia from within 3 years later, in 1948.

Also the part played by the Communist Secretary General Rudolf Slansky should be stressed in the same way as the part played by the state security police. Slansky-Salzman was the prime mover in the communization of Czechoslovakia, more powerful than the Communist Prime Minister Klement Gottwald.

Some politicians of the Communist-led national front were able to come to the West after 1948. I believe we should encourage and ask them to reject any type of collaboration with the Communists and to reject any past unlawful deeds which they had committed in the 3 years of the national front, 1945–48. We should encourage them to seek friendship and cooperation among all nations of former Czechoslovakia, and to set just aims for the future above all the restoration of political and economic freedom and of ethnic conditions as they were before the Communist and Nazi interventions, and second, the application of a full and absolute right for self-determination for each nation of former Czechoslovakia.

Instead of giving praise to the National Front men here in the United States, telling them that Czechoslovakia—founded in 1918—was one of the oldest European states or that the first Czechoslovakian university was founded in 1348 or even calling the National Front President Benes a great modern citizen or calling the National Front a government of independent political parties, which all is misleading, not only for the students of history but also for those who would like to find means how to protect the rest of the free world against Communist intrigues and tactics, we rather should watch closely the situation as it really is and also see that many politicians of the National Front of Czechoslovakia who did not understand sly Communist tactics in 1945–48 obviously also today, in America, do not understand the sly Communist tactics, and while working in Radio Free Europe or the Assembly of Captive European Nations, never reveal and attack the system of the Communist State Security which had outwitted them already once in their homes. We probably should, instead of giving them undeserved praise, ask the National Front politicians to start finally to understand the true Communist system and to fight it, not to protect it.

Finally I should like to stress and to recommend to the attention of my colleagues that not all the refugees of former Czechoslovakia are acting in the way the former National Front politicians are acting. The really anti-Communist Czech, Slovak, Sudeten German and Hungarian refugees and expellees understand the system of the Communist State Security in the Communist countries and they also do not believe in national communism and Titoism. They believe that Gomulkaism and Titoism were invented by the Communists themselves in order to get economic aid from the West and in order to soften and paralyze all real anti-Communist and intelligent policies on the part of the free world.

Real anti-Communists from Czechoslovakia reject the illusions about Titoism, spread by the Communists, and request rather a realistic policy of liberation which could abolish communism without war and which is expressly wished by the enslaved nations. I call this policy, as it is being recommended by the secretary general of the Sudeten German Council, Dr. Walter Becher, and the Czech exile, Mr. George Brada, and by other anti-Communist exile leaders, to the attention of my colleagues:

The active and concrete policy of liberation, as expressedly wished by the enslaved nations, meaning the abolishment of communism and war contains the following points:

1. Restoration of the free world's authority and foundation of Western policies on the principles of both the real American traditions and the best traditions of Europe, on the principles of sound reason, morale, social justice, enlightened nationalism, and Christianity.

2. Founding of a possible military strategy planning on a technical and scientific superiority, on guided missiles, rocket weapons, air force, etc.

Restoration and strengthening of the West's scientific and technical superiority so that communism cannot start any war and, therefore, may be abolished without war.

3. Removal of the artificial fear of Russia, created by means of false propaganda. Showing the real basic weaknesses of the Communist slave system, of its collectivist economy, of the system of conspiracy and rule by a minority. Revealing of the fact that the Soviet successes in the past were mere swindles and thefts.

4. Fight against as well revelation of the Communist state security system (the "invisible government" behind the scene) in the East, revelation of the Communist system of agent provocateurs.

5. Fight against communism and the secret Communist conspiracy also in the West by all means of press, radio, and other facilities of enlightenment. Full support and intense publicity for the splendid work of the committees of the United States Congress as well as practical application of the conclusions of their findings. Full and definitive exclusion of all security risks, crypto Communists, and of spies. Full eradication of the Communist conspiracy in the West, which will be followed by the absolute eradication of communism in the East.

6. Revelation of those who form the backbone of world communism. Concentration of all the attacks against this backbone of international communism and promise of amnesty to all those seduced, if they will repent, in order to separate them from the heartless and incorrigible leaders of international communism.

7. Severing of the economic relations with Communist countries and stoppage of every military and economic aid for Communist or Communist-allied countries.

8. Severing of the diplomatic relations with Communist countries and expulsion of Communist representatives from international organizations, as the U. N., etc.

9. Concentration of all anti-Communist refugees and expellees in national organizations, units, and institutions according to their nationalities for various individual tasks, e. g., the strengthening of anti-Communist spirit and work, the creation of magnets causing defection of Eastern nationals and soldiers, and the acknowledgment of exile governments formed by anti-Communist refugees.

10. Declaration addressed to the peoples of the world stating that the enormous tax burdens as well as armaments and the atomic danger can be stopped provided that communism is destroyed. Promise of full economic aid to the enslaved peoples after their liberation has taken place.

11. Better radio broadcasts for the East, practically doing the very opposite of what Radio Free Europe is doing now, giving to the enslaved peoples real guidance, counsels and leadership.

12. Active and material support for anti-Communists in the East.

13. Outlawing war.

Using all deterrents to war, besides those mentioned above, so that communism can be finally destroyed and abolished without war from within, by its own slaves, who will remove the tiny minority ruthlessly governing them.

I assume that all my colleagues will agree with me that the best thing we and the exiles of the nations of former Czechoslovakia can do at the occasion of the 10th anniversary of the completion of the communization of Czechoslovakia is to urge the people of the free world to accept a new policy of liberation without war and to work actively for it.

Salute to Emma Bellamy, Registered Nurse, of the Wilkes-Barre General Hospital

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 11, 1958

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following:

SALUTE TO EMMA BELLAMY

Both the profession and the community shared the sentiments expressed by Wilkes-Barre General Hospital officials, alumnae and students last night in paying tribute to Miss Emma S. Bellamy, registered nurse, who has been identified with the institution for 40 years, the past 20 in the responsible role of director of nursing education and service.

It is unusual for a nurse to dedicate her life to her alma mater. With Miss Bellamy, this obviously has been a labor of love, providing her with an unparalleled opportunity for service in the finest tradition of a noble profession.

Miss Bellamy not only has had the personal satisfaction of catering to the needs of humanity, but of training others to follow in her footsteps. Thus, her example and skill have combined to obtain maximum results in the discharge of her duties.

Miss Bellamy has been honored by the commonwealth and by the profession on many occasions. Impressive as this recognition has been, it could not have meant more to her than the expression of good will and esteem last night from the hospital which she has served with such inspiring fidelity for four decades.

Louisiana Editor Urges Caution in Proposals for Military Changes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWIN E. WILLIS
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 11, 1958

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. Speaker, there has come to my attention an editorial from the Daily Iberian of New Iberia, La., in which the editor and publisher, Mr. M. A. Wolcott, very thoughtfully and wisely calls for calm and careful consideration of some suggested changes in our Military Establishment, such as abolishment of the Joint Chiefs of Staff and the merger of the armed services. Whatever opinion his readers may hold on these matters, Mr. Wolcott stresses that the Nation should not be stampeded into quick and perhaps dangerous changes simply because of a sudden and surprise move by the Soviets in launching their sputnik. I think his advice to move cautiously and deliberately is most timely.

I am glad to have the opportunity of placing in the RECORD this editorial appearing in the issue of the Daily Iberian for February 26, 1958, and which follows:

JOINT CHIEFS OF STAFF—KEEP 'EM OR SACK 'EM

What's all this talk about abolishing the Joint Chiefs of Staff, merging armed services, interservice rivalry?

You hear arguments to dispense with the Joint Chiefs of Staff and substitute a super-Prussian type of command, eliminate so-called interservice rivalry by merging the Army, Navy, Marines, and Air Force in one standard uniform answerable to one supreme commander.

Here in New Iberia we have as much stake in those proposed changes as the rest of the country. They concern us and we ought to start doing our own thinking about the problem and offer some suggestions.

Probably the beginning of the argument came when Russia put the first satellite into space. The temper of feeling was to change things, reorganize the armed services, crack down on somebody.

Presently we are operating under a Joint Chiefs of Staff, principal military advisers to the President. It is composed of five men: Gen. Thomas D. White, Chief of Staff United States Air Force; Gen. Maxwell D. Taylor, Chief of Staff United States Army; Gen. Nathan F. Twining, USAF, Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff; Adm. Arleigh A. Burke, Chief of Naval Operations; and Gen. Randolph McPate, Commandant United States Marine Corps.

Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff (now General Twining) is selected by the President. As chairman he is not responsible to his own service, USAF, but serves as coordinator.

Serving directly under the Joint Chiefs is a staff of several hundred experienced, specially trained officers. These officers are drawn from the military service in proportionate numbers. Most have had combat experience and are familiar firsthand with the strategic employment and the combat capabilities of their respective services.

The Joint Chiefs of Staff, with their operational deputies, usually assemble twice a week. The deputies usually meet separately three additional times each week.

Before meetings, each Chief goes over the agenda items himself. He studies the problems and the solutions recommended by the joint teams. He then listens to the views of his operational deputy and other assistants from his own service who have also studied the agenda items. In this manner each problem is given careful, professional analysis and consideration before it reaches the Joint Chiefs of Staff conference room.

Some critics say that all the Joint Chiefs of Staff does is bicker, that nothing is ever done, or it's postponed until forgotten, or swept under the rug.

Interservice rivalry in itself is not bad. What usually is considered as interservice rivalry is simply an honest difference of opinion. Problems of necessity have to be weighed and debated and then arrive at a conclusion of what's best for the good of the country.

There are three basic areas of war—land, sea, and air. If we are ever to deal with them in proper balance, it is imperative that we have experienced and determined advocates for each.

Like counsel before a judge, their duty is to urge their case so strongly that when the arguments are done we can feel sure that no area for betterment has been overlooked.

One respected military man has pointed out that in his opinion downgrading the Joint Chiefs of Staff system and merging the military services into a single service would be following the logic that the best way to stop a nosebleed is to apply a tourniquet around the neck.

Well, it also ought to be mentioned that we won World War II under a Joint Chiefs of Staff operation and they probably had some honest differences of opinion during those perilous days.

It sums up to the fact that we shouldn't be stampeded into a rambunctious change merely because a Soviet-built satellite was fired into the air by surprise.

Let's reexamine the operations with the thought in mind that perhaps we've still got the best system, including Joint Chiefs of Staff and interservice rivalry.

A Congressman Changes His Mind

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. A. D. BAUMHART, JR.
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 11, 1958

Mr. BAUMHART. Mr. Speaker, on March 5, 1958, the Norwalk Reflector-Herald, of Norwalk, Ohio, an outstanding daily newspaper in my congressional district, published an editorial centered around certain remarks made by my esteemed colleague, the Honorable FRANK T. BOW from the 16th District of Ohio. This editorial pointed out how Mr. Bow's conceptions concerning a strong and active merchant marine have changed during the 8 years he has served in Congress.

As a member of the Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee and representing a congressional district whose lake ports, with the completion of the St. Lawrence seaway project, will participate directly in foreign commerce, I fully concur with Mr. Bow's recent statements.

The United States, as the bastion of free world commerce, has the responsibility of maintaining supply lines with other democratic nations the world over. Even in this day of earth satellites and supersonic aircraft, it is still essential that the bulk of our international commerce be carried on with ships as the primary means of transportation. We must not be placed in a position wherein we need rely upon foreign hulls which for one reason or another might not be available. A strong United States merchant marine will free us from our dependency on other nations for this transportation service and strengthen our hand militarily, thereby helping us maintain the peace.

I ask unanimous consent that the editorial concerning the timely and considered remarks of our distinguished colleague, FRANK BOW, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

A CONGRESSMAN CHANGES HIS MIND

Representative FRANK T. BOW, of Ohio, first came to Congress in 1950. At that time, he says, he was "not convinced that the dollars our Government spends to help support a merchant marine were necessary."

Then Mr. Bow became a member of the House Appropriations Committee, one of the most important committees in Congress. As a member, he goes on, he "made a careful study of the reasons that Congress, in 1936, passed legislation to help maintain a strong and active merchant marine, equipped to carry a substantial portion of our foreign commerce in time of peace and prepared to transport troops and equipment in a military emergency."

As a result of this study Mr. Bow came to a conclusion diametrically opposed to his view when he took office: "Government support of our merchant marine is one of the soundest investments we are making in the prosperity and security of the Nation."

Mr. Bow is certainly not alone in this. All manner of other people, in and out of Government, who have studied the merchant marine siutation, and objectively evalued its importance to our economic and military welfare, have reached the same conclusion. Some 300 merchant ships now operate under Government contracts, and the contracts are strict indeed. The steamship companies must provide regular service on 33 essential world trade routes. They must replace their ships with vessels built in United States shipyards and manned with American crews. For meeting these and other requirements, the lines receive payments from the Government to help equalize high United States shipbuilding and operating costs with low costs of foreign competitors. Thus the Nation pays a small price for not being at the mercy of a foreign merchant marine.

William T. Roy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL G. ROGERS
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 11, 1958

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, shortly after I was elected to the

House of Representatives, I had the pleasure of meeting William T. Roy, Assistant Parliamentarian of the House, and after that time, had the opportunity to see and talk with him on many occasions and to benefit from his many years of parliamentary experience. It is with great regret that I learned of his retirement for he will be truly missed in the House of Representatives. However, my district is fortunate in that Bill has bought a home in Delray Beach, Fla., and plans to make it his permanent home, so while we have lost a very able parliamentarian in the House, Florida has gained a fine citizen. As Congressman from the Sixth District, I would like to take this opportunity of publicly expressing my great satisfaction in knowing that Bill Roy will reside in Delray Beach, and of welcoming him and his family to our district.

Remove Limitation of Advancement of Postal Transportation Service Substitutes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. VINCENT J. DELLAY
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 11, 1958

Mr. DELLAY. Mr. Speaker, today I introduced a bill to amend the Postal Field Service Compensation Act of 1955 (39 U. S. C. 981) by striking out the limitation on the advancement of postal transportation service substitutes.

Mr. Speaker, section 401 (c), which my bill would amend, now provides, "Each substitute employee in the postal transportation service whose position is allocated to salary level PFS–5 as a distribution clerk in a railway or highway post office shall be advanced in the manner prescribed for other employees under subsection (a) of this section, but such substitute shall not be advanced beyond step 4 of salary level PFS–5."

Until a few months ago all postal transportation service substitutes were recruited at level 5 of the postal field service schedule. In November 1957, the Post Office Department changed its procedures and placed some postal transportation service substitutes in postal field service schedule level 4 and gave dual appointments in both levels to others.

My bill would remove the restriction in the last part of the section by removing the limitation that such substitutes could not advance beyond step 4 of level 5. In view of the fact that some postal transportation service substitutes are now going to the top step of level 4 it seems to me that those substitutes who are assigned in level 5 should also be enabled to advance to the top of their particular level.

It is understood that one of the reasons why the limitation originally was included in the act of 1955 is that the post office anticipated that there might be difficulties if a top step postal transportation service substitute in level 5 were to be given a regular assignment in level 4. The problems that were anticipated were centered upon the reduction in pay which would be involved. In view of the fact that conversion from substitute to regular is a voluntary action, there would in fact be no applied pay reduction. The conversion in such cases is at the request of the employee and, consequently, there should be no administrative difficulty.

In the letter which was sent by the Post Office Department to employees who were given appointments at level 4 it is declared that "this action is proposed because the law specifies that distribution clerk work in terminals and airport mail facilities is level 4 work." It must then also follow that the work in railway and highway post offices and in other level 5 assignments should properly be compensated at the appropriate step of level 5 within the spirit of the act of June 10, 1955.

Mr. Speaker, my bill would accomplish that purpose, and I hope that the legislation I have proposed will be speedily enacted by this Congress.

Home, Sweet Home

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STUYVESANT WAINWRIGHT
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 11, 1958

Mr. WAINWRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, every Member of Congress is proud, at least in public, of the community from which he comes. Both publicly and privately one of the most fortunate things that ever befell me was that a chance of nature made the village of East Hampton, N. Y., my home. Several years ago I invited a dozen of my colleagues for the weekend. To a man they agreed they had never seen a lovier place in all the world—in mid-July, cool, clean, green, with lovely homes, giant elms and oaks and an aura of peaceful happiness. A colloquial expression, which I deem a badge of honor for a resident of East Hampton, is "Bonacker." This has been defined as "someone who wants to get back to East Hampton when he's away." Our most famous "Bonacker" adds substance to this definition. John Howard Payne wrote the song Home Sweet Home while in Europe. His most famous home is located off the village green and the town pond in East Hampton.

How much is fact and how much is fiction in regard to Payne's early life and childhood in East Hampton is always a subject of lively debate. On the other hand, I invite you to visit the village of East Hampton and its shrine. Based on a firsthand inspection, you will be forced to conclude that John Howard Payne could only have poured out his soul for this heritage.

Tomorrow there will be an unveiling of one of the original copies of Home Sweet Home in the handwriting of John Howard Payne. A fine article by George Kennedy appeared in yesterday's Washington Evening Star. It is here set forth:

HOME, SWEET HOME
(By George Kennedy)

'Mid pleasures and palaces though we may roam,
Be it ever so humble, there's no place like home.

On the night of May 8, 1823, in Convent Garden, London, a singer took the center of the stage in an opera entitled "Clari; or, The Maid of Milan," by a young American, John Howard Payne; and sang Home, Sweet Home.

The song was a hit. But Payne never received a nickel for it. That was before copyright laws. For the opera, which was interred after 12 performances, he received 50 pounds.

This is one of three or more copies of this most successful expression of nostalgia in Payne's handwriting. The Eastman School of Music at Rochester, N. Y., has the entire manuscript of Clari; or, The Maid of Milan, including the lyrics of Home, Sweet Home.

The Pennsylvania Historical Society in Philadelphia has a copy of the lyric written by Payne. Tradition has it that the copy to be exhibited here was written for Dolly Madison.

As to the music, Payne could not write in the diatonic scale, and he wrote the words to the measures of a song called Ranz des Vaches, whose composer seems to be unknown.

According to legend, Payne is supposed to have written his sentimental verses about home while wandering on a foreign shore in difficult circumstances.

The truth was that he was in one of the prosperous periods of his existence and comfortably ensconced in Paris.

When it comes to Payne, truth is better than legend. There is one thing that can't be taken from him—he had an interesting life.

He was publishing a critical review of the New York theater at 14. At 15 he wrote his first play. At 16 he made his debut as an actor playing Romeo and Hamlet and even King Lear. He was a sensation for 1 year, 1809; a failure in 1810. Friends raised $2,000 for him and sent him to conquer the London stage when he was 22. He was not a success. He returned to writing plays with successions of success and failure. He leased Sadler's Wells Theater to produce one of his own melodramas, but the financial fiasco landed him in Fleet Street Prison for debt.

He fell in love with Mary Wellstonecraft Shelley, the author of Dr. Frankenstein, and widow of the poet. She told him she was in love with Washington Irving.

He returned to America 9 years after the first singing of Home Sweet Home, poor but famous. After 10 years of precarious literary existence, friends got him appointed United States consul at Tunis. He died there on April 9, 1852.

Thirty-one years later, W. W. Corcoran, Washington's wealthiest citizen, arranged to have Payne's body brought back from Tunis and reburied in Oak Hill Cemetery in Georgetown on the wooded slopes of Rock Creek. It was quite an event. The procession formed at the Corcoran Art Gallery (now the Court of Claims) at Pennsylvania Avenue and 17th Street NW. President Chester A. Arthur, the Cabinet, the diplomatic corps, the members of the Supreme Court, and Members of both Houses of Congress were in the carriages. Bands played and the Washington Rifles marched.

Payne's monument in Oak Hill draws an occasional pilgrim. His bust, atop a tall pedestal, shows that he was a handsome man. In the grass nearby is the stone slab under which he was buried in Tunis. For some unknown reason it says he was born in Boston. He was born in New York.

Salute to 4-H Youth

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE S. McGOVERN
OF SOUTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 11, 1958

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, more than 2,165,000 young people throughout the Nation belong to the 4–H Club, which is one of the finest youth organizations in existence today.

Last week, communities throughout the country honored these young boys and girls between the ages of 9 and 21, through various observances. It is only fitting and propper that we should pay tribute to each and every one of these young people and their leaders, who have dedicated their hearts, hands and minds to better living and greater service to their country.

I am proud to say that South Dakota has 15,692 members, who make up some 1,300 4–H Clubs across the State.

By tradition, the 4–H Club has emphasized the importance of family living and the development of wholesome attitudes and activities on the part of rural youth.

In addition, the 4–H Club has taught millions of farm youth the vital need of improved farm methods and the application of scientific findings to the production of food.

To sum it up, the 4–H Club program has specifically aimed its activities toward the development of more responsible citizens. Its past record is eloquent proof of its success. Even today, the rate of juvenile delinquency is practically nonexistant among its millions of members.

As further tribute to this organization I wish to include in my remarks the following editorial from the Yankton Daily Press and Dakotan of March 5, 1958:

NATIONAL 4–H CLUB WEEK

An honored American institution is being given well-deserved special recognition during the March 1–8 period. The occasion is National 4–H Club Week. This year its theme is 4–H Salute to Parents.

The week will be highlighted in Washington, D. C., when six top 4–H members present the annual 4–H club report to the Nation. This will summarize 4–H accomplishments in stories and pictures and pay special tribute to parents who help to make the achievements possible. It's expected that these 4–H'ers will review the report personally with President Eisenhower at the White House.

More than 2,165,000 young people are now members of the 4–H Clubs. The overall purpose of the week is to inform the public about the meaning and value of the 4–H program, to invite more boys and girls to join, to assist new members in starting 4–H projects, and to honor parents and the 358,000 volunteer leaders who help to guide the work in some 90,000 local clubs throughout the 48 States, Alaska, Hawaii and Puerto Rico.

The 4–H'ers carry on widely varied projects. There is recreation as well as work. Character development and good citizenship are their most significant goals. They learn by doing and their motto is "to make the best better." Here is an attitude that is urgently needed in today's discordant world.

One way that Yankton business people can help promote the 4–H Club program in Yankton County is by supporting the farmer-businessman dinner April 8, sponsored by the agriculture committee of the chamber of commerce. Four-H club families throughout Yankton County will be serving the banquet, and all proceeds from the affair go to the building fund of Yankton County 4–H Clubs, Inc.

Ticket sales are in progress this week by members of the chamber's agriculture committee.

A New Birth of Freedom

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN E. FOGARTY
OF RHODE ISLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 11, 1958

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, on last Thursday, February 27, 1958, I had the happy privilege of addressing the 22d annual meeting of the Davis Memorial Goodwill Industries at the Hotel Statler, here in Washington, D. C.

As I said at that time, Goodwill Industries has certainly been true to its mission—a mission based on compassion and humanity and one for which they should be publicly commended. Its record of achievement over the years has been outstanding, and the help and encouragement it has given the handicapped can truly be termed a new birth of freedom for those who, as a result of birth, accident, or disease, suffer mental or physical affliction.

Because of the high regard in which this organization is held, I was deeply moved to be the recipient of its national award for my "good will toward the handicapped." You may be sure that I shall prize this citation always, and I am pleased to have this opportunity to publicly thank the officers and members of Goodwill Industries for so honoring me.

Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the address made by me at the luncheon meeting:

A NEW BIRTH OF FREEDOM

Mr. Chairman, distinguished guests, professional and volunteer workers of the Davis Memorial Goodwill Industries, friends of the handicapped, I am very happy to be with you today, because it is almost like being home with my own constituents in Rhode Island. As you know, a politician (and I consider politics one of the most necessary and honorable professions) is always hard put to turn down a speaking invitation within his own congressional district. And, although we are not in Rhode Island, I feel that I am talking with a special constituency, those interested in the handicapped.

As you have been told, since 1946 I have acquired a special group of constituents—those who are dedicated to giving greater equality of opportunity to those among us who because of birth, accident, or disease have become handicapped. The House Subcommittee on Appropriations which I have the honor to chair has consistently sought new and imaginative ways of waging war on disability. We have enlisted for the duration of this conflict and I can pledge to this audience the continued interest, enthusiasm, and legislative support of programs which seek to change disability into ability, to remove certain indignities under which some handicapped today must labor, and to guarantee, insofar as it is possible in this imperfect old world of ours, that the men, women and children whom God in His infinite wisdom has chosen to suffer mental or physical affliction may do so with a maximum of dignity and a minimum of suffering, neglect, or misunderstanding.

I am indeed pleased to accept your kind invitation because it gives me an opportunity both to compliment Goodwill on the excellent work it has been doing these past few years and also to tell you about a new piece of legislation which should be of interest to all who work with and for the mentally and physically handicapped of our great country. The volunteer spirit so well exemplified by your fine board of directors and ladies' auxiliary, is one of the great things about our beloved country, and through you I wish to pay tribute to the more than 120 local Goodwill Industries throughout the Nation who have been in the forefront of this modern crusade for greater equality of opportunity for the handicapped.

Since passage of Public Law 565, the Vocational Rehabilitation Amendments Act of 1954, as amended in 1956, 48 Goodwill Industries in 23 States have received Federal funds totaling $855,193. In order to receive these funds under the grant expansion program, local Goodwill agencies with community support have poured an additional $432,000 into this program which has helped give a new dynamism and imagination to work for the handicapped.

According to a report prepared by your national headquarters, the results have been dramatic and have proven that the effort was well worth the cost in time and talent. We in the Congress are sometimes accused of being overly concerned with statistics and with figures, but those of us who are responsible for saying "yes" or "no" to these new pieces of legislation as they come along are always confirmed in our enthusiasm when we see such reports as yours, stating that between September 1955 and September 1957 the 48 Goodwill Industries receiving assistance grants showed an increase of 26 percent in the number of handicapped persons served, at a time when other Goodwill Industries were increasing services by only 16 percent.

Of course, we who live here in the Washington area are all aware of the wonderful new Rehabilitation Center which Goodwill has built to better serve the area and the Nation under provisions of Public Law 565. Perhaps less generally known to this audience is the establishment in other areas of 9 sheltered workshops, 9 special projects to better serve the severely disabled (too long the forgotten people in this field), and the expansion of services by some 30 local Goodwill Industries through acquisition of vitally needed equipment. I have summed up much of the progress in a single paragraph when I could have spoken for hours on what this means to people and to our country.

However, dramatic as has been the progress of the past, we must ever look to the future. In summary, I should like to quote from the last paragraph in the introduction of your Goodwill Industries of America report, for it best expresses my own reaction and that of my fellow colleagues on the Hill. Your report says in summary, "this is indeed a magnificent example of Government and community cooperation working successfully to meet an ever-increasing challenge to serve the Nation's handicapped."

But now to the future. On February 10 of this year I had the great honor to introduce in the present Congress, H. R. 10608, a bill proposing the Rehabilitation Act of 1958. As you know, we generally try to explain the purpose of legislation in the first paragraph of a bill. This particular bill is 21 pages in length and the first paragraph reads as follows:

"To provide evaluation of rehabilitiation potentials and rehabilitation services to handicapped individuals who as a result thereof can achieve such ability of independent living as to dispense with or largely dispense with the need of an attendant at home, to assist in the establishment of public and private nonprofit workshops and rehabilitation facilities, and for other purposes."

I can almost hear my friends in the audience whispering, "What a mouthful." However, the key words in this all-inclusive paragraph are those which trigger the three major sections of the bill, namely, independent living, workshops and rehabilitation facilities, and evaluation services. I'd like to share with you some comments and ideas on each of these sections because they have great meaning to Goodwill Industries and, in time, could well be as vital and meaningful for your local industries as have been certain sections of Public Law 565.

First, I'd like to highlight the five findings of fact which serve as background material for those considering this legislation and for the State and local groups which must understand and implement it. The Congress has found, through expert testimony and its own staff research that—

1. Many severely handicapped persons, including the mentally ill or retarded, and older persons, now ineligible for vocational rehabilitation, as a result of independent living rehabilitation services can achieve such a degree of independence that institutional care can be terminated, need for attendant's care at home can be ended or substantially reduced and, in many instances, these individuals will be found to be capable of vocational rehabilitation and will become gainfully employed.

2. Independent living rehabilitation services ends or minimizes the public and family burden, contributed to dignity and self-respect and is in the public interest.

3. There is a grave shortage of rehabilitation facilities where independent living and vocational rehabilitation services are provided the severely handicapped.

4. There is a grave shortage of sheltered workshop facilities wherein work capacities of severely handicapped can be evaluated and developed, and can also be utilized in productive work.

5. Federal grants for the above facilities and services are required in the public interest as a necessary expansion of present grants under the Vocational Rehabilitation Act.

As you can see, the Congress hopes to do something specific and special for the severely handicapped and to do it as a reasonable extension of present services, under existing Federal-State programs and in a manner which will make it possible for local groups to undertake additional steps in this partnership of "Government and community cooperation."

At the time H. R. 10608 was introduced, I said that States would be able, when the bill was enacted, to rehabilitate people to enable them to achieve a level of independent living so as to dispense with institutional care or attendant care at home. I feel that freeing such disabled people of their physical dependence on institutions or their families will not only contribute to their personal dignity and self-respect, but also sharply cut the high costs that many communities are encountering in taking care of their disabled.

Independence has long been a hallmark of America. We were founded on a declaration of independence and we have grown and prospered and increased in world leadership as we maintained our own independence and helped assure our friends in the world community of nations of their continued independence insofar as we were able. Shall we have two kinds of independence in our country—one for the able-bodied and another for the handicapped? I think not and for this reason I am hopeful that the public will understand what this bill does and that the Congress will write a new declaration of independence for the handicapped in enacting this legislation. It has been many months on the drawing boards and has passed through the hands of many of the most distinguished professionals in and out of Government as we worked to perfect a document which can mean so much to so many.

Our Founding Fathers were writing as much for 1958 as for 1776 when they said, "We hold these truths to be self-evident: That all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable rights, that among these are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness."

There can be little life, liberty, or pursuit of happiness for many Americans who today live under the bondage of severe disability. It is our hope that through the independent living provisions of H. R. 10608 we can help assure a greater equality and a greater enjoyment of those unalienable rights which belong to all Americans, including the severely disabled.

The independent living rehabilitation services section would appropriate $10 million this fiscal year and $20 million next fiscal year so you can see that it is a program of substance and one which may provide a major breakthrough in local services to the severely handicapped, a breakthrough I might say that cannot come too soon.

Many public and private groups are now taking admitted long shots in providing rehabilitation services to severely handicapped persons, gambling that the end result will be competitive employment. This bill will lessen administrative pressures on those making decisions and enable findings to be made based more upon justice rather than possible employment. For who among us in work with and for the handicapped can't name person after person who, after being declared nonfeasible by competent authority on the basis of the best facts available, has confounded all the experts and gone forward with indomitable spirit and proved feasibility by actually going out and getting a job and making good at it?

Medicine is not yet an exact science. Counseling is not yet, nor will it ever be, the final answer to inner motivations. The human spirit has yet to be measured exactly in individual cases, probably because there is a spark of Divinity in all of us and who can measure God at work in His creatures? So, we propose to make it possible to provide services to men and women to enable them to free themselves from institutions and from hourly dependence upon heroic family ministrations, while at the same time cutting local costs of institutions and freeing the dedicated families of all or part of the crippling burden of waiting hand and foot upon their loved ones for want of the modern, almost miraculous, medicine of vocational rehabilitation.

Under the third title, "Workshops and Rehabilitation Facilities," the bill provides 10 million this year, 12½ million next year and $15 million for the year ending June 30, 1961. Like the other title, the bill provides for additional sums as decided upon by other Congresses.

As you know, the Hill-Burton bill which was proven such a boon to our care for the crippled and disabled, is medically or hospital-oriented. This title would be community-oriented and would emphasize vocation aspects rather than medical. Thus, it is a logical extension of Hill-Burton and would put on a permanent basis one of the lapsed provisions of Public Law 565 which made it possible to partially finance some workshops and rehabilitation facilities. This construction section allows more elasticity to the States and makes it possible to provide more communities with workshops serving the severely disabled. This particular section could be more helpful to Goodwill than that part of Public Law 565 which was previously mentioned, the grant expansion program, for you could obtain matching funds for expansion or development of workshops.

The last major title of the bill provides for rehabilitation evaluation services. This will be a Godsend to the handicapped and also a great timesaver to the community once it is tried and understood for it short cuts the agonizing trial of the handicapped from agency to agency, from referral to referral each with its duplication of questions, forms, findings, and evaluations. It makes possible a central referral point where diagnostic and other services are done but once, probably in greater detail for better results both to the client and the community agencies which are trying to serve him. We hope to speed up treatment through better referrals based on better findings at great savings in professional time and talent and considerable lessening of the wearing and tearing process to the footsore and heartweary handicapped person who trudges from referral to referral trying vainly to find where he is eligible, where he has rights, where he is nonfeasible and where he can get services.

This provision also should be of real interest to Goodwill Industries across the Nation for you could expand your present vocational evaluation work for the severely disabled, and, as you know, many self-help clients are useful and valuable prospects for your workshops or homebound programs. In going into this program, you would be helping materially in raising the standards of present evaluation services in many areas, in saving local tax and contributed money by making information available to interested agencies without making them dig for it and by generally increasing the professional competence of all workers in this important field.

In conclusion, I should like to compliment the Davis Memorial Goodwill Industries upon another year of magnificent service to the Washington area. I was fortunate to have an advance copy of your annual report and I was thrilled at your past year of progress, at your modern rehabilitation center, and at the promise of greater service when your new building is finished in time for this annual meeting next year. I am particularly struck by the quotation by Betsey Barton in your report where she says, "Freedom of spirit, freedom within * * * is the most important freedom of all." That certainly summarizes the feeling of the Congress as we devote ourselves to assuring a new birth of freedom for the severely handicapped.

And, I would be remiss in the presence of officers and staff members of Goodwill Industries of America whose advice and counsel have been so generously given to the Congress and to me personally, if I did not also pay tribute here before the bar of public opinion to the splendid work done by Goodwill throughout the Nation as graphically outlined in your recent 1957 report. I was particularly impressed to read that 18 percent of the persons you helped in 1957 were among the mentally and emotionally handicapped and more than 14 percent were aged and infirm. Here you have been true to your mission, a mission based upon compassion and humanity and one for which you are to be publicly commended.

As we work together, the Congress and the States and the public and private organizations of this country, we shall help provide the handicapped of our Nation with a new birth of freedom, a new declaration of independence. And, in the concluding words of the Declaration of Independence, "with a firm reliance on the protection of divine providence," I ask that you who work with and for the handicapped so devotedly join

with Members of Congress in pledging to each other our lives, our fortunes, and our sacred honor, that the handicapped of America may truly enjoy life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.

How Freedom Vanished by Vote of the People—A Study of History, Including Modern Times

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH W. GWINN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 15, 1958

Mr. GWINN. Mr. Speaker, some years ago I was in utter distress of mind to see our own drifting, like the rest of the world, into our own variety of modern-day socialism and statism. Ours is, without a doubt, one of the worst.

I tried to get some relief by studying history. I was somewhat relieved to find that the Greek and Roman world experienced generally, long before and after Pericles' time, substantially what we are doing through today.

So it appears that people do live through such times, even though it is painful.

It may be a relief and indeed, some will even find humor in the fact that mankind stumbles and makes mistakes like drunken men do over and over. To some, drunken men are so alike that they are indeed funny. Just so, people are cast into a series of spells by political leaders—who are able to deceive them by outpromising each other—over and over again.

Fortunately, there are a few interludes of freedom from these spells in history. They are known as periods of constitutional restraints which are imposed on the government by the people.

The progress of mankind during such periods is phenomenal and makes the story worth telling. As Burke points out in his English studies, these rare examples in history show that the only genius for government people have lies almost wholly in constitutional procedures and not in the voting processes exercised by the people.

A kind of revelation must be brought to the people of the nature of government. By some process other than the voting process—perhaps by handing down the tablets from the fiery mountain—the eternal principle of right and of government must be proclaimed. Some president or some dictator or even some constitutional convention may affirm these principles.

The people, because of the eternal verities of the principle and the desire to live by moral law, find ways of assenting. A supreme court may affirm these eternal principles and thus a nation may be launched for a period of time which will be willing to be governed by moral and natural laws as programed by the constitutional documents.

Thus it was in my study entitled "How Freedom Vanished in the Ancient World by Popular Vote":

How Freedom Vanished in the Ancient World By Popular Vote

(A study of how majority rule can be used to impose ruthless dictatorship from the earliest times to the Middle Ages, with an observation that the modern day forms of dictatorship (communism and socialism) are likewise imposed by popular vote.)

Interludes of freedom are short and far between.

About 500 years before the birth of Christ, Athens—then the center of the world's civilization—was rapidly falling into a severe depression.

To combat it, Pericles started what would today be called a PWA program. His public works program staggered the imagination. He began with the building of a great temple, called the Temple of Athena Nike. In 9 years he constructed the Parthenon, then art galleries and still more public buildings. Dams were built with PWA money, some wholly unnecessary. Along with all this was his own variety of giveaway programs: public housing, licenses, privileges, loans and contracts—plunder to the faithful voters and members of his political party. He himself dipped into the public treasury too.

All this made Pericles more and more popular. The people elected him Chief Strategos, a title roughly comparable to that of President of the United States. They elected him to this office 15 times. In so doing they violated what one historian called the most sacred tradition in the Constitution—the rotation tradition that had rigedly been observed and which was considered a bulwark against dictatorship. In fact, democracy under Pericles degenerated into liberty of the sovereign people to decide as Pericles thought best. And a majority approved.

The big PWA program brought jobs to a lot of people. Here are some of them, listed by the historian, Plutarch (Pericles, 12): "Carpenters, sculptors, cobblesmiths, stone masons, dyers, moulders of gold, painters, embroiderers, engravers, merchants, sailors, wheelrights, wagoners, drivers, rope makers, flax workers, leather cutters, road makers and miners."

According to the pattern that has come down to this date, Pericles asked for and got from the people all power concentrated into his hands. He could even decide the issue of war or peace. In the end he chose war, as nearly all governments do in the pinch of trouble, threatened resistance by the people, unemployment, and especially fading popularity of the leader. Pericles went to war with Sparta. Most of the experts now agree the disastrous Peloponnesian War was wholly unnecessary. Pericles thought it was. Sparta did not attack Greece. Greece—at the direction of Pericles—attacked Sparta. The Spartan king, Archidamus, did all in his power to prevent war. Neither he nor his countrymen wanted war.

In fact, Archidamus put up with all sorts of insults from Pericles rather than go to war. He received ambassadors from Pericles who taunted Sparta about her shortcomings in the Persian wars. When that didn't work, Pericles "cut inland Greek states off from an outlet to the sea by closing the port of Piraeus which they (the Spartans) had used for many years." He violated a 30-year peace pact by a belligerent act. Plutarch, the historian, said flatly that but for Pericles, the Spartan war could have been avoided.

The real reason for Pericles' decision to go to war was revealed in the plays of the great dramatist, Aristophanes, who said that since Pericles' power and popularity were fading, he saw war as the only way to bolster both.

But the gigantic PWA program of Pericles, and the war expenditures, "left the door open for one type of effective opposition." That was to promise more to the people in the way of government money.

Now take a look at the man who did that:

Cleon

Cleon was a shoe salesman. Like Huey Long, who sold mineral oil, Cleon managed to get around among a lot of people. When Cleon wasn't peddling shoes, he was a cobbler. He had a loud voice, was given to uncouth language. He decided maybe he could outpromise Pericles. So he went around promising the people better pay and shorter hours. The people began to listen to him. He offered more government spending than Pericles ever thought of. That they liked, too.

By this time Athens was in the second year of the war with Sparta, and since the war was unpopular, the prestige of Pericles was slipping. Cleon had support both from the rabble and those who honestly thought the war was a mistake. Although Pericles had taken over most of the democratic forms, he hadn't yet conquered the courts. And Cleon successfully accused Pericles of misappropriating public funds. That was the end of Pericles, and Cleon took over.

Cleon now had to make good. If he was going to keep up government spending, he had to get the money from somewhere. "Under his leadership," says one historian, "Athens extorted every penny she could from the vassal states remaining to her. This fund, augmented by wholesale confiscations of the property of wealthy people, was distributed as a dole to the people. For a short time the people realized higher doles and more leisure, but they were to discover that higher wages would not buy wealth that was not produced."

Cleon had no ethics. He looted the Athenian treasury without compunction. When it came time to submit the annual budget for a vote in the Ecclesia, he didn't submit it item by item, as Athens had once known in the days of democracy. He asked it be approved as a lump sum. Had debate been allowed, Cleon's thievery would have been exposed.

Meanwhile, he put more and more people on the public payroll. A vast bureaucracy was developed. Long after the war with Sparta, thousands were still on the public payroll. Only a feeble democracy survived. Demosthenes describes it "as overrun with salaried paupers."

When at last, in the third century before Christ, Phillip of Macedon destroyed what was left of Greek democracy, he found—as he stood at the gates of the once proud capital—"a hollow democracy in which the people were ground down by poverty and resigned to a spiritless dependence on the state for their daily crusts of bread. The Athenians had long since ceased to take pride in the glory of Athens or any courageous interest in defending free government."

It was the rise of big government, with its one and only policy—government spending—that ruined Athens. Today, as we lok on the ruins of the Parthenon, we should remember that those who choose to ignore the mistakes of history are condemned to repeat them.

Octavius

The next outstanding world figure to use the giveaway programs to get the vote through the forms of freedom was the successor to Julius Caesar. He was the Caesar Augustus (Octavius) referred to in the New Testament as emperor of Rome when Jesus of Nazareth was born. Like Pericles and the rapacious Cleon, he believed in government spending on a big scale. That means big government management and control, which means in turn destruction of individual invention and freedom of choice.

Julius Caesar himself, faced with economic crisis, had contrived to keep his popularity by a combination of (a) extraordinary political showmanship, and (b) a modest amount of government spending. Soon after he came into power in 49 B. C. he made free distributions of corn and oil and even money to the

populace and staged vast shows—wild beast hunts and gladiatorial contests—in every quarter of the city of Rome.

Likewise he stirred the imagination of the people by grandiose schemes, such as diverting the course of the Tiber, cutting up the Campus Martius into building sites, building a huge theater, establishing large libraries, piercing the Isthmus of Corinth, building a gigantic road over the Apennines, and the codification of all existing law.

But Caesar and his friends also conducted a wholesale pillage of public money under his eyes. In his climb to power he had not hesitated to bribe liberally. But before long he was running out of money. How was he to get more? He cast envious eyes on Parthia (Persia). Here were vast stores of all sorts of material wealth. If only he could conquer it. Plainly, it was the only way out.

So he set out to conquer Persia. Some of his rich friends, however, knew that if he came back with the plunder of Persia, he would be powerful enough also to plunder them. And Caesar was ambitious. So one of these friends (Brutus) assassinated him just as he was to leave on the Persian campaign.

No sooner was Caesar buried than the nation plunged into civil war, out of which emerged Octavius as the supreme leader. He had at his command a tremendous amount of war booty. War was the quickest way in ancient times of getting wealthy. Monopoly—by and with the consent of the dictator—was the second fastest way.

Octavius was not only the richest man in the Roman state but he made himself richer after the murder of Caesar by confiscating the estates of his political enemies. Besides, in Egypt he had captured all the treasure of Cleopatra, then believed to be the biggest single fortune in the world. The redistribution of wealth to his supporters and party members bought their votes in his time. These techniques that had been employed for 2,000 or 3,000 years before Karl Marx were simply modernized by him out of facts of history that were very old by his time.

As chief consul, Octavius observed all the outward forms of a constitutional dictatorship created with the consent of the people. He even continued the tradition of having two annually elected consuls, the other being his stooge. From 30 years before Christ to 27 years after his birth, Octavius ruled Rome; but 3 years before Jesus of Nazareth began His ministry, he took over a new office conferred on him by the senate, called the principate. The senate also gave him the complimentary title of Augustus, by which he is known chiefly in history. In his new office he ceased to go through the forms of running for office each year.

He was also elected by the senate pontifex maximus for life. That meant he was the chief priest of the Roman religion. Finally, he was voted the power to issue edicts, and so—for the first time in Roman history—we have government by edict.

By vote of the majority, he was also voted the power to convene the senate at his pleasure, to commend candidates for election to any post, to set aside the act of any magistrate.

Now, how did the citizens of Rome come to yield all these powers, in spite of the lessons of disaster following dictatorship? Did the people have any choice but to follow one dictator after another who could bump off the dictator before him, often by outpromising him?

First of all, as Ferrero notes in his Greatness and Decline of Rome (vol. IV, p. 163):

"To secure his hold of Rome and of the republic without any display of force or undue influence, he patiently worked to attach every social class to the new government, and these bonds were forged of golden chains, delicate and almost invisible, but, nonetheless, strong. Augustus laid down one of the essential principles for the future policy of the Empire—that expenditure should be wide and free at Rome and directed to the profit of every class."

Says Willis J. Ballinger in By Vote of the People (p. 117):

"Only a thoroughgoing reform of Roman capitalism, which would have been directed to releasing the productive powers of private business in the domestic market, could have made it possible for the Roman citizen to earn his living without being dependent on the state. * * * With a prodigal hand, he annulled all the state claims for back taxes * * * he paid the Roman municipalities for land seized from them in the civil war, distributing among them probably 300 million sesterces in hard cash. To the plebians of Rome, that dangerous and disorderly rabble of more than 250,000 men, he distributed 400 sesterces apiece. To his soldiers, who totaled some 250,000 men, he gave 1,000 sesterces apiece and, in addition, a plot of land."

While Octavius was playing Santa Claus in a big way, he further endeared himself to the voters by affirming his faith in Roman democracy. He even announced he had "handed over the republic to the control of the Senate and the people of Rome."

Now, he started a more ambitious public-works program than Julius Caesar ever dreamed of. He built roads and temples and public buildings on a vast scale. His personal fortune was so vast, derived from war booty and inheritance, that he could for a while delay the day when he had to increase taxes at Rome and on the barbarian tribes. But that day was to come. So great was his government spending program that he created in process one of the most powerful political machines ever known in the history of the world. But he did this, using all the forms and trappings of democracy.

All this government spending made him enormously popular. "The evidence," says Ballinger, "is convincing that Octavius was deeply venerated by the people, and that the people on more than one occasion petitioned him to become dictator. Indeed, in one instance, the masses threatened to burn down the Roman Senate if it did not make Octavius a dictator at once. * * * The gradual absorption of power was done by vote of the people. All during the emerging dictatorship, the Roman Assembly continued to exercise its two basic functions—the election of magistrates which, of course, included the Princeps, and the ratification of all laws. The transference of power was ratified step by step by the Roman Assembly. The conclusion is inescapable that, in the last analysis it was the Roman people who destroyed Roman democracy."

Thus under Octavius, Rome passes from the outward form of a republic to an empire and a long line of emperors.

The last and final step was to make Octavius' dictatorial powers hereditary. Thus Tiberius, Octavius' stepson, became his successor. The Roman Senate and Assembly voted to make Tiberius Princeps for life. That was the end of representative government in Rome.

In fact, the truth is that "under a literal rain of jobs, the people surrendered their sovereignty. But when dictatorship became fully established, the picture changed. The necessity no longer existed to court the people. They no longer had any power to surrender. Dictatorial government then changed its tune. It became thoroughly exploitive. The Roman people one day awoke to find that they no longer possessed civil rights and that their lives were at the mercy of the Emperor."

After Octavius came the deluge—government interference with business, with the individual, with the expression of public opinion. Paul Louis in Ancient Rome at Work (p. 21) describes how the state interfered with the marketing of oil, the conditions of carpentering, earthenware manufacture and of house paintings. So much so, adds this historian, that "the masses of people, broken under tyrannical legislation and plunged into incurable misery, did not even dream of emancipation."

Diocletian

Three hundred years after Octavius (284-305) came the Roman Emperor Diocletian, who outdid in state control anything his predecessors, both in the republic and empire, ever tried.

He not only fixed prices and regulated wages, but persecuted Christians in the bargain. The reason he did the latter was that they were the only ones he couldn't control. He wanted to revive the old Roman religion, and the church as an independent organization he looked upon as a menace to his authority.

"Diocletian," says Ballinger, "for all his purple toga and imperial dignity, sounds a good deal like the La Follettes and Bryans of our day. He excoriated the rich men of his era for stifling production and impoverishing the people as thoroughly as many liberal leaders of our own democracy have done."

But what did Diocletian do?

He decided that everything could be remedied, everything straightened out, if only he could fix wages and control prices. That would give a fair break to everybody. But how to do it? First, he must wipe out the last vestiges of local government. There was some local autonomy even under the empire. Clearly, that was bad. So he set to work to centralize all authority in Rome.

He set up a huge bureaucracy, entirely dependent on—guess whom?—the emperor. He filled the ancient capital with thousands upon thousands of civil servants. Everything had to be decided from Rome.

Like Octavius, he was enamoured of a public-works program. He adorned the city with numerous buildings, such as the Thermae, of which extensive remains are still standing.

But Diocletian made himself famous—one of the few Roman emperors to be remembered—by his effort to control prices and fix wages.

Never had the ancient world seen anything like it.

It has gone down in history as the imperial edict of 301 A. D.

The punishment fixed for violating the price-fixing edict was—death.

Pricefixing included cereals, wine, oil, meat, vegetables fruits, skins, leathers, furs, footgear, timber, carpets, and all clothing. There were maximum prices set in great detail for all these articles.

Wages were also controlled, ranging all the way from the wages of laborers to the fees for lawyers and doctors.

The effect of the price-fixing-wage-control edict was disastrous. Business was bound down in a maze of redtape. Trade came virtually to a standstill. The value of money was also rigidly controlled, adding to the confusion.

So many violations were alleged that Diocletian himself pardoned or exonerated many; the tribunes (courts) were clogged; nobody could make any sense out of what was going on. The price-fixing, wage-control attempt was limited to the eastern part of the empire. The law was on the books long after Diocletian died, but enforcement fell by the wayside, and finally fell into abeyance. Technically, it was on the books of the empire at least down to 403 A. D., but long before that it was recognized as impossible to enforce. It was the last and most ambitious attempt in the ancient world to control wages and fix prices. Yet the effort was bound to fail, just as the empire itself centuries later was bound to fall, not only from external assault but internal decay.

Cosmo, dictator of Florence (1434–64 A. D.)

Now we come to the most interesting story of all. No people in the history of the world loved freedom more than the people of Florence, an independent state on the Italian peninsula. They did not have a democracy, as we know it, nor even representative government. But they did love freedom, and they went to extraordinary lengths to safeguard it—but even Florence was taken in by a dictator who beguiled them with government spending—and the end, as usual, was ruin.

In fact, Cosmo founded a dictatorship which lasted 300 years. Yet the citizens of Florence thought they had done everything possible to prevent a dictator from rising.

Florence in the 13th century had a population of about 90,000, but only 4,000 or 4,500 could hold office. They included the merchants, learned lawyers, and great artists. Within this small circle was an intense love of political liberty and an ever-present dread of despotism. Now this small group appeared to have one purpose in common: that was to prevent the rise of a dictator.

To achieve this purpose, they wrote extracautious provisions into the constitution. Let us see how the constitution came about.

In the 11th century Florence was little more than a town in northern Italy. A feudal nobility owned most of the land. Gradually, however, the city of Florence expanded rapidly in 3 centuries, and the merchants—getting together in 7 guilds—wrested political power in the realm from the nobles, so that by the 13th century, the Florentine constitution was an extraordinary instrument of freedom.

By the 14th century, the people—that is, every male resident—had the right to approve or reject any change in the constitution. This did not mean that everybody could hold office in the state. They couldn't as these honors were limited to the merchants and the professions.

Whenever a change in the constitution was proposed, the government had to summon a gathering of the whole male resident population of Florence. Whatever change was proposed was to be carried out by a specially appointed commission. And the question would be put to the people whether such a commission should be appointed.

Thomas A. Trollope in his History of the Commonwealth of Florence (vol. 2) describes the Florentine Constitution and how jealously the merchants and professional class guarded the freedom of the people—for a while.

Instead of having a chief executive or president, they feared the centralization of power in one man, so the executive office or signory was composed of 36 members, with a presiding chairman called the gonfalonier.

Instead of having 1 attorney general, they had 12 attorneys, schooled in constitutional law.

To avoid having a legislature that might be pliant to the will of the executive office, even though the latter was composed of 36 members, the legislative power was split into three houses. Further to prevent the rise of a dictator, the constitution provided that all of the above-named officials were to rotate in office every 2 months.

But the Florentines carried their caution further:

Because they thought the commander in chief of the Florentine Army might become a military hero and thus become a dictator, they provided by law that he must be a foreigner, chosen annually, and thus not eligible for any civil office. Likewise, they provided that the chief of police and the minister of justice must be foreigners, appointed in a similar manner.

Finally, to prevent the rise of a political machine, the Florentine Constitution provided that officeholders (drawn from the special group hitherto mentioned) must be selected by lot. Thus, "the names of all citizens eligible for office were put into borse or purses. Citizens so eligible were business proprietors who were not in arrears in their taxes."

The historian, Trollope (vol. 2, p. 179) goes on to say:

"No people under heaven ever had so much faith in the virtue of haphazard * * * the names of all citizens should be put and drawn by chance for all offices of trust and power * * * for how else can we prevent our rulers from getting to be greater than we?

If we appoint the most able, his very ability will help him to put the yoke on our necks * * * we will trust no man. * * * Then, at all events, I am as likely to be king as you. And in order that every dog may have his day, and we may be all kings in our turn, we will reduce the term of office to 2 months. There surely can be no danger of a man making himself great in that time."

Now one would think, on the face of this, that it would have been impossible for a dictator to have arisen in Florence. The people had written extraordinary precautions into law against the possibility. But they reckoned without the cleverness and the government spending ideas of one Cosmo di Medici.

Cosmo—the people called him that—inherited, like Octavius in Rome, a great fortune. His father, Giovanni di Medici, had been one of Florence's richest bankers at a time when Florence was the banking center, or financial capital, of the world. The Florentine bankers in the 13th century loaned money even to the kings of England and of France. At this time Florence had 120 banking firms, each with branch offices all over Europe.

Cosmo's father had made the family name revered among most Florentines by leading a reform in the tax system, whereby the rich paid their fair share of taxes. On the death of his father, Cosmo fell heir to the leadership of the liberal party. There was the counterpart of the liberal and conservative party running all through this history.

There was a great difference between Cosmo and his father, however. Cosmo was ambitious. He saw dreams of personal power. To get it he remained in the background. Like Boss E. H. Crump of Memphis, he held no political office—for a while. Instead, he went around quietly paying up the tax arrears of citizens qualified to hold office. Next there were rumors that the borse or purse, from which officeholders were selected by lot, had been tampered with. The right names seemed to be coming up all the time. In fact, a blind beggar by the name of Benedetto "made himself rich by predicting what names would come out of the borse when a new signory was drawn."

In addition, Cosmo—still keeping in the background—lent money to influential men. It was not long before every important citizen in the commonwealth was indebted to him. His behind-the-scenes power got to great that the signory, not yet under his control, ordered him into exile.

Yet this did not face Cosmo. Even from exile he continued to dictate things. Within a year, however, a new signory, favorable to him, came into power and he was brought back into the city as a hero. The deft way he had manipulated "the selection by lot" of the signory now paid off. The members bent to his will. They summoned a parliamento of the people, and it granted him dictatorial power for 5 years!

Never had Florence seen anything like it. He had seduced the processes of free government by his money bags, and now he started on a spree of government spending.

He started what today would be called a WPA and PWA. He ventured on a gigantic public hearings and even churches.

He established his dictatorship in Florence in 1434. For 30 years he ruled with a despotic hand—so cruel that many murders were committed by his henchmen and no man was brought to justice for them.

The technical name of the Signory had been the Priors of Signory. He changed the name to Priors of Liberty. Why? Machiavelli amused all of Europe by explaining: "He did this so that the people might at least preserve the name of the thing they had lost."

Gradually, government spending increased, instead of lessened, and Florence sank from the foremost republic in the world to a tax-ridden tyranny. The people were abandoned to their poverty, the slums of Florence became models of filth and disease. For 300 years the dictatorship, initiated by Cosmo, continued until fell before the invading armies of a united Italy.

Significantly, however, Cosmo acquired his dictatorship by majority vote, and until he had firmly intrenched himself he appeased the masses by government spending until the people were finally reduced to incredible poverty. Yet never before had so many safeguards been thrown around republican government, all to no avail in the face of an ambitious man, greedy for power with his supporters and beneficiaries corrupting the voters by taking from those having the fewer votes and giving the proceeds to those with the greater number of votes.

We now move toward communism by majority vote, while observing all the forms of democracy.

A STUDY OF KARL MARX'S COMMUNIST MANIFESTO AND THE EXTENT OF ITS TRANSLATION INTO FACT IN THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

The Communist Manifesto was published in 1848. It is the official creed of the Communist Party. In 1948 the 100th Anniversary edition of this book was published. The following are the major goals in the modern giveaway programs already tested in history as sure to work and get the vote of a majority of the people, as set out in the official Communist Manifesto (pp. 32, 33, 34). We are all quite familiar with them. Most of the countries of the world have adopted the concepts, including the United States. It has adopted the principle of Marx but in some cases stopped short of Marx's total consummation of his goals. Having adopted the principles, how can we stop or reverse the course?

1. Abolition of property in land and application of all rents of land to public purposes.

How far has this happened in the United States of America?

To get an understanding of the answer, we must look at the traditional land policy of the Government. As Admiral Ben Moreell has pointed out, the early American policy was to get this land into the hands of private owners as quickly as possible. Sometimes it was given away, but always the idea was to get it into the hands of private owners, whether it be a railroad, a college, an individual homesteader, or others.

Now, however, the reverse is true. More and more land is being taken, for public purposes. So what has happened? One-fourth of all the land now in the confines of the continental United States is owned by the Federal Government.

Thus, the Federal Government owns 85 percent of Nevada, 71 percent of Utah, and 69 percent of Arizona. There isn't much land left to acquire west of the Mississippi and the trend is steadily upward.

2. A heavy, progressive or graduated income tax.

In this, our beloved country has out-Marxed Marx.

In 1894 a revenue bill was passed by Congress which provided for a graduated income tax (act of August 27, 1894).

The law was declared unconstitutional by the Supreme Court on April 8, 1895 (*Pollock*

v. Farmers Loan and Trust Co.). It was held invalid on the ground that the law imposed direct taxes, not apportioned among the States as required by the Constitution.

On February 25, 1913, the 16th amendment to the Constitution was adopted authorizing the imposition of income taxes without apportionment among the several States.

The tax, says Moreell, "was described by its proponents as a modest levy, with a normal rate of 1 percent on personal income up to $20,000, a surtax to a maximum of 6 percent of $500,000, and a flat corporate tax rate of 1 percent. The sole purpose, they said, was to produce revenue. When a Senator protested that the normal rate might some day rise to the confiscatory level of 10 percent, he was shouted down in derision."

Instead of 10 percent, the personal tax has risen to more than 90 percent in the highest brackets. The tax acts as a powerful brake on private capital, this making it easier for the Government to step in with public capital.

Take a specific illustration in line with the Marxian ideal of wrestling, by degree, all capital from the owners of private property. In 1951, says Moreell, "the total of the income-tax payments to the Federal Governmen by the largest company in each of the twenty largest industries was three times the total amount that was paid of the owners of the businesses. That is, for every dollar set aside for Federal taxes and dividends by these companies, 75 cents went to the Federal Government and 25 cents to the stockholders."

3. Abolition of all right of inheritance.

Not only has the inheritance tax taken as high as 75 percent of the grants in the highest brackets, but to this has been added the gift tax, something Marx never thought of.

When one of the Du Ponts died recently, leaving an estate of $75 million, a total of 75 percent of this was paid out to the Federal Government in inheritance taxes. This, too, is moving in the direction of the Marxian goal "to wrest, by degrees, all capital from the bourgeoisie."

To quote Moreell: "You may condone this action, saying 'Oh, well, there is plenty left,' but I speak here of a basic moral principle, the right to retain property."

4. Confiscation of the property of all emigrants and rebels.

American citizens of Japanese parents, who were suspected of possibly becoming rebels, were deprived of their property during World War II. When the war was over the Government compensated them for it at a fraction of what it was worth.

5. Centralization of credit in the hands of the State, by means of a national bank with State capital and an exclusive monopoly.

Already proposals are before the Congress, with the support of the New Dealers and Fair Dealers, to buy stock of the Federal Reserve bank and place title in the Government. Then all new Government money requirements, including those for retiring outstanding bond issues, would be met by delivering non-interest-bearing bonds to the banks, which "would establish corresponding credits on their books." Better than that: the United States variety of socialism issues interest-bearing Government bonds at 3 percent tax-exempt. For example, 3 percent public housing bonds in the hands of those in the 80 to 90 percent tax bracket is better for them than investments in 13 percent dividend stock. Thus public ownership thrives—private investment dies. Lenin said the surest way to destroy the capitalistic system is to destroy its currency. Government control of credit and interest rates is a movement in exactly the direction Marx had in mind.

6. Centralization of the means of communication and transport in the hands of the State.

Both the FCC and ICC have made a start in this direction. The railroads, for example, are not only sometimes taken over by the Government, but they are so strictly controlled they cannot, with propriety, be pointed to as examples of private ownership and operation. Add to this situation the heavy Federal subsidies to steamship lines, airlines, airports, bridges, etc., and we have the beginning of overall controls.

7. Extension of factories and instruments of production owned by the State, the bringing into cultivation of waste lands, and the improvement of the soil generally in accordance with a common plan.

Here we have a record of many manufacturing plants owned outright by the Federal Government. Then there is the entry of the Federal Government into the ownership and operation of electric powerplants. Federal ownership in this field (of plants already in operation) has reached 10.7 percent of the total, and by the end of 1955 it will be 15.4 percent. If State and local plants are added, the total is 23.8 percent.

In another field—synthetic rubber—in the first 6 months of 1952, Government-owned plants produced 62.3 percent of the Nation's consumption of new rubber.

8. Equal liability of all to labor. Establishment of industrial armies, especially for agriculture.

This one plank has not gained wide acceptance here, despite memories of the Works Progress Administration and the Civilian Conservation Corps. Yet the American Communist Party in 1921 advocated the closed shop as essential to the creation of a Red America.

Nor should the Temporary Industrial Disputes Settlement Act of May 26, 1946, recommended by President Truman, be forgotten. This empowered the President to draft workers and management into the Army. The House of Representatives, by overwhelming majority vote and under suspension of the rules, voted it 306 to 13. In the Senate, Senator Taft led the fight to eliminate the draft provisions, and was successful; the bill then was passed and died in conference. Said Taft at the time: "I wish to say that it seems to me that section 7 goes further toward Hitlerism, Stalinism and totalitarian government than any provision I have ever seen proposed in any measure."

9. Government planning in agriculture and industry.

We appear to have accepted the fundamentals of this plank. Proposals are now under consideration to force the decentralization of industry under the emergency powers of the Defense Production Act. Likewise we have the example of the Truman-sponsored Brannan plan, "a scheme to lock a large segment of agricultural production in the vise of bureaucratic controls." Rent, wage, and price control are commonly accepted policy.

10. Government-controlled schools.

The president of Harvard University recently advocated the abolition of all privately operated grade and secondary schools. In a recent Columbia University study, James Earle Russell reported: "The Federal Government in a typical year (1947) spent $500 million of the $1 billion it cost the colleges to operate—or 50 cents of every dollar." The report shows higher education has become a major concern of the Federal Government. The Supreme Court has already laid down the principle: "It is hardly lack of due process for the Government to regulate that which it subsidizes." How far off is regulation?

Observes Ben Moreell of these 10 planks: "We cannot imprison or shoot an idea. We can only study it and try to understand it. If the ideas we sponsor—knowingly or unknowingly—are Communist ideas, democracy will be of little help. It is just as much a Communist idea if the majority impose it upon a minority * * * as if it is done in the name of dictatorship."

Martin Van Buren (1837–41)

Like a breath of fresh air in a smoke-filled room was the philosophy expressed in the message of Martin Van Buren to Congress on September 7, 1837.

It came at the height of the first great depression to hit the United States. In it President Van Buren turned down suggestions, emanating from both parties, that he take the lead in a program of Government spending. Said the President to Congress:

"All communities are apt to look to the Government too much. Even in our country, where its power and duties are strictly limited, we are prone to do so—especially at periods of sudden distress and embarrassment. But this ought not to be.

"The framers of our Constitution, and the people who approved it with calm and sagacious deliberation, acted at the time on a sound principle. They wisely suggested that the less Government interferes with private pursuits the better for general prosperity. * * *

"It is not the Government's legitimate object to make men rich or to repair, by direct grants of money or legislation, losses not incurred in the public service. This would be substantially the use of the property of some for the benefit of others."

This philosophy, expressed by the President of the United States, raised a storm of objection in Congress, in both Houses, but the President stood his ground.

Daniel Webster professed to be shocked. Said Webster, addressing the Senate, "I confess this declaration [of the President] is to me quite astounding. And I cannot think but that—when it comes to be considered—it will be a shock to the country. This avowed disregard for the public distress on the ground of alleged want of power; this exclusive concern for the interest of Government and revenue—now for the first time drawn—between the interest of the Government and the people, must surely be regarded as commencing a new era in our politics."

The press echoed with Webster's denunciation, but suddenly support came to the President from a strange quarter. John C. Calhoun and his followers had all but withdrawn from the Democratic Party. Now, almost overnight, they returned. And Calhoun himself, although ill and hardly able to stand, took the floor of the Senate and alined himself squarely on the side of the President of the United States. Said Calhoun:

"I dread the doctor more than the disease itself. * * * I rely more on the growing crops, on the cotton, rice, and tobacco of the South, than all the projects and devices of the politicians. * * * We have arrived at a remarkable era in our history. The days of legislative and executive encroachment * * * and extravagant expenditures are past for the present. We are about to make a fresh start. I move off under the States-rights banner, and go in the direction in which I have long been so long moving."

A revolt against Van Buren's policy broke out in his own party, however, led by Nathaniel Talmadge, of New York, and William C. Rives, of Virginia. Nevertheless, the President was able to muster enough support, including Calhoun and his followers, to avert upset of his leadership.

And so we conclude, that where the Constitution has been torn down, the first step is to repair and reassert it. The way to do it is clear. Who will do it?

Retired President Judge W. Alfred Valentine of Wilkes-Barre Honored

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 11, 1958

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following:

JURISTS CITE VALENTINE AS INDIVIDUAL, JUDGE

Judges and lawyers from Luzerne County and throughout the State gathered last night at Hotel Sterling to honor retired president judge W. Alfred Valentine at the annual dinner of Wilkes-Barre Law and Library Association. An estimated 250 persons turned out to pay tribute to Judge Valentine, who recently retired after 29 years on the county bench.

Keynoting the testimonial event was President Judge John J. Aponick, who spoke on behalf of the court of common pleas. Outlining Judge Valentine's long career of service, Judge Aponick stated the retired judge "has made an indelible impression on the judicial history of our county."

Quoting Greek philosophy, Judge Aponick called attention to the four qualities a judge should possess as set forth by Socrates: "to hear courteously, to answer wisely, to consider soberly, and to decide impartially." Claiming he would add dignity as the fifth, the speaker said: "Judge Valentine possesses all of those five qualities to a high degree."

"From the time he walked into the courtroom and ascended the bench, there was an atmosphere of quiet dignity pervading the courtroom," Judge Aponick said. "All of those present had an instinctive feeling that here justice would be dispensed with kindness and impartiality," he added.

Terming Judge Valentine "a guiding force and an able adviser to the court en banc ever since he became president judge," the speaker declared: "During his 16 years as president judge, the spirit of good will and cooperation among the members of the court has never been greater."

"He loved the law for itself—not as a means of livelihood," Judge Aponick maintained, adding that "it was his very life."

Lauding Judge Valentine for "his infinite capacity for hard work" and "his remarkable memory," Judge Aponick called attention to the fact that for long periods of time Judge Valentine performed the major portion of the work of the entire court. Citing the retiring judge's term in juvenile court, the speaker said: "No one can ever know how many boys and girls he has saved from a life of crime by his wisdom and insight into character." He continued: "Only Almighty God knows all of the tremendous good he has done in guiding the wayward youth of this county into the paths of right."

Pointing out that Judge Valentine will be "gravely missed and his place will not be easily filled," Judge Aponick said: "Despite the reputation he has gained throughout the State as an able and conscientious judge, he has remained the same humble and unassuming person he always was."

"Looking back on Judge Valentine's career and my long association with him brings to mind the legend of Abou ben Adhem who received a visit from an angel who was writing in a book of gold," Judge Aponick said, adding, "Ben Ahdem asked the angel what he wrote, and the angel replied: 'The names of those who love the Lord,' Ben Adhem asked if his was one and the angel replied in the negative. Then Ben Adhem said: 'Write me down as one who loves his fellow men.' The next night the angel returned and displayed the names on the page, and Ben Adhem's name led all the rest.

"I believe we can draw a parallel to that in the career of Judge Valentine," the speaker stated. "His only aim was to be able to say: 'I have done my work, I have dispensed justice as I saw it, and I have tried to do the best I know how to my fellow men.'"

Judge Aponick concluded: "So when the book is finally closed and the great judges of Pennsylvania are set forth on the golden pages for all mankind to see, we may expect that, like Ben Adhem, lo, his name will lead all the rest."

Speaking for the superior court was President Judge Chester H. Rhodes, who praised Judge Valentine as "an individual devoted to serving the people of this Commonwealth" and as a judge who has carefully adhered to the role of judicial impartiality.

"He has set an outstanding example in the impartial administration of justice and has displayed great judicial ability in his work," Judge Rhodes said.

Following the speakers, Attorney J. Thirwall Griffith, president of the association, presented a portable television set to Judge Valentine.

Toastmaster of the affair was Attorney Joseph L. O'Donnell. Attorney John L. McDonald was chairman of the dinner event. Invocation was given by Rev. Jule Ayers, pastor of First Presbyterian Church. Benediction was given by Rt. Rev. Msgr. Francis A. Costello, of St. Mary's Church, Wilkes-Barre.

Senator Smathers and Inter-American Economic Solidarity

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT L. F. SIKES
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 25, 1958

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call the attention of the Members of the House of Representatives and the United States Senate to two editorials appearing in the Americas Daily for February 25 and February 28 concerning a speech made by my colleague and a Member of the United States Senate, the Honorable GEORGE A. SMATHERS, on inter-American affairs. At this crucial time in our history when it is so important that we in the United States promote a better understanding between our Government and the Latin American countries, I think Senator SMATHERS' speech merits serious consideration and study. The editorials are as follows:

[From the Americas Daily, Miami Springs, Fla., of February 25, 1958]

A SPEECH BY SENATOR SMATHERS

On February 17, 1958, GEORGE SMATHERS, the Senator from Florida, gave in the Senate a speech of historical importance which will establish an era in inter-American relations. He talked about the position of the United States concerning the Latin American Republics.

Senator SMATHERS lamented that, perhaps because of the proximity of neighbors, world and historical perspective are not given the problems of a region that already has a population of 183 million, compared with 172 million of the United States—a population which, by the end of the century, will have reached 500 million. The American Republics, just beginning to grow, have the greatest wealth in the world and, as in any growing process, it is during adolescence that support and help are required. Even during this growing up period, a country like Venezuela, for example, is her biggest customer in Latin America, and one of the leading in the world, followed by Mexico, Brazil, and others. Latin America absorbs 33 percent of the total United States exports; but, nevertheless, when it comes to aid, it seems there is scantiness because she is considered safe. While millions are scattered in other parts of the world, and the Senator does not object but rather applauds that aid, no steps are taken for a guaranteed trade between the Americas, with price stabilization, with enough investments, of private and public capital, with assurances that no restrictions or limitations will be set on the entry, of raw materials into the United States. He recalls that Latin American dependency on the United States market is enormous: Colombia, Mexico and Cuba sell two-thirds of their total exports to this country; whereas Peru's exports of lead and zinc to the United States represent 31 percent of her total foreign sales. Venezuela's oil, much attacked for its importation into the United States and representing 90 percent of total Venezuelan exports, is a product which in peacetime complements and, in times of emergency, history has demonstrated, Venezuela is the only foreign source there is from which to obtain this fuel. Is the United States, the Senator asks, buying just to buy? No, because each dollar paid for raw materials and other goods from Latin America returns to the United States to purchase articles manufactured throughout the length and breadth of each and every one of the States of the Union.

Senator SMATHERS, with the vision of a statesman, declares that "the solution of the economic problems of Latin America rests on more loans, a stable trade policy, and inducements to American private enterprise to invest in these countries on an increasingly larger scale." And then, he adds, "Inter-American economic problems have been explored to death in the last 5 years. But the United States has yet to come up with a bold plan to make the Hemisphere a real stronghold of the free world. Although we do not have a plan, we reject virtually all proposals made by Latin America for effective cooperation in inter-American affairs. I would agree that not all their proposals would be completely practical for us, but the point is—we are not coming up with any good alternatives."

Heretofore, the most favorable step taken has been the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act, enacted in 1934 and now a point of national policy; however, as we stated in a recent editorial, that act has never been in as much danger of perishing as it is now. It is not enough, although it is commendable by all means. Something permanent is required—that will prevent the Latin Americans from believing that, in economic affairs, they depend on the anguish of the United States: In times of emergency, in times of uneasiness, to buy everything, to induce them to change crops, paying rewarding prices, to intensify production of certain raw materials for which there will be no market when peace comes. Such a policy only results in that, in some countries, defensive measures now being taken appear as hostile to American trade.

What the Latin Americans require, in the words of Senator SMATHERS, is "to be assured of stable, consistent trade policies with the United States so they can plan for the years ahead without fear that our doors will be opened wide one moment, then summarily closed next. A swinging-door policy will do us no good in Latin America. We need long-range, consistent trade policies upon which we can all rely."

[From the Americas Daily, Miami Springs, Fla., of February 28, 1958]

SENATOR SMATHERS AND INTER-AMERICAN ECONOMIC SOLIDARITY

Recently we commented on the brilliant speech of Senator SMATHERS, a piece of oratory that, undoubtedly, will have repercussions in inter-American relations. Today, we wnat to point out another aspect of that speech, which will place it among the historic speeches made in the Senate of the United States.

Senator SMATHERS stated: "Most of us have a shallow understanding of the civilization that lies to the south. In reality, Latin America consists of a group of states firmly devoted to principles that the United States seeks to uphold. Down through the years they have struggled valiantly to promote democratic principles." An honest statement, worthy of being taken into consideration; because perhaps the enormity and the universality of this country, causes that in some instances its glance be limited to domestic affairs; and when some outside phenomenon does not agree with the habits he has had from childhood, the average American necessarily becomes confused and does not understand that in other areas there is a different way of reacting to life. Evolution, education, and economic improvement through the industrialization process now making headway in Latin America, will cause the principles of formal democracy to be strengthened in some nations, since there is in all nations a deep sense of human democracy.

In effect, it is through the creation of an economically healthy middle class, through improved living conditions for the people, and through solidarity in economic affairs throughout the hemisphere, that some nations which have not yet reached the development goal we all desire, will reach that level which will permit economic and political stability. In this respect, Senator SMATHERS makes it very clear, the United States has an enormous responsibility, which is that of saving our own continent from the danger of economic penetration by international communism—which penetration would mean an advance in their world domination and an attack against the United States. About this, Senator SMATHERS said: "Herein lies the danger. Our mutual enemies, the Communists, seized upon the fierce longing of our neighbors for more rapid fulfillment of their aspirations. With deceptive promises, the Communists are seeking to infiltrate Latin America both economically and politically." And, as an admonition for the future, he adds: "It is self-defeating for the United States to be exerting itself economically and financially toward other more distant areas of the world if at the same time we do not render the type of assistance needed and asked for by our neighbors in our own hemisphere. We cannot say that we need not help Latin America because Europe, the Middle East, and the Far East are the immediate danger areas in the cold war. The fact is that any Soviet penetration in Latin America could do us incalculable harm."

Political solidarity within the inter-American system having been achieved, the job should be crowned with continental economic solidarity. Blessed be America which has the Organization of American States which has made possible a peaceful coexistence among the States in a climate of respect, understanding, and mutual aid in political affairs. However, the moment has arrived for that political solidarity to be completed with an economic solidarity, as is contained in the spirit of Senator SMATHERS' speech.

If in the previous century, Henry Clay, in the Senate of the United States, took it upon himself to have the United States recognize the political independence of the Hispanic-American nations in their fight for freedom, on February 17, 1958, GEORGE SMATHERS asked that this be complemented by the proclamation of economic solidarity in the Western Hemisphere.

Infighting

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEON H. GAVIN
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 26, 1958

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Army Times of March 8, 1958:

INFIGHTING

Assistant Navy Secretary for Air Garrison Norton told a congressional hearing recently that the Army's Jupiter-C missile, which put the Explorer satellite into orbit, was "very, very expensive and rather inefficient." Well, let's see:

As this was written, the Navy's Vanguard project had yet to get off the firing pad at Cape Canaveral. (Oh, it chugged skyward 2 feet one time before toppling, and again it got up to several hundred feet before breaking in two.) Yet the schedule, which looks more optimistic every day, calls for Vanguard eventually to put six 20-inch spheres into orbit.

If Vanguard ever fulfills itself, those little moons will have cost you taxpayers $18.3 million each. And what you'll have at the end will be strictly magnolia (to quote the old song), for there is no practical use for the Vanguard missile as a weapon: it is too fantastically complex.

The other side of the coin: Jupiter-C was built and paid for as a tool in the development of the intermediate range ballistic missile, Jupiter. For similar purposes in developing the Thor and Atlas, the Air Force had its X-17. So the use of Jupiter-C as a satellite-launching device (successful on its first try) came as a complete gift to all of you taxpayers. Its cost had been written off previously for military work. Its components—1 redstone and 15 sergeants, plus 4th-stage engineering—might have cost a million bucks. That takes care of the cost question.

We don't know how Mr. Norton defines efficiency, but this should be pertinent to the record: the Vanguard project is 2½ years old. When Explorer went into orbit it was less than 3 months old as a satellite project.

Further, but for the rockheadedness of a lot of people in the Defense Department and the administration, the Army could have saved millions of dollars and American prestige by launching a 5-pound satellite on September 20, 1956. That was the day a 4-stage Jupiter-C reentry test missile flew 3,300 miles over the Atlantic. Unfortunately, its last stage rocket and satellite had been replaced by dummies on orders from the Pentagon. This was done to prevent the Army from making an unauthorized satellite launching.

Now, once again, the Army faces a highly speculative future in the satellite field. It must still pool its vehicles and its projects with those of the Navy and the Air Force—and hope that the people in control do not make the same error as was made in 1954, when Vanguard got the green light over the Army's project Orbiter.

The outlook becomes less than hopeful when it is realized that the sort of opposition voiced by Mr. Norton is not confined to 1 service or 1 group of interests. The Air Force Secretary, James H. Douglas, has already hinted to Congress that formation of Jupiter missile squadrons for service in allied countries should be reduced while that of Thor squadrons is expanded. He has figures proving that this would cut costs in half. It is understood that an extension of his plan would result not only in the curtailment of Jupiter production but in stopping it altogether.

A similar argument had previously been advanced in trying to gain priority for the Air Force's Minuteman project over the Navy's Polaris. We can anticipate the same kind of infighting in the Thor-Jupiter controversy.

Construction of Armories, Training Centers, and Other Facilities—Resolution

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OVERTON BROOKS
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 3, 1958

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD I include therewith a resolution unanimously adopted by Subcommittee No. 1 of the Armed Services Committee, and approved by the full committee, concerning the construction of armories, training centers, and other facilities to accommodate and support the Reserve Forces of the Army, Navy, Air Force, and Marine Corps.

RESOLUTION 3, MARCH 5, 1958

Whereas Subcommittee No. 1 of the House Committee on Armed Services has had under consideration the program of the several military departments for the construction of armories, training centers, and other facilities to accommodate and support the Reserve Forces of the Army, Navy, and Air Force and Marine Corps; and

Whereas in August of 1957 the Secretary of Defense imposed on each of the military departments a limit on the rate of expenditures, which limit necessitated the curtailment of many programs, including the construction of Reserve facilities, by each of the military departments; and

Whereas the construction of all Reserve facilities now authorized would still fail to meet the facilities requirements of our Reserve Forces, and this would remain true even if the Army National Guard and United States Army Reserve were further reduced in strength in fiscal 1959; and

Whereas the several States have appropriated and have available for immediate obligation more funds than have been appropriated by the Federal Government for armory construction in those cases requiring matching funds by the several States; and

Whereas these appropriations will lapse in many of the States unless obligated before the expiration of this fiscal year; and

Whereas this situation is causing undue confusion and delay in the plans and programs of the several States: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That Subcommittee No. 1 recommends that the Department of Defense and the Bureau of the Budget be urged to immediately release to the military departments those funds heretofore appropriated for Reserve facilities construction which have been frozen under the expenditure limitation heretofore mentioned.

Labor Leaders' Views on Farmer-Labor Problems

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. VICTOR L. ANFUSO
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 11, 1958

Mr. ANFUSO. Mr. Speaker, I am in receipt of a copy of a letter addressed to Secretary of Agriculture Ezra Taft Benson by the Amalgamated Meat Cutters and Butcher Workmen of North America which I consider of vital interest. The letter, dated March 6, 1958, is signed by Thomas J. Lloyd, president of the union, and Patrick E. Gorman, secretary-treasurer.

In their letter to Mr. Benson, the two leaders of the amalgamated meat cutters and butchers make reference to his present and past views on certain farmer-labor problems, as expressed by the Secretary of Agriculture in speeches he made concerning wage gains and the standard of living of American workers. They call his attention to the role of the Fair Labor Standards Act and others in improving living conditions not only for labor but for all Americans, including the farmers.

Of particular interest is the following paragraph in the letter to Mr. Benson:

We also continuously said that the worker must have sufficient money to buy the food and fiber the farmer grows, and the farmer must have a sufficient income to buy the products workers make and sell. We believe this as firmly today as when you were attacking us. The desperate economic straits of the farmer and the continued annihilation of the family farm is of as much concern to us as the deepening industrial recession. In fact, one affects the other. One makes the other worse.

The two labor leaders conclude with a call for increasing the purchasing power of millions of Americans by extending the Fair Labor Standards Act to provide the $1 an hour minimum wage and the 40-hour workweek.

Mr. Speaker, I support the extension of this legislation from which millions will benefit, particularly the low-income families, and it will also serve as a boon to our sagging economy at this time. Under leave to extend my remarks, I am inserting into the RECORD the text of the letter to Secretary Benson, which reads as follows:

AMALGAMATED MEAT CUTTERS
AND BUTCHER WORKMEN
OF NORTH AMERICA, AFL–CIO,
Chicago, Ill., March 6, 1958.

The Honorable EZRA TAFT BENSON,
Secretary of Agriculture, United States Department of Agriculture, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. BENSON: After our union was invited to participate, two of our representatives attended the national food conference, held in Washington on Monday, February 24, 1958. We sent them to the conference because our union agrees with the stated objectives of the conference: the improvement of the American diet and the increase of American food consumption.

Our representatives called to our attention your speech to this conference. Although we cannot agree with all parts of the address, we were delighted to note the emphasis you put on the increased purchasing power of the American worker and the benefits this higher buying power bears for the farmer.

We are disappointed, however, that you failed to mention in your speech why workers have increased their purchasing power. The overwhelming credit must go to the trade-union movement which has done a tremendous job in raising the living standard of the American worker. The work and struggle of organized labor, not only in collective bargaining, but also in legislative programs to obtain such measures as the Fair Labor Standards Act and other basic welfare legislation, have benefited the entire Nation. This fight of the labor movement has not been a narrow one for selfish interests, but one which has made life more livable, more decent, more filled with dignity for all Americans.

We are glad to see that you have changed from your former attitude toward the wage gains of American workers. We recall that from 1955 to 1957, you continuously and falsely blamed the wage gains of workers for the farmers' economic plight. On one occasion, you specifically attacked the unions in the packinghouse industry, such as the Amalgamated Meat Cutters and Butcher Workmen, AFL–CIO. During this campaign of yours, our union answered by pointing out not only the falsity of your charge, but also of the invalidity of the figures you were using. But you kept on, nevertheless.

We showed that workers generally paid for their own increases through increased productivity and we emphasized, as you do now, although belatedly, that wage increases allow workers to purchase more food. We stated these increased purchases help the farmer.

We also continuously said that the worker must have sufficient money to buy the food and fiber the farmer grows, and the farmer must have a sufficient income to buy the products workers make and sell. We believe this as firmly today as when you were attacking us. The desperate economic straits of the farmer and the continued annihilation of the family farm is of as much concern to us as the deepening industrial recession. In fact, one affects the other. One makes the other worse.

Excessively low farm prices in relation to other segments of the economy, resulting in a depression in agriculture, drag the whole economy backward. We want prosperous family farms—not a feudal agriculture with little purchasing power for our products.

In your speech to the food conference, you also voice concern about the inability of millions of low-income families to buy sufficient amounts of food. You declared:

"But many families in low-income brackets are not getting proper food. * * * We still have a long way to go to bring all family diets up to the recommended nutritional goals. Three out of ten families surveyed in 1955, were short on calcium. Others were short on vitamins, minerals, and protein. And this study, remember, was based on the quantity and quality of foods entering the home."

We believe that the millions of Americans who are underfed must be helped both because human feeling and sympathy demand this and because added purchasing power is needed in the economy. We are, therefore, strongly backing legislation before the Congress to extend the Fair Labor Standards Act to some 6 million Americans now exempt from this law's provision. This legislation would provide these men and women with the $1 an hour minimum wage and the 40-hour workweek.

This legislation is not the total answer to the problems of America's poverty-stricken, underfed, and ill-housed, but it will help. We invite your support for this legislation as a means of helping both these low-income families and our Nation's farmers. The millions of men and women who would escape their worse-than-substandard wages by gaining the protection of the Fair Labor Standards Act would certainly use their additional income to buy the food and shelter they so desperately need. This would be a boon to the farmer by immensely increasing the purchase of food.

Very truly yours,

THOMAS J. LLOYD,
President.
PATRICK E. GORMAN,
Secretary-Treasurer.

The Position of the South on Race Relations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. F. EDWARD HÉBERT
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 11, 1958

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Speaker, it has been with difficulty that the South has been able to make its position clear on the very controversial race problem.

In order to get the South's position before our friends from the North, the Joint Legislative Committee of the State of Louisiana purchased a full-page advertisement in the New York Herald Tribune spelling out the South's position on the subject.

I think it most proper and most informative to bring this full-page advertisement to the attention of the Congress and therefore have obtained consent to reproduce the following full page here:

THE POSITION OF THE SOUTH ON
RACE RELATIONS

To the People of New York City:

Recent tragic events in the integrated schools of Washington, D. C., Kansas City, Little Rock, and your own New York City suggest that an accurate presentation of the views of southern people on the race question might receive sympathetic consideration in the North and might even contribute to the solution of a problem in which we are now all concerned.

A PROBLEM UNIQUE WITHIN OUR NATION

Here in the United States we are witnessing an unprecedented attempt by certain white and Negro leaders to force the Negro people of our country to abandon their own culture and mores, lose themselves physically and culturally within other races, and commit racial suicide.

Meanwhile, outside of the United States every dynamic racial group in the world pridefully promotes its own culture. In view of their examples, should we not look twice before we leap?

In looking we do not propose here to review the influences behind the integration movement. (For detailed analysis of a major influence we recommend that you review Subversion in Racial Unrest, a documented study recently released by this committee.) Rather, let us here consider the logic of the movement and its ultimate effect on a country that we all love and cherish.

THE AMERICAN MAJORITY: A BLEND OF HOMOGENEOUS PEOPLES

You may ask: Doesn't this great country of ours represent a melting pot of different races? From a scientific standpoint, the answer is an unequivocal—No.

The vast majority of this Nation represents a blending of like peoples of common European ancestry, rather than a mixing of divergent races. But the energy and vitality which made America a great Nation arose neither from racial self-idolatry nor racial suicide—it was an outgrowth of a passionate love of individual liberty, balanced by a sense of justice and individual responsibility which makes this liberty possible. On such a foundation, a new Nation was created, capable of winning and retaining the love and loyalty of peoples of different races, different cultures and different religions.

WHAT ABOUT THE AMERICAN NEGRO?

We in the South think of our colored friends as Negro Americans, rather than as American Negroes. The normally cordial relationships between southern white and colored people are regulated by a set of conventions or customs, the product of years of experiment and experience in adjusting to a biracial society.

RACIAL PATTERNS—A COMMUNITY MATTER

These customs vary widely from State to State and indeed from community to community. Until May 17, 1954, each community in the South was a laboratory in which many of these customs were being constantly examined and revised to meet changing conditions. Each community adapted itself to the problems which confronted it.

It is significant that all of the communities in the South and, indeed, many of the communities in the North, agreed that separation of the races in the fields of elementary and secondary education was essential.

THE SOLUTION NORTH AND SOUTH

This method of adjustment, which has been loosely referred to as segregation, enabled both the Negro and white people in the South to overcome the devastating effects of the War Between the States and pile up a record of progress second to none in history.

We believe it will, in practice, enable our northern friends to adjust themselves to the more than one-half of the Negroes in this country who will live in the North by 1980.

A DANGEROUS PARALLEL

Now we are told that this is all wrong—that each community must conform to one unvarying racial pattern—complete integration—prescribed and enforced by a central governmental authority. But, the disastrous results of this policy are causing Americans to ask themselves: Is forced racial integration the answer?

At one time the belief was prevalent that all must attend the same church to prosper in the next world, as well as in this one. Many futile attempts of powerful groups in Europe to force their religious views on others only succeeded in dividing the continent into hostile camps. Ghastly wars and senseless massacres occurred in the conflicts over the rights of mankind to individuality, this time in the field of religion.

Today peoples of different nations may attend different churches without degradation or psychological injury to their personalities. Indeed, no one questions the right of a great religion to prohibit nonmembers from participating in certain of its rituals or partaking of its sacraments. "Experience keeps a dear school, but fools will learn in no other."

THE BEACON OF THE FUTURE

The trend to differentiation, racial and religious, represents a natural law, as well as a basic human right. Any attempt to force a rigid conformity in such matters of human relations must inevitably result in a repetition of the deadly European pattern of religious conflict.

Upon the establishment of workable race relations hinges the very fate of our great country. In the Talmud is a saying to the effect that time may, in some situations, resolve problems which cannot be solved by human intelligence at the moment. Now is the hour for Americans of all races to heed the wisdom of this counsel.

The Joint Legislative Committee, State of Louisiana, Baton Rouge: Senator W. M. Rainach, Chairman; Representative E. W. Gravolet, Jr., Vice Chairman, Point-a-La-Hache, La.; Represenative Carroll L. Dupont, Houma, La.; Senator Louis H. Folse, Arabi, La.; Representative John S. Garrett, Haynesville, La.; Senator H. W. Jones, Minden, La.; Representative Ford E. Stinson, Secretary, Benton, La.; Representative L. D. Napper, Ruston, La.; Senator B. R. Patton, Parmerville, La.; Senator Alvin T. Stumpf, Gretna, La.; W. M. Shaw, General Counsel, Homer, La.

Ninetieth Anniversary of the Miners National Bank of Wilkes-Barre

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 11, 1958

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following:

MINERS BANK 90TH YEAR

This is the 90th anniversary year of the Miners National Bank of Wilkes-Barre. It obtained its charter on February 13, 1868, and on July 9 of that year occupied its first home at what was then No. 107 Franklin Street and later No. 2 South Franklin Street. The building, since torn down, was situated on part of the site of the present Miners Bank Building.

The bank has grown until it is the largest in Wyoming Valley and the second largest in Northeastern Pennsylvania. Some of the more rapid growth of the bank has come in recent years as is evidenced by the existence of five branches in addition to the home institution.

In 1918, when the Miners Bank was celebrating the first half century of its existence, an exceedingly interesting history of the institution, written by Oscar Jewell Harvey, was published by the board of directors. In the succeeding 40 years, the Miners Bank has acquired a total of 7 other banks—the Luzerne County National in 1923, Wyoming Valley Trust Company in 1931, South Side Bank and Trust Company in 1932, the First National Bank of Nanticoke and the Miners National Bank of Nanticoke in 1952, the First National Bank of Dallas in 1953, the First National Bank of Ashley in 1957 with its branch at Mountaintop.

In an announcement today marking the anniversary, the Miners Bank expresses a hope that its friends will not think of the institution as bricks and mortar but as people. In view of the fact that its personnel has shared in a large measure in the responsibilities of community leadership, this concept of the Miners Bank family is readily acceptable. From one generation to another during the entire existence of the bank, officers and other members of the staff have responded readily and fruitfully to calls for community service. Therefore, the anniversary can be considered as something not restricted to the institution. It is a matter for proper notice by the people of Wilkes-Barre and its environs.

Originally the bank was called the Miners Savings Bank of Wilkes-Barre, and by majoring on savings accounts, the bank has from the beginning lived up to that name. Today about 60 percent of the deposits of this institution are in savings accounts.

Politics: A Job for Every Citizen

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KENNETH B. KEATING

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 25, 1958

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, the American system depends on the active participation of each and every citizen in operation of his government. An informed and interested citizenry is the only way in which this system will work at its best.

Unfortunately, all too often we have witnessed the spectacle of large numbers of Americans staying away from the polls and failing to exercise most directly their voice in the choosing of those who make the laws. All too often, it becomes a real task to get qualified citizens to serve their communities and our great political parties.

More than ever, people seem to be completely engrossed in their own affairs and occupied with the many demands of modern living. That is quite understandable from the individual point of view, but if our democracy is to retain its validity and achieve its maximum goals, there must be a revival of interest in all fields of public service. There must be a quickened interest in the day to day workings of our Government and of our political parties. Only in that way can our system become as responsive and responsible as possible to the will of the people.

A most important aspect of this revival of interest must be a renewed understanding and appreciation of this game we call politics. Of course, we're always hearing talk about politics being a dirty business, and so on. Actually, politics is no more dirty a business than people will allow it to become. If more people take a greater interest in politics, if more people become active participants in it, the level of performance will be raised and the public interest better served.

I like to think of politics as the job of every citizen. If that ideal is put into practice, we will have insurance that at every level of government there will be honest and capable effort, expressive of the popular will and the American ideal of freedom.

These thoughts and others have been expressed far more eloquently than I ever could by Mr. Paul Miller, the editor and publisher of the Rochester (N. Y.) Times-Union. In succinct fashion, Mr. Miller has set down his credo that politics is a job for every American. Because he speaks from a wealth of experience in the field of journalism and has a distinguished career in public service, his words bear listening to. So that a wider

audience may have the benefit of his thoughts, I insert his remarks at this point in the RECORD, under leave previously granted:

YOU SHOULD GET INTO POLITICS—IT'S A JOB FOR EACH OF US

(By Paul Miller)

Here's a resolution you and I could make with profit to our Nation, our community, and ourselves:

Take just one-half the time we now give to various clubs and causes, and to professional groups and conventions, and devote that time to politics.

Yes, politics. From the precinct level on up.

Most of us will battle snow, slush, and all the rest of it, to the annual dinner of a social or business club, or take the heart out of an entire week for a trade or professional group convention.

Yet, how many of the same busy diners and conventioners even know the ward or town leaders of their party, much less turn out for the small party meetings that in sum add up to the big ones?

It is vital that people who never dreamed of getting into politics before, realize now that there's little more important civic activity that could claim them.

Big government no longer is something we are just trying to head off. It's here. And it's here to stay for as far ahead as we can see. The best we can do is try to keep it in some bounds—not lose freedom here in the battle for survival and peace in the world.

A letter to your Congressman no longer is enough. An individual who cares must get in himself. How?

Start, if you will, by joining your ward or town political club. If you become an officer, you'll probably get on a ward or town political committee—fundamental legal organization of a political party. Or you may want to shoot for that directly, without joining a club.

In any case, get to know your ward or town leader. He can recommend you to the rest of his political committee, push you along. Soon, you can be in the middle of political effort with acceptance at secondary policy level a possibility from there.

A prominent businessman told me the other day:

"I have resolved to resign from a national industrialists' organization and half a dozen activities around here and give the time in grassroots politics instead. Never thought I'd come to it."

That may be an indication of a trend. Perhaps our whole popular concept of political activity is changing. It'd better. Whether we like it or not—and who does—there will be more and more government. It must have more and more working attention.

The Honorable John L. Lewis Honored

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 11, 1958

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following:

UNITED STATES WELSHMAN OF YEAR

In presenting a medallion to John Llewellyn Lewis as the American Welshman of the year, the Philadelphia Welsh Society paid an impressive tribute to the president of the United Mine Workers of America whose forebears had their roots deep in the soil of the old country. John Lewis would qualify as the American Welshman of any year, such is the eminence he has attained in his country.

Like so many individuals of Welsh extraction, Mr. Lewis carved a career out of mining. This was a natural outlet because mining was, and is, a principal means of livelihood for the people of Wales.

The Philadelphia Welsh Society dates back more than two centuries, holding these annual functions on St. David's Day while Greater Wilkes-Barre still was a wilderness, over which the Indians roamed. To be singled out by a group so long established is no small distinction in itself.

The Dam Business

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. AL ULLMAN

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 28, 1958

Mr. ULLMAN. Mr. Speaker, the decision of the Federal Power Commission to deny licenses for the construction of low dams at Mountain Sheep and Pleasant Valley was both a sound and a welcome determination from an Agency which has shown little previous concern for full development of our natural resources. Yet, the Commission's laudable decision was one of too little and too late at best, for it does nothing to rectify the damage done by earlier FPC decisions affecting the Snake River.

A recent editorial appearing in the Wallowa County Chieftain presents some clear thinking on this basic issue. I think these comments by Mr. Gwen Coffin, editor of the Chieftain, will be of interest to my colleagues:

THE DAM BUSINESS

An examination of the full opinion of the Federal Power Commission in denying licenses for the construction of dams at Mountain Sheep and Pleasant Valley reveals some matters which have received little publicity.

The Commission pins its entire case on the necessity of providing somewhere along the Columbia and Snake Rivers a minimum storage of water amounting to approximately 21 million acre-feet in order to limit the flow at The Dalles to 800,000 cubic feet per second. This was the firm recommendation of the Corps of Army Engineers in their master control plan.

The master control plan contemplated 2,300,000 feet of storage at Hells Canyon and did not recommend a dam at Nez Perce. However, when the FPC licensed three low dams in the Hells Canyon section of the Snake River only 1 million acre-feet of storage was provided, leaving 1,300,000 to be picked up somewhere beyond the Army engineers' recommended projects.

This is where the FPC got itself and everybody else in a jam. Having sacrificed this storage capacity at Hells Canyon they were forced into the position of having to pick it up somewhere else and the only place left was Nez Perce after all other sites and projects were figured. They could not approve another low dam, and certainly not two low dams at Mountain Sheep and Pleasant Valley and have the slightest chance of getting the total storage which the engineers demanded. Passing up the Army engineers' plan for a high dam in Hells Canyon put the FPC squarely on the spot.

Consequently the FPC could not license Mountain Sheep and Pleasant Valley with a storage of only 500,000 acre-feet. If they did, they recognized and admitted that they would have to authorize a high dam on the lower Salmon River (the lower canyon project) to get 1,560,000 acre-feet of storage there to meet the minimum storage requirements for this section of the Snake River area. But a high dam on the Salmon the FPC said, "would be subject to the same disadvantages with respect to the fish runs as Nez Perce without the advantages (power, control of the Imnaha, and additional storage) of the latter project."

The FPC also pointed out that the Mountain Sheep and Pleasant Valley projects would develop only 1,002,000 kilowatts at the site compared with 1,672,000 kilowatts for Nez Perce and said that in addition to the at-site generation Nez Perce, because of its greater water storage capacity, would confer substantially greater benefits with respect to the generation of power at downstream projects than would the Mountain Sheep-Pleasant Valley projects.

The FPC recognized the objections of the commercial fish industry and the sportsmen to a high dam below the Salmon and Imnaha at Nez Perce. However, they are of the opinion that ladders, lifts, and locks can move the fish upstream past the dam and they believe that methods will be devised to move the fingerlings downstream past the dams. The most promising method, the Commission said, is "to provide that the intakes to the generating units be located far below the surface of the water so that the downstream migrants will not be drawn into the turbines." A skimmers device would be used to operate near the surface of the pool and draw a current which would attract the fingerlings. The fingerlings would be deposited in the tail race of the dam. The FPC said that the skimmer device was installed on the Pelton project on the Deschutes River and has been recommended by the Secretary of the Interior for the Brownlee project.

The FPC opinion also points out that 25 percent of the entire Columbia River salmon and steelhead production occurs in the Snake River Basin above the Nez Perce site, and the annual gross value of this fish production, including sport fishing, was placed at $5,250,000. However, the FPC points out that $1,050,000 of this amount is attributable to production above the Mountain Sheep site and would be subject to hazard even under the Mountain Sheep-Pleasant Valley plan. The FPC also points out that the cost of catching, processing, and marketing the fish should be deducted to arrive at any net value of fish which might be lost.

If all efforts to move fish over the Nez Perce Dam should fail completely the gross (not net) annual loss would be something over $4 million, which would probably not represent over a 1 percent return on the investment in the Nez Perce Dam. And it is hardly conceivable that the effort to move fish past the dam would not be at least partially successful.

It therefore appears that the hue and cry of the fish industry is based upon money values which are almost insignificant when compared with the hundreds of millions of dollars involved in the construction of a dam at Nez Perce and the many more hundreds of millions which would be involved in the resulting expansion of power and industry and the development of new jobs and new communities.

It is a pretty safe assumption that the Mountain Sheep-Pleasant Valley project is as dead as a dodo bird. The alternatives now along this section of the Snake River

are: (1) A high dam at Hells Canyon flooding out Brownlee; (2) a high dam at Pleasant Valley flooding out Hells Canyon; or (3) a high dam at Nez Perce. There will be no more low dams where high dams are feasible.

And the sad part of it all is that every argument against low dams at Mountain Sheep-Pleasant Valley is applicable against the three low dams planned by the Idaho Power Co. When these dams were authorized a high dam at Nez Perce became the inevitable result.

As pointed out in some quarters, a high dam at Hells Canyon, flooding out Brownlee, would still make money and be a good investment even if the Idaho Power Co. is paid in full. We could then go back to the master control plan of the Army engineers where we belong.

Subversive Peril Mounts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 11, 1958

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the first in a series of eight articles by the Honorable FRANCIS E. WALTER, of Pennsylvania, chairman, Committee on Un-American Activities. This article on the Communist Party apparatus in the United States appeared in the Philadelphia Inquirer:

UNITED STATES REDS BLOODY BUT UNBEATEN: SUBVERSIVE PERIL MOUNTS

(By Representative FRANCIS E. WALTER, of Pennsylvania, chairman, Committee on Un-American Activities)

When the Communist newspaper, the Daily Worker, suspended publication early this year, some Communist officials "admitted," with a suspiciously frank gloominess, that membership in the party had sunk as low as 8,000. Compared with the 25,000 members the Communist Party of the United States had boasted at its 16th national convention just 1 year ago, the present figure apparently marks a drastic decline in the party's prosperity. Compared with the 80,000 members who had joined the ranks in the depth of the depression of the 1930's, today's total seems to prove the Communist Party in America, for all practical purposes, has collapsed—and with it the danger of Red subversion in the United States.

The grim truth is just the opposite.

The past year has been one of the greatest periods of triumph for the Kremlin and its confederates throughout the free world. Within the United States, the Communist apparatus has evolved new implements of political conquest. These have found roots in, and have in turn contributed to, a dangerous climate of complacency which itself represents an acute threat to the very foundation of our security system.

The danger of communism is mounting—not receding. The United States remains the major target of Soviet aggression. Indifference to the Kremlin's avowed program of global conquest can lead only to the inevitable destruction of our free institutions and ourselves as a people.

It is not pleasant to state these conclusions. I would much prefer to report that the tide has turned against international communism and that the day of its dissolution is in sight. But I cannot do so.

Numerically, it is true, the membership of the Communist Party of the United States has declined. Partly, this is because many dilettantes have gradually left the fringes from which they had long gazed with starry-eyed credulity. A great deal of the "decline," however, is more apparent than real: Many party members have resigned—some with a great public fanfare—because it suits the party's purposes to have them go underground rather than to continue working as confessed Communists.

What Americans must never forget is this: Those remaining in the Communist apparatus comprise a hard core of revolutionaries who have consecrated themselves to accomplish the annihilation of our form of government. And, actually, there are half a dozen kinds of Communists.

First are the professionals, who may or may not be card-carrying party members. Then there is the concealed Communist, the sympathizer, the fellow traveler, the innocent who has been duped by the Communists and, finally, there is the opportunist. For every party member, there may be hundreds able and willing to do the party's work. Put another way, there are at this moment the equivalent of some 20 combat divisions of enemy troops on American soil, engaged in propaganda, espionage and subversion—troops that are loyal only to the Soviet Union.

During the past year a nationwide campaign of political subversion directed by the Communist Party and aided by numerous affiliate organizations, has spread throughout the United States, as a part of what may emerge as the most successful technique thus far devised by the Soviet apparatus in this country.

Into this campaign, the Kremlin has succeeded in enlisting, at a conservative estimate, more than a million Americans. Their participation has ranged from membership in the farflung network of Communist-front organizations to the signing of Communist-sponsored petitions and has included substantial financial contributions.

Let me make this clear: I do not say there are 1 million Communists in this country. Far from it. It is only fair to say that many of the persons who have taken part in this subversive campaign would be aghast if they understood the full import of their actions and if they appreciated the extent to which they had unwittingly benefited the Communist conspiracy.

The clear objective of this campaign is the destruction of the entire security system of the United States. More immediately, it seeks to cripple the antisubversive programs of the executive branch of the Government and of Congress.

It would do this in two ways: One, by shackling or abolishing the Committee on Un-American Activities; two, by discrediting the Federal Bureau of Investigation and its Director, J. Edgar Hoover.

This drive is best exemplified by the work of the so-called Emergency Civil Liberties Committee, which inaugurated its campaign against the FBI and the Un-American Activities Committee at a rally in Carnegie Hall, New York, just a few months ago.

One of the speakers was Dalton Trumbo, playwright and screen writer, a member of the notorious Hollywood ten who was convicted and sentenced for contempt of Congress in refusing to tell the Un-American Activities Committee whether he was a Communist.

Trumbo loudly vilified the committee, J. Edgar Hoover and the FBI and crudely derided a group of Hungarian patriots who were picketing the rally. His speech, and those of others, made clear the objectives of the campaign. Communists not only seek to destroy the House committee but to wreck completely the investigative powers of Congress in the field of subversive activities.

So far as our committee was concerned, the Communists not only admitted their goal—they boasted of it. Harvey O'Connor, chairman of the Emergency Civil Liberties Committee, hailed the New York rally as "historical, because it opens the abolition campaign against the House Committee on Un-American Activities."

O'Connor was identified as a member of the Communist Party by Benjamin Gitlow, a former secretary general of the party, as long ago as October 17, 1939. In addition, he has a long record of association with numerous Communist-front organizations.

His chief assistant, as vice chairman of the abolition drive, was Corliss Lamont, who for years has been one of the foremost apologists for the Soviet Union in the United States.

The O'Connor-Lamont outfit as I said, made no attempt to camouflage its determination to abolish the anti-Communist agencies of Congress but in its attacks on the Federal Bureau of Investigation it was slightly more subtle. Typical of its tactics was an advertisement which appeared in a few magazines, headed, "You and the FBI."

Avoiding a frontal attack, the committee cunningly suggests that FBI agents engage in tactics of intimidation against American citizens. Stripped of its Communist gibberish, the advertisement flatly advises Americans to ignore FBI investigators who may enlist their help in protecting the security of the United States.

"The FBI, unlike courts and grand juries, does not have the power of subpena and of compulsory examination," it declares. "You may decline an invitation to visit FBI agents or to receive them at your home or office."

Then, the advertisement goes on to suggest that G-men engage in political intimidation, like the brutal secret police who characterize every Communist state.

"Unfortunately," it continues with mock concern, "at the present time many FBI inquiries appear to be concerned with political associations rather than with obtaining facts for the constructive purposes of criminal investigation. The very nature of political inquiries means that many of the questions will be of the sort which no citizen is, or should be, required to answer.

"Finally, the use of investigative power by governmental agencies to intimidate or threaten is expressly forbidden by law. We suggest that you report any attempt at intimidation to the Emergency Civil Liberties Committee."

The effrontery of such an attack is obvious when one remembers that its intended victim, the FBI, is the agency which exposed such Communist enemies of the United States as Harry Gold, David Greenglass, and Ethel and Julius Rosenberg—all convicted atomic spies; Judith Coplon, a Justice Department employee convicted of passing secret information to a Soviet diplomat—but who escaped prison on a technicality.

In subsequent articles I will review these cases. They are well worth remembering—and all Americans should keep them in mind when they read such shabby, snide attacks on the FBI by Communist-directed organizations such as the one I have mentioned above.

Here I wish to discuss the Communist menace in more general terms. The Russians themselves have made one aspect of the peril clear enough, by the satellites they have sent soaring into space within the past few months. These present fresh evidence of Soviet Russia's technological progress, a progress made possible to a large degree by the penetration of our internal defenses by Soviet conspirators and their theft of some of our most vital military and scientific secrets.

Communist political subversion presents a danger to the American people equaling that

of Soviet satellites and long-range missiles. The U. S. S. R. would prefer to achieve its program without the physical destruction of its enemies; if the gates can be opened from within by dupes and Communist agents, overt aggression by the Soviet Union will obviously be unnecessary.

This would be the fulfillment of Lenin's prophecy, made at the inception of the international Communist empire:

"First," he said, "we will take Eastern Europe, then the masses of Asia, then we will encircle the United States, which will be the last bastion of capitalism. It will fall like an overripe fruit into our hands."

The Communist Party in America, since the death of Stalin, has lost considerable numerical membership. Nevertheless, the Communist leadership in the United States has proved itself equal to its assigned task. In a fundamental shift of tactics, their old cries of revolution and forcible overthrow of the Government have been muted and replaced by more subtle calls for "peaceful coexistence," "universal disarmament" and the like.

It is essential to remember, however, that the effectiveness of the Communist operation has nothing whatever to do with the size of the party. A compact, hard-core elite can be and is of greater value to the Kremlin than would be an unwieldy mass of undisciplined and various adherents.

As the normal party structure recedes from view, it is being replaced by a widespread undercover apparatus, duplicating—beneath the surface—all the mechanisms of Communist Party Activities: Printing and publishing Communist propaganda, formulating strategy, and leading the apparatus.

A few months ago, in a series of articles in the Inquirer, I related the exploits of the counterspy Borris Morros, who enabled this country to unmask agents of the international Soviet apparatus.

His story demonstrated, with new emphasis, the constant secret warfare of the Communist empire against the United States and its free world allies. The danger is heightened by the fact that it lies hidden from our view and stems in many cases from persons who would not ordinarily be suspected as agents of the Kremlin.

It is instructive that Morros himself, regarded by the Soviets as a key instrument of espionage in the West, had no affiliation with the Communist Party or any Communist fronts. This explains how anyone in such a capacity can swear under oath that he is not a Communist and never has been a Communist and yet can be important in the Soviet apparatus.

Col. William T. Roy

SPEECH
OF
HON. LEON H. GAVIN
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 4, 1958

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, my sincere congratulations on his birthday anniversary to my good and able friend, the distinguished Assistant Parliamentarian, Col. William T. Roy, who has so faithfully served us for the past 27 years in the House of Representatives.

Also, it is with deep regret that I note his retirement after his many years of public service in this body.

Bill has been a hard-working, conscientious public servant during his service here in the House—always ready with his great gift of understanding, experience and ability to be helpful in any way he could. His work has been outstanding, and he has earned and deserves the hearty commendations of the Members of the House for the excellence of his performance. He has turned in a magnificent record of which he can well be proud.

Bill has been my very good friend since my coming to Congress. We certainly will miss the fine companionship which we have enjoyed with him over the years. No matter what request was made of Bill, he was always greatly pleased when any little act or deed of his added to the happiness of any of us.

It is my sincere hope that Bill's health will greatly improve and that in his retirement he will find great happiness. My wish for him is that he will enjoy all the good things in life over the years ahead.

American, Rather Than Foreign, Aid

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHESTER E. MERROW
OF NEW HAMPSHIRE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 11, 1958

Mr. MERROW. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include therein the following editorial from the Somersworth Free Press, Somersworth, N. H., on March 6, 1958, entitled "American, Rather Than Foreign, Aid":

AMERICAN, RATHER THAN FOREIGN, AID

Congressman CHESTER MERROW makes a point on this question of so-called foreign aid which strikes a responsive chord with us. He says the term should better be American aid, because the dollars this country sends abroad are as much an investment in the security of this country as they are designed to strengthen the country to which they go.

We know it's popular to decry the use of American money abroad; we know it's almost no effort at all to talk about giveaways and of pouring dollars down ratholes. But we also know that the facts, for those who wish to examine them, show convincingly that the funds which Congress appropriates each year for the help of other peoples in other parts of the world are one of the best investments which this country makes toward keeping the cold war from getting hot and of putting off the day when American boys will have to go to war.

This subject of aid isn't just a matter of charity with this country; our motives aren't all altruism as some would have you believe. As example, of every one of those dollars that go abroad, 75 cents of it is spent right here in this country in the form of a purchase of an American product from an American businessman or farmer. Then the people who share in the program of foreign aid—this includes the people who grow the products or manufacture the equipment which is to be bought and sent overseas—represent a sizable number. That figure, to be exact, is 600,000 men and women.

Once that aid is overseas it performs a dual job. First it in many cases is employed by a country that, without the aid, would be a natural prey to the spreading scourge of communism. It is the shot in the arm to provide immunization against Red infiltration and eventual overthrow of western-oriented or neutral powers. In other instances, such as South Korea, the aid results in a direct tax saving to American citizens. It permits the arming of a native of that country at a cost of $302 to hold the position that an American soldier would otherwise be forced to hold at a cost to taxpayers near the $4,000 mark.

Perhaps there is no better evidence of the value of dollar aid to other countries than in the recent news that Russia has stepped up her economic assistance program and, indeed, in the past 2½ years has pledged and expended the largest share of $1.5 billion to 10 undeveloped nations. In that same period of time the United States had given those countries less than $1 billion. With this money the Russians have been building petroleum refineries in Syria, steel mills in India, and flour mills in Aghanistan.

Supporting a program of aid to other lands such as the foreign-aid program calls for, may seem to be a remote matter to folks who live in a small New Hampshire community such as ours. Actually, though, it isn't remote and the good which may result from it is the sort that could keep your son or loved one from again having to bear arms on a field of battle.

Volunteer Firemen's Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWIN H. MAY, JR.
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 6, 1958

Mr. MAY. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing a companion measure to H. R. 3406, introduced by my colleague, the gentleman from Indiana, F. JAY NIMTZ. This bill would authorize the Administrator of the Federal Properties and Administrative Services Act to donate surplus equipment and materials to volunteer fire fighting organizations throughout the country,

At present, such surplus equipment can be donated free of charge to educational and public health institutions. They are required to pay only the costs of care and handling.

Many small communities throughout our Nation depend solely upon volunteer fire departments for their protection. The task is admirably performed by dedicated men. There is always present, however, the struggle to raise funds for badly needed equipment; funds are often meager and the equipment insufficient. It would be difficult for me to think of more deserving recipients of Federal surplus property than the volunteer fire departments of the Nation, who would put this equipment to the direct use of saving lives and property. Inasmuch as I am a member of the Subcommittee on Donable Property of the House Government Operations Committee, I have become deeply interested and spent considerable time analyzing this proposed legislation. In my opinion, Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Indiana, Congressman NIMTZ, has performed a great service to the pepole with his bill designed to bolster the fire-fighting ability of our volunteer fire departments. I wish to support him strongly in his endeavor through the introduction of this companion measure.

Can We Control Slumps?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 4, 1958

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I commend to the attention of our colleagues the following scholarly survey of the policies available for preventing economic slumps. The article, by Prof. Roy Blough, appeared in the Saturday Review of January 18, 1958:

CAN WE CONTROL SLUMPS?

(By Roy Blough)

The year 1958 has opened with the level of business activity falling and the level of unemployment rising. For the third time since World War II the American public is wondering if we are headed for the kind of major depression that has followed most of our big wars. The major problem of economic instability during the past decade has been inflation, but we continue to be highly depression-conscious. It is well that we are, for in addition to its tragic domestic effects a major depression would be a major disaster in international politics. It would be an apparent fulfilment of Soviet prophecies and would come at a time when the international horizon is blacker than it has been for some years. Even a minor depression would be a blow to our efforts to keep uncommitted nations out of the Soviet orbit.

If we became bogged down in a major depression, a tremendous expansion of market demand for goods and services would be required to pull us out. The only likely source of such demand would be large-scale deficit spending by the Federal Government. There can be no serious doubt that the Government could pull us out of a depression if it undertook enough deficit spending. The experience of the war proved that. But large-scale deficit spending is something to be avoided if possible, for a variety of reasons.

Pulling the economy out of a major depression is a last resort but not an acceptable goal of national policy. Much more attractive is the accepted economic goal of this country, namely, economic stability with growth, that is, the simultaneous maintenance of high employment, stable prices, and continually rising levels of per capita production and consumption. It is also a more practical goal than pulling the economy out of a depression, just as it is more practical for a performer on a high wire to maintain his balance than to jump up again in case he falls off.

Maintaining economic stability with growth requires both broad powers and delicate balance. Only the Federal Government has the financial resources and universal coverage necessary to do the job, and even it must achieve a difficult combination of conditions.

First, the policymakers of Government must have available to them adequate measures for achieving high employment while keeping prices stable, and for maintaining economic stability without unduly checking economic growth.

Second, they must be able to determine when and with what force to apply such measures.

Third, they must have the will and courage to apply the necessary measures at the right time and with the correct force.

To what extent have these three conditions been met? Judged by results since the war, they have not been met perfectly. There have been inflations and deflations, and recently consumer prices have continued to rise even in the midst of a business decline. Nevertheless, the record must be judged a good one. War crises, not peacetime economic forces, generated the major price inflations, including the repressed inflation that broke out after markets were set free. The recessions of 1949 and 1953 were relatively short and mild. After 1951 there was a considerable period of overall price stability. Clearly, unless we have been enjoying fantastic luck, the necessary conditions must have been met in considerable degree.

It is by now widely recognized that the group of measures commonly referred to as fiscal policy and monetary policy are the main instruments for maintaining economic stability. Monetary policy acts by influencing the amount of private consumer and business demand; fiscal policy, in addition, compensates through changes in Government spending for changes in private demand.

The exercise of fiscal policy is carried out by varying upward and downward the amounts of Federal expenditures and of tax collections, whether automatically through the built-in stabilizers of some 20 governmental programs, or by legislative and, to a lesser extent, administrative action. The exercise of monetary policy, which is in the hands of the Federal Reserve System, under congressional authority, is carried out by varying the supply of bank money through adjusting rediscount rates and bank reserve ratios and through open market operations.

Fiscal policy and monetary policy are very powerful instruments, but they have their defects.

First, they are general controls applying to the whole economy and cannot be pinpointed to meet problems of particular sectors or geographical areas.

Second, fiscal and monetary policies involve time lags that interfere with their effective use. One kind of time lag is the interval that elapses after the need for action is recognized but before action is taken. This may be very short in the case of monetary policy; it is likely to be several months in the case of fiscal policy, especially when congressional action is required.

Another kind of time lag is the interval that elapses after action is taken but before the action has an impact on the economy. In the case of monetary policy this lag varies according to the sector of the economy, the stock market perhaps responding instantly while the home-building market may respond only after 6 months or more. In the case of fiscal policy even longer lags may be involved—as long as 2 or 3 years in the case of a public-works program. An antidepression public-works program might well come into full effect just in time to accelerate a lively inflation.

Third, fiscal and monetary policies have not demonstrated much effectiveness in dealing with cost-push inflation; that is, inflation initiated by the pushing up of wages more rapidly than the rise in productivity, and to a lesser extent by the raising of administered prices of materials and other cost items. Given a national attitude that apparently does not accept a substantial degree of unemployment, creeping cost-push inflation remains a problem.

Fourth, fiscal and monetary policies may not be powerful enough in themselves to maintain economic stability in the presence of strong shocks from the outside, such as hot or cold wars. Dealing with the impact of such shocks may require more drastic measures, such as price controls, wage controls, and rationing. Such measures are too wasteful in the resultant allocation of resources, too difficult to administer, and too restrictive of economic growth to be used except in periods of economic emergency. Less drastic measures, such as controls of installment credit and real-estate credit, are appropriate for use in more normal situations but are not now available except through new congressional action.

Despite their defects, which make the task of the economic stabilizer a difficult one, I believe the instruments available are reasonably adequate to avoid major instabilities that arise in the normal course of the operations of the national economy.

Let us turn to the second condition mentioned above; namely, that to achieve economic stability policymakers must be able to determine when and with what force to apply the various stabilization measures. Do we know enough about our highly complex economy to judge accurately what the economic situation is, and can we forecast well enough to determine when and how vigorously we should use the stabilizing instruments at our disposal?

There is no lack of personal competence. I believe it is only fair to say that the generality of the economists and statisticians in the Federal Government are highly competent, and have an integrity and devotion to the public interest of a very high order. They can advise policymakers on the use of stabilization measures, if anyone can.

There are two kinds of requirements for knowing when, and how forcefully, to apply monetary and fiscal policy. One requirement is adequate information about the ramifications of our highly complex economy. Today the information is far superior to what was available in 1929. A whole system of national economic accounts has been developed which greatly enlarges our grasp of the operation of the economy.

There still remain, however, many gaps in the information called for by this system of accounts. Many figures that are needed quarterly or more frequently are available only annually. The figures in some of the statistical series are unreliable because of inadequate sampling. These defects are due to lack of money. Congress, despite urging, has been niggardly in providing the relatively small amounts required.

The second kind of requirement is good forecasting. Even with the best of statistics, economic forecasting is likely to remain an art rather than becoming a science in the foreseeable future. There is no forecasting except by projecting past experience into the future, which requires a full understanding of past experience and assumes the continuity of past economic relationships into the future. The enormous complexity of the economy, the impact of overseas developments, the frequent occurrence of unpredictable events, the mass movement of public responses to such events, and the effect of forecasts on what actually happens, all add to the difficulties of forecasting.

The impossibility of making precise and continually reliable forecasts is regrettable but not fatal. Despite lapses, Government economists in the main continue to be close enough to the situation to chalk up a very acceptable record. We must not expect perfection. If we are satisfied with reasonable expectations, I believe knowledge is sufficient to permit the prevention of serious depression and serious inflation in the absence of very powerful forces outside the normal operation of the economy, such as war. Certainly, we are far better off in this respect than we were in 1929 and subsequent years.

There remains the question of whether our policymakers and the public whose support they require have the will and courage to carry out stabilizing policies.

We are clearly better off in this respect also than we were in 1929, at least with re-

spect to dealing with downward business movements. The public learned a good deal from the depression and was freed from some economic superstitions and inhibitions. If anything, it is prone to call for action that is not necessary.

Nevertheless, timely and vigorous action even to offset downward movements is not assured. Recovery always seems about to take place—"prosperity is just around the corner." Some persons in official life do not believe in fiscal policy; they do not accept deficits as a means of promoting recovery. Those who do accept fiscal policy regret giving up the balanced budget because of its symbolic power in promoting fiscal responsibility. Moreover, tax reductions, which are the most readily available fiscal policy measure, are virtually irreversible in practice; they must be used sparingly if they are not to contribute to future inflation.

This suggests the crux of the matter. Economic stabilization is a two-way street. If there is to be stimulation of the economy in recessions, there must be offsetting restrictions in inflation. If there are to be deficits in some years, there must be offsetting surpluses in others. Policymakers may be reluctant to take vigorous steps to stop downswings because they fear, with justification, that they will not have public support in halting inflationary movements, whether these are the results of excessive action to halt downward movements, or grow out of other developments within or outside the economy. Monetary policy has been applied with considerable skill and courage, but in the face of vigorous criticism. We have had notable lack of success in using fiscal policy to fight inflationary movements. The reasons are not hard to understand. Persons want prices to rise for what they sell, even while they protest inflation in general. Buyers as well as sellers are annoyed by restrictions on purchases that result from the tightening of credit. Escalation of prices and wages is built into many kinds of transactions, notably farm parity prices and wage agreements. Everyone is annoyed by tax increases. We have yet to see an increase in taxes adopted as an anti-inflationary measure at a time when the Treasury was anticipating a balanced budget or a surplus.

The Government is not well organized to achieve a unified policy to promote economic stability, even with the Council of Economic Advisers and the Congressional Joint Economic Committee. The various departments operate with a large measure of independence under congressional authority. Congress in turn lacks policy-unifying machinery strong enough to offset the fragmentation of policymaking among numerous legislative committees, each with its own objectives and public clientele.

My conclusions may be summarized briefly. The Federal Government can pull the country out of a major depression through deficit spending, but the far better and easier course is to prevent one by maintaining economic stability with growth. Our instruments for maintaining stability are not perfect but they are reasonably adequate. Our knowledge, our facts, and our ability to forecast are not perfect either, but they are not so deficient as to prevent effective action. The Federal Government has structural aspects that make unified stabilization policy difficult to achieve. This might delay action to meet developing recessions or inflations until a good deal of damage was done. The public support of antidepression measures is likely to be strong, but unless the complacency toward inflation can be replaced with effective support for anti-inflationary measures, our national policy of economic stability with growth faces troubled waters ahead.

Resolutions Memorializing Congress Against Certain Legislation Commonly Referred to as Right-To-Work Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 11, 1958

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include resolutions adopted by the General Court of Massachusetts on February 26, 1958.

RESOLUTIONS MEMORIALIZING CONGRESS AGAINST CERTAIN LEGISLATION COMMONLY REFERRED TO AS RIGHT-TO-WORK LEGISLATION

Resolved, That the General Court of Massachusetts respectfully urges the Congress of the United States not to enact any legislation relating to the right to work, so-called, or any similar legislation designed to prohibit closed shops or to provide that no employee shall as a condition of his employment be required to join a labor union, which proposed legislation will, if enacted, tend to undermine the strength of labor and of labor unions throughout the country; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of these resolutions be transmitted forthwith by the Secretary of the Commonwealth to the presiding officer of each branch of the Congress of the United States, and to each member thereof from this commonwealth.

House of Representatives, adopted, February 24, 1958.

LAWRENCE R. GROVE, *Clerk.*

Senate, adopted in concurrence, February 26, 1958.

IRVING N. HAYDEN, *Clerk.*

Attest:

EDWARD J. CRONIN,
Secretary of the Commonwealth.

New President of the Giants Despair Hill Climb Association

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 11, 1958

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following:

HILL CLIMB PRESIDENT

In the election of Dr. W. R. A. Boben to the presidency of the Giants Despair Hill Climb Association, the board has entrusted the leadership of the organization to a professional man with an impressive background of public service.

During the Second World War, Dr. Boben was a flight surgeon who was cited for heroism.

His peacetime activities, apart from his duties as a practitioner, have covered a wide range, including tours of duty as president or chairman of a half dozen bodies, evidence of his executive ability.

In drawing upon his experience, the Hill Climb Association is putting at the helm a man with many contacts who knows his way around the community and has demonstrated his willingness to share his time and talents in many worthy causes.

It is stimulating to have residents of the caliber of Dr. Boben put the public interest ahead of personal considerations.

More Signs of the Times: Farmers Going to Cities

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. COYA KNUTSON
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 6, 1958

Mrs. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, Letters continue to come in giving instances where trained farmers have been forced out of their occupation by present farm policies. Under unanimous consent I request permission to quote from another of these written me by a young man who had to quit his chosen occupation of farming:

FARGO, N. DAK.

DEAR CONGRESSWOMAN: First of all I wish to thank you for sending me a copy of the agriculture hearings at Fergus Falls. I wish I could have been there and testified also. I remember the time the hearings were at Moorhead when I testified. In my testimony I said that 13 farm boys in my high school class started farming after high school and that there were 3 still farming at that time (2 years ago). Well, Coya, now there are only two, as I quit farming a year ago too, and went to work with Farmers Union GTA.

This just goes to show the steady drain of the farm boys which leave the farm to go into something else, but into what are they going to find work? With close to 5 million people out of work. I too loved farming, but as a renter I could not see that borrowing money against my personal property year after year to operate was such a wise thing either. Certainly the farmer must get a break pretty soon.

Sincerely,

BILL WIGDAHL.

Soil Conservation Pays Dividends

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEON H. GAVIN
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 26, 1958

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Bethlehem, Pa., Leader-Vindicator of March 5, 1958:

SOIL CONSERVATION PAYS DIVIDENDS

Fitting indeed was the underscoring by our State department of agriculture of the fact that all Pennsylvania taxpayers benefit from soil conservation districts in one way or another.

It is a fact, tragically, too few realize.

Those in soil conservation districts—farmers themselves in some cases—all too often fail to realize the tremendous importance of soil conservation.

But in soil conservation not only farmers themselves are benefited—virtually everyone is benefited.

How come? Use Pennsylvania's highway system as an example.

Along a stretch of test highway in York County it was found that it cost the Commonwealth—that's you taxpayers—$116 a year to maintain 1,200 feet of highway where farmers did not practice soil conservation.

However, on another stretch of the same highway where erosion has been reduced through conservation practices, the cost of maintenance for the year was $9.

It's as simple as that.

Farmers themselves benefit. Their good soil is retained. Their farm property retains a high value. There are good crops.

Everyone else benefits. The water everyone uses is better, more plentiful, and less costly. Conservation is everywhere.

Even the lowly highways benefit.

Library Services Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. CHESTER E. MERROW

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 11, 1958

Mr. MERROW. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include therein an editorial from the New York Times, New York, N. Y., on Sunday, March 9, 1958, entitled "Library Services Act."

LIBRARY SERVICES ACT

In 1956 the Congress of the United States recognized the urgent need for public-library development when it adopted the Library Services Act. This law called for the expenditure of $7,500,000 a year for 5 years to enable the States and Territories to set up and develop public-library programs in the rural and sparsely populated areas of their States with funds supplied on a matching basis.

The first year's allotment was only $2,500,000 instead of the called-for $7,500,000. With only one-third of the allotment available many States started their programs with hopes that the following year would bring the full appropriation. Last year, after much discussion, only $5 million was allocated to this worthy educational purpose. This year the funds under the act have been reduced to $3 million.

Forty-eight States and Territories out of a possible 53 have started administering approved programs under the Library Services Act. Regional centers have been set up to broaden the base of library service which is needed to support the educational effort in rural areas. It is to the advantage of this country to see that all of its educational institutions work at maximum efficiency. Schools are only one facet of our educational system. The public library, frequently called the people's university is another important one. Unless the full appropriation of $7,500,000 is voted this and the next 2 years the existing State efforts to enlarge the educational plant of this country with needed libraries will be throttled on the verge of bringing the tools of information and education to 27 million people whose geographical location put them beyond the pale of such service in years before the act.

LAWS AND RULES FOR PUBLICATION OF THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

CODE OF LAWS OF THE UNITED STATES

TITLE 44, SECTION 181. CONGRESSIONAL RECORD; ARRANGEMENT, STYLE, CONTENTS, AND INDEXES.—The Joint Committee on Printing shall have control of the arrangement and style of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and while providing that it shall be substantially a verbatim report of proceedings shall take all needed action for the reduction of unnecessary bulk, and shall provide for the publication of an index of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD semimonthly during the sessions of Congress and at the close thereof. (Jan. 12, 1895, c. 23, § 13, 28 Stat. 603.)

TITLE 44, SECTION 182b. SAME; ILLUSTRATIONS, MAPS, DIAGRAMS.—No maps, diagrams, or illustrations may be inserted in the RECORD without the approval of the Joint Committee on Printing. (June 20, 1936, c. 630, § 2, 49 Stat. 1546.)

Pursuant to the foregoing statute and in order to provide for the prompt publication and delivery of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the Joint Committee on Printing has adopted the following rules, to which the attention of Senators, Representatives, and Delegates is respectfully invited:

1. *Arrangement of the daily Record.*—The Public Printer will arrange the contents of the daily RECORD as follows: First, the Senate proceedings; second, the House proceedings; third, the Appendix: *Provided*, That when the proceedings of the Senate are not received in time to follow this arrangement, the Public Printer may begin the RECORD with the House proceedings. The proceedings of each House and the Appendix shall each begin a new page, with appropriate headings centered thereon.

2. *Type and style.*—The Public Printer shall print the report of the proceedings and debates of the Senate and House of Representatives, as furnished by the Official Reporters of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, in 7½-point type; and all matter included in the remarks or speeches of Members of Congress, other than their own words, and all reports, documents, and other matter authorized to be inserted in the RECORD shall be printed in 6½-point type; and all rollcalls shall be printed in 6-point type. No italic or black type nor words in capitals or small capitals shall be used for emphasis or prominence; nor will unusual indentions be permitted. These restrictions do not apply to the printing of or quotations from historical, official, or legal documents or papers of which a literal reproduction is necessary.

3. *Return of manuscript.*—When manuscript is submitted to Members for revision it should be returned to the Government Printing Office not later than 9 o'clock p. m. in order to insure publication in the RECORD issued on the following morning; and if all of said manuscript is not furnished at the time specified, the Public Printer is authorized to withhold it from the RECORD for 1 day. In no case will a speech be printed in the RECORD of the day of its delivery if the manuscript is furnished later than 12 o'clock midnight.

4. *Tabular matter.*—The manuscript of speeches containing tabular statements to be published in the RECORD shall be in the hands of the Public Printer not later than 7 o'clock p. m., to insure publication the following morning.

5. *Proof furnished.*—Proofs of "leave to print" and advance speeches will not be furnished the day the manuscript is received but will be submitted the following day, whenever possible to do so without causing delay in the publication of the regular proceedings of Congress. Advance speeches shall be set in the RECORD style of type, and not more than six sets of proofs may be furnished to Members without charge.

6. *Notation of withheld remarks.*—If manuscript or proofs have not been returned in time for publication in the proceedings, the Public Printer will insert the words "Mr. ——— addressed the Senate (House or Committee). His remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix," and proceed with the printing of the RECORD.

7. *Thirty-day limit.*—The Public Printer shall not publish in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD any speech or extension of remarks which has been withheld for a period exceeding 30 calendar days from the date when its printing was authorized: *Provided*, That at the expiration of each session of Congress the time limit herein fixed shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee.

8. *Corrections.*—The permanent RECORD is made up for printing and binding 30 days after each daily publication is issued; therefore all corrections must be sent to the Public Printer within that time: *Provided*, That upon the final adjournment of each session of Congress the time limit shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee: *Provided further*, That no Member of Congress shall be entitled to make more than one revision. Any revision shall consist only of corrections of the original copy and shall not include deletions of correct material, substitutions for correct material, or additions of new subject matter.

9. The Public Printer shall not publish in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the full report or print of any committee or subcommittee when said report or print has been previously printed. This rule shall not be construed to apply to conference reports.

10. *Appendix to daily Record.*—When either House has granted leave to print (1) a speech not delivered in either House, (2) a newspaper or magazine article, or (3) any other matter not germane to the proceedings, the same shall be published in the Appendix except in cases of duplication. In such cases only the first item received in the Government Printing Office will be printed. This rule shall not apply to quotations which form part of a speech of a Member, or to an authorized extension of his own remarks: *Provided*, That no address, speech, or article delivered or released subsequently to the final adjournment of a session of Congress may be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

11. *Estimate of cost.*—No extraneous matter in excess of two pages in any one instance may be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD by a Member under leave to print or to extend his remarks unless the manuscript is accompanied by an estimate in writing from the Public Printer of the probable cost of publishing the same, which estimate of cost must be announced by the Member when such leave is requested; but this rule shall not apply to excerpts from letters, telegrams, or articles presented in connection with a speech delivered in the course of debate or to communications from State legislatures, addresses or articles by the President and the members of his Cabinet, the Vice President, or a Member of Congress. For the purposes of this regulation, any one article printed in two or more parts, with or without individual headings, shall be considered as a single extension and the two-page rule shall apply. The Public Printer or the Official Reporters of the House or Senate shall return to the Member of the respective House any matter submitted for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD which is in contravention of this paragraph.

12. *Official Reporters.*—The Official Reporters of each House shall indicate on the manuscript and prepare headings for all matter to be printed in the Appendix, and shall make suitable reference thereto at the proper place in the proceedings.

SENATORS WITH RESIDENCES IN WASHINGTON

OFFICE ADDRESS: Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.

[Streets northwest unless otherwise stated]

Vice President, Richard Nixon

Aiken, George D., *Vt.*—Carroll Arms
Allott, Gordon, *Colo.*—Cleveland House
Anderson, Clinton P., *N. Mex.*—6 Wesley Circle
Barrett, Frank A., *Wyo.*—The Woodner
Beall, J. Glenn, *Md.*
Bennett, Wallace F., *Utah.*
Bible, Alan, *Nev.*
Bricker, John W., *Ohio.*—The Mayflower
Bridges, Styles, *N. H.*
Bush, Prescott, *Conn.*
Butler, John Marshall, *Md.*
Byrd, Harry Flood, *Va.*—The Shoreham
Capehart, Homer E., *Ind.*—The Westchester
Carlson, Frank, *Kans.*—Sheraton-Park
Carroll, John A., *Colo.*
Case, Clifford P., *N. J.*
Case, Francis, *S. Dak.*—4635 Mass. Ave.
Chavez, Dennis, *N. Mex.*—3327 Cleveland Ave.
Church, Frank, *Idaho.*
Clark, Joseph S., *Pa.*
Cooper, John Sherman, *Ky.*
Cotton, Norris, *N. H.*
Curtis, Carl T., *Nebr.*
Dirksen, Everett M., *Ill.*
Douglas, Paul H., *Ill.*
Dworshak, Henry C., *Idaho.*
Eastland, James O., *Miss.*—5101 Macomb St.
Ellender, Allen J., *La.*
Ervin, Samuel J., Jr., *N. C.*
Flanders, Ralph E., *Vt.*
Frear, J. Allen, Jr., *Del.*
Fulbright, J. William, *Ark.*
Goldwater, Barry M., *Ariz.*
Gore, Albert, *Tenn.*
Green, Theodore Francis, *R. I.*—University Club
Hayden, Carl, *Ariz.*
Hennings, Thomas C., Jr., *Mo.*
Hickenlooper, Bourke B., *Iowa.*—5511 Cedar Parkway, Chevy Chase, Md.
Hill, Lister, *Ala.*
Hoblitzell, John D., Jr., *W. Va.*
Holland, Spessard L., *Fla.*—Sheraton-Park
Hruska, Roman L., *Nebr.*
Humphrey, Hubert H., *Minn.*
Ives, Irving M., *N. Y.*
Jackson, Henry M., *Wash.*
Javits, Jacob K., *N. Y.*
Jenner, William E., *Ind.*
Johnson, Lyndon B., *Tex.*
Johnston, Olin D., *S. C.*
Kefauver, Estes, *Tenn.*—4929 Hillbrook Lane
Kennedy, John F., *Mass.*
Kerr, Robert S., *Okla.*
Knowland, William F., *Calif.*
Kuchel, Thomas H., *Calif.*
Langer, William, *N. Dak.*—2101 Conn. Ave.
Lausche, Frank J., *Ohio.*
Long, Russell B., *La.*
McClellan, John L., *Ark.*
McNamara, Pat, *Mich.*
Magnuson, Warren G., *Wash.*—The Shoreham
Malone, George W., *Nev.*—The Mayflower
Mansfield, Mike, *Mont.*
Martin, Edward, *Pa.*
Martin, Thos. E., *Iowa.*—4545 Conn. Ave.
Monroney, A. S. Mike, *Okla.*
Morse, Wayne, *Oreg.*—5020 Lowell St.
Morton, Thruston B., *Ky.*
Mundt, Karl E., *S. Dak.*—122 Schotts Court NE.
Murray, James E., *Mont.*—The Shoreham
Neuberger, Richard L., *Oreg.*
O'Mahoney, Joseph C., *Wyo.*—Sheraton-Park
Pastore, John O., *R. I.*
Payne, Frederick G., *Maine.*
Potter, Charles E., *Mich.*
Proxmire, William E., *Wis.*
Purtell, William A., *Conn.*
Revercomb, Chapman, *W. Va.*
Robertson, A. Willis, *Va.*
Russell, Richard B., *Ga.*
Saltonstall, Leverett, *Mass.*—2320 Tracy Pl.
Schoeppel, Andrew F., *Kans.*
Scott, W. Kerr, *N. C.*
Smathers, George A., *Fla.*
Smith, H. Alexander, *N. J.*—Sheraton-Park
Smith, Margaret Chase, (Mrs.), *Maine.*
Sparkman, John J., *Ala.*—4928 Indian Lane
Stennis, John, *Miss.*
Symington, Stuart, *Mo.*
Talmadge, Herman E., *Ga.*
Thurmond, Strom, *S. C.*
Thye, Edward J., *Minn.*
Watkins, Arthur V., *Utah.*
Wiley, Alexander, *Wis.*—2122 Mass. Ave.
Williams, John J., *Del.*
Yarborough, Ralph W., *Tex.*
Young, Milton R., *N. Dak.*—Quebec House So.

OFFICERS OF THE SENATE

Secretary—Felton M. Johnston.
Chief Clerk—Emery L. Frazier.
Sergeant at Arms—Joseph C. Duke.
Secretary for the Majority—Robert G. Baker.
Secretary for the Minority—J. Mark Trice.
Chaplain—Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D.

STANDING COMMITTEES OF THE SENATE

Committee on Agriculture and Forestry

Messrs. Ellender (chairman), Johnston of South Carolina, Holland, Eastland, Humphrey, Scott, Symington, Talmadge, Aiken, Young, Thye, Hickenlooper, Mundt, Williams, and Schoeppel.

Committee on Appropriations

Messrs. Hayden (chairman), Russell, Chavez, Ellender, Hill, McClellan, Robertson, Magnuson, Holland, Stennis, Johnson of Texas, Pastore, Bridges, Saltonstall, Young, Knowland, Thye, Mundt, Mrs. Smith of Maine, Messrs. Dworshak, Dirksen, Potter, and Ives.

Committee on Armed Services

Messrs. Russell (chairman), Byrd, Johnson of Texas, Kefauver, Stennis, Symington, Jackson, Ervin, Saltonstall, Bridges, Flanders, Mrs. Smith of Maine, Messrs. Case of South Dakota, Bush, and Barrett.

Committee on Banking and Currency

Messrs. Fulbright (chairman), Robertson, Sparkman, Frear, Douglas, Monroney, Clark, Proxmire, Capehart, Bricker, Bennett, Bush, Beall, Payne, and Case of New Jersey.

Committee on the District of Columbia

Messrs. Bible (chairman), Morse, Frear, Clark, Proxmire, Beall, Morton, Javits, and Hoblitzell.

Committee on Finance

Messrs. Byrd (chairman), Kerr, Frear, Long, Smathers, Anderson, Douglas, Gore, Martin of Pennsylvania, Williams, Flanders, Malone, Carlson, Bennett, and Jenner.

Committee on Foreign Relations

Messrs. Green (chairman), Fulbright, Sparkman, Humphrey, Mansfield, Morse, Long, Kennedy, Wiley, Smith of New Jersey, Hickenlooper, Langer, Knowland, Aiken, and Capehart.

Committee on Government Operations

Messrs. McClellan (chairman), Jackson, Symington, Ervin, Humphrey, Thurmond, Lausche, Mundt, Mrs. Smith of Maine, Messrs. Martin of Iowa, Curtis, Revercomb, and Capehart.

Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs

Messrs. Murray (chairman), Anderson, Jackson, O'Mahoney, Bible, Neuberger, Carroll, Church, Malone, Watkins, Dworshak, Kuchel, Barrett, Goldwater, and Allott.

Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce

Messrs. Magnuson (chairman), Pastore, Monroney, Smathers, Bible, Thurmond, Lausche, Yarborough, Bricker, Schoeppel, Butler, Potter, Purtell, Payne, and Cotton.

Committee on the Judiciary

Messrs. Eastland (chairman), Kefauver, Johnston of South Carolina, Hennings, McClellan, O'Mahoney, Ervin, Carroll, Wiley, Langer, Jenner, Watkins, Dirksen, Butler, and Hruska.

Committee on Labor and Public Welfare

Messrs. Hill (chairman), Murray, Kennedy, McNamara, Morse, Thurmond, Yarborough, Smith of New Jersey, Ives, Purtell, Goldwater, Allott, and Cooper.

Committee on Post Office and Civil Service

Messrs. Johnston of South Carolina (chairman), Monroney, Scott, Neuberger, Church, Yarborough, Proxmire, Carlson, Jenner, Langer, Martin of Iowa, Morton, and Hoblitzell.

Committee on Public Works

Messrs. Chavez (chairman), Kerr, Gore, McNamara, Neuberger, Scott, Church, Martin, of Pennsylvania, Case of South Dakota, Kuchel, Cotton, Hruska, and Revercomb.

Committee on Rules and Administration

Messrs. Hennings (chairman), Hayden, Green, Mansfield, Talmadge, Curtis, Cooper, Javits, and Case of New Jersey.

UNITED STATES SUPREME COURT

Mr. Chief Justice Warren, of California, Hotel Sheraton-Park, Washington, D. C.
Mr. Justice Black, of Alabama, 619 S. Lee St., Alexandria, Va.
Mr. Justice Frankfurter, of Massachusetts, 3018 Dumbarton Ave.
Mr. Justice Douglas, of Washington, 4852 Hutchins Place.
Mr. Justice Burton, of Ohio, the Dodge.
Mr. Justice Clark, of Texas, 2101 Connecticut Ave.
Mr. Justice Harlan, of New York, 1677 31st St.
Mr. Justice Brennan, of New Jersey, 3037 Dumbarton Ave.
Mr. Justice Whittaker, of Missouri, 6920 32d St.

OFFICERS OF THE SUPREME COURT

Clerk—John T. Fey, 2931 Cathedral Ave.
Deputy Clerk—Edmund P. Cullinan, 4823 Reservoir Road.
Deputy Clerk—Richard J. Blanchard, 427 St. Lawrence Drive, Silver Spring, Md.
Marshal—T. Perry Lippitt, 6004 Corbin Road.
Reporter—Walter Wyatt, 1702 Kalmia Rd.
Librarian—Helen Newman, 126 3d St. SE.

UNITED STATES JUDICIAL CIRCUITS

JUSTICES ASSIGNED

TERRITORY EMBRACED

District of Columbia: Mr. Chief Justice Warren. District of Columbia.

First judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Frankfurter. Maine, Massachusetts, New Hampshire, Puerto Rico, Rhode Island.

Second judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Harlan. Connecticut, New York, Vermont.

Third judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Brennan. Delaware, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Virgin Islands.

Fourth judicial circuit: Mr. Chief Justice Warren. Maryland, North Carolina, South Carolina, Virginia, West Virginia.

Fifth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Black. Alabama, Canal Zone, Florida, Georgia, Louisiana, Mississippi, Texas.

Sixth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Burton. Kentucky, Michigan, Ohio, Tennessee.

Seventh judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Clark. Illinois, Indiana, Wisconsin.

Eighth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Whittaker. Arkansas, Iowa, Minnesota, Missouri, Nebraska, North Dakota, South Dakota.

Ninth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Douglas. Alaska, Arizona, California, Idaho, Montana, Nevada, Oregon, Washington, Guam, Hawaii.

Tenth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Whittaker. Colorado, Kansas, New Mexico, Oklahoma, Utah, Wyoming.